

subjects he can argue fairly enough. Why, then, did he argue this case so unfairly? The answer is obvious. It was a question affecting the British people, and race prejudice immediately warped his judgment. Now I believe I am right in stating that Mr. Telang was the best educated native at the meeting. He is not inferior in attainments to any of those whom Lord Ripon calls the pick and cream of the native Civil Service. Probably his education was sounder, because there was no cramming in it. But, as soon as a question affecting the British people arises, his judgment is warped. What confidence can we then have in the judgment of educated natives in criminal trials in which a Briton is the accused? Nay rather, how greatly ought we to distrust them, seeing that their race-prejudice warps their judgment in matters which concern us, and causes them to bring all their intellectual power to bear upon the case in order to distort it in our disfavour.

It is clear, then, that the greater their intellectual power and the higher their education, the greater will be the danger of intrusting them with criminal jurisdiction over the British. What chance would a poor British artisan, his wife, or daughter, have of acquittal by such Magistrate, especially if the false charge against him or her is supported by cleverly concocted false evidence? Literally none, for before a word of evidence is given the Magistrate's judgment will be warped against them by race-prejudice.

BRITANNICUS.

June 6, 1883.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—Mr. Telang next accuses the *Times of India* of committing a literary fraud upon the public by publishing a letter purporting to be written by a Maratha, and so signed, "but whose nationality, from internal evidence, seems to be European and not Maratha." "As the *Times of India* not only allowed that accusation to pass unchallenged, but even praised the moderation of the principal speeches, of which this was one, all I can say is that I am sorry for it.

The speaker informs us that "Maratha" in his letter "says that natives are not fit and competent Judges of Europeans, because the native papers are writing about the cases of deaths of natives at the hands of Europeans as if they were all cases of deliberate murder, and the explanation of a ruptured spleen always untrue." He argues that as this view of the native papers has not been disavowed by educated natives, it indicates the state of their feelings towards Europeans and renders them unfit Judges for trying Europeans. The speaker then has the candour to say "Now I am not one of those who believe that the

explanation of the ruptured spleen is always untrue." At this statement the meeting laughed and applauded, though it did not appear at what they laughed unless it was that the jaunty air with which the words were spoken induced them to take the disclaimer for a joke. The speaker then added, "I have no doubt that in many cases it is true, and that the language of many of our native papers on the subject is exaggerated and without justification." This statement was not applauded, therefore we may justly conclude that the rest of the educated natives present agreed with the native papers, and not with the speaker, thus confirming the truth of "Maratha's" argument, which I must take to have been correctly stated by Mr. Telang, as I have not the paper in which the letter appeared to refer to. The speaker then said, "But having admitted that, I do not admit the correctness of "Maratha's" argument. I will not, however, analyse it now, but put another argument on the other side." I opine that "I will not" here must be taken to mean "I cannot." The argument which he puts on the other side is put for the purpose of a *reductio ad absurdum*. Let us see whether he succeeds. He said "We all know that many Europeans have spoken of the native communities in a way which means that they consider all of us, as a whole, a people given to perjury. This opinion publicly expressed by some of the members of the European community has not been disavowed by others. And therefore, according to 'Maratha's' logic, the true conclusion to be derived from this is that Europeans are not fit Judges for natives." At this the educated portion of the meeting cheered, thereby showing that they approved of the argument. I will not imitate Mr. Telang, for I will analyse his argument. I will premise, however, by denying that any of us have said that all natives, without exception, are perjurers. All that has been said is, that mendacity and perjury are rife among them. I wonder at a Barrister of Mr. Telang's attainments not being able to see how fatal it was to his argument to misrepresent the statements of the parties against whom he was arguing. "Maratha's" conclusion is drawn from premises which Mr. Telang admitted to be true. Shortly stated his premises are as follow:—Native papers are in the habit of falsely accusing Europeans of murdering natives. Educated natives allow these false statements to pass unchallenged, therefore they tacitly approve of their being made, though they know them, as Mr. Telang admitted he did, to be false. The conclusion which "Maratha" draws from this is that educated natives having, by their silence, supported false charges against Europeans, are not fit to be trusted with criminal jurisdiction over them. Mr. Telang's premises are that many Europeans have spoken

of all the natives, as a whole, as a people given to perjury. He does not say, "falsely accused," because he knows that against any denial of the truth of what we did say, namely that perjury and mendacity are rife among the natives of India, there are arrayed the decisions of the Privy Council of the late Supreme and the present High Courts, as well as the testimony of Dr. Hunter quoted by me in a former letter, and of Trevelyan, Macaulay, and others, who had ample opportunity of judging, to say nothing of Mr. Telang's own experience as a barrister. But he says that Europeans do not disavow this opinion. How can they do so? Would it not be absurd on their parts to contradict the high authorities who have had the best means of forming an opinion on the subject? The conclusion which Mr. Telang drew from this fact, and which he, who knew better, asserted to be in accordance with "Maratha's" logic, was most illogical. It was couched in the following words:—"The true conclusion to be derived from this" (the fact of Europeans not contradicting the high authorities above referred to on the proneness of natives to perjury) "is that Europeans are not fit Judges for natives." I wonder Mr. Telang was not ashamed of using such an argument. It seems to me to have been an insult to the intellects of his hearers to use it to them. But I suppose Mr. Telang gauged the intelligence of his audience better than I have, and thought such an argument good enough for them, or he would not have used it. Mr. Telang having arrived at the false conclusion from false premises, that you cannot have European Judges, says, and "Maratha" has proved, allowing his argument to be sound, that you cannot have native Judges. How then is the administration of justice to be secured? The educated natives laughed at this, thereby showing their utter inability to see the fallacy of Mr. Telang's argument. The fact is, that, since Mr. Telang's conclusion drawn from false premises is necessarily false, you can have European Judges, and if "Maratha's" argument is sound, and we must take it to be so, at least against Mr. Telang and his audience, since he evaded analysing it, and they approved of his evasion, you cannot have native Judges, therefore all Judges, which term includes Magistrates, ought to be European.

Mr. Telang then concludes by assuring his audience as follows:—"We have a very good case, let us take it before the House of Commons." Nothing would please me better than to see it there, and to hear its fallacy fully exposed, as most assuredly it will be, if it is ever heard in that august assembly.

In the early part of his speech, Mr. Telang said, "Being appointed to serve on the Education Commission I had recently to spend a few months in Calcutta. And during the period of my stay there I came

into close, intimate, and frequent contact with the leaders of thought and the leaders in public affairs of the Bengali nation. And having frequently had frank communications with many of them, having thus seen them in a sort of mental undress, so to speak, I venture to affirm, and to affirm very confidently, that this hatred and hostility is a mere figment of some alarmist brain, and has no existence in reality." Mr. Telang is very venturesome. He ventured to say that he had satisfactorily answered the principal points of Sir Fitzjames Stephen's argument, though, being no fool, he must have known that he had not done so. He now ventures to affirm, and to affirm very confidently that the Bengalis feel no hostility towards us. He makes this affirmation with the proceedings of the Dacca meeting staring him in the face, and the scurrilous attacks of the Bengali native press upon the British people ringing in his ears. About the time, too, that he uttered that confident affirmation, there occurred, as if on purpose to contradict him, the shameful and mendacious attack made upon Mr. Justice Norris by Surendranath Banerjee, one of Lord Ripon's pick and cream, a leader of Bengali thought, and an Honorary Magistrate. In addition to that he was contradicted by the Bengali riot at the High Court of Calcutta, and the seditious conduct of the educated natives of Bengal in attempting to stir up the uneducated portion of the population against the British people, with the false cry that the sanctity of their idols is being interfered with. On placing these acts beside Mr. Telang's insolent and confident assertion that the hatred and hostility of the Bengalis to the British people is a mere figment of some alarmist brain, and has no existence in reality, I was strongly reminded of the following passage in Mr. Trevelyan's "Competition Wallah." "But, however deeply engrained in the Hindu nature are habits of mendacity, there is good ground for believing that those habits may be corrected or modified in time;" and I was led very greatly to fear that sufficient time had not yet been given to Mr. Telang.

It may be urged that the abuse, at present heaped upon the British people by the Bombay and Bengali native papers, is caused by the agitation about the obnoxious Bill. But the scurrilous abuse heaped upon the British people by a native paper at Poona a few years ago long before the obnoxious Bill was even thought of, cannot be excused on that ground, or explained upon any hypothesis but that of the hatred and hostility which educated natives entertain towards the British people. That paper, without provocation, mendaciously asserted of the British people that they are untrustworthy, liars, Shylocks, and devouring tigers; and that they possess none of the

essentials for friendship, or intimate communication, and that they are therefore so unfit to associate with natives, that, if they were to admit Englishmen to associate with them, they would cause the contagion to spread, and the natives would be ruined and ruined for ever. That base calumny remained uncontradicted by educated natives. The Government of Bombay endorsed it by its opinion in favour of the obnoxious Bill, and the Government of India has further endorsed it by declaring the British people ineligible for appointment in its statutory and uncovenanted Civil Services, as well as for admission into the Public Works Department, through the Roorkee College, and by trying to thrust us, our wives, and daughters under the feet of those hostile educated natives by means of its obnoxious Bill.

If further proof were needed of the hatred and hostility of the educated Bombay natives towards the British people, it would be amply furnished by their conduct in glorifying the murderous dakait Wassadeo Bulwant as a patriot and a martyr to his country's cause after he had been sentenced to transportation for life, though, as the able writer in the *Englishman's Weekly Journal* said on the 22nd November 1879, for the loss of life he had caused, he ought to have been hanged. "It never seemed," said the writer above referred to, "to strike these writers that it is rather a contradiction for a man to declaim in his diary about the woes of the people, and the poverty to which they had been reduced by the exactions of an alien Government and then to add to those woes and poverty by taking what little they possessed, to say nothing of wounding and illtreating them." Of course not, no statements strike them as contradictory, however, contradictory they may really be, which are vituperative and unjust towards the British people.

BRITANNICS.

June 8, 1883.

---

THE MEETING OF THE BOMBAY NATIVES—  
MR. VIZBHOKUNDASS-ATMARAM'S SPEECH.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—Mr. Vizbhokundass-Atmaram seconded Mr. Kasinath Trim-buck Telang's motion. This was the last speaker at this meeting. In attempting to make a speech upon the subject he was so inaudible that he was saluted with the contradictory cries of "speak up" and "sit down." He contrived, however, before he sat down to express the sense of the meeting by flatly contradicting Lord Ripon's assurances of the finality of the obnoxious Bill in the following words:—"The

(Queen's) Proclamation then made forms the charter of our rights and privileges, and I say that the present Bill is one of the numerous other measures which are required to be carried out, in order to secure for the natives of this country the full benefit and enjoyment of the rights and privileges vouchsafed to them by the highest authority in the realm." This is the demon which Lord Ripon has evoked by his short-sighted and suicidal policy. The Hindus seem determined to prove that that good-natured writer, Amir Khusro, referred to by Rajah Shiva Prosad, correctly described them, when he applied such contemptuous terms to them as "raven-faced" and "raven-like in nature," for notwithstanding all that has been given to them, they are still crying out for more, and the Bombay Muhammadans and Parsees, fearing that the Hindus would outstrip them in the race for the plunder of the British, have joined them in the cry in order to obtain their share of the plunder before the Hindus have crammed all into their insatiable maw.

These men display their "raven-like nature" by the way in which they appropriate the Queen's Proclamation as the "Charter of their rights and liberties," as if the British people in India had no share in it. Long and intimate association seems to have imbued the Bombay Muhammadans and Parsees with the same nature, for they have joined the Hindus in that illegal appropriation. Yet if at any time there is a rumour that our Government intends to annex anything, which they look upon as thievish, they immediately raise a howl of indignation. Such a howl was raised some years ago, when, on the deposition of the late Gaikwar, there was a rumour that the Government intended to annex Baroda. The howl was too contemptible. The following fact will show how little reliance is to be placed upon these people's loyalty. At the time of the rumour that our Government intended to annex Baroda, Hindus went about Bombay saying that they would welcome the Russians with open arms, if they came to turn us out of India. I smiled when I heard it, for I thought to myself that they would find the hug of the Russian bear very different from the gentle clasp of the British. If I were their enemy I could wish them no worse fate than the hug of the Russian bear.

The meeting ended with votes of thanks to the Hindu Sheriff for convening the meeting and to the Parsee Chairman for presiding at it. This meeting was the most fortunate thing that could have happened at the present time, because it afforded the strongest possible proof that educated natives and Parsees entertain race prejudices against the British people. I use the term "British people" in preference to 'Anglo-Indians,' because the latter expression seems to separate us

in interest from our brethren at home and in all the Colonies, and to suggest that we are a race separate and distinct from them, whereas the fact is we are one with them in everything, and their interests are ours and our interests are theirs. It is very necessary, in the present controversy, that this should not be lost sight of, for attempts have been made to stir up the British people at home against us, under the nomenclature of Anglo-Indians, as if we were a separate and distinct race, and did not, as we do form a part of that great whole, styled the British people. A Briton who takes up his residence, or is born in France or Germany, is not styled "Anglo-French" or "Anglo-German." Then why should a Briton who takes up his residence, or is born, in India be styled "Anglo-Indian?"

