

nations of the earth rejoicing in their national greatness. Champagne was drunk on the top of the hill, and Germans and Frenchmen, Englishmen and Americans, pressed us to share their hospitality. I accepted their offer with thanks on my lips, but I felt within me that I had no place among them."

It is easy to conceive how the victories of Japan over what used to be one of the proudest European nations must have intensified such feelings.

Since 1905 nationalism has gradually expanded, generally blending in some measure with racial feeling. The Morley-Minto Councils operated to weaken social barriers and stimulate co-operation, but have been powerless to arrest or even check nationalist tendencies; and away from the Council-rooms, in the cities and towns, among the English-educated classes, these are now, partly through the influence of the Press, partly from the general unsettlement of the times, and partly as a result of increasingly frequent "constitutional agitations," far stronger and more combative than they were in 1908. It is only natural that Indian agitators should seek to better the instruction which they often receive from British politics, (but unfortunately agitations in India, however legally flawless, are generally sustained by methods which sharply exacerbate racial feeling and have already led more than once to lamentable disorders.) Almost always it may be said of such movements that even if they attain some immediate object, they leave a widened breach between peoples who have great need of each other, and that they produce a train of unforeseen and undesired consequences. This is perfectly well known in India; and the effect of some bitter lessons of the past may be seen in the prompt repudiation by the Moderates of Mr. Gandhi's passive resistance movement. But, un-

fortunately, of late years, for various reasons, the idea has found growing favour that, if an agitation be sufficiently loud and menacing, it will achieve success. The disastrous results of the agitation over the Sedition Bill, and the manner in which that movement was used for criminal purposes by the enemies of the State, may induce a greater reluctance to light fires which can by no means be extinguished at will.

We have our own defects and national peculiarities. Much of the resentment of the Indian political classes is social; and lies deep in the colour-line which has been drawn with rigour in some British colonies and is still drawn in India, at times unavoidably. India was a land of caste and social cleavages, of a severity unknown in Western countries, long before the British ever saw it. It is still a land of such divisions, and would remain one if the British left it. It is true that educated Indians have had some reason to complain of social barriers, and avoidable incidents occur from time to time which breed bad feeling.<sup>1</sup> But the existing wall of reserve has been buttressed largely by the extreme sensitiveness and racial dislike often cherished by Nationalists themselves. Only recently a very able Indian politician frankly admitted this, stating that some Nationalists desired that no Indian of prominence should be associated with Europeans even in social matters, and "mixing up wish with reality, indulge in day-dreams from which perhaps the European might be absent." He reminded his audience that in the India of the future the European would be present as well as the Indian. If all politicians would regard prospects in this sensible light, and if they would fashion their ideas accordingly, they would find plenty of response from the British side. And we ourselves, at this crisis

<sup>1</sup> The Press can do much to improve relations.

of the world's history, cannot wonder either at the sensibility of the political classes or at their natural appetite for posts and power. It is easy to see why, although they have been sheltered by a strong Imperial system from a world-wide storm, they meditate little on the benefits of such protection and much on the least agreeable of its accompaniments. It is comprehensible that, in their own words, they want to be in their own country "what other people are in theirs," that they think that they would hold their heads higher in the world under a national government of their own. These are ideas which in themselves appeal to Englishmen whether resident in India or elsewhere. Both sides must approach the questions raised thereby from a practical point of view. Such approach would be far easier if more Indian Nationalists showed a disposition to allow for existing facts, for the hard-earned position of Britain in India, for the heavy and compelling responsibilities which that position entails. "Britain," said the Maharaja of Ulwar, at the Delhi War Conference, "has wished India well, and has guided her destinies for 160 years." This is a true saying. The guidance has been through Britain's sons in India, who, aided by Indians, have established and maintained order, have dealt with obstacles, have taken risks, have worked indefatigably for progress. Necessity has trained them to consider what is really practicable in the interests of all communities. If their point of view were better understood, we would hear less of the doctrine that, unlike Britons at home, who are amiable philanthropists, Britons in India are specious oppressors.

This doctrine is ever the result of Extremism, the origin of which was, as I have shown, clearly described by Mr. Gokhale. Its history, its vicissitudes, its achievements have been traced in these pages. At this

moment it pursues constitutional methods, as these promise more fruitful results. Moreover, it has of late years attracted many adherents who have no taste for any but declamatory tactics. It includes, however, some men whose plans the future will disclose. For the present they wear the label "loyalty to the Crown, but impatience of bureaucratic government." Loyalty to the Crown is indeed a potent and valuable factor in India, but, professed by such persons as these, is simply a mask. Their aim is to reduce British rule to impotence as soon as possible by any methods that seem to promise success. The Sedition Bill legislation and its sequel afforded a notable opportunity to sober politicians of isolating such people. The opportunity was lost.

Mr. Jinnah, addressing the Muslim League in December 1916, quoted a passage from the speech of the Prime Minister on the Irish situation, and remarked that every word thereof applied almost literally to conditions in India. Mr. Lloyd George had said that in attempting to settle the Irish difficulty he had felt all the time that he was moving "in an atmosphere of nervous suspicion and distrust, pervasive, universal, of everything and everybody. . . . It was a quagmire of distrust which clogged the footsteps of progress. That was the real enemy of Ireland."

Mr. Jinnah's audience understood him to mean that advanced Indians are the victims of undeserved suspicion. It is true that the restrictions on military service, recruiting for which had till then been confined to the martial castes and classes, have encouraged this belief; and persons prominent in politics have, since the inception of a revolutionary movement, sometimes been watched by the police in a foolish and obtrusive fashion. This was sure to happen when the latter were faced with grave outbursts of political crime. But



trust is, after all, a plant of spontaneous growth. The British Government wishes to trust every section of Indians, and, not least, the section which, unless peaceful progress be definitely and violently arrested, must in time leaven many others. Should it be compelled to distrust particular leaders of this section, such distrust must be in the highest degree unwelcome, and can easily be removed by those concerned.

In any case, however, there remains another suspicion, and that is an Indian suspicion. It is the idea, often fostered by the Press, that the policy of the Government, even when definitely progressive, is, in fact, dictated by racial exclusiveness, by needless and selfish caution. Racism among Indians derives much of its strength from this suspicion which has wrought considerable mischief. It has obstructed a much-needed reform of secondary education with the theory that the real design is to limit the numbers of the restless English-educated. It has hindered measures of supreme importance to the public welfare, and has thereby advertised the necessity of retaining safeguards against such hindrances. For the latter reason Progressives might be expected to work for its removal, but hitherto there have been few signs of the approach of so bright a dawn. In September 1918 there was an indication of a change of view. There had been similar indications when the Morley-Minto Reforms were announced. Those had passed. This, too, passed. It yielded to the idea that there is a royal road to democratic government in India which is blocked by inconsiderate selfishness.

And yet it has often been seen that when members of the political classes meet British officials with open minds, either because there is no antagonism of views or because politics are not in question at all, things go

well enough. Indians, too, of these classes who enter Government service work contentedly, and have often shown a fine spirit of loyalty in difficult circumstances. So far, indeed, is it from being the case that there is an immovable barrier between them and the British officers with whom or under whom they serve, that intercourse is generally pleasant and sometimes ripens into warm regard. May these circumstances be harbingers of better things to come! We might be sure that they would be were it not for the preaching of racial hate.

We have discussed the economic condition of the political classes, and the influence on these classes of nationalism and racialism. We must now turn to the landlords, a far more numerous class which contributes very largely to the revenues of the country. (The future depends, in no small measure, on the degree to which the landlords will adapt their ideas to the requirements of the new era. Their influence in a great agricultural country must always be powerful. In parts of India the influence of the proprietors of large estates has weakened for reasons indicated on a former page. But where, as in the United Provinces and the Punjab, there are quantities of yeomen farmers living on the land in close touch with, and often belonging to the same caste as, their tenants, the influence of landlords is still very strong indeed. A quotation from a speech by Sir Michael O'Dwyer shows clearly its value during the recent war. In the Imperial Legislative Council he said :

“Take one cardinal feature of the Punjab. We have no great territorial aristocracy like other provinces, but we have what is perhaps even more valuable. We have over most of the province a large class of landed gentry or prosperous yeomen living on the land, in close

touch with the rural masses of whom they are usually the recognised leaders, and an invaluable support to the administration. Over all the province we have that splendid body of stalwart peasant proprietors, Muhammadans, Hindus, Sikhs, whose energy and enterprise, guided by a government in which they have never lost confidence, have built up the prosperity of the Punjab, and whose loyalty and sturdy valour have built up the fabric of the Indian Army. These are the two classes to which the Punjab Government has looked, and never looked in vain, in times of stress and difficulty; those are the two classes to which we owe almost exclusively the magnificent contributions which the province is now making in men and materials. In recognising the services of the province during the war, it is only just and reasonable that those classes should receive first consideration."