My object in criticising the proceedings of this meeting has been to show how unfairly and illogically these Bombay natives and Parsees argue in matters which concern the British people, and to refute their arguments. I have also endeavoured to expose the misquotations and misrepresentations in which they have indulged, and which are so fatal to their arguments. I have also tried out of their own mouths to convict them of entertaining race-prejudice against the British people, and to show that the proceedings of the meeting afford abundant proof that the educated natives and Parsees present were actuated by such race-prejudice against us. I will not imitate the boastfulness of Mr. Budroodeen Tyabjee by saying that I have had no difficulty in exposing the hollowness of their flimsy arguments, nor will I follow the bad example of Mr. Kassinath Trimbuick Telang by venturing to say that I have satisfactorily answered the principal points of their arguments. On the contrary, I say nothing, but I leave you and your readers to judge whether I have, or have not, been successful in effecting the object I had in view.

I regret that by my endeavours to defend my countrymen from the unprovoked attack made upon them by this meeting I have incurred the displeasure of the *Times of India*; for I look upon its lukewarm advocacy of the good cause as of some value, even though its attempt to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds is too apparent. I fear, however, that no adverse criticism of the proceedings of this meeting could have had any effect, as regards that journal, but that of rousing the ire of its Editor, for, however mild the criticism, it must have clashed with the fulsome praise bestowed upon the meeting and the principal speakers thereat, in that paper's leading article of the 30th April last. I will not, however, imitate the Editor of the *Times of India* by even hinting that, in bestowing such praise, he was not expressing his honest opinion. But I will say that his opinion, expressed in that

praise, was most erroneous. It was that very opinion which induced me to examine most carefully the printed speeches of those who were praised so highly, and I was astounded to find how greatly the Editor had erred in committing himself to such an opinion. I should not, however, have referred to the fact of the *Times of India* having expressed so erroneous an opinion, if the Editor of that paper had not, by his vicious and unmerited attack upon me, on the 28th May last, compelled me to do so in self-defence. All that concerns me was to do all in my power to prevent my countrymen from being injured by the use to which his pets had put their moral deformities. What mattered it to me that those moral deformities were as pleasing to him as Hagne's wen was to Balbinus?

" Illuc praevertamur; amatorem quoddam amicae

Turpia decipiunt caecum vitia, aut etiam ipsa haec  
Delectant; veluti Balbinum polypus Hagnae."

BRITANNICUS

June 9 1883.

---

#### SIR JOHN KAYE'S TESTIMONY.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—We have been accused of maligning and vituperating the natives of India in the course of this controversy. The fact is that we have been compelled to state the truth about them, in self-defence. In support of what I have said, I have quoted the words of Sir Frederic Halliday, Mr. Trevelyan and others. But I venture to say that my utterances have been mild in comparison with the following statement of Sir John Kaye in his *History of the Administration of the East India Company*.

"It may be that a conquered people are always, more or less, a false people—that it is not in the nature of men to be truthful with the yoke on their necks. But the form of Government observed and the character of the religion professed by the conquerors must always regulate the degree to which political prostration is accompanied by moral debasement. Falsehood is the child of fear. And who can estimate the tremendous amount of falsehood against which the English legislator has now to contend?—falsehood which baffles the wisdom of the enlightened, and sets at nought the best efforts of the humane. The state of things which existed under the rule of the Mogul despots was too surely calculated to corrupt both Muhammadans and Hindus—to perpetuate among both classes the selfishness and faithlessness which years of milder rule and more ennobling example have yet scarcely even begun to eradicate.

We found the people of India abject, degraded, false to the very core, Mussulman domination had called into full activity all the bad qualities which Hinduism has in itself a fatal tendency to generate. To the esoteric vices inseparable from such a religion were added the exoteric vices born of circumstances injurious to any people, but to such a people fatal in the extreme. The faithlessness, if not engendered, aggravated and perpetuated by Mussulman despotism, is now the grand stumbling-block of British legislation. There is hardly an hour of his official existence in which it does not present itself in the path of the Christian functionary to impede his advance and embarrass his movements. It is as patent to him as the Taj-Mehal or the Kootub Minar; and go where he will, it is sure to stare him in the face."

The book from which the above extract is taken was published in 1853. But will any one be venturesome enough to assert that during the last thirty years, with the rebellion of 1857 intervening, the character of the natives of India has undergone a change which the previous 200 years of intercourse with the British was unable to effect? Will any one be so rash as to assert that, instead of being "false to the very core," they are now honourable and truthful? Will any one who has had any experience of native Magistrates and Judges have the temerity to say that the state of affairs described by Sir Frederic (then Mr.) Halliday in his evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons no longer exists? The passage to which I refer was quoted in a former letter. It is that in which he states that "owing to the long experience of the natives of the corruptibility of their own countrymen, and their great want of confidence in them as compared with the confidence they have acquired in the Europeans, there is not generally in the minds of the natives such a complete reliance upon the impartiality and incorruptibility of the Courts under native Judges as could be wished." The distrust of native Courts by natives here alluded to is justified by the fact that most of the native Magistrates and Judges manage by some peculiar method of finance, a knowledge of which would be invaluable to the Finance Minister, to save in about ten years four or five times as much as their salary has amounted to during that period. But we are told that the nature of those natives who have obtained admission to the Covenanted Civil Service has changed so entirely that they have become "more English in thought and feeling than Englishmen." Did Dr. Hunter mean, when he uttered those words, to assert that those natives had become more honourable and more truthful than himself and Lord Ripon? If he did not mean that, I confess that I am utterly at a loss to know what he did mean. "It is all irony of fate" as the male Malaprop

of the meeting of Bombay natives said that when Dr. Hunter had supported a bad cause by such a statement, he was flatly contradicted by the untruthful and dishonourable conduct of one of those whom he described as "more English in thought and feeling than Englishmen." I allude to Surendronath Banerjee, one of Lord Ripon's "pick and cream," and his disgraceful and mendacious attack upon Mr. Justice Norris. That fact alone ought to convince every man of sense and discernment that a three years' cramming in London for the Indian Civil Service Examination is utterly unable so to change the nature of a native of India as to make him the equal of a Briton in honour and truthfulness. That it makes him more skilful in his plausibility, I admit. The proof of that lies in the fact of a clever man like Dr. Hunter having been so taken in by it that he styled these men "more English in thought and feeling than Englishmen." The successful deception practised upon Dr. Hunter proves how truly Sir John Kaye described the natives when he wrote. "Who can estimate the tremendous amount of falsehood against which the English legislator has now to contend?—falsehood which baffles the wisdom of the enlightened, and sets at nought the best efforts of the humane."

Has education, it may be asked, had no effect? I reply with another question. Did education ever eradicate a natural propensity to falsehood in the person educated? The Borgias were well educated. Did their education make them less false and treacherous? The style in which the notorious "cooked telegram" was compiled proves that the author is well educated. He, too, probably underwent the same amount of cramming as Lord Ripon's "pick and cream." Did his education and cramming diminish his natural proneness to falsehood and treachery. The fact of his having compiled "the cooked telegram" proves that it did not. How absurd therefore it is to allege that education in Indian schools and colleges, supplemented by two or three years of cramming in London for the Indian Civil Service Examination, can so alter the nature of natives of India as to eradicate the falsehood to the very core, and the other bad qualities which Hinduism has in itself a fatal tendency to generate, and which have been engrained in their very nature by having been called into full activity by centuries of Mussulman despotism! And yet it is to men like these that the Government of India seeks to entrust the honour and liberty of British men and women by altering the law, which has hitherto worked without injury to any one, so as to give natives of India, steeped, as Sir John Kaye says; and Surendronath Banerjee proves, to the very core in falsehood, criminal jurisdiction over us, our wives and daughters! In attempting to do this the present

Government of India utterly disregards the following warning of Sir John Kaye, one of the ablest writers on Indian affairs: "Who can estimate the tremendous amount of falsehood against which the English legislator has now to contend?—falsehood which baffles the wisdom of the enlightened and sets at nought the best efforts of the humane." Is it possible that the Government of India is rash enough to imagine its wisdom so transcendental that it cannot be baffled? If that be the case, I would advise it to remember the following proverb: "*Quem Deus vult perdere, prius dementat.*"

Allow me also to remind the Government of India that Sir John Kaye also says: "When the difference between the master and servant is slight, the latter is little able to understand why the relationship should exist, and little willing to suffer its continued existence. He does not recognise either the physical or the moral superiority which should place one in subjection to the other. And therefore he is restless under the yoke and endeavours to cast it off. But when the master comes from a distance—from some far-off fabulous country—when he speaks another language, has another complexion, wears another dress, and comes with all the environments of wealth and wisdom, and physical power, great alike in activity and endurance—the servant recognises the necessity of submission; his self-love is less wounded, he is more patient under the yoke." Let the Government of India then ponder well these words of wisdom, and refrain from its suicidal policy of lessening the difference between the Briton and the native. Above all, let it eschew the policy of subjecting the British to the criminal jurisdiction of native Magistrates, especially those of the Bengali race, the race most despised in India, lest by so doing it should teach the warlike races to doubt why they should remain in subjection to those who are in subjection to the despised Bengali, and lest those warlike races should cease to recognise either the physical or the moral superiority which should place them in subjection to the British, and should therefore be restless under the yoke and endeavour to cast it off.

BRITANNICUS.

June 14, 1883.

# THE BOMBAY GAZETTE AND MR. W. WORDSWORTH ON THE CRIMINAL AMENDMENT BILL.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—In a late issue of the *Bombay Gazette* the Editor, forgetful of the French proverb *qui s'excuse s'accuse*, excuses himself for having

supported the obnoxious Bill by saying, " Had Mr. Branson, Britannicus and the rest of them left the measure within the pale of reasonable discussion, we should not, in all probability, have opposed it." On reading this I was about to propose to Mr. Branson, and those whom the Editor, above referred to, vaguely calls the " rest of them," that we should all repent in sackcloth and ashes for having lent to the cause so able an advocate, when it suddenly struck me, that, even if it were true, which I deny, that we had taken the measure beyond the pale of reasonable discussion there was nothing to prevent the Editor from bringing it back within that pale in his own paper. His excuse, then, for supporting the Bill against his convictions is untenable and absurd. It reminds one of the little sneak at school, who excused himself to the master for having joined others in robbing an orchard by saying, " Please, Sir, I would not have done it if the other naughty boys had not led me astray." The fact is, the Editor finds himself left out in the cold, and, instead of blaming himself for his folly in supporting the, in every sense, insupportable Bill, he tries to throw the blame on those who neither influenced nor cared to influence his acts.

If, however, the Editor means that the arguments used by Mr. Branson, myself, and the " rest of them," were so exhaustive, that nothing was left for him to say against the Bill, I thank him for the compliment he has paid us, though I am still unable to understand how that can be a good reason for his writing in favour of the Bill in opposition to his convictions.

The attack, however, which the Editor of the *Bombay Gazette* makes upon Mr. Branson, myself, and " the rest of them," comes with a very bad grace from him ; for, in another issue of his paper, he himself takes the measure as much out of the pale of reasonable discussion as, he says, we have done, by stigmatising it as a " trumpery affair unworthy the notice of a statesman."

That the Bill is an unstatesman-like measure is the opinion of most " men of light and leading," but whether or not it is a " trumpery affair" depends upon circumstances. If the " objects and reasons" published by the Government are the true objects and reasons, it is so. But if the Government have other objects and reasons, not disclosed by them, a knowledge of them is necessary to enable us to judge whether the Bill is a trumpery affair or not. The opinion of the British in India is that the Government have undisclosed objects and reasons, which are so dangerous to the stability of the British Empire in India, that they take the Bill out of the category of trumpery affairs. It is for that reason that it has been so strenuously opposed.

Mr. W. Wordsworth, of the Bombay Educational Department, is surprised at the above-mentioned opinion of the Editor of the *Bombay Gazette*. He, therefore, writes to him in a letter, published in the issue of that paper on the 12th instant, as follows: "If this" (administrative convenience) "was the only ground for the change, it would be difficult to acquit the Indian Government of great inadvertence." This mild euphemism does not seem very applicable to the case, unless Mr. Wordsworth means that it was very careless on the part of the Government to omit to state in their "Objects and Reasons" that "administrative convenience" was their only reason for proposing the measure. "But," continues Mr. Wordsworth, "we may assume that they had in view some considerations of a wider nature, to which it was not incumbent on them to refer more explicitly." Poor Lord Ripon! Even his apologists, in trying to pull him out of the "slough of despond," push him further into it. Neither Mr. Branson, nor I, nor "the rest of them," have said anything worse of his Government than that. Lord Ripon and the members of his Government professed, in the debate in the Legislative Council on the 9th March last, to take the public into their confidence with respect to the scope and design of the Bill. On that occasion Lord Ripon said "If the vehemence of feeling is due in any degree to a misapprehension as to the scope of the Bill or the course which Government intended to pursue in regard to it, or to fear that we have ulterior designs, which we never had, then it is possible that this discussion may have done good." And further on he adds, "I do not think I have anything more to add now by way of explanation of the views of Government." In attempting to defend Lord Ripon's policy, Mr. Wordsworth, without intending to do so, flatly contradicts these explicit statements, by saying. "We may assume that they" (the Government) "had in view some considerations of a wider nature" than these which Lord Ripon admitted, "to which it was not incumbent on them to refer more explicitly," that is to say, he charges Lord Ripon and the members of his Council with grossly deceiving the public by withholding from them "some considerations of a wider" and, therefore, of a far more important "nature" than those which they disclosed whilst pretending to take the public into their confidence. I therefore recommend to Mr. Wordsworth's serious attention the following lines of Horace:

"Principibus placuisse viris, non ultima laus est,

Non cuivis homini contingit adire Corinthum."

In treating the question economically Mr. Wordsworth, in one short sentence utters two fallacies. He says: "The cost of foreign agency is one which no nation can or will endure, when it can afford

to dispense with it." In this sentence he assumes that the natives of India are one nation, and that the British people are foreigners in this country. I submit that I have clearly proved, in my letter of the 12th March last, that India is peopled by "a heterogeneous mass of disjointed\* members incapable of union into one homogeneous whole," and, therefore, it is a fallacy to dignify the natives with the name of a nation. I shall not, therefore, go over that ground again, even though it has suited Mr. Wordsworth's purpose to ignore that proof.

I join issue with him, however, upon the question, whether the British people are foreigners in India. I maintain that the people, to whom the land of a country belongs, are not foreigners in that country. The owners of land are those to whom the rent for that land is paid. The rent for the land of India is paid to the British people. Therefore the land of India belongs to them, and consequently the British people are not foreigners in India. Again, India belonged first to the Aryan and afterwards to the Muhammadans by conquest. It now belongs to the British by conquest. If, then, the British conquerors are foreigners, the Aryan and Muhammadan conquerors must also be foreigners. In that case the only natives of India are the aborigines. For the same reason all the families in England with Saxon or Norman blood in them are foreigners, and the only natives are the pure descendants of the ancient Britons. Is Mr. Wordsworth prepared to accept that doctrine? If not, why does he call the British foreigners in India? When the British first came to India, they were only traders and did not possess the land, consequently they were foreigners then, but they are no longer foreigners in such parts of the country as they have obtained by conquest or cession. In the same way, before 1870 such Germans as went to Alsace or Lorraine to trade were foreigners in those provinces, but now that the Germans have obtained possession of those provinces by conquest they are no longer foreigners there. Why, then, does Mr. Wordsworth call the British people foreigners in India. For no reason that I can understand, but that it suits his argument. But the fact of its suiting his argument does not make his assertion true. Since, then, his argument is founded upon two fallacies, it is worthless, and the conclusions he arrives at are erroneous.

p

To parody Mr. Wordsworth's own words, it would be as unreasonable to be surprised at his error as to condemn it too harshly. It is to the interest of the educated and half-educated natives to maintain the fallacy that the British people are foreigners, in order that they may be excluded from office in India. Mr. Wordsworth's avocations bring him constantly into contact with educated and half-educated

natives. Probably, being the descendant of a poet, he is rather impressionable. The natives with whom he has come in contact, with their usual astuteness, have taken advantage of that fact to impress him with the fallacy that the British people are foreigners in India—*Hinc illae lacrimae*. For this reason, though it was necessary to point out his error, I have no wish to condemn it too harshly.

There is another fallacy in Mr. Wordsworth's letter which deserves special notice. He says, with reference to the obnoxious Bill: "The issue has, first of all, this actual importance, that it will be largely decisive of the extent to which educated natives may expect employment and promotion in Government service in their own country." This statement contains a double fallacy. It treats India as if it belonged to the natives and not to the British. It also treats the native inhabitants of India as one nation or people, instead of what they are, a number of peoples distinct from one another. Now, the fact is that a Bengali is as much a foreigner in the Panjab as an Englishman is in Germany. There is, in fact, far more difference between the Bengali race and the Sikh race than there is between the English and German races. The Bengali and Sikh languages differ, too, as much as, if not more than, English and German. The same is the case with the other peoples of India. They are as much foreigners in each other's parts of the Peninsula as the Bengali is in the Panjab. It is, then, as absurd to call the Panjab a Bengali's own country as it would be to call Prussia an Englishman's own country. But, perhaps, Mr. Wordsworth intended his words to be understood in a more restricted sense. If so, and he meant to call Bengal, for instance, the Bengali's own country, I join issue with him again. The Bengalis are the inhabitants of that part of the Peninsula called Bengal, but since the Muhammadan conquest it has never belonged to the Bengalis. It first belonged to the Muhammadan conquerors, under whom the Bengalis were no better than helots. It now belongs to the British. Therefore, with reference to right to employment in the service of the British Government, it is a political fallacy to call it the Bengali's own country. The same argument applies to every other people of this Peninsula of many peoples. Mr. Wordsworth's premises, then, being false, the conclusion which he draws from them is necessarily erroneous.

In the course of his argument Mr. Wordsworth goes out of his way to sneer at Lord Lytton. He says: "Perhaps had he" (Lord Lytton) "remained in this country, 'the irony of fate' might have forced him to abolish altogether the Educational Budget." I differ from him. Recent events might have convinced Lord Lytton that it

was a political blunder to expend the funds allotted to the Educational Department upon high education in colleges and universities, where erroneous political ideas are instilled into the minds of the students by those who have only a smattering of political knowledge, whereby those students are made ridiculous agitators instead of useful members of society. Lord Lytton would, perhaps, have seen the ill-effect of highly educating a half-civilised race, and he would, probably, have devoted the funds, now applied to create sedition, to their legitimate use, the instruction of the masses in the English language in village schools, with the ultimate object of making English the language of all the Mufasal Courts, and of thereby preventing the possibility of the continuance of malpractices, which are a blot upon the administration of justice, and greatly injurious to the people.

The most surprising part of Mr. Wordsworth's letter is the inane sneer in which he indulges at the Briton's "pride of race." With reference to the opposition to the obnoxious Bill he says: "The principal factor was, perhaps, that 'pride of race' to whose rather ridiculous manifestation in the Calcutta Town Hall I desire to make no further reference." Even a native, the Hon'ble Kristo Dass Pal, could have taught him better than that, for in his speech in the Legislative Council, on the 9th March last, he said "Pride of race, I use the phrase in no offensive sense, is a commendable feeling." Mr. Wordsworth being a Professor is, doubtless, acquainted with history. Let me ask him what but "pride of race" has made every nation great that has been great? What but "pride of race" enabled Leonidas and his small but gallant band of Spartans to defend the pass of Thermopylae against the immense army of Xerxes for several days? What but "pride of race" enabled the small army of the Athenians to defeat the innumerable hordes of Xerxes at Marathon, and the small fleet of the Greeks to conquer the immense fleet of Xerxes at Salamis? What but "pride of race" enabled Alexander the Great with 30,000 foot and 5,000 horse to defeat Darius' army of 500,000 men at Issus, and afterward to penetrate into India? What but "pride of race" made ancient Rome so great and powerful as she was? What but "pride of race" has made France and Germany great nations? And what but "pride of race" has made Great Britain so great as she is, and enabled her to conquer and reconquer India, each time with a handful of men? And yet it is at this all-powerful "pride of race" that Mr. Wordsworth inanely sneers! He, forsooth, would have "pride of race" abolished. Let him go and preach that doctrine in Afghanistan, where he will find an abundance of "pride of race." But no, he prefers the safer platform of Bombay, where he will have the greasy

applause of his admiring native pupils and their oily fathers for proposing to reduce us to the level of those whom our "pride of race" has enabled us to conquer, and whom that which Lord Lawrence called "our moral superiority," has enabled us to hold in subjection. The patriots of the Calcutta Town Hall, at whose manifestation of "pride of race" Mr. Wordsworth so inanely sneers, will, doubtless, be infinitely obliged to him for his kind intentions, though they may question his ability to pose either as a patriot or a politician. I, therefore, recommend to his attention the following lines of Horace:—

"Optat ephippia bos piger, optat arare caballus.

Quam scit, uterque libens, censebo, exerceat artem."

I have been much amused at the abuse and misrepresentation to which I have been subjected by native papers, and by some persons who ought to have known better. The only answer I shall give them all is contained in the following quotation from Horace, in which I have changed one word:

"O imitatores, servum pecus; ut mihi risum.

Ut mihi sœpe jocum vestri movere tumultus.

In conclusion, allow me to say that my detractors, in addition to amusement, have afforded me the great gratification of feeling what Cicero so tersely expresses in the words "*Rem acu tetigit.*"

BRITANNICUS.

July 22, 1883.

---

### THE PROPOSED COMPROMISE.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—From the reply given by Lord Kimberley to the deputation from the meeting held in St. James's Hall it appears that the Government of India intend to modify the Criminal Procedure Amendment Bill, or, in other words, to propose a compromise. For this Mr. Bright has prepared the way. At the meeting held in Willis's Rooms on the 1st instant he appealed to the British people to redress the wrongs of their forefathers by placing the necks of the British in India under the heels of the natives. Granting, for the sake of argument, that there are wrongs to redress, then, upon the principle that the sins of the fathers shall be visited upon the children to the third and fourth generation and not upon others, Mr. Bright ought to hunt up the descendants of those who committed the wrongs, and procure their banishment to India without office, with directions that the obnoxious Bill shall be made applicable to them, and to them only. Among those to be so banished and subjected to the jurisdiction of

native Magistrates will, of course, be the descendants of those who were shareholders and directors of the East India Company, and of those who were the civil and military servants of that Company, during the time of wrong-doing; not omitting, the course, the descendants of Clive, Warren Hastings, Lord Cornwallis, Lord Mornington, and Colonel Arthur Wellesley, afterwards Duke of Wellington, who made himself so conspicuous by the wrongs he committed upon the mild and peaceable Mahrattas. As there may be some difficulty in tracing the descendants of all the wrong-doers, the deficiency may be made up by banishing those who lately wronged the natives by insisting upon their piece-goods being admitted into India free of duty, whilst persisting in the retention of the duty on Indian silver ware exported to England. I was about to add, and the retention of the duty on Indian tea, but as that affects "the brutal tea-planter" only, who is entitled to no consideration, I refrained from doing so.

By means of this arrangement the Government of India will be enabled to save its dignity by passing the Bill in the above modified form; the wrongs committed by the forefathers will be redressed by the punishment of their descendants; the promises alleged to be made in the Queen's Proclamation will be fulfilled; and the natives will be enabled to wreak their vengeance upon the descendants of those who wronged them by treacherously substituting the tyrannical rule of the Briton for the mild and fatherly Government of the Muhammadan. All this too will be effected without the innocent being made to suffer for the sins of other people's forefathers.

If it should happen that noble lords and Caucus-Radicals are found among the people proposed to be banished, their banishment to India and subjection to the criminal jurisdiction of native Magistrates will only make the righteousness of the present godly Government of England shine with greater splendour.

This arrangement, too, will doubtless carry out what Mr. Bright evidently intended, for he is far too just a man to have meant that we, the innocent descendants of righteous forefathers, who never wronged the natives, should be made to suffer for the sins of those whose descendants are enjoying in England the fruits of their wrong-doing.

My anxiety to suggest a feasible compromise to the Government of India has induced me to propose this arrangement. It would, however, receive Mr. Bright's more careful attention if the Government of India would themselves propose it to him as the solution of the present difficulty. May I hope that they will do so?

BRITANNICUS.

August 10, 1883.

## MR. BRIGHT ON THE BILL.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—When Lord Ripon said in the Legislative Council on the 9th March last: "I observe that the opponents of this Bill speak of appealing to the House of Commons. I am the last man in the world to object to such a course being taken. To the decision of the House of Commons both parties to this controversy must bow," he must, as an honourable man, have meant what we understood him to mean, namely, that our appeal should have an impartial hearing in that honourable House, and should be decided on its merits. Such a hearing is utterly incompatible with the matter being made a party question. But that is what his friends, Messrs. Chamberlain and Bright, have lately been trying to make it, the former by pulling the wires which set his puppets, the Caucus-Radicals, in motion, and the latter by haranguing these puppets. I therefore submit that His Excellency is bound in honour to put a stop to these attempts to make the matter a party question, and to do all in his power to procure our appeal an impartial hearing.

If the opponents of the Bill were a body of Conservatives, and the object of their appeal were to oust a Radical Viceroy, there would be some reason for making their appeal a party question. But it is not so. The opponents of the Bill in India would, if they were in England, be found to belong to diverse parties in politics, in India indeed, as regards Indian questions, there are no such parties as Tory, Whig, Conservative, Liberal, or Radical. Therefore it is not a question in India between Conservatives and Radicals. Neither is their appeal an attempt to oust the Viceroy. On the contrary, they give him the credit of being actuated by the best intentions, but the worst advice. Their contention, too, is not that the Bill is bad, because it is the outcome of erroneous Radical policy, but because it is the outcome of erroneous Indian policy, irrespective of English party politics. Further, their intention in appealing is not so much to obtain a victory as to have the truth authoritatively confirmed. As Hallam says of Locke, no quality more distinguishes the opponents of the Bill than their love of truth. These are of no sect or party, and they have no oblique design. The great complaint against them is, that they have told the truth too plainly, and have exposed fallacies too remorselessly. But in a search after truth, facts, however unpalatable, which bear upon the question must be made prominent, and fallacies which obstruct the road to truth must be swept away. For all these reasons our appeal ought not to have English party politics imported into it in the House of Commons.