The Government of the United Provinces, too, has mainly to thank the landlords for the success of its war-efforts.

In Bengal only are the territorial proprietors materially interwoven with the professional or literary classes, and there they manifest more interest in politics than they do in other provinces. But in landlords generally, conservative and cautious instincts are naturally dominant. Their attitude toward the recent disturbances was very apprehensive, as was shown in an eminent degree by a circular appeal, addressed to their tenants in May 1919 by 300 landlords of Bengal.

There are, of course, in all provinces among the territorial aristocracy, men who sit on the Legislative Councils and interest themselves in politics, but these are by no means as fluent in speech as the lawyer-members, and have so far played a part there which corresponds in a small degree with the real power of the order to which they belong. It can never be the interest of the

landlords to desire weak government, even if it be national government, and they do not desire it. They are well aware of their stake in the country, and know that, in the words of a letter written last April by the Maharaja of Darbhanga to two large land-holding associations, their "very existence depends" on the protection of property and the maintenance of law and order which they "have been enjoying and continue to enjoy under the British Government." For this reason the Maharaja went on to urge the associations to exert themselves to the utmost "in quieting down the unrest which stalks through the land, and render the utmost possible assistance to the State in preventing disorder and removing root and branch the causes which have brought into existence this dreadful state of things."

It is true that some of the more important landlords are attracted by the vision of a self-governing India in the future, and others find it convenient to swim with the Nationalists. But in practice landlords, as a class, have never wished that the British Government should cease to be able to protect and arbitrate. They desire this less than ever now. Politics are to their minds a game which can pass into somewhat bitter earnest. They are conscious of being inadequately prepared for it. Their attention has hitherto been directed far more to their tenants, to litigation, and their private concerns than to anything else. The adjustment of their relations with the former has often been a matter of no ordinary complexity, for disputes regarding the landed tenures of India require careful study and impartial arbitration. Experience shows that for such arbitration they prefer British revenue officers.

The landlords, although very numerous, are the

minority of the rural population. The majority consists of peasant proprietors, under-proprietors, and tenants of various grades.

(The cultivators generally are so far untouched by the Nationalist propaganda.) Some have been approached by persons who tell them that they are exploited and impoverished;<sup>1</sup> their corn is, to their injury, exported from the country; their money is drained away in salaries spent by foreigners in Europe; their condition can be bettered only by Home Rule.) So far, such appeals have effected little more than a promise of unrest in odd places and a delegation of tenants to the last Congress, the history of which would probably be instructive. As was stated by Lord Curzon in 1909, what the agricultural masses require of a government is, that it shall worry them for money as little as possible; shall assist them generously in times of famine, floods, or other calamities; shall settle their disputes without fear or favour; shall protect them from the exactions of the worst kinds of landlords, money-lenders, or legal practitioners. At present they value British administration because its main effort is to supply these requirements. If untouched by insidious suggestions, they confide in its integrity, its freedom from susceptibility to intrigue or secret influence. Of many individual British civil administrators they have kindly recollections. Never was the demeanour of the country people of the Author's own provinces more conspicuously friendly toward British officers on tour than it was in the early months of the war, when some hearts were failing for fear of the future. Nor is it easy to think that the enthusiasm manifested by the masses on the occasion of the visit of their

<sup>1</sup> The recent report of the Foodstuffs Commissioner and Mr. Datta's report of 1910 on the rise of prices in India testify strongly to the contrary.

Majesties the King and Queen, sprang from those who were dissatisfied with their Government or unaware of the goodwill and honest purpose of His Majesty's servants.

These people, who when let alone are contented, friendly, and industrious, but when captured by those who wilfully or recklessly pour jars of paraffin upon their ignorance and credulity, can break out into fanatical fury, are to be trained to co-operate in affairs in order that they may take their part in the democratic India of the future. Let us not forget that they have been correctly described in the Reforms Report as "illiterate peasants whose mental outlook has been coloured by the physical facts of India, the blazing sun, the enervating rains." We stand on the threshold of a new era, but cannot anticipate that such physical facts will alter or that they will cease to operate on the minds of these many millions. It remains to be seen how far they will avail themselves of the political education which they are to undergo. If this political education implies the continuous and self-sacrificing effort on the part of the educated classes which was preached by Mr. Gokhale in 1909 and by Lord Sinha in 1915; if Indian Nationalism is so genuine and healthful a creed as to be able to inspire living patient service of a true and noble kind, all will be well and the co-operation of British officers is amply assured. But it may be said, both of the cultivators and of the labourers and lower orders in and near towns who have been lately so seriously affected by Extremist agitation, that if incidents of this education are to be persuasion of tenants to withhold rent at discretion, of peasant-proprietors to withhold revenue, of mill-hands and labourers to beware of British employers, of all to cultivate racial hatred and distrust; if the minds of the ignorant masses are to be warped, as the minds of the

better-educated youth of the country have to a considerable extent already been warped in what are called political interests; then, indeed, the last state will be worse than the first, and incalculable mischief is in prospect. Such mischief can only be averted by determined co-operation between the sober elements of Indian society and the officers of Government, strengthened, should occasion demand, by convincing proof that Britain will not abandon to hostile disorder the Empire built up by British and Indian valour and effort.

It appears that where the low castes or depressed classes are articulate, where they have organised associations, as in Madras and Bombay, they view coming constitutional changes with apprehension. From addresses lately presented to the Viceroy and Secretary of State, it appears that they fear what they anticipate would mean a régime of class legislation and repression, and consider that British rule alone, in the present circumstances of India, can hold the scales even between creeds and castes. Yet in the Joint Congress and Muslim League address to the Viceroy and Secretary of State presented at Delhi on November 26th, 1917, it was claimed that these associations had made many representations in favour of the amelioration of the condition of the masses and had "pressed for the removal of all disabilities and distinctions based on racial and religious grounds." As far as representations and resolutions go, this claim is well founded, and behind these representations and resolutions lies a genuine sentiment. There is testimony to this in the eagerness with which opportunities for social service are sometimes seized by youths of the political classes, and in the existence of associations for the purpose of philanthropic work among the lower orders. The forerunners in such paths were the Christian missionaries. But a

great deal more than resolutions or sentiment, or the societies that, amid the gravest obstacles, cultivate the advancement of social reform, will be required before material impression can be made on the usages of centuries. Not only are about 50,000,000 of Hindus treated as untouchable by the higher castes of their own faith, but in parts of Southern India they are even regarded as unapproachable. They are not allowed to enter the temples or use the village wells. Before British rule they were serfs. Now, though legally free, they are outcastes in a sense hardly appreciable in a Western country. Thus it is that in addresses to the Viceroy and Secretary of State they have expressed the strongest distrust of the Home Rule Leaguers; and thus it is that the President of the Indian National social conference held at Calcutta, less than two years ago, reminded his audience that while "gorgeous visions of a United India" were filling the political imagination, "loud protests of indignation were being raised by classes and communities amongst us which we can no longer ignore."

The authors of the Reforms Report desire that both the agricultural masses and the depressed classes may ultimately learn the lesson of self-protection. Special assistance is to be given to them if under the new régime they fail to "share in the general progress." Such assistance will certainly be needed, although the Honourable Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee has informed the Parliamentary Joint Committee that the influence of caste was on the wane, and that the Brahmans themselves, as well as the educated classes, desired its disappearance. Since the large majority of Hindus of the higher castes, and particularly of Brahmans, consider the caste system to be, as it undoubtedly is, the very foundation of the Hindu religious and social edifice, Mr. Banerjee



must indeed have been transported by the atmosphere of democratic England before he embarked on so venturesome an assertion.<sup>1</sup> Even Hindus who have received education in English, much as they may chafe under the rules and restrictions which caste imposes, widely as they may sometimes relax those rules and restrictions, would, if the caste-system really were on the verge of dissolution, inquire very anxiously indeed what could possibly take its place and what would become of Hinduism after its disappearance.

To the elements out of which, diversified as they are by varieties of caste, language, and religion, the self-governing India of the future is to be evolved, must be added numbers of gallant Indians who have been fighting in the Empire's cause. They belong to the agricultural and landholding classes, to the forces of conservatism. But since the commencement of the war they have been far more in contact with Western countries and Western ideas than ever before. It is not known how far they are attracted by the idea of government composed of indigenous parliaments. They have no previous experience or tradition of anything of the kind. But one lesson of recent years they have probably grasped. As was said by an Indian member of the Imperial Legislative Council :

“ From the time when the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, India has attracted the cupidity of powerful rulers and states ; from time immemorial her eternal mountains have witnessed the march of invading hordes, and her mighty rivers have flowed past the battle-fields of contending armies. The peace and prosperity of the country have been interrupted by long periods of rapine and plunder ; and the soil of India has seen the rise of great and powerful empires.”

<sup>1</sup> Further examined, Mr. Banerjee said that he referred to the educated Brahmins of Bengal.

There is little in the state of Asia or the world which gives assurance that things are now calm and peaceful ; that the nations are satisfied with what they have got, or that the future of India will henceforth be a matter of interest merely to India and Great Britain. Never was it more certain that, in the words of the President of the 1915 Congress, " free from England, and without a real power of resistance, India would be immediately in the thick of another struggle of nations."<sup>1</sup>

We have considered the position of the Ruling Chiefs, and noted their devotion to the Throne and the generous loyalty of their response to the Empire's needs. We are given to understand by a few of the more prominent Hindu princes that they are in sympathy with the prospect of an increasingly democratic India. The future will show how far such an India will affect politics in their states.

We must remember the non-official representatives of Britain in India, and particularly those to whom India's commercial progress is mainly due. It is obvious that no constitutional settlement should be made which fails to give due weight and security to their interests.

We have, too, the indigenous Anglo-Indians, the Eurasians, the Indian Christians and other communities who stand somewhat apart from the general masses of the population. Hindu-Muhammadian relations at their best and at their worst have been illustrated by events of various kinds described in previous pages. Ordinarily they are placid.

(We have seen that the demand for a parliamentary

<sup>1</sup> The traditional relations between Indian soldiers and their British officers are more easily understood from Younghusband's *Story of the Guides* than from any other book I know.

system came from a small section of India's many peoples, a section which pursues nationalist ideals and considers that British rule obstructs the realisation of these ideals. Partly for this reason the Nationalists are frequently moved by a racialism which has, in its extreme phase, produced a string of revolutionary conspiracies. Nationalist ambitions have been sharpened by economic pressure and by the present world-tendency to regard parliamentary government as the hall-mark of a civilised state. From the latter point of view, and because there is in true nationalism a source of uplifting inspiration, these ambitions must necessarily appeal to many thinking Indians outside active politics, but of these some are uneasy and by no means appreciate the uncertainty of the future.) We cannot doubt, however, that unless they lead to recognised calamity, nationalist ideals will in years to come appeal to a constantly widening circle. Even now they dominate the Press, and have largely penetrated schools and colleges. The British Cabinet has responded to these aspirations in a definite and unmistakable manner.

Minimising difficulties which recently seemed insuperable to two Liberal Secretaries of State, they issued the declaration of August 20th, 1917, and proclaimed a policy of not only increasing association of Indians with every branch of the administration, but also progressive realisation of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire. Progress is to be by stages; and the Viceroy and Secretary of State, in framing their proposals for carrying out the declared policy, have aimed at including in the very first stage by means of dyarchy, a measure of separate clear-cut ministerial responsibility. We have seen that the majority of local governments considered that dyarchy is unlikely to work without severe friction,

and have framed alternative proposals. The choice between the two sets of proposals will shortly be made by Parliament.<sup>1</sup>

In order to fulfil the purpose of the Declaration, the authors of the Reforms Report propose to disturb the present usually placid contentment of the masses because such disturbance will be "for India's highest good." It is certainly a consequence of the terms of the Declaration, but implies facilities for politicians which, unless employed with loyal discretion, will do India much harm and make administration extremely difficult. Often they will be honourably and discreetly used; but when they are not, the brunt of any consequent troubles will fall on the Executive servants of the Crown, and more especially on the Civil Service and Police.

It is these services which supply the commissioners, district officers, and superintendents who, themselves a mere handful, are responsible for the maintenance of peace and order among millions.

Generally a district officer has no troops whatever to support him, but merely a force of civil police under a British superintendent. His charge consists of a population of all castes and creeds, numbering from about 1,000,000 to 2,000,000 or 3,000,000. He has not only to keep the peace, but to collect the revenue, to combat epidemics, to foster education, and to do all he can for his people in every possible way. His friend and adviser is the commissioner, a senior officer who is responsible to Government for the charges of several district officers. The district officer is assisted by Indian deputy magistrates and sometimes by a European Joint Magistrate. He exercises a general supervision over the work of the police, which is carried on

<sup>1</sup> This was written before recent Parliamentary legislation.

## 254 A SUMMARY OF EXISTING CONDITIONS

under the control of the superintendent. He presides over a very large Indian subordinate staff. Some district officers are Indians, and many more will be Indians in future.

It may be said of district and police officers that as things are, their responsibilities are heavy and their days are fully occupied. They often pass through anxious experiences, and, in order to carry out their duties, need to be regarded as representatives not of a moribund, but of an active and vigorous power. Yet it is certain that in the future they will have at times to contend with the impression that power is departing from the British Raj, for that is how impending changes and a gradually shrinking British official element must appear and will often be represented to the Indian masses. Only if responsibility changes the political spirit will executive officers receive much help from it in difficulties. Nationalists have hitherto regarded them as generally hostile to reform. The truth is that they have to deal with not only the political, but all classes and creeds, and wish to be able effectively to discharge their responsibilities. If they are inclined to linger in the old tents, it is because before leaving those tents they would like reasonable assurance that the new encampment will not develop into a troubled scene where the same results will be expected from their work, but the atmosphere around it will gradually deteriorate.

(The Police have again and again been assailed by politicians because of the action which they have been compelled to take in dealing with and thwarting revolutionary crime. The English-educated classes have always been reluctant to acknowledge that the game of revolutionary politics must necessarily be perilous and rough for the players and their associates, that practised in India among vast masses of people who

inhabit great tracts of country sparsely policed, it necessitates stringent and effective remedies which may inconvenience other than guilty persons. Nor have the Nationalists hitherto been able to see that as they so much dislike such repressive measures, it is desirable that they should themselves take determined steps to put an end to the revolutionary propaganda which has produced occasion for them. It is certainly no gratification to the Police or to any officers of Government to devote energies for which there is ample employment in other directions to the disagreeable and thankless task of fighting anarchical conspiracy.)

British civil officers generally have good reason to be well aware of the enormous value of educated non-official co-operation, and their hearts warm to those from whom they receive it. They are proud that their mission is a mission of liberty and progress : and their sympathies would naturally incline towards Indians who, reading English history and literature, are attracted by the ideas of nationality and freedom which they draw from those inspiring pages. But there are other sources of inspiration ; and when such ideas operate through a medium of sensitive and suspicious racialism, they produce something widely different from that co-operation which is essential for progress, and when forthcoming, slights all difference of colour, bringing a mutual goodwill which makes all things possible.

(The Extremists wish to push forward recklessly, regardless of obstacles or consequence, of sectarian and social divisions, of the dangers of racial conflict, of the ignorance of the great majority of the population, of the responsibility of Britain for the good government of India. They mean to press their views by the promotion of incessant agitation.) The Moderates see the danger of precipitate changes, and know that progress

worth having can only come through co-operation with Government and its officers. Their position is difficult, but they can establish it by trusting the strength which will be theirs with courageous resolution. Neither party allows sufficiently for the natural obstacles in the path of democratic progress in India or for British responsibilities to every class and race. Neither party seems to grasp adequately the difficulties of the coming years of transition, difficulties inevitable in any case, and augmented by the troubled state of the world. These difficulties are, however, understood by many thinking Indians and by the Services. In their opinion, whatever be the scheme of reforms, Government must preserve full weight and power for years yet. Without Britain, India would directly be torn by invasion; and, in the absence of a trained electorate that can protect itself and be said to represent sufficiently the educated intelligence of all classes of His Majesty's subjects, Britain cannot abdicate her responsibilities for India's domestic affairs.

It is not surprising in such times as these that the doctrines of Western democracy have carried the ambitions of Indian Nationalists on to adventurous lengths. As some declare for a future of perpetual agitation, we may note that premature Home Rule would mean an unhappy attempt at government by particular castes and classes. Genuine Indian progressives would, without that British support which has done so much to assist them all these years, be liable to succumb to the reactionary sectarian and social influences which they are even now reluctant to combat seriously. Clouds of confusion would gather rapidly; British interests and credit would suffer irretrievable damage; and the vision of a brilliant happy India, raised by the endeavours of

all classes of her sons to a worthy place within the circle of the British Empire, would prove a delusive dream.