There is another thing which, I submit, His Excellency the Viceroy is bound in honour to do, and that is to vindicate the honour of the Covenanted Civil Service by forthwith publicly contradicting Mr. Bright's unjustifiable statement to the effect that the clamour which has been raised against the Bill is attributable to jealousy on their part. No one knows better than His Lordship how silent the members of that service remained until he requested them to give him their opinions on the Bill. Will His Excellency permit a body of gentlemen second to no other body in the world for intelligence, honour, and integrity, to be maligned with impunity by Mr. Bright, because, forsooth, their honest opinions are adverse to the Bill? In other words, will he allow Mr. Bright to damn his eyes and ears (*vide* Mr. Quinton's speech) without resenting the insult? In India we can afford to laugh at Mr. Bright's ridiculous calumny, but in England the audiences outside the House of Commons, which he is in the habit of delighting with his oratory, are so ignorant of Indian affairs, and believe in him so implicitly, that he does incalculable mischief when he indulges in rash and unfounded statements. In addition to publicly contradicting Mr. Bright's unjustifiable remarks, I submit that His Excellency is bound in honour to publish *in extenso* the opinions of the maligned Covenanted Civil Service on the Bill, as they themselves constitute a refutation of the calumny.

Again, if His Excellency's words quoted at the beginning of this letter, were sincerely spoken, and who can doubt it, his meaning must have been that both parties to this controversy must bow to a decision of the House of Commons founded upon all the facts and arguments of the case. But that honourable House will not have all the facts and arguments before them, unless they are put in possession of the opinions *in extenso* of the Covenanted Civil Service of India. It will not be sufficient to publish a collated summary of those opinions. No court of justice would allow a party to a suit to substitute such a document for the evidence itself, and since before the House of Commons the Government of India and ourselves are in the position of litigants, we have a right to ask, and we do so most respectfully, to be furnished with the evidence itself, and not with a collated summary thereof. I therefore submit that His Excellency is bound in honour, and in justice to us, to publish those opinions *in extenso*, and defer proceeding with the Bill until we have had an opportunity on laying them with our memorial before the House of Commons, and of obtaining their decision thereon.

In his speech in Willis's Rooms, on the 1st instant, Mr. Bright whether honestly or not is best known to himself, entirely misstated

the question. The Queen's Proclamation did not and could not command legislation in the direction proposed by the Bill, and the controversy is not whether any wrongs were done to the natives by our, or other people's forefathers, and, if any, how they ought to be redressed, but whether our goods, our liberty, and our lives are to remain our own or to be delivered up to the enemy by means of the obnoxious Bill. I say nothing about the honour of our wives and daughters, because it goes without saying that their honour will never be assailed with impunity so long as a drop of blood remains in our veins.

I should be sorry to use unparliamentary language towards so great an orator as Mr. Bright, but I cannot help remarking that his utterances of late prove that, in opposition to the tenets of the Society of Friends, to which he belongs, he occasionally deviates from the strait path and narrow way of accuracy, and indulges in erratic excursions into the flowery fields of fiction. During those rambles he is apt to confuse fancies with facts. His confusion of fancies with facts, in asserting lately that the Conservative members of Parliament had been aiding and abetting Irish rebels, might have seemed a courageous act, on the ground that he knew they could defend themselves in the House, were it not for the fact that he also knew that he would be protected from punishment by a majority of Caucus-Radical votes. But this calumnious attack upon the Covenanted Civil Service of India is devoid of even that semblance of courage.

A disinterested foreigner must have been exceedingly amused at the way in which the heads of this hydra-headed Bill have been smashed by the Herculean club of Truth. The first head was described by the Government through the mouth of Mr. Ilbert in the following words: "The only object which we have in view is to provide for the impartial and effectual administration of justice. It is by this test that we desire our proposals to be tried." That challenge was accepted. The Bill was tried by the test proposed, and it was found that not only was justice being impartially and effectually administered without the Bill, but also that justice would not be impartially and effectually administered with it, so that head was smashed. The "only object" of the Government having been proved to be effected without the Bill, the logical sequence would have been its withdrawal, so that the Bill would have given up the ghost. But no; like its prototype, the Lernean Hydra, it put forth two heads in the place of that which had been destroyed. They were styled the "anomaly" and the "administrative inconvenience" heads. The "anomaly" head was demolished as soon as it arose. The "administrative inconvenience" head was naively but ruthlessly broken by

its cruel foster father, Mr. Gibbs, and the *coup de grace* was given to it by the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal. Then up sprang the "stigma to natives" head, which was destroyed by you, and so forth. Whilst the right was going on, the simile was carried on by the appearance on the scene of the gigantic crab, in the shape of Mr. John Bright, with the intention of crippling the opponents of the many-headed monster with the Queen's Proclamation. But the faithful Iolaus, in the shape of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, came to the rescue and paralysed the claws of the crab by calmly, clearly, and forcibly proving in its Memorial that the Queen's Proclamation did not and could not bear upon the question. Lastly, the "overwhelming consensus of official opinion" head was demolished by its being shown that that overwhelming consensus, instead of being in favour of the Bill, was against it. The only head that now remains is the immortal one, styled the "*sic volo sic jubeo* of Lord Ripon." Let us hope that the simile will soon be rendered perfect, and the many-headed monster be utterly destroyed by that immortal head being buried under the huge rock, styled "the House of Commons."

The disinterested foreigner will also have observed that every effort has been made to throw discredit upon the opponents of the Bill, as if they who did so illogically imagined that the principle of a Bill could be rendered good or bad according as its opponents were peasants or princes. The opponents were first contemptuously described as only a lot of planters, and then as only the non-official Europeans, and afterwards as only a knot of Calcutta lawyers, none of whom had any right to have their protests attended to. At the same time the Government boasted that on the side of the Bill was arrayed an overwhelming consensus of official opinion. The Government had not then consulted its eyes and ears, as Mr. Quinton calls the District Officers. When the Government had consulted them, it found that the overwhelming consensus of official opinion was not for the Bill, but against it. Then an attempt was made by Lord Ripon's friend and supporter, Mr. Bright, to discredit the Covenanted Civil Service, who had honestly reported against the Bill, by alleging that they were actuated by jealousy, and consequently not by truth, in doing so. Nevertheless the fact remains, that according to the admission of Government, the planters, the Calcutta lawyers, the Indian bar, and the rest of the non-official community, as well as an overwhelming majority of the District Officers, who are the eyes and ears of Government, are opposed to the Bill. It has been suggested that the Government would withdraw the Bill if they were not afraid to do so. I decline to believe it. No British Government of India has ever acted or desisted from acting

through fear, and I trust no British Government ever will do so. If we ever have such a Government, the sooner the members of it retire to the security of England the better, in order to make room for British men to come and rule India in their place. That the Bill still lives can only be attributed to the fact that Lord Ripon does not believe his eyes and ears. Let us hope that he will soon see the necessity for believing them, so that he may be able to answer honestly to his name when he is called "wise and good," and may not share the fate of the man referred to by Horace in the following lines:—

"Quum pateris sapiens emendatusque vocari,  
Respondesne tuo, dic sodes, nomine? Nempe  
Vir bonus ac prudens dici delector ego, actu.  
Qui dedit hoc hodie, cras, si volet, auferet: ut si  
Detulerit fasces indigno, detrahet idem.  
Pone, meum est, inquit: pone, tristisque recedo."

BRITANNICUS.

August 15, 1883.

---

### HONOUR DISCARDED.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—Montesquieu says:—"As virtue is necessary in a republic, and in a monarchy honour, so fear is necessary in a despotic Government; with regard to virtue, there is no occasion for it, and honour would be extremely dangerous." Now since you are well aware that the Government of India is a despotic Government, are you not rather unreasonable in expecting it to allow its actions to be guided by a principle so dangerous to itself as honour.

If you will only reflect a little, you will see that in the matter of the Ilbert Bill the Government of India has acted strictly in accordance with the rule laid down by Montesquieu. It has discarded honour in the following instances:—

I.—In pretending that it had introduced the Bill in compliance with a suggestion from the Government of Bengal, in order to avoid consulting that Government, which it knew to be hostile to the measure.

II.—In consulting the other Local Governments upon the advisability of giving only native Covenanted Civilians who may become District Magistrates or Sessions Judges criminal jurisdiction over European British subjects, and on receiving their replies, incorrectly stating that all the Local Governments, except Coorg, approved of the Bill, which is very different from the restricted measure upon which they were asked to express their opinions.

III.—In incorrectly including Bengal among the Local Governments which had approved of the Bill, though it had not been consulted, and was known to be hostile to it.

IV.—In submitting the opinions of the Local Governments approving of the said restricted measure to Lord Hartington, the then Secretary of State for India, and, on his approving thereof, introducing the present very different and far more extended measure, and incorrectly stating that he had approved thereof, well knowing that it was the restricted measure only of which he had approved.

V.—In incorrectly stating through its mouthpiece, Mr. James Gibbs, that administrative convenience required the Bill on account of large railway works commenced at Karwar, well knowing that no such railway works had been commenced at that place.

VI.—In declaring in its "Objects and Reasons" that the object of the Bill is to remove from the Code, at once and completely, every judicial disqualification which is based merely on race distinctions, and, in order to secure the vote of H. E. the Commander-in-Chief creating a judicial disqualification based on race distinctions by declaring natives of India disqualified from holding the office of Cantonment Magistrate.

VII.—In stating by its mouthpiece, Mr. Ilbert, that the only object it had in view was to provide for the impartial and effectual administration of justice, and that it was by that test it desired its proposals to be tried, and when they had been tried by that test and found wanting, ignoring the trial of its proposals by the test proposed by itself.

VIII.—In sending through Renter as an ordinary message, for the information of the press in England, the notoriously incorrect and cooked telegram, whereby it knew that the British people at home would be misled into believing that there was no real opposition to the Bill, well knowing that the opposition to it was universal among the non-official British population of India.

IX.—In boasting that there was an overwhelming consensus of official opinion in favour of the Bill, the result of consulting the District Officers proving that the overwhelming consensus of official opinion was opposed to the Bill, and not in favour of it.

X.—In incorrectly stating in Parliament, by the mouth of Lord Hartington, that the opposition to the Bill was caused by the jealousy of Europeans of the introduction of natives into State employment, or in allowing that allegation to remain uncontradicted, well knowing that there is no foundation for such a statement.

XI.—In incorrectly stating in Parliament, by the mouth of Mr. Cross, the Under-Secretary of State for India, that the summed-up

replies received from the Madras and Bombay Presidencies, and the Panjab, North-West and Central Provinces, are against the withdrawal of the Bill, or in allowing that statement to be so made without contradicting it in Parliament, well knowing that it was incorrect.

Under these circumstances, I think you will agree with me in holding that the conduct of the Government of India in the matter of the Ilbert Bill is defensible, on the ground that, being a despotic Government, it has no virtue, because it has no occasion for it, and it has discarded honour, because it would be extremely dangerous to possess it.

BRITANNICUS.

*September 14, 1883.*

---

### SUPPRESSIO VERI.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—The Government of India, in publishing the opinions on the Ilbert Bill, has thought fit to publish in connexion with them only Memorials in favour of the Bill, especially the disingenuous Memorial of the natives of the city of Bombay, and to suppress the Memorials against it. Allow me, therefore, to suggest the advisability of our counteracting this suppression of the truth by publishing the Memorials against the Bill, as an appendix to your advertised pamphlet, or, if this suggestion comes too late, as a supplementary pamphlet. If you approve of this suggestion, allow me further to suggest that, if you approve of the answer to the Memorial of the natives of the city of Bombay, contained in my letters, published in your paper on 1st June last and several subsequent days, it may be as well to publish that antidote to the poison, contained in the said disingenuous Memorial, in the appendix, or in the supplementary pamphlet above suggested.

BRITANNICUS.

*September 16, 1883.*

---

### DISTINCTIONS OF RACE AND THE ILBERT BILL.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—Some time ago a native correspondent of yours offered us the assistance of the natives to bring about the withdrawal of the Ilbert Bill, but he clogged his offer with a condition which no Englishman could accept. That condition was that we should relinquish our claim to physical and moral superiority as Britons and conquerors, which Lord Lawrence, who thoroughly understood the natives declared us

to possess. The reason why the British people cannot accept that condition is that with their physical and moral superiority, their supremacy in India must also depart from them.

Such a proposal from an Indian Aryan is more preposterous than it would be from any other race whom the British have subdued, because the former have, during the last four thousand years pertinaciously retained and insisted upon their claim to ascendancy, as Aryans and conquerors, over the aborigines of India.