Thus it is that to many who have eaten the salt of India, who wish India well and desire to see her prosper and progress, it seems that a vital issue of the present is, Will the constitutional changes in prospect be such as adequately to maintain British supremacy, so long as that alone can carry on the work of the past and guarantee the well-being of the people whom we have known as the friendly companions of the best years of our lives ?



## CHAPTER IX

### A YEAR LATER

A YEAR has passed since I wrote the last chapter. The attitude of the party of disorder in India has become more imperious, more challenging to British rule. A dangerous movement has achieved a certain measure of success. On the other hand, there are some hopeful portents, although many among the people of India must be profoundly puzzled by one aspect of present affairs. It seems worth while to trace briefly certain developments from the situation which existed at the end of April 1919. These have been influenced to some extent by doings in the world outside India. In fulfilling my task, I purpose to avoid reopening bitter controversies on which judgment has recently been passed.

Throughout the summer of 1919 the Government of India Bill, prepared by the Secretary of State on the lines proposed in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, was examined by a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons presided over by Lord Selborne. Together with the Bill, the Reports of the Franchise and Functions Committees, appointed in pursuance of the dyarchy scheme, were carefully studied. These committees had toured in India in the previous cold weather under the chairmanship of Lord Southborough. They had been composed partly of officials and partly of non-officials. The Parliamentary Joint Committee examined representatives of deputations from Indian political bodies, various English-speaking Indians, and a number of British officials and non-officials. They considered the

voluminous literature which had accumulated on the subject of the Reforms, and they reported to Parliament on November 17th, 1919, accepting provincial dyarchy in accordance with the Bill's proposals and the evidence of most witnesses, but in opposition to the majority of Local Governments and two notable ex-Lieutenant-Governors. They considered that, in the present circumstances of India, electorates must be small and the experience of the representatives of these electorates must be limited. Dyarchy would fix responsibility, but would enable each side of a provincial Government to assist the other. Joint Cabinet discussion should take place as often as possible.<sup>1</sup>

The Parliamentary Committee, rejecting the expedient of Grand Committees of provincial Legislative Councils, enabled a Governor, under carefully defined safeguards, to pass an Act in respect of a reserved subject on his sole responsibility. Such an Act would, however, be reserved for the pleasure of His Majesty in Council.

The Committee extended separate representation, by means of the reservation of seats, to the non-Brahmans in Madras and the Marathas in Bombay. They considered the representation proposed for the rural classes and the depressed classes inadequate. Provincial Legislative Councils must no longer be presided over by Heads of Provinces, but for four years by appointed chairmen. Then they would elect their own chairmen.

In the Government of India there would be no dyarchy, but three members of the Viceroy's Executive Council would be public servants or ex-public servants, and not less than three should be Indians. No restriction would in future be placed on the total number of members of this Council.

The Council of State would be a true second chamber.

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 160-7.

Both this Council and the Legislative Assembly would have special electorates. For four years each body would have an appointed chairman; and after that period it would elect its own chairman. Arrangements were made to enable the Governor-General to secure the passage of necessary legislation.

It had been proposed by a specially appointed Committee, which sat under the chairmanship of Lord Crewe, to supplant the Council of the Secretary of State by an Advisory Committee. This proposal was rejected, but more Indians were to be appointed to this Council, and the term of service thereon would be shortened. In accordance with a proposal of Lord Crewe's Committee, a High Commissioner for India would perform functions of agency in London analogous to those performed by the High Commissioners of the Dominions.

The Parliamentary Committee declared that the public services of the Crown in India had "deserved the admiration and gratitude of the whole Empire." At all times the personal concurrence of the Governor would be essential in the case of all orders prejudicially affecting the position or prospects of public servants appointed by the Secretary of State. Every precaution should be taken to secure to all public servants the career in life to which they looked forward when they were recruited.

The Committee considered that the Statutory Commission contemplated by the Montagu-Chelmsford Report for examination later on of the working of the new constitution should not be appointed until ten years had expired, and that in the interval no changes of substance, in the franchise, or the list of reserved or transferred subjects, or otherwise, should be made. Against the advice of the Government of India, the Committee transferred the whole field of education to ministers. They attached much importance to the

educational advancement of the depressed and backward classes, and they trusted that this subject would receive special attention from Indian ministers.

They strongly advised that Government in India should take special pains to explain to the masses of the people the reasons for and motives of its measures.

Finally, the Committee disclaimed all intention of condemning the existent system of Government in India. That Government had introduced a reign of law to which it was itself subject. It was necessarily autocratic in form so long as Parliament bestowed no form of self-government on any part of India while holding the Indian administration responsible to itself for every action. But whatever had been the form, the spirit of Government in India had everywhere been for the welfare of the masses of the people of the country.

The Bill, modified in accordance with the Joint Committee's recommendations, passed quickly through both Houses of Parliament, and received the Royal Assent on December 23rd, 1919. His Majesty, when assenting, was pleased to issue a memorable proclamation to India. This proclamation pointed out that the path to responsible government would not be easy, and that on the march toward the goal there would be need of perseverance and of mutual forbearance between all sections and races of His Majesty's people in India. "I rely," it proceeded, "on the leaders of the people, the ministers of the future, to face responsibility and endure to sacrifice much for the common interest of the State, remembering that true patriotism transcends party and communal boundaries; and while retaining the confidence of the legislatures, to co-operate with my officers for the common good in sinking unessential differences and maintaining the essential standards of a just and generous Government. Equally do I rely

on my officers to respect their new colleagues and to work with them in harmony and kindliness ; to assist the people and their representatives in an orderly advance towards free institutions ; and to find in their new tasks a fresh opportunity to fulfil, as in the past, their highest purpose of faithful service to my people." His Majesty expressed an earnest desire "at this time that so far as possible any trace of bitterness between my people and those who are responsible for my Government should be obliterated "; and in fulfilment of this desire an amnesty was at once granted to political prisoners and to persons who had been convicted of offences against the State or had been subjected to restrictions of liberty under any special or emergency legislation. The proclamation also announced the establishment of a Chamber of Princes and the forthcoming visit to India of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. "With all my people," His Majesty concluded, "I pray to Almighty God that by His wisdom and under His guidance India may be led to greater prosperity and contentment, and may grow to the fullness of political freedom."

The Proclamation and the Amnesty mark a notable stage in the history of the Indian Nationalist Movement. They came at a time of unusual racial tension in India. To explain this circumstance it is necessary to summarise developments in that country, and especially in the Punjab, between the suppression of the April riots of 1919 and the beginning of the year 1920.

Sir Michael O'Dwyer left India in May 1919. Before his departure he received addresses from Muhammadans and Sikhs, tendering warm acknowledgment of his firm grasp of the recent situation. Hindus also presented an address expressing sorrow for "the foolish and mischievous acts" of certain misguided men, and promising co-operation with the Government.

Sir Michael O'Dwyer administered the Punjab during a long period marked by such danger as had been altogether unknown in India since the Mutiny. In previous chapters I have referred to the perils which on two memorable occasions beset his administration. After grappling with the conspiracies of 1915, which showed him the extent of the danger which, although for the moment surmounted, might easily reappear, he steadily set his face against extension to the Punjab of any of the Home Rule campaigns<sup>1</sup> which in other parts of India had kindled so much racial excitement. He held that such operations would not only militate strongly against recruitment, but, in so critical and difficult a season, would tend directly to produce disastrous consequences. He was the guardian of the principal recruiting field in the country at a time when the Empire needed soldiers sorely. Not only was he fearlessly true to his trust, but with never-wearying insistence he constantly visited every part of his province throughout the long critical years of the war, appealing again and again in vigorous and stimulating language to every section of its people. It would be grossly insulting to those who responded in such ample measure to his earnest addresses to suppose for a moment that his influence was that of a suspicious tyrant. Had he not possessed a kindly and inspiring, as well as a courageous and vigorous personality, the Punjab would not have shone forth as it did in the Empire's sorest need. The charge that this pre-eminence was attained by methods which contributed largely to the riots of April 1919 was examined by the Hunter Committee and rejected as ill-founded. They pointed out that comparatively few soldiers came from the towns wherein the

<sup>1</sup> Messrs. B. G. Tilak and Bipin Chandra Pal (see p. 183) were during the War prohibited from entering the Punjab.

disturbances broke out, that nowhere did the demobilised soldiers, who were returning to their homes in numbers at the time of the riots, show any disposition to sympathise with the rioters.

Sir Michael O'Dwyer brought the Punjab through the difficulties and trials of the War with supreme credit. But, call no man fortunate until he is dead ! More than four months after what seemed to be the end of his anxieties, forces set in motion from outside produced a sudden and violent eruption in his province. He was placed in difficulties of extraordinary gravity. It is impossible to suppose that any measures which would have effectively and speedily arrested the conflagration would not have afterwards been bitterly criticised and attacked. The measures which he took will not be dispassionately appraised until the further issues of the events of the last two years have brought scales and weights of their own. The general tendency has been altogether to minimise the emergency which produced them.

He was succeeded by Sir Edward Maclagan, an officer of very high character, popular in the Punjab. At first all was quiet. The rioters and their abettors were in jail, and as war was going on with Afghanistan, there was constant passage of troops. Newspapers were few and timid. Political oratory had ceased. But the political classes were resentful, and it was desired to restore normal conditions. A number of the less important pending riot cases were dropped. Punishments of forfeiture of property were remitted. Newspapers which had become temporarily defunct reappeared, and a start was made in reducing sentences passed on rioters. The idea evidently was that now that calm had been restored, it was no longer necessary to carry out all the severe sentences. Before long, however, a policy

of very heavy reductions was put into execution. In the case of certain promoters of the trouble, sentences were very considerably shortened. Apparently these measures were well received.

Meantime, politicians from outside the Province, who had during the continuance of martial law been prohibited from entering the province, began to arrive, and in July a committee of the National Congress was started there, the members of which travelled over the districts affected by the disorders, and made inquiries into the administration of martial law. Simultaneously the newspapers of all provinces expatiated very vigorously on Punjab grievances. Matters came to a head with the discussions at Simla on the Indemnity Bill which was introduced by the Government of India in the September session of the Imperial Legislative Council to condone such illegalities as might have been *bona fide* committed in the course of suppressing the riots. Prominent non-official members were giving evidence in London before the Joint-Parliamentary Committee, but Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, an influential Hindu politician of the United Provinces, bitterly opposed the Bill; and although it was passed, an offensive began.

Two announcements were made at these September sessions. In order to meet criticisms of the sentences passed by the Courts which had tried the rioters, it was stated that two judges of the highest status would be appointed to examine a number of the cases in question. This was done. A British and an Indian High Court judge, after careful examination, upheld the decisions referred to them in all but a few cases.

It was further announced that a Committee would be appointed to investigate the recent disturbances in the provinces of Bombay and the Punjab as well as at Delhi,



the causes thereof, and the measures adopted, to restore order. The carefully selected Committee would consist of three British and two Indian members, whose names were announced, and the President would be Lord Hunter of the Scotch Bar. Afterwards another British and another Indian member were added. The final list of members included the names of Mr. Justice Rankin of the Calcutta High Court, Mr. W. F. Rice, C.S.I., Secretary to the Government of India, Major-General Sir George Barrow, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., the Hon. Pundit Jagat Narain of the United Provinces Legislative Council, the Hon. Mr. Thomas Smith of the same body, Sir Chimmanlal Sitalvad, Kt., Advocate of the Bombay High Court, Sardar Sahibzada, Sultan Almad Khan, Barrister-at-law, Member for Appeals, Gwalior State.

In October and November Mr. Gandhi visited various places in the Punjab, working with Pundit Madan Malaviya and Mr. Andrews, an ex-missionary, preparing the Congress case relating to the Disorders. It was decided, apparently with some reluctance on the part of the local people concerned, that the Congress should sit at Amritsar during the Christmas week; and a new "hartal," stoppage of business, was arranged for October 17th, as a protest against the impending settlement with Turkey. The hartal was partially successful, and the pro-Turkish or Khalifat agitation took more definite shape. Mr. Gandhi had adopted it earnestly, and endeavoured to stimulate a boycott of the Peace celebrations which were to be held in December. But his proceedings were exciting no small alarm among all sober and reasonable politicians, as is evidenced by the following passage from a prominent newspaper of the time. "Mr. Gandhi supplies merely a popular motive: at one time it is the Rowlatt Act; at another time it is the Khalifat question; a third time it may

be any other matter which is exercising the public mind; to push on his passive resistance movement nothing else probably matters to him but the success of his movement, in which he profoundly believes as being calculated to overcome the powers of darkness as he apprehends them. Indians should decide once for all intelligently, and with a full appreciation of his bent of mind, whether they are going to play the rôle of passive resisters at his bidding. Such of them as are not prepared to be the instruments of his policy should, without the least hesitation, disregard his advice."

It was at this critical juncture, when all who wanted peace in the Punjab were beginning to fear for the future, that the Disorders Inquiry Committee began to sit first at Delhi and next at Lahore. At the very outset a difficulty arose, as the Congress sub-committee insisted that certain of the leading prisoners convicted in connection with the riots should be temporarily released from jail, under ample security, for the period of the inquiry. They were informed that this request could not be granted, but that if the Committee desired to hear the evidence of any of the prisoners, arrangements would be made accordingly, and that if it were found necessary for the Council engaged in the inquiry to visit the prisoners for purposes of consultation, proper facilities for such consultation would be afforded. Further negotiations took place, and on November 15th Mr. Gandhi intimated that the Congress Sub-Committee would not appear before Lord Hunter's Committee. The Congress Committee then proceeded to collect, through its agents, a large number of statements of persons who were alleged to have been maltreated during the suppression of the disturbances. These statements, together with an introductory report, were published by the Congress some months afterwards,

The publication contains a large number of allegations which have never been tested, but have, to a considerable extent, been accepted as true by the public for whom they were intended. It is most unfortunate that such allegations were not laid before the tribunal, which would have carefully sifted them.

The Hunter Committee sat in a crowded room before an audience often largely consisting of students. The evidence of each day was published in the newspapers under prominent headlines, and growing tension reached a climax with the examination of General Dyer. Shortly afterwards, as a result of the Amnesty, some hundreds of convicted rioters were released from jail, eighty, however, of the worst offenders being retained there. Many of the men convicted of complicity in the revolutionary conspiracies of 1915 (mostly Sikhs) were also set at liberty. All restrictions on the liberty of certain persons which had been imposed under the Defence of Order Act and Emigration into India Ordinance were removed, and new Presses and newspapers were established without security. Some of the persons released were required to promise to abstain in future from any movement against the Government. In fact, very full effect was given to the policy laid down by the Amnesty.

The Congress began to sit at Amritsar on December 27th, 1919, and some released prisoners, especially Drs. Kitchlew and Satyapal, who had figured so prominently in connection with the Amritsar disorders, were hailed with loud acclamations. The Congress and Muslim League meetings proceeded on lines which have in recent years become habitual. The former body was presided over by Pandit Moti Lal Nehru, a barrister from the United Provinces, who was supported by Messrs. Tilak, Gandhi and others. A few days later the party was joined by Messrs. Muhammad Ali and

Shaukat Ali, Muhammadan brothers who had been in 1915 interned by Lord Hardinge's Government at Chindwara in the Central Provinces, and in April 1919 committed to gaol, because, as announced by the Government of India, they had been "making every effort to induce Indian Muslims to assist the hostile action of the Amir" (of Afghanistan).

There was abundance of wild talk. Mr. Gandhi with some difficulty induced the Congress to pass a resolution condemning the excesses of the April rioters, but the attention of the meetings was mainly given to the measures employed in suppressing the disturbances. The recall of the Viceroy and the impeachment of Sir Michael O'Dwyer were demanded. Pilgrimages were made to the Jallianwala Bagh. For some days Amritsar was in a political turmoil. All hope of better things for the Punjab vanished for the hour. Influences from outside the Province, combined with the effect of the sittings of the Hunter Committee, had proved too strong.