When the Aryans first settled in the Panjab, caste was unknown among them, as Dr. Hunter correctly informs us in his *Brief History of the Indian People*. It was for the purpose of keeping themselves distinct from the aboriginal races of India, and of perpetuating their claim to ascendancy as conquerors over them, that the Aryans formed themselves into castes. The Aryan castes thus formed were three, and three only,—the Brahman, the Kshattriya, and the Vaisya. They styled themselves "twice born," and wore the "sacred thread," the distinguishing mark of caste. The Brahmans represented the wisdom of Brahma, the Omniscient, inasmuch as they were the depositaries of the science and knowledge of the nation; the Kshattriyas represented the protection of Vishnu the Preserver, inasmuch as it was their duty to protect the nation from the attacks of its enemies; and the Vaisyas represented the destruction and reproduction of Siva the Destroyer and Reproducer, inasmuch as it was their duty to destroy the seed by sowing it in the earth, in order that it might be reproduced fifty or a hundred fold at harvest time. Hence it will be seen that there was no room for any more true castes.

With all due deference to Dr. Hunter, I submit, that he errs in assigning to the Sudras the dignity of caste. Indeed, his own description of them clearly proves that they were carefully and designedly placed beyond the pale of caste. The Aryans styled all the Indian races Dasyus, or enemies, before they conquered them, and Sudras Dasas, or slaves, after they conquered them. "The Sudras," says Dr. Hunter, "were the slave bands of black descent of the Veda. They were distinguished from their 'twice-born' Aryan conquerors, as being only once-born, and by many contemptuous epithets. They were not allowed to be present at the great national sacrifices, or at the feasts which followed them. They could never rise out of their servile condition, and to them was assigned the severest toil in the fields, and all the hard and dirty work of the village community." And he might have added, their touch was pollution to the "twice-born" Aryans. Again, Raja Shiva Prasad said in his able speech in the Legislative Council on the 9th March last: "I cannot

conceal from your Excellency that the Indian branch of the Aryan race has been the most intolerant towards their conquered, and had no distinction between a conquered and a slave. Up to this time the Sudras, the remnants of the conquered aborigines, who form the mass of the population, are looked down upon by the military and the then ruling class of Kshattriyas, and the sacerdotal Brahmins, as worse than slaves. The very name of *Dass*, a corruption of *Dasyu*, means a slave or thief. Prohibition to wear the sacred thread has been for the poor Sudras a lasting mark of humility and subjection. *Manu*, says: "If any Sudra takes it into his head to speak Sanskrit or to teach that language, scalding oil is to be poured into his mouth; nay in killing a cat, a weasel, a peacock, a frog, a dog, a lizard, and an owl or a crow, a Brahmin should expiate his sin by the same penance which he has to undergo for killing a Sudra—Chapter XII, stanza 132. Further, having slandered a Brahmin, a Kshattriya becomes liable to a fine of 8,000 kauries (shells), amounting to less than one rupee and a half, but a Sudra merits death—Chapter VIII, stanza 267." Dr. Hunter further says: "The Aryans entered India from the colder north and prided themselves on their fair complexion. The Sanskrit word for colour (*varna*) came to mean 'race' or 'caste.' The old Aryan poets, who composed the *Veda*, at least 3,000, and perhaps 4,000 years ago, praised their bright gods who, 'slaying the *Dasyus*, protected the Aryan people;' who 'subjected the black skin to the Aryan man." Hence it is clear that the Sudras were debarred from the possession of caste, for there is abundant evidence to prove that they were denied every distinguishing mark and privilege thereof.

When Buddhism arose in India, its birth-place, its tendency was to release the Sudras from the thralldom of the Aryans. To counteract this, when Buddhism was on the decline in India, the astute Brahmins prepared gaudily painted yokes of sham caste, which so tickled the fancy of the Sudras that they put their necks under them. In this way almost all of the 3,000 sham or spurious castes, mentioned by Dr. Hunter, were formed. By putting their necks under these gaudy yokes the Sudras lost their newly acquired freedom, and gained nothing, for they still remained Sudras in fact, though not in name. This is proved by the fact that the members of those sham or spurious castes labour under the late disability as the ancient Sudras. They are all prohibited from wearing the sacred thread, and they are forbidden to study "the holy books." They have been emancipated from the last prohibition by the British, but that does not alter the fact of the existence of the prohibition in the Hindu law. An incident, which occurred in the course of Major Baring's reply to an address presented to him in

Bombay, proved the absurdity of Mr. Gladstone's idea, that people who know nothing of India are better able to deal with Indian affairs than those the business of whose lives has been to reside there and to become acquainted with the history, manners, and customs of the people. Among the members of the deputation who presented the address, there were some men belonging to sham or spurious caste. In the course of his speech Major Baring told the deputation that he disliked shams. He little knew the sarcasm he was uttering. In calling these castes sham and spurious, my intention is to state a fact, and not to disparage the members. There are, doubtless, many estimable men among them, but they would be better, because free, men without their self-imposed trammels of sham or spurious caste. My object in stating this fact is to make it known, especially to my countrymen at home, to prevent their being misled by glib-tongued Sudras into believing that they are men of real caste, and therefore descendants of the noble Aryan race.

One can understand the pride which the Indian Aryans take in their true caste, because, however much they may have degenerated from their and our glorious beef eating ancestors, it denotes that they are sprung from that noble race. But the pride of the "once-born" in their spurious caste is inexplicable. It is the pride of being descended from a race of Dasas, or slaves, who were conquered and held in slavish subjection by a handful of Aryans. The disparity of numbers must have been very great, for at the present time, after three or four thousand years of occupation, the Aryans in British India number only 16 millions, whilst the non-Aryans number 142 millions. I have called the common ancestors of the British and the Indian Aryans "beef-eaters" upon the authority of Dr. Hunter, who says:—"Under the modern Hindus, the Aryans of the Veda ate beef, used fermented liquor or beer, made from the *soma* plant, and offered the same strong meat and drink to their gods."

Among the 3,000 castes above referred to, there are some which arose from misalliances with the three pure castes, and others which are said to be descended from Aryans who lost their caste. Nevertheless, according to Dr. Hunter, the great bulk of the spurious castes are the descendants of Sudras, or non-Aryans. Dr. Hunter describes the spurious castes as, "the great mixed population generally known as the Hindus, which has grown out of the Aryan and non-Aryan elements (chiefly from the latter), and numbers 124 millions." Those 124 millions, like the ancient Sudras, are under the influence of the "twice-born" Aryans. The rest of the native population of British India, according to Dr. Hunter, who, I suppose, took his figures from the

pus, consist of aborigines, who have not embraced Hinduism, numbering 16 millions, and Muhammadans numbering 41 millions, making a grand total of 199 millions, and not 250 millions, as is commonly, but erroneously, asserted.

People who have not studied the subject, or who have only listened to the nonsense talked by natives who themselves are ignorant of the origin and history of caste, imagine that caste is a religious institution; but a reference to Dr. Hunter's *Brief History* will dispel that illusion, and satisfy them that it is simply a social and political arrangement, which had its origin in the desire of the Indian Aryans to keep themselves distinct from the aborigines, and to perpetuate their claim to ascendancy, as conquerors, over them.

From Dr. Hunter's and Raja Shiva Prasad's testimony, it appears that the Indian or Eastern Aryan made their ascendancy as conquerors over the Sudras or non-Aryans banefully aggressive, inasmuch as, by means of it, they thrust the latter down in the social scale infinitely below themselves, placed insuperable obstacles in the way of their rising out of that abyss, degraded them by declaring their touch to be pollution, and debarred them from honourable office under their Government. Moreover, by the device of caste, the Indian Aryans have unjustly managed to retain their ascendancy, as conquerors over the Sudras or non-Aryans, notwithstanding the fact of their claim to ascendancy, as conquerors, over the latter having been destroyed by their subjection to the British. It is equally manifest that the ascendancy of the British, or Western Aryans, as conquerors over the natives of India, is only innocuously defensive, inasmuch as it merely defends their own rights and privileges, without seeking to degrade the natives, or to exclude them from honourable office under their Government. And yet the Indian Aryans ask the British to relinquish their rightful claim to ascendancy, which is beneficial to the people, in favour of their own wrongful claim to ascendancy, which is injurious to them. Nay, more, in the very same breath as that in which the Indian Aryans ask us to relinquish our rightful claim to ascendancy as their conquerors, they assert a wrongful claim to ascendancy over us by saying, "Oh! whatever you be, your touch will always be profanation to us," whereby they claim to thrust our beloved Queen, her ministers, her Viceroy and the whole British nation, whether residing in India, in England, or elsewhere, down in the social scale below any native of India, whom the Indian Aryans, whether rightly or wrongly, choose to recognise as possessing caste. If, then, there were no other reason for retaining and enforcing our rightful claim to ascendancy as conquerors, the assertion by the Indian Aryans of that

wrongful claim amply justifies us in retaining it as a bar to such an arrogant attempt to degrade us, and exalt themselves.

In a late telegram Mr. Gladstone is reported to have said : " With reference to the Ilbert Bill, the Anglo-Indians were only following the example of most English residents in colonies where great reforms had been introduced by the courage, wisdom, and foresight of British legislation." One at least of the examples he gives of that " courage, wisdom, and foresight" is very unfortunate. The abolition of slavery was, no doubt, a good measure ; but the mode of abolition adopted by the " courage, wisdom, and foresight of British legislation," namely, pretending to pay the owners the value of their slaves without paying them a tithe of it, ruined the West India Planters, and drove large numbers of peaceable and industrious Dutch farmers, the back-bone of the colony of the Cape of Good Hope, into Kafirland, where they destroyed whole tribes of Kafirs, and founded the Independent Orange River Free State, and the quasi-Independent Transvaal State. Those States have now become thorns in the side of the colony, of which their members formerly constituted the strength. True wisdom and foresight would have avoided all those evils, but then the Legislature would not have been able to pose as the incarnation of philosophic philanthropy. What analogy there is between the abolition of slavery and the subjection of English men and women to the criminal jurisdiction of native Magistrates would, I think, puzzle even Mr. Gladstone to explain. If, however, the object of the Ilbert Bill had been to emancipate the Sudras, the descendants of the aborigines of India, from the thralldom of the Brahmans, the descendants of the Indian Aryans, by abolishing that which Raja Shiva Prosad shows to be, and Dr. Hunter styles, " the cruel distinctions of caste," the analogy would be complete. But a Radical Government has not the courage to attack the prejudices of 140 millions of Hindus. Its courage only suffices to attack that which it is pleased to style the prejudices, but which really is the rights and privileges, of a hundred thousand of their countrymen, whose numbers they think, I trust erroneously, too few to make a successful resistance. Its wisdom and foresight in the matter of the Ilbert Bill, if we may judge from the utterances of Messrs. Gladstone and Bright and Lords Hartington and Kimberley, the leaders of the Radical majority, are nil.

I suppose it was in ecstatic admiration of the benefits conferred, or in crass ignorance of the injuries which Dr. Hunter and Raja Shiva Prosad have shown to be inflicted, by the Indian Aryans upon the aborigines of India by means of caste, that the " courage, wisdom, and foresight of British legislation" enacted Statute 38, Vict. Cap. 3.

For the objects of that statute, in effect, are to aid in the perpetuation of "the cruel distinctions of Hindu caste," and to stamp as true the arrogant falsehood that our countrymen and countrywomen at home, not excluding Her Gracious Majesty, belong to a race so infinitely inferior to that of men of real or spurious caste, that the touch of the former pollutes the latter. Therefore, to prevent the pretended purity of men of real or spurious caste from being contaminated by coming into contact with any members of the falsely alleged inferior British race in England, "the courage, wisdom, and foresight of British legislation" enacted the statute above referred to. I admit the "courage," for it was undoubtedly very courageous to tell the British people that they are so mean and despicable a race that their very touch pollutes a native of India of real as well as of spurious caste. But I doubt the "wisdom and foresight," for reasons which the legislators who made those admissions will probably discover when the British people are sufficiently instructed to understand the gross insult to their nation conveyed in them.

Mr. Gladstone is also reported to have said: "English residents in India are not in such a good position for forming a comprehensive judgment" (on Indian affairs I suppose he means) "as those at home." Upon the same principle ships ought to be manned by captains, officers and crews who have never seen the sea. But, however that may be, Lord Ripon and the members of his Executive Council are "English residents in India." Therefore, according to Mr. Gladstone, they "are not in such a good position for forming a comprehensive judgment" on the Ilbert Bill as those at home. "Since, then, the question of that Bill has been referred, with Lord Ripon's approval, to those 'at home,' the Government of India ought not to proceed with it until the British people at home have pronounced judgment upon it.

Mr. Gladstone then proceeded to say that the British in India look upon themselves as superior to the persons by whom they are surrounded. He does not say they are wrong in doing so, probably because they proved their physical superiority in 1857, and Lord Lawrence testified to their moral superiority. But he says their looking upon themselves as superior to the natives dooms them to a narrow mode of examining such questions as the Ilbert Bill. When he sees the broad method of examining that question adopted by the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal and all the officials in India, native as well as European, who are opposed to the Bill, I suppose he will tell us that the expression "doomed to a narrow mode of examining such questions" was used "in a departmental sense," which is one of his modes of expressing that it has no meaning whatever.