Meanwhile, however, although in other parts of India interest had mainly centred on reading reports of the proceedings of the Joint Parliamentary Committee and later on of the Hunter Committee, the cleavage between Moderates and Extremists was widening. The harvest had been satisfactory, but prices were still high, and the example of English labour movements was gradually taking effect in various strikes. The enactment of the Reforms and the issue of His Majesty's Proclamation were well received by the Moderates, who held another separate Conference in Calcutta to celebrate the occasion. When the Imperial Legislative Council met in January 1920, Mr. S. Sinha, a Moderate politician, moved—"that the Imperial Council offers His Most Gracious Majesty the King-Emperor its dutiful homage and loyal devotion, and expresses its sense of profound gratefulness

for the Royal Proclamation issued by His Majesty on the memorable occasion of His having given His Royal Assent to the Government of India Bill, declaring, as the Proclamation does, the noble and lofty principles of Government which are to guide in future the policy of His Majesty's Officers to enable the Indian nation to attain full responsible government and full political freedom as a member of the British Commonwealth." Mr. Sinha said : " I have always believed that British rule is the one instrument by means of which the people of India will be raised to a higher sense of nationality and in the scale of nations. . . . What is wanted is real co-operation between officials and non-officials, and there will be no trouble hereafter. The occasion demands great forbearance on both sides, and I sincerely believe both sides will rise equal to it." Mr. Surendranath Banerjee said that when H.R.H. the Prince of Wales visited India, he would receive " a rousing and enthusiastic welcome from the people in conformity with their cherished traditions." The British representatives of the Calcutta and Bombay Chambers of Commerce pledged their communities to make the Reforms Act a " real success." Sir William Marris, on the part of the Government, made a memorable speech containing the following sentences :

" The problem before this country and Government was unprecedented in political history. There was no practical experience to guide the makers of the new constitution, and they could only follow lines which they believed would secure two distinct and equally necessary elements, namely, permanence and security of the official system for such a period as would enable the new material to form and harden together with the fullest and freest opening of the door of responsibility and experience within a definite but generously widening

experience. These were the dual principles before the builders, and the verdict of Parliament has been given to the effect that no better scheme than this could be devised. . . . We stand on the threshold of a great undertaking, and the best way in which we can prepare ourselves to lay hands to it is to search out our own hearts and make sure, so far as it possibly lies in us, that it shall not fail."

The resolution was carried unanimously, but several non-official members who belonged to the Congress had withdrawn from the Council during the discussion.

The year 1920 has seen frequent and vigorous attempts to diffuse racial and religious hatred under cover of the non-co-operation movement. These endeavours have been particularly persevering in the Punjab, the most inflammable area. In that province there was a lull after the political meetings and the wholesale releases. Every latitude was given to the Press in view of His Majesty's proclamation. But the more prominent of the men released, as a rule, showed no sign whatever of repentance or conversion; and, simultaneously with the growing Khalifat agitation, a strike movement began among the railway employes. In Lahore 15,000 unemployed and discontented men were for weeks wandering about, and when at last they returned to work a great deal of harm had been done, economic and political. In addition came all the consequences of the divided Hunter Committee Report, the Debates in Parliament, and the Dyer controversy. It is by no means surprising that, despite the patient and earnest efforts of the Lieutenant-Governor, who on April 6th last urged the members of his Council, and through them the leaders of political opinion in the Province, to bear in mind the need for peace, to put aside passion and hatred, to discourage the revival of old animosities, despite also the distribution of

180,000 acres of canal lands to soldiers who fought in the war, and the grant of practically free education to sons of soldiers, a section of the Sikhs, disappointed with the proportion of elected seats allotted to their community on the coming provincial legislative council, has been induced to declare for non-co-operation. The Punjab Government, too, has been compelled to take special measures to protect rural audiences from inflammatory harangues. It is earnestly to be hoped that better things are to come in this fine province, but malignant influences are busily operating to thwart all the efforts of the Government and propagate racial hatred.

Among the resolutions passed at the recent Nagpur Congress was one to the effect that committees are to start in every village in the country, to spread abroad the doctrines of non-co-operation, boycott of the Government and all its works, of the new Councils, of the police and army, of State and State-aided schools, by far the larger number of schools in the country. It would be a mistake to regard all the flamboyant announcements made at this gathering as seriously meant by all the crowd of excited people who either assented to or did not dissent from them; but what they do portend is that a campaign is to be boldly developed which has already begun, a campaign the main objective of which is to incite to rebellion the illiterate, gullible masses and thus to render Government more difficult. The methods which will be used for this purpose are those which have already been employed, which were employed when the train was laid which led to the conflagration of April 1919.<sup>1</sup>

The prime movers in the operations which preceded the Nagpur Congress are, according to all reports, Messrs. Gandhi, Muhammad Ali, and Shaukat Ali. The pleas which these men and their coadjutors advance are the

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 211-12.

attitude of the British toward the Turkish Government and the action of the former in regard to methods adopted in suppressing the Punjab riots. They say that their object is immediate Home Rule. Hitherto they seem to have devoted their main attention to working up religious fanaticism. Mr. Gandhi on March 12th, 1920, issued a manifesto which ran as follows: "I trust the Hindus will realise that the Khalifat question overshadows the Reforms and everything else. If the Muslim claim was unjust apart from the Muslim scriptures, one might hesitate to support it merely on scriptural authority, but when a just claim is supported by the scriptures, it becomes irresistible." He then enumerated the Khalifat Committee's demands, deprecated violence or boycott, advised the Viceroy to put himself at the head of the movement, and concluded by recommending non-co-operation. "Every step," he wrote, "in withdrawing co-operation has to be taken with the greatest deliberation. We must proceed slowly, so as to secure retention of self-control under the fiercest heat."

Mr. Gandhi's hand is always on his heart. He protests his sincerity. He has often publicly deprecated racial hatred. He desires always to pursue the truth. But when a devout Hindu announces that boiling indignation because Turkey is to suffer penalties for her attack on the Allies and her share in the war has decided him to initiate such a programme as that proclaimed by the non-co-operators, he protests too much. It is unnecessary to quote from his further effusions. In June he was reported as taking a leading part at a meeting of the Khalifat Committee, which resolved, *inter alia*, that a Khalifat Volunteer Corps be established all over India in order to collect subscriptions for the Khalifat fund and to prepare the Indian public for the non-co-operation movement. The preparation has apparently



consisted of a powerful use of social boycott carried even to the verge of the grave. Latterly Mr. Gandhi has become much more truculent and outspoken, partly, no doubt, because he is encouraged by the ground which, he thinks, has been gained by the enemies of England at home and abroad, partly also perhaps because he is desperately anxious to achieve martyrdom of some kind. But if he and his coadjutors have not suffered from their movement, others have suffered very severely. Not only has a British official of high character and promise been murdered by adherents of the Khalifat agitation, but thousands of Muslim cultivators have been induced to leave their homes by the preaching that religious obligations required their exodus from India to Afghanistan. Thousands have found it necessary to retrace their steps and to seek the aid of the officers of the Government which they had been taught to hate and mistrust. They are said to be indignant with their false teachers. But the latter have merely varied the field of their operations.

Nor are Muslim cultivators alone disturbed. What has been going on here and there in India is evidenced by a passage in a speech by a member of the United Provinces Legislative Council delivered some months ago. He complained bitterly that the affairs of Turkey were being exploited with the object of adding to the indigenous troubles of India, that frequent hartals<sup>1</sup> were causing very serious hardship to the poor, that these hartals were not voluntary, but were forced upon shopkeepers. Of this bullying he gave a notable instance. In a certain city bad characters had been, a few days before, ordering people to close their shops on pain of being plundered, and in fact some poor people, who had arrived from the country to sell milk and vegetables,

<sup>1</sup> Stoppages of business.

had been plundered. Such hooliganism was, he said, assuming a very serious shape, and required the intervention of the Government.

As to the Punjab riots and the measures adopted for their suppression, Lord Chelmsford asked his Legislative Council last August not to enter the new era in a spirit "charged with the animosities of the past," but leaving those things which are behind, to "press forward to the things that are before." He could see in the continuance of those discussions nothing but fresh recriminations tending to further racial exacerbation. The advice is excellent, although there are those on both sides in India who doubtless find it hard to follow. But it is not so natural that prominent among them should be those men who, above all others, let slip the dogs of racial strife, organised the movement which led directly to the riots, and have either not suffered at all for their action, or, after conviction of the most serious offences, have been released, after a few months' incarceration, to be acclaimed and paraded as heroes.

Among the vigorous energies of the non-co-operation leaders is a campaign which aims at the capture of the youth of the country. The path of revolutionary movements in India is strewn with victims of enterprises of this sort. By far the larger number of Indians killed in the commission of revolutionary crime, or convicted of revolutionary crime, have been boys or young men deliberately tutored. This fact, together with other realities of the past, is unheeded by the fanatics of the present. "These wreckers," said Sir Harcourt Butler, a governor who possesses in a remarkable degree the confidence of the people of his provinces, "stand across the path of progress like Apollyon in the immortal allegory stating: 'Thou shalt go no further. Here I will spill thy soul.' Others have preceded them.

Like others they will find, I doubt not, their last affinities in silence and cold. But many young men will suffer by the way." The truth of these words is recognised by the great majority of the Indian educated public, but only strenuous exertions on their part can prevent fulfilment of the foreboding conveyed in the last sentence. Between the perils of a propaganda that inculcates murder and robbery as a direct means of overthrowing the only Government that can steer India through the storms of these times, and the dangers of a campaign that preaches racial and religious hatred and calculated action thereon, the difference is slight indeed. "Anyone," has said Lord Ronaldshay, the governor who has guided Bengal through these difficult times with remarkable success, "anyone making a comprehensive survey of the non-co-operation movement, could scarcely be blamed if he came to the conclusion that the only password required to give admission to the non-co-operation camp was race-hatred. . . . Surely the world has had its fill of hatred. Cast your eyes over the past six years, and what do you see—the world in agony. . . . Humanity in torment, scourged with sorrow, losing its hold upon hope, drifting in the terrifying ocean of despair. That is what hatred has done for mankind, and is mankind going to tolerate those who would deliberately, and out of malice aforethought, perpetuate this grisly tradition of hatred among men? Let us have the answer of the people of this country to that question. For myself I have faith in the better mind of the people of Bengal."

Early in August last Mr. B. G. Tilak died. He had been absent in England in the previous year, and had given evidence before the Parliamentary Joint Committee. He had returned in November, and had taken part in the Amritsar Congress. He had expounded his views at Delhi in March 1920 in the following terms :

"The Egyptian and Irish troubles are in a great turmoil, and the whole atmosphere is hot and boiling. Such a favourable opportunity comes once perhaps in a century; and if during this time of upheaval and unrest India can press her demands with a vigour worthy of her position, she will get what is her birthright. But if she is enamoured by the prospect of the Reforms, the world-cauldron will grow cold during the next few years, and it will be impossible to heat it up again." These words explain the attitude of others beside Mr. Tilak. To strike while the iron is hot, reckless of all results, if only British power in India can be overthrown, is their object. Religious, agrarian, economic discontents are pressed into that service.

It will be remembered that Mr. Tilak began public life as a bitter opponent of the Age of Consent Bill which the Government of India introduced in 1891 to remedy the crying evil of Hindu child-marriage, and that one of his earliest complaints, put into the mouth of the long dead hero Sivaji, was that under British rule Brahmans were subject to incarceration. He never forgot that he belonged to the Chitpavan Brahmans from whom the line of Peishwas had sprung. Although, as was obviously expedient, he employed the phrases of Western democracy, it is difficult to doubt that his real object all along was the establishment of Brahman temporal supremacy in fact if not in name.)

The year 1920 has seen a gradual consolidation of the Moderate party, who with faint-hearted exceptions, have vigorously opposed the non-co-operation movement. It has also witnessed some stir among the landed classes, who have good reason to take alarm at the course of events. It has finished with the Council-elections which have generally gone well. We may hope that the heavy, wearisome, harassing responsibilities which Dis-

strict and Police Officers have been discharging with such patience and courage will lighten. But it would seem that much more strenuous and uncompromising effort is required from all Indians who care for their country's welfare, if the non-co-operation movement is to be prevented from accomplishing very serious mischief. It has been vigorously denounced by some ruling chiefs, but so far has not been directly arrested by the Government.

"What we gain in a free way is better than twice as much in a forced way, and will be more truly ours and our posterity's." These words explain the official policy. But whether or not this attitude has hardened desirable tendencies and disturbed Mr. Gandhi's calculations, it has certainly given free room for a great deal of poisonous activity which has produced some lamentable results. It has also profoundly puzzled many among those millions who consider that no Government deserves respect or obedience which does not promptly combat the operations of its open enemies. Notwithstanding all the implications of the coming parliamentary system, this root-idea will remain. It will always remain and can be disregarded only at an accumulating cost. The whole history of India shows this. It may be that what Mr. Gandhi and his associates most desire is preventive action by the Government. But an alternative explanation of their boldness is that they think they have friends in England at their backs. In any case the root-idea must be reckoned with.

It is remarkable that not only are the extreme nationalists denouncing the new régime for which they so loudly cried, but that a Hindu gentleman of advanced views, who has long laboured in the educational field, has reflected that the old times were not so bad after all. "The poor Indian," he wrote in a newspaper last May, "however else he may be minded, is not, at

any rate has not been politically minded in *this* modern sense that political electioneerings, intrigues, and cliquings are the be-all and end-all of life, the staple of all conversation, 'a source of interest and joy for ever,' as they are said to be to the Englishman 'at home,' if not in India. Life in India has already palpably grown greyer. The old joyous melas (fairs), tamashas (spectacles), festivals and holidays, the visits to the rivers, temples, hills and woods, the opportunities for communion with nature and the enjoyment of beauties that come every alternate week, if not every alternate day, are largely gone. The law courts, the endless small-print, the innumerable public meetings, always in the fag-end of the day to make people more fagged and headachy—these are the substitutes of the new civilisation for the simple enjoyments of the older. That older civilisation is decadent no doubt, alas! Otherwise the new would not have had a chance, but some of us devoutly wish that the new were something better! " In another passage of the article the author stated that the "genius and traditions" of the Indian people were different from those of the British people, but were being "forcibly adjusted" to the Parliamentary party system by circumstances which Indians could not control.

This adjustment is, however, the response to the insistent demands of the Indian political classes themselves, and it is hardly reasonable that their representatives should complain of it. Such reflections come too late. The ancient backwater is behind. "The voice of the Almighty saith: 'Up and onwards for evermore.' This is what the vocal section of educated India has asked for. The prayer has been granted. But the transition from the old to the new will be sharp indeed if not cautiously adjusted. Only firm maintenance of order and willing co-operation can secure the future.

<sup>1</sup> Article in the *Leader* by B. Bhagvan Das—May 1920.

"The world grows better even in the moderate degree in which it does grow better, because people wish that it should, and take the right steps to make it better. . . . Social energy itself can never be superseded either by evolution or by anything else." Eleven years ago Mr. Gokhale, who realised this clearly, stated some of the tasks which lay before his countrymen if a democratic form of self-government was ever to be a success in India. If the shouldering of these tasks, each of which, he said, needed a whole army of devoted missionaries, was urgent then, it is imperative now. A scheme of gradually developing democratic self-government has been actually launched. No reasonable person who is acquainted with the real conditions of the country can doubt that it is on a most trustful scale. The reproach that insufficient scope has been given to Indian ability is entirely baseless. Education, industries, the agricultural co-operative movement, local self-government, all administrative functions of supreme importance, have been made over to the direction of Indian Ministers; and in all the departments of domestic government Indian Ministers are to have their say. Three Indian lawyers now sit on the Viceroy's Executive Council. The services will be increasingly manned by Indians. Now or never is the time for the exertion of social, educational, and industrial energies. But if these opportunities are largely to be dissipated on the promotion of war, of whatever kind, with the nation to which India owes her new unity, then assuredly this great continent with its hundreds of millions of people, its many varieties of race and creed, will advance toward nothing but a return of the strife and disintegration from which British and Indian valour and effort combined to rescue it.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX I

#### POLITICAL UNITY IN EARLY INDIA<sup>1</sup>

TWICE in the centuries before the Muhammadan conquests the political unity of all India was nearly accomplished; first in the third century B.C. by Asoka, and again in the fourth century A.D. by Samodragupta. Both these emperors had their capitals in Northern India, in the Gangetic plain.

"Harsha was the last native monarch prior to the Muhammadan conquest who held the position of paramount power in the north. His death loosened the bonds which restrained the disruptive forces always ready to operate in India, and allowed them to produce their normal results—a medley of petty States, with ever-varying boundaries, and engaged in internecine war. Such was India when first disclosed to European observation in the fourth century B.C., and such it has always been, except during the comparatively brief periods in which a rigorous central government has compelled the mutually repellent molecules of the body politic to check their gyrations and submit to the grasp of a superior controlling force."—*Vincent Smith's "Early History of India."*

### APPENDIX II

#### THE ANANDA MATH<sup>2</sup>

THE methods of the *sanyasis* in the famous novel of Bankim Chandra, the *Ananda Math* (Monastery of Joy), vaguely foreshadow the political robberies of the Revolutionaries of present times.

The *sanyasi* rebels against the rule of the Muhammadan

<sup>1</sup> See page 28.