Mr. Gladstone, in conclusion, said: "There is a tendency to indulge in a spirit of ascendancy, which it is the business of the Home Government and the business of a patriotic Governor-General with wisdom and care, but with decision, to modify and check." If he means the Indian Aryans' baneful spirit of ascendancy which must be checked I agree with him, because all who know the fable of the earthen pipkin and the iron pot will recognise the danger of the Indian Aryans' claim to ascendancy coming into collision with ours. If, however, he means that our beneficent spirit of ascendancy must be checked, I think he makes a slight mistake, because it is the only safeguard the mass of the people have against being oppressed and degraded, as both Dr. Hunter and Rajah Shiva Prosad state they have hitherto been by the "twice born" Aryans. I am glad to find that Mr. Gladstone recommends the Governor-General to use wisdom and care in the matter. As for decision, if it means coercion, I thought Mr. Gladstone knew history better than to try that with Englishmen. It was tried in America in the last century, with what result the existence of the United States proves.

The supporters of the Bill have been ringing the changes upon race distinctions and distinctions of race, and have been advocating the passing of the Bill for the purpose of abolishing such distinctions. They are either so blind that they cannot see, or they shut their eyes to the fact that the whole social system of India rests upon race distinctions, not race distinctions between the British and that heterogeneous mass jumbled together under the name of natives, but race distinctions among those natives themselves. As above stated, Dr. Hunter enumerates 3,000 castes (exclusive of the three Aryan castes), the members of which are separate and distinct from each other, and "regard themselves as separate classes." That is a tolerably large number of race distinctions, but Dr. Hunter thinks there may be more, for he says "there are not fewer than 3,000." Now the race distinctions between these castes cannot be as wide as that between the British, who come from a distant country, and any one of them, and yet the Government of India, instead of endeavouring to acquire experience by attempting first to bridge over the little rivulets which divide the Hindu castes from each other, has rushed headlong into an absurd attempt to bridge over, with its inexperienced hands, the almost impassable gulf of race distinction between the British and the natives of India.

A very little reflection ought to have shown the Government of India the impossibility of abolishing race distinction between the British and a people divided into upwards of 3,000 castes. There is no

room for the British anywhere between the highest and the lowest caste. As long as caste exists, they must be either above the Brahman or below the Sudra in the Hindu social scale. As the Indian Aryans claimed and enforced their ascendancy, as conquerors, over the Indian races conquered by them, so must the British claim and enforce their ascendancy over the Indian races, including the Indian Aryans, conquered by them. If the British retain their ascendancy as conquerors, their place in the Indian social scale will be above the Brahmans. If, however, Mr. Gladstone and Lord Ripon succeed in their threatened attempt to check British ascendancy, the British must take their place in the Indian social scale below the Sudra, for all the intermediate places are filled by real and spurious castes. The Ilbert Bill is one of the means whereby Mr. Gladstone and Lord Ripon propose to check British ascendancy in India. Let, then, all those who wish to continue to rank above the Brahman oppose the principle of the Bill, and let all those who wish to rank below the Sudra support its principle. There is no medium course. There is no compromise possible. If the Bill is passed in any form, its principle is approved of, but it is approved of only by those who report in favour of it, and who vote for its passing in the Legislative Council. Let it, then, be in force against them, and against them only. Let them, and them only, sink in the Indian social scale below the Sudras. We who reject it will have none of it. That is what I understand Mr. Hudson to say, and I fully agree with him.

If, however, the Government of India are really sincere in believing that, by subjecting a race claiming to be superior to another to the Criminal Jurisdiction of Magistrates or that race they will succeed in abolishing race distinctions between those two races, let them appoint none but Dher and Dangar Magistrates to Benares, and every other centre of strict and orthodox Hinduism, and prohibit the transfer of cases in which Hindus are concerned to other courts, and then let them watch the result. If experiments are to be the order of the day, there can be no good reason why they should not be made upon the Hindus as well as upon the British.

In conclusion, I submit that until the Government of India has succeeded in effecting the abolition of the artificial distinctions of race created by caste between the natives of India, they are bound to abstain from attempting to abolish the distinctions of race, created by nature between the British and those natives. For if they are unable to abolish an artificial distinction, *à fortiori* they will be unable to abolish a natural distinction. If, however, they attempt to abolish the latter before they have succeeded in abolishing the former, they will be guilty of such an act of violence against nature, as will justify those

who suffer from it in resorting to natural means to resist the attempt.

Lord Kimberley said he approved of the principle of the Bill, but neither the noble Lord, nor any other supporter of the Bill, has ever defined what the principle is. The reason is obvious. The worst feature of the Bill is that it has no principle. It is, in fact, an unprincipled Bill. The Government declare, in the "Objects and Reasons," the object of the Bill to be "to remove, at once and completely, every judicial disqualification which is based merely on race distinctions." The use of the word "disqualification" is disingenuous, for it is incorrect and misleading to describe persons as "disqualified," that is, "deprived of powers, who never possessed the powers referred to." I may be "unqualified" to be the Legal Member of the Supreme Council but I am certainly not "disqualified." Again, the Bengal opinions, your articles and your correspondents' letters have clearly proved, if we read "unqualification" for "disqualification," that the Bill does the very reverse of that which the "Objects and Reasons" state to be its object. It leaves some "unqualifications" untouched, and creates "disqualifications" which are based on race distinctions, by disqualifying Englishmen, not in the covenanted service, from becoming Justices of the Peace in future. The words and actions of the Government in this matter are, therefore, so untrustworthy, that I cannot better conclude this letter than in the following words of Banquo:—

"Fears and scruples shake us.

In the great hand of God I stand; and thence  
Against the undivulged pretence I fight  
Of treasonous malice."

BRITANNICUS.

September 19, 1833.

---

#### ANSWER TO HOPE.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—If your correspondent "Hope" will mention the names of any working men's papers, which are not too Radical to publish letters opposed to the Ilbert Bill, and will give me their addresses, I shall be happy to do anything in my power. The only working men's papers, the names of which I at present recollect, are the *Weekly Despatch*, *Reynold's Weekly* and the *Weekly Budget*, all of which are published in London. But, as the Radical leaders are making the Ilbert Bill a party question, and those papers are intensely Radical, I do not think they would publish any letters on the subject opposed to Radical views,

especially letters exposing, as mine would, such shamefully false and misleading statements as were made in Parliament by Sir George Campbell and Lord Hartington on the 22nd August last when the Indian Budget was under discussion.

BRITANNICUS.

September 22, 1883.

## OFFICIAL RECKLESSNESS AND MENDACITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—Mr. Cross's incorrect statement in the House of Commons reminds me of two statements which the Government of India allowed to be made, without correction, in the Supreme Legislative Council on the 9th March last, and which they afterwards officially published, also without correction, though they knew them to be grossly incorrect. The gross incorrectness of the statements has never yet been noticed. I refrained from noticing it at the time, because the statements were so audacious that I thought it possible that they had been made upon information not divulged to the public. I have now discovered that there was no foundation for them. The statements to which I refer were made by Mr. Quinton, the Commissioner of Allahabad. They are contained in the following words:—"It cannot be denied by the most earnest opponents of the present Bill that there is a strong array of official opinion in support of it. The measure which it embodies, originated with the Government of Bengal. The Governments of Madras, the North-Western Provinces and the Papjab, the Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces, of British Burmah, of Assam and of Coorg, and the Resident of Haidarabad, who is *ex-officio* Chief Commissioner of the Haidarabad Assigned District, have all written in no qualified terms expressing their approval of it on the grounds of public policy and administrative convenience."

At the time when Mr. Quinton made the above statements he had in his hands the papers, published by the Government of India, containing the measure submitted to the Local Governments mentioned by him, and their opinions thereon.

He also had in his hands the measure which, he says, originated with the Government of Bengal, but which the papers show really originated with Sir Ashley Eden only. I pass over Mr. Quinton's assertion that the Chief Commissioner of Coorg approved of the measure upon which the opinions of the Local Governments were invited as an unintentional, albeit culpably careless, blunder.

The measure upon which the opinions of the Local Governments were invited is thus described by the Chief Commissioner of Assam:

"It will be remembered that the proposal originally circulated was to give the power of trying European British subjects to Covenanted Native Civilians, either before or when they have attained the position of a District Magistrate or Judge. \* \* \* \* The Bill has gone far beyond that recommendation." Consequently, the Bill embodies a very different measure from that recommended by Sir Ashley Eden. The Governors of Madras and Bombay, the Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces, and the Acting Chief Justice of Bombay, confirm the statement made by the Chief Commissioner of Assam regarding the measure upon which the opinions of all the Local Governments (except Bengal) and all the High Courts (except Calcutta) were invited. Mr. Gibbs, who spoke after Mr. Quinton on the 9th March last, said:—"The opinions already published were invited, not on the Bill, but on a proposal submitted by the Government of Bengal." (It would have been more correct to have said by Sir Ashley Eden.) That measure is the measure above set forth in the words of the Chief Commissioner of Assam. It was, then, upon that measure, and that measure only, that the Local Governments had given their opinions before the 9th March last. Those, and no other, opinions of the Local Governments were in Mr. Quinton's hands when he made his above-mentioned boastful statements. Consequently, when he asserted that there was a strong array of official opinion in support of the Ilbert Bill, and that the Local Governments had all written in no qualified terms expressing their approval of it, he made two statements, both of which he ought to have known from papers in his hands published by the Government of India, to be untrue; for those papers proved that, so far from there being, at the time he made those statements a strong array of official opinion in support of the Ilbert Bill, or of the measure which it embodies, and so far from the Local Governments having written in no qualified terms expressing their approval of the Ilbert Bill, or of the measure which it embodies, there existed no official opinion whatever upon the Ilbert Bill outside the Executive Council of the Governor-General, and there existed no opinions of any of the Local Governments expressing approval either of the Bill or of the measure which it embodies, for the simple reason that neither the Bill, nor the measure which it embodies, had ever been submitted to any of them for their approval. When Mr. Quinton made the above reckless assertions, which I have shown to have no foundation in fact, the Government of India made no attempt to correct him, and when they published his speech officially, they refrained from doing their duty to the British public, whose servants they are, by pointing out in a foot note the inaccuracy of his statements.

In this disgraceful matter it is difficult to decide which to admire the most. Mr. Quinton's reckless audacity, or the placid contentment, in imitation of Mr. Caseby, with which the Government of India listened to, without contradicting, statements which they knew to be untrue, and which they afterwards palmed off upon the public of India and of England by officially publishing Mr. Quinton's speech without calling attention to the inaccuracy of his statements.

It is this style of thing which has thoroughly disgusted the opponents of the Bill with the conduct of the Government of India. The Bill is so utterly unprincipled that it seems as if it corrupted the morals of every one who looks upon it with favourable or admiring eyes. In attempting to support it they either become argumentative mendicants, and shamelessly beg the whole question on every point, or they make rash and reckless statements which are not founded on fact.

BRITANNICUS.

October 1, 1883.

---

### THE STIGMA ARGUMENT.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—There is a rumour afloat to the effect that the Government of India intend to modify the Ilbert Bill by restricting the criminal jurisdiction over European British subjects, which it proposes to grant, to native Civilians who have entered the service by competition, and have attained the position of District Magistrate or Sessions Judge. The argument by which they propose to support that modified Bill is, that it is necessary to pass it in order to remove the stigma which attaches to such native Magistrates and Judges in consequence of their not having the criminal jurisdiction over European British subjects which European Magistrates and Judges of the same rank possess. This may be styled the "Stigma argument."

They do not intend to adopt Sir Charles Aitchison's argument that the question has been settled by Parliament, for they know that to be absurd, because the Act quoted by him does not settle it.

If such a modified Bill is passed, the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal points out that, by the time it becomes law, it will "affect only the one native Civilian in the Bombay Presidency, and possibly one in Bengal," and in connexion therewith he says:—"In the presence of the extreme animosities which the question has excited, this seems rather a small object to be attained, and the descent from the original proposal suggests something of the trivial results of great efforts." And in another place His Honour says:—"It can scarcely be conceded that we

are in India simply to make our laws symmetrical, and to redress the sentimental grievances of an infinitesimal minority."

In proposing to give up so much of the original Bill, the Government of India are apparently very generous to us. But are they really so? *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*. What will be the result of our allowing the Government of India to bring this wooden horse of a modified Bill inside our fortified city? Most undoubtedly the result will be that the two native officials concealed within it will open wide our gates to all their *confrères* by means of the "Stigma argument" with which they will be armed; therefore, that modified Bill must be resisted, both before and after it becomes law, as firmly as the original Bill has been resisted; for, as the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, with true wisdom and foresight, says:—"Finality in such legislation is impossible, if once the principle is yielded."

Before pointing out how the "Stigma argument" will be worked, it may be as well to show its fallacy. Mr. R. Wight, Officiating Deputy Commissioner of Cachar, uses the same argument as I used in one of my letters. He says:—"Claims they (competition native Civilians) can have none. When they entered the service, they did so with the full knowledge that, under the law, they could not try Europeans." Having entered into a covenant into which the law imported that proviso, they have no more right to be relieved from it than any other person has to be relieved from a proviso contained in an agreement executed by him. If an Englishman were to ask the Government of India to pass an Act relieving him from a proviso in a lease of a house to the effect that he shall not carry on any dangerous or noxious trade therein, they would write him down an ass. But when Mr. Behari Lal Gupta asked that Government to pass an Act relieving him from the proviso, by operation of law, in his covenant, to the effect that he should not exercise in the Mufassal the dangerous and noxious profession of trying European British subjects on criminal charges, instead of writing down Mr. Gupta an ass, they, like their great prototype, invited the public to apply the writing down process to them, by entertaining his ridiculous, not to say dishonest, proposal. If an Act is passed to break Mr. Gupta's covenant in a way which he considers beneficial to himself, why should not another Act be passed further breaking the already broken covenant in a way which he would think detrimental to himself, namely, to exclude him from the benefit of the Civil Fund? Again Mr. Wight says, "I have heard in open court most respectable persons (natives) tell each other they lie. In native society 'You lie' is freely interchanged. At panchayats I have heard it myself. The most foul

abuse is occasionally interchanged by persons who ought to know better, yet there is apparently no resentment. There is certainly no interchange of blows, nor the thought of any." Are such persons capable of feeling a stigma? Most decidedly not, and yet they pretend to do so in the matter of their not having criminal jurisdiction over European British subjects. Mr. Wight adds:—"This question was never raised by the natives themselves; there never was any clamour for such a Bill, there was no movement of any kind made in favour of such a Bill, until the present one was introduced. It was founded on the sentimental grievance of an individual. It is not desired by the mass of the natives."

Mr. W. E. Ward, the Commissioner of the Assam Valley District, pertinently says:—

"As regards these (the native official class), I must say that if, before the Bill was published, they ever felt, which I very much doubt, the invidiousness of the distinction which prevents their trying Europeans, I cannot understand the feeling. \* \* \* I refuse to believe that any such native feels in the least degree slighted at the thought that he can only try a man of his own race. \* \* \* The feeling, however, is a bad one, and it is not towards gratifying the vanity of the few that legislation should be directed." Those are wise words, and deserve to be pondered well by the Government of India.

Mr. Muspratt, the Judge of Sylhet, says:—"It cannot possibly cast any slur on those native gentlemen who have won high positions in the covenanted and uncovenanted services, that they should not be asked or compelled to try charges brought against European British subjects. I have been a member of the Bengal Civil Service for 33 years, and I never heard such an assertion made before I read the speech of the Hon'ble Durga Churn Laha. Nor did any other person ever hear of native officials feeling that their want of criminal jurisdiction over the dominant race cast a slur upon them. On the contrary, they accepted the want of that jurisdiction as a matter of course, because they knew that no subject race had ever had criminal jurisdiction in India over the members of any race for the time being dominant. If indeed they ever thought upon the subject at all (which I doubt), they thought it would be an 'anomaly' for them to have such jurisdiction, and they would have thought right."

The opinions of the officials are full of able and statesmanlike arguments upon this point, but want of space compels me to conclude with the following pertinent remark by Mr. A. J. Primrose, Assistant Commissioner, Mangaldi, who says:—"In all the discussions excited by the Bill, I have not as yet discovered any reply to negative

Sir Fitzjames Stephen's maxim that, in deciding the court for the trial of an accused, the feelings of the accused, and not those of the Judge, should be kept in view." Of course not. How can subaltern supporters of the Bill like Sir Charles Aitchison and others be expected to grapple with our arguments when even their great general "the grand old man" practically acknowledges that any attempt to do so would end in an ignominious defeat. This he does by shirking the question on every occasion, and by taking refuge in such vague generalities as "justice, generosity, blessed works, and glorious fabrics," and by disingenuously asserting that "English residents in India are not in such a good position for forming a comprehensive judgment (on Indian questions) as those at home." I say that assertion is disingenuous because Mr. Gladstone is far too clever a man to believe it to be true. He knows full well that officials and non-officials who spend their lives in the Mufassal, surrounded by natives with whom they are brought into daily contact in the course of their business and their official duties, are far better able to form a correct and comprehensive judgment on the Ilbert Bill than himself, or other people at home who have never resided in the Indian Mufassal, and who, like Mr. John Bright, allow themselves to be led astray by glib-tongued Sudras, pretending to be Aryans, or by wily Aryans outcasted for having become apostates to the religion of their forefathers, without the excuse of having entered the pale of any other. If Mr. Gladstone really does not know this, a perusal of the many statesmanlike papers in which the officials who are opposed to the Bill have embodied their opinions will convince him, if he will read them with an impartial mind that English residents in India, especially those who reside in the Mufassal, are capable of forming a more correct and comprehensive judgment upon the measure under discussion than people at home who have never seen India, or, having seen it, have never resided in the Mufassal and had daily intercourse with the people of the country.

If, instead of the application of Behari Lal Gupta to have his vanity pandered to by the grant of criminal jurisdiction over English men and women residing in the Mufassal, the application had been made by the natives of India to be tried in criminal matters by British or by native Magistrates only, the action of the Government of India in entertaining the application would have been intelligible, because a whole people are entitled to have a voice in the constitution of the courts which shall have criminal jurisdiction over them. But the application of Behari Lal Gupta is so absurd upon the face of it, that the action of the Government of India in taking serious notice of it would be laughable, if it were not mischievous. Mr. Gupta's

application reminds one of an envious child crying and squalling to be allowed to play with his brother Billy's rattle.

Let us now inquire to what the "stigma argument" will lead us, if we yield to it. We will imagine that, in the matter of the modified Bill alluded to in the beginning of this letter, the "stigma argument" prevails, and that the Bill is passed into law. As soon as that becomes an accomplished fact, native Joint Magistrates who are competitive Civilians will complain that, since European British Joint Magistrates have criminal jurisdiction over European British subjects, a stigma attaches to them in not having such jurisdiction conferred upon them also. Having admitted the "stigma argument" to be unanswerable in the case of the District Magistrates, the Government of India will be compelled to yield to it in the case of the native Joint Magistrates, and to pass a second amending Act conferring such jurisdiction upon them. Then native full-power Deputy Magistrates will complain that they are full-power Magistrates as well as Joint Magistrates, and that they suffer under the stigma of being unable to exercise their full-power functions upon any but the vile bodies of natives, whilst native Joint Magistrates, who have no greater powers of punishment than they have, are empowered to exercise their functions upon the delicate bodies of Englishmen, and Englishwomen. Again, the "stigma argument" must triumph over all opposition, and a third amending Act must be passed, giving all full-power native Magistrates, whether belonging to the competitive, statutory, or uncovenanted civil service, criminal jurisdiction over European British subjects. After that all the inferior grades of native Magistrates will advance the "stigma argument" on their own behalf, and its immense force will again carry the day, and a fourth amending Act will be passed, making European British subjects amenable to the same criminal laws and native criminal courts as natives.

Having worked the "stigma argument" down to the bottom, the natives will begin to work it upwards. The first step will be that some Gupta or other will send up a mournful moan to Government to the effect that there is a stigma upon him, because he has not been made Commissioner of a Division. The "stigma argument" must prevail here also, and Gupta & Co. will become Commissioners of Divisions. By means of the same "stigma argument," Gupta & Co. will become Chief Commissioners, Lieutenant-Governors, and Governors of provinces. It cannot fail also to make them Members of Boards of Revenue, Members of Executive Councils of Local Governments, and of the Executive Council of the Viceroy, and lastly, it will make a Gupta a Viceroy.

The same "stigma argument" will also be used in the army, and in every other department of the State. A native sepoy will plead that, when an English private soldier rises from the ranks and obtains commissioned rank, he receives a Lieutenant's Commission. It is, therefore, a stigma upon him that, when he is promoted to commissioned rank, he, instead of being made Lieutenant, receives only the inferior commissioned rank of Jemadar and Subadar. Of course the "stigma argument" must prevail here also, and in time all native regiments will be officered and commanded by natives. By the use of the same argument natives will become Brigadiers, Generals of Division, and Commanders-in-Chief. In short, the result will be that the "stigma argument" will fill every department of the State with Guptas, and place them at the head of everything. Is England prepared to concede this either to the Guptas or to Lord Ripon? If not, the British people had better be up and stirring to help us to destroy the stigma-tailed monster. For the Government of India are nursing and fostering it with much care, so that it may assist them in their suicidal and unpatriotic work of destroying British supremacy in India, and of handing the country over to Guptas and Guptaism. After that the deluge. But that deluge will be a deluge of blood, in which the first victims will be Guptas and Guptaism.

At first sight this may seem to be an exaggerated picture, but a little reflection will show that it is not so, if the equality of the subject with the dominant race, and the right of the former to have criminal jurisdiction over the latter is conceded, and the Government of India persist in holding that the "stigma, anomaly, and administrative convenience" arguments are sound and valid. For, if the "stigma argument" is admitted to be irresistible in one case, it will be an "anomaly" to reject it in any other, so that it will be aided by that which the Government of India considers the enormous force of the "anomaly argument," as soon as any attempt is made to reject it, and, if those two forces fail to carry the day, that which the Government of India holds to be the irresistible "administrative inconvenience" argument will be advanced to aid the other two in bearing down all opposition, when they must succeed, for how can the Government of India resist the combined force of these three arguments, every one of which they have held to be irresistible in the matter of the Ilbert Bill? Then, perhaps, the Government of India will begin to recognise the wisdom and foresight displayed by the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal when he wrote:—"The fact is, that with whatever sincerity finality may be pleaded, finality in such legislation is impossible, if once the principle is yielded."

Most of the officials, including even some of those who are in favour of passing the Bill in some form, say that our protests against it are earnest and sincere, and therefore are entitled to be treated with respect. They have not been so treated by the ruling Radicals either in India or England. On the contrary, Lord Ripon is advised by a few Englishmen only, fortunately for the honour of our nation, to pass the Bill, because we have protested against it. This is a strange argument on the part of those who accuse us of having consented to the criminal jurisdiction of native Magistrates in Presidency towns because we did not oppose the measure as vehemently as we have been opposing the Ilbert Bill. It amounts to this, that, if we do not vehemently oppose a Bill depriving us of our rights, we are held to consent to it, and therefore it must be passed, and if we do vehemently oppose such a Bill, it must be passed because we oppose it. The people who give that advice appear to me to be addicted to playing at the game of "Heads I win, tails you lose."

The people whom the Government of India have treated with such scant courtesy, whom Lord Ripon has been advised to crush, and whom Messrs. Gladstone and Bright, and Lords Hartington and Kimberley, have insulted, are those who have devoted their industry, their capital, and their health, and whose forefathers have devoted their lives, to the civilization of India, the welfare of its people, and the development of its resources. They are a people whose cheerful obedience to the laws is unrivalled in any country in the world, who, rather than embarrass the Government have heretofore allowed their rights to be encroached upon, not without grumbling, I admit, for that is an Englishman's birthright, without serious opposition; whose loyalty is undoubted, and upon whose but loyal assistance in the cause of order and progress the Government of India could always rely. The following passage, then, in one of Junius's letters so exactly applies to our case that it seems as if it were written for the occasion:—"It naturally fills us with resentment to see such a temper insulted or abused in reading the history of a free people whose rights have been invaded, we are interested in their cause. Our own feelings tell us how long they ought to have submitted, and at what moment it would have been treachery to themselves not to have resisted. How much warmer will be our resentment, if experience should bring the fatal example home to ourselves!" It has been brought home to ourselves, and therefore nothing now remains for us to do, but to be true to ourselves, our Sovereign, and our country by resisting the Ilbert Bill in any form, and revolutionary Radical oppression with all our might.

It is, therefore, in a true spirit of loyalty that I exhort the Government of India to reject the advice of the few time-servers who have advised them, to their harm, to proceed with the Ilbert Bill, and to follow the advice of their true well-wishers, the many honest and loyal officials who have advised them, to their good, to withdraw it. And I especially recommend them to act in accordance with the valuable advice given them by Mr. Elliott, the Chief Commissioner of Assam, advice which is the more valuable, because it is evident, from his manner of discussing the question, that he would have supported the Bill if he could have honestly done so. But he could not, and, being too honest to be a time-server, he advised its withdrawal in the following words :— "It is Mr. Elliott's opinion that the measure under discussion will, on the whole, produce more harm than good, and he advises its withdrawal. \* \* \* It need be no cause of shame to the Government of India that one step in advance has been proposed too soon, and should be receded from "

BRITANNICUS.

October 4, 1883.

### THE PRINCIPLE OF THE ILBERT BILL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—I do not think the significance of the following statement, made by Lord Ripon on the 9th March last, has been fully appreciated. His Lordship said in his speech in the Legislative Council :—" I can only say that, so far as this question is concerned, it is not the thin end of the wedge, and that this measure represents the final views of the present Government in respect to changes regarding this portion of the Criminal Procedure Code " That statement must be read not in connexion with the Bill only, but in connexion with the Bill and the Objects and Reasons, taken together ; for the principle of the Bill is embodied and declared in the latter. Now in the first sentence of paragraph 2 of the Objects and Reasons the Government of India states that it "has arrived at the conclusion that the time has come for modifying the existing law and removing the present bar upon the investment of native Magistrates in the interior with powers over European British subjects. In the beginning of paragraph 3 the Government of India says.— "With this object the present Bill has been prepared." Mark, then, that the object of the Bill, whatever may be its details, is to remove the present bar upon the investment of native Magistrates in the interior with powers over European British subjects, and note that the bar to be removed is not merely the bar to the investment of native District

Magistrates, or of native First Class Magistrates only, but simply of "native Magistrates" which term includes native Magistrates of every grade. The principle then of this most unprincipled Bill is, to subject English men and women of every grade and status to the criminal jurisdiction of every grade of native Magistrates. The Bill of course does not go so far. A certain old gentleman always conceals his cloven hoof until his object is gained, when its being seen is of no consequence. If this Bill is passed in any form, the principle affirmed will be that the time has come for subjecting British men and women of every grade to the criminal jurisdiction of every grade of native Magistrates.

When, therefore, Lord Ripon said "this measure represents the final views of the present Government in respect to changes regarding this portion of the Criminal Procedure Code," his statement bore truth upon the face of it, for the simple reason that since the object of the Bill is to remove the bar upon the investment of every grade of native Magistrates in the interior with powers over European British subjects, it was simply impossible for the Government of India to have any further views upon the subject.

In conclusion, I maintain that the fact of the Government of India having declared the principle of the Bill to be that above stated necessitates the most strenuous opposition to its being passed in any form.

BRITANNICUS.

October 5, 1883.

---

### THE INCORRECT GOVERNMENT SUMMARY OF THE ASSAM OPINION.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—The Official Summary of the opinion of the Chief Commissioner of Assam is not a fair one. It softens down some strong expressions adverse to the Ilbert Bill and omits others. Mr. Elliott does not say that "the Bill would be unobjectionable in principle if confined to conferring jurisdiction on native Covenanted Civilians, &c." On the contrary, he declared himself decidedly hostile to the principle of the Bill. If the Bill has any principle at all, it is that which is contained in the following words in the "Objects and Reasons." "After consulting the Local Governments, the Government of India has arrived at the conclusion that the time has come for modifying the existing law and removing the present bar upon the investment of native Magistrates in the interior with powers over European British subjects. The Government of India has accordingly decided to settle the question of jurisdiction over European British subjects in such a way as to remove from the Code at

once and completely every judicial disqualification which is based merely on race distinctions. With this object the present Bill has been prepared." Mr. Elliott says that, in his reply in May 1882 to the circular letter of the Government of India proposing "to give the power of trying European British subjects to covenanted Native Civilian either before or when they have attained the position of a District Magistrate, or Judge," he "dissuaded the Government of India from abolishing altogether the race distinction between European and native Magistrates, as a step for which the time is not yet ripe." Further on Mr. Elliott says "if in May 1882 he had had the Bill before him, we would have been obliged to dissent from the details to which exception has been taken; he would have recommended the omission from the statement of Objects and Reasons of the passage about removing at once and completely every judicial disqualification which is based merely on race distinction." That is to say he would have omitted that which the Government of India declare in their "Statement of Objects and Reasons," to be the object with which the Ilbert Bill has been prepared, or, in other words, he would have advised the omission of that which the Government of India declare to be the principle of the Bill. I therefore have no hesitation in saying that he who prepared the Official Summary of Mr. Elliott's opinion strangely misapprehended and misstated its purpose in asserting that the Chief Commissioner of Assam had stated that, in his opinion, the principle of the Bill was unobjectionable, for it is precisely that which the Government of India expressly declares to be the principle of the Bill that Mr. Elliott specially condemns.

The next misstatement of Mr. Elliott's written opinion consists in the allegation that that official said that "he thinks the opposition mainly sentimental" for Mr. Elliott made no such statement. What that gentleman does say is that, in May 1882, he drew attention to the race antagonism and to the prejudice which is still felt by non-official Europeans against native Magistrates, and he adds that the feelings of mutual distrust appear to be as active as ever. \* \* \* But whatever may have been the origin of the excitement, there can be little doubt that the opposition now embraces all and every provision of the Bill, and that no compromise, such as a return to the proposals originally circulated, would satisfy the European public or lead them to look on the Bill with favour. \* \* \* And in deciding this question they (the Government of India) must take into consideration not only the arguments for and against the Bill, but also the weight and volume of the opposition, and its possible effects on the course of Government." Here allow me to remark that, in addition to the arguments of non-officials, and the weight and volume of their opposition to the Bill, the

Government of India must take into their consideration that which the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal truly styles "the great weight and numerical superiority of the earnest arguments (of Government officials) now adduced in condemnation of the Bill." Further on Mr. Elliott says, "But though the arguments against the Bill seem weak (to him, perhaps, though they seem very strong to officials at least as capable as he is, the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, for instance), there remains the weight and volume of the opposition," and that appears to Mr. Elliott a much more serious matter. In the beginning of his written opinion he reports that the "officials of his province are in every case opposed to the Bill, and recommend its withdrawal," and he here reports that the non-official Europeans of his province are also unanimously opposed to it. He truly describes the opinions of the Assam officials as written with the frankness and independence which become the character of the gentlemen who wrote them, and he with equal justice thus describes the non-official Europeans of his province:—"In Assam they form a larger number, relatively to the population, than in any other part of India, and their interest in the country is more influential and important than the interest of any other class. They are the one intelligent, energetic, improving class in the province, they are the natural allies and assistants of the district officers; and any event which should set them in determined opposition to the Government would be in a high degree disastrous." It is clear then that the official and non-official Europeans of the Province of Assam, all of whom are men whose opinions, according to their provincial ruler, are entitled to the highest respect, unanimously condemn the Bill. Mr. Elliott "thinks, therefore, that it would require a very strong case to justify any enactment which should exacerbate and perpetuate the alienation which at present exists," and he adds that "no such case can, in his opinion, be made out for the Bill under discussion, \* \* \* and, if it were modified, it would not be one of much practical importance, and events have shown that it had better be withdrawn." The following words show that the Commissioner's opinion that the Bill should be withdrawn is not the hastily formed opinion of a partisan against the Bill, but the firm resolution of one who has scrutinised every point in order to find a loop hole through which he might escape from advising its withdrawal. The honour and honesty of an English gentleman, however, prevailed even against his predilections, and he advised the withdrawal of the Bill with a sigh which found vent in the following words:—"The recommendation to abandon the Bill is not made without regret." Then he winds up thus:—"It is Mr. Elliott's opinion that the measure under discussion will on the whole

produce more harm than good, and he advises its withdrawal. \* \* \* It need be no cause of shame to the Government of India to admit that one step in advance has been proposed too soon, and should be receded from."

I regret to be compelled to remark that Mr. Elliott has greatly misjudged us in the following passage :—" The most painful part to him," (Mr. Elliott,) in all this bitter ebullition of feeling, has been the conviction that it has not been evoked by the Bill alone, but is the expression of a determined hostility on the part of non-official Europeans to the general scheme of raising the natives of India to a political equality with ourselves, and to a fair share in the Government of the country. He fears that it is the principle of Local Self-Government that is being struck at under the guise of the Ilbert Bill." I deeply regret that Mr. Elliott has made these remarks. He ought to know that there is no foundation for them. We have no hostility to the general scheme of raising the natives and making them honest and honourable. The only difference between us and the Government of India is that we wish the application of the scheme to be general, and not to be confined, as the Government of India have been confining it, to raising the effeminate Bengalees. That they have, by the injudicious means which they have employed, raised that effete race in a way different from that which they intended, is patent to the meanest capacity, and if they pursue the course indicated by the Ilbert Bill, they will, by pandering to their inordinate vanity, the besetting vice of a weak race, raise them into a tribe of sedition-mongers, whom they will have eventually to put down with the strong hand of power. As for political equality, that is impossible until social equality is established, and social equality, as the natives themselves tell us, can never be attained as long as caste and the social degradation of native women exist ; for by means of caste they claim social superiority over all Englishmen, however exalted their rank may be, whilst by degrading their women, they debase themselves. We have heard something, in the great Maharajah case of Bombay, of the sort of adoration which the husbands and fathers of Hindu women sanction their paying to Maharajahs, the pretended incarnations of Krishna, wherever they set up a temple. We have heard something of the sort of adoration which Borah husbands and fathers permit their wives and daughters to pay to their Aga when on his peregrinations to collect tribute. We have heard something of the sort of veneration which Hindu husbands and fathers allow their wives and daughters to pay to Kulin Brahmins. And we have heard something of the rites and ceremonies which Hindus allow their wives who find favour in the eyes of Brahmins to perform at Benares. It is such hus-

bands and fathers as these to whom Lord Ripon, under the guise of political equality, proposes to give criminal jurisdiction over us, and (*proh pudor*!) over our pure-minded sisters. Shall we permit it? A thousand times no! Let him open his ears and hear. Every true Briton in India and many in England have forbidden it, and the noes in England are daily increasing.

Mr. Elliott also errs in saying that we are hostile to the natives having a fair share in the Government of the country. What we object to is not their having a fair share of appointments and work for which they are fit, but to their monopolising all the appointments not reserved for the Covenanted Civil Service, especially those obtained through Burki College, which as given to them through the examinations, prove they are less fit for them than their European and Eurasian competitors. We also object to the appointment of natives to the Statutory Civil Service by the condemned method of nomination, because it furnishes no test of their fitness, as well as because it is an insult to the British nation to admit that Hindus would be polluted by coming in contact with our brethren in England.

Mr. Elliott's insinuation that we are striking at the Local Self-Government scheme under the guise of the Ilbert Bill is, I regret to be compelled to say, ungenerous. We might, with perhaps more justice, say that the Ilbert Bill has been sprung upon us in order to distract our minds from calmly considering the Local Self-Government measure, and thereby to prevent us from seeing what the Government of India knows to be its defects. At any rate, Mr. Elliott ought to have seen what is patent to every one, that the want of co-operation of the tea planters of Assam in the Local Self-Government scheme has been caused by the Ilbert Bill, and, therefore, his insinuation that we are striking at Local Self-Government through the Ilbert Bill is absurd as well as ungenerous.

Mr. Elliott's idea that no permanent Government can possibly rest on the basis of not sharing the government of the country with the natives, is belied by history, as far as India is concerned, for the government of the Aryan conquerors rested on that basis, and since it continued to flourish for about 3,000 years before the first irruption of the Muhammadans, I think we are entitled to say that it was more permanent than any other Government of which we have any authentic history.

Nature will neither be curbed nor forced by Acts of Parliament or even by Acts of the Government of India. The fittest race will always govern. Mr. Gladstone, or even Lord Ripon, might with as much safety sit on the safety valve of a steam engine to keep the

steam from escaping, as attempt to subject the fit to the unfit, the dominant to the subject race, the Briton to the Bengalee or the Borah. They may do much mischief to themselves and others for a time, but their success can never be permanent.

BRITANNICUS.

October 6, 1888.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—The contrast between the opinion of Mr. Elliott, the ruler of Assam, and that of Sir Charles Aitchison, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Panjab, is so remarkable that it requires special notice.

Mr. Elliott has the courtesy to summarise the opinions of the officials of his province, and to say that, though he disagrees with some of them, "he would not have wished them to be in any respect modified." Sir Charles Aitchison has not the courtesy to notice the opinions of the officials of his province, though those opinions clearly prove that they are the opinions of men not inferior to himself, either in ability, or in knowledge of the subject under discussion.

Mr. Elliott calls attention to the unanimity with which the officials and non-officials of his province recommend the withdrawal of the Ilbert Bill. Sir Charles Aitchison takes no notice of the fact that the officials of his province are unanimous in objecting to the Ilbert Bill, or of the fact that of the 19 officials consulted by him, 15 advise its withdrawal, and four recommend alterations to be made in it destructive of its principle.

Mr. Elliott, acting upon the correct idea that this is a question purely between European British subjects, whose rights and privileges are being attacked, and the Government of India, who are attacking them, refrained from inviting natives to furnish him with their written opinions upon the subject. Sir Charles Aitchison, acting upon the fallacious idea that this is a political question between Europeans and natives, invited four non-official native individuals and four non-official native associations, to send him their written opinions upon it. But with manifest unfairness he consulted no non-official European individual, and only one non-official European association. Moreover, with further unfairness, Sir Charles Aitchison indicated to the native individuals and associations consulted by him the kind of reply he wished them to make, by letting them know what his own opinion was before they wrote theirs. This is proved by the following passage in the opinion of Agha Kalbi Abid: "I agree not only to the amendments proposed by the Bill, but also agree to the proposal of Sir Charles Aitchison, the Lieutenant-Governor, that all first class Magistrates