<sup>2</sup> See page 62.



Nawab Nazim of Bengal, which was supported by the East India Company, are described by Bankim Chandra as seizing public money by violence when they can and using it to finance their warfare. They are victorious against Mussulman sepoys, even though led by Englishmen. They bring Muslim rule to a close. Among the concluding passages of the book are the following :

"Satyananda," said the physician, "grieve not! In your delusion you have won your victories with the proceeds of robbery. A vice never leads to good consequences, and you may never expect to save your country by sinful procedure. Really what may happen now will be for the best. There is no hope of a revival of the true Faith if the English be not our rulers. The true Faith does not consist in the worship of 330,000,000 deities; that is only a base worship of the masses. Under its influence the true Faith, which *mlecchas* (barbarians) call Hinduism, has disappeared. The true Hinduism is based on knowledge and not on action" (To revive true religion, objective knowledge must be disseminated. It must first be imported.) "The English are great in objective sciences, and they are apt teachers. Therefore the English shall be made our sovereign. Imbued with a knowledge of objective sciences by English education, our people will be able to comprehend subjective truths. Then there would be no obstacle to the spread of the true Faith; it will shine forth of itself. Till that is so, till the Hindus are great again in knowledge, virtue, and power, till then the English rule will remain unaltered. The people will be happy under them, and follow their own religion without hindrance. . . . Where is the enemy now? There is none. The English are a friendly power; and no one, in truth, has the power to come off victorious in a fight with the English."

### APPENDIX III

#### THE KHALIFAT<sup>1</sup>

MUHAMMADANS in India are rather sharply divided into Shias and Sunnis. According to Shias, the Prophet, who

<sup>1</sup> See page 73.

belonged to the Koreish tribe of Arabs, on his death-bed recognised his son-in-law Ali as his spiritual and temporal successor (Khalif). He was, however, in fact succeeded by Abu Bakr, another of his companions, whom he had deputed to take his place at the daily prayers. Abu Bakr was succeeded by Omar, and Omar by Othman. Both Omar and Othman belonged to the band of Muhammad's companions. Then Ali came in, and was murdered after a short lease of power. He left two sons, Hassan and Husain, grandsons of the Prophet. Hassan abdicated, and was succeeded by Muawiya, the representative of another tribe of Arabs. He was followed by Yezid; and Husain, rebelling against Yezid, was killed on the fatal field of Karbala.

The sad end of a grandson of the Prophet shook Islam to its depths, and is now yearly commemorated in the Muharram. It also confirmed the Shia doctrine that inasmuch as Ali had been designated as Khalif by the Prophet, Abu Bakr, Omar, and Othman were not true Khalifs. But this doctrine was opposed by the Sunnis, the Muslims who hold by the sunnas or precedents. These basing their creed on the general allegiance of the Faithful, recognise the Khalifats of Abu Bakr, Omar, and Othman as well as the subsequent Khalifat of Ali.

The last of the dynasties of Arabian Khalifs came to an end in 1258 A.D. But about three centuries later the title was assumed by the Sultans of Turkey, as protectors of the Holy Places and the most powerful Muhammadan sovereigns in the world, although without pretensions of consanguinity to Muhammad. These claims have not been admitted by the Shias, but have been largely acknowledged by the Sunnis. The Shias are strong in Persia, but comparatively weak in India. The kings of Oudh were Shias. The Moghul Emperors were Sunnis. Both Shias and Sunnis intensely revere the Holy Places of Arabia, Mecca, Medina, and Karbala, and regard it as essential that these should be in Muslim hands.

Regarding the Khalifat, Sir Saiyid Ahmad, who was himself a Sunni, wrote in the Akhiri Mazamin: "Therefore

those who became rulers after the period of Khalifat had come to an end can be called Sultan, ruler, Amir, etc. ; but we Muhammadans cannot have that religious relation with them which we had with those Khalifs who ruled during the period of thirty years after the death of the Prophet, though they call themselves Khalifa, Sultan, Amir, or whatever they like. We cannot consider a Muhammadan ruler who rules in any country anything except a Muhammadan ruler. We cannot consider him as the Khalifa of the Prophet of God."

## APPENDIX IV

EXTRACTS FROM A REPLY BY HIS EXCELLENCY  
LORD CHELMSFORD TO THE PRESS DEFENCE  
ASSOCIATION <sup>1</sup>

GENTLEMEN,—I think you will admit that it is unusual for a Viceroy to receive a deputation of this nature, but when you sought permission to wait on me, I put aside precedent because I thought it well to meet you face to face to hear your representations and to give you a clear and frank answer to those representations. I presume at the time of making your request you weighed the fact that the Empire is in the throes of a life-and-death struggle, and that such a time is hardly the moment at which to raise even such an important matter as this. But you must not take my ready consent to receive you to mean that I considered the moment you had chosen opportune. I put aside, however, this consideration, though it has meant that precious time has had to be devoted to a matter which might well have awaited a more convenient season. I shall not dwell further on this point. I merely mention it because I want to show that in a matter like this I am always ready to meet those who feel they have a grievance to advance.

<sup>1</sup> See page 136.

Let me make one more preliminary observation. You are here as representatives of the Press, to complain of certain legislation which embodies the attitude of the Government of India towards certain aspects of journalism. The function of the Press informing public opinion holds within its compass the possibilities of an ideal as high and noble as any that can be imagined. You have each and all of you the right to be proud of the profession to which you belong, and I find it a little embarrassing to discuss with you, however dispassionately, matters which may be taken to reflect upon the methods in which journalism is, or may be, or has been, conducted in India. You have yourselves placed me in that position, and I only ask you, if you find yourselves in disagreement with what I say, to acquit me of any discourtesy, and to realise that I am dealing with the question in the abstract, and not in any sense whatever are my remarks to be taken as having any personal application.

#### A FREE PRESS

You have rightly abstained from addressing to me any elaborate argument in defence of the principle of a free Press. It is a principle that commands the instinctive adherence of every Englishman. I am an Englishman, and I can assure you that my education, my training, my inherited instincts, all bias me in this matter, and the bias is not against your case, but in favour of it. Anything in the nature of muzzling the Press strikes right across the grain of my whole being.

(If, therefore, I find that so broad-minded an Englishman as Lord Minto found it necessary to pass an Act such as that of which you complain, that so staunch an apostle of liberty as Lord Morley approved of it as Secretary of State, and that my predecessor saw no reason to relax the restrictions it imposes, I venture to think that there must be a better case than you are disposed to admit in favour of this much-abused Press Act.)

## THE OPERATION OF THE ACT

(Turning to the second-portion of your paragraph 5, your arguments would lead one to suppose that this Act had been worked by the Local Governments with great harshness and indiscretion,) and I have had a careful search made of the records of the Government of India, but I cannot find that a single case of that character has been brought to our notice, and, on the other hand, the Government of India were careful from the first to issue instructions enjoining leniency and discrimination. In no single case has an appeal to a High Court against the Local Government's orders succeeded, and in the majority of cases the Court has definitely branded the articles complained of as objectionable.

Perhaps it will make the case a little clearer if we look at the statistics of the operation of this Act since 1910. Take newspapers first: 143 have been warned once, and thirty thrice or oftener. Only three have had their first security forfeited, and not one its second. As regards Presses: fifty-five have been warned once, nine twice, and five thrice or oftener. Thirteen have had their first security forfeited; only one its second. I cannot agree with you that this evidences illiberal action on the part of the executive authority, and in this period, if your argument holds good, we should surely expect to find a steady diminution in the number of presses, newspapers, and periodicals. But what are the facts? (The presses have increased from 2,736 in 1909-10 to 3,237 in 1915-16; newspapers from 726 to 857, and the periodicals from 829 to 2,927.) And these figures do not support the theory that a journalist's career is as perilous as you suggest.

## PRESENT CONDITIONS

(In paragraph 13 you claim that the Press is now honest and law-abiding, and that all necessity for restriction has disappeared. Is that not rather arguing in a circle?) Because a river has been embanked and thus prevented from

flooding the surrounding country, do the engineers say: "This river is now safe, and we will not trouble to maintain the embankment"? I do not think you can urge that because floods have been controlled the possibility of their recurrence has disappeared. (The history of the Press in India is against your theory. In 1878 a growing section of the Indian Press was expressing covert or open hostility to Government. The passing of the Act of that year exercised a restraining influence, but when it was removed there was a recrudescence of malevolent hostility. From 1884 to 1898 a section of the Press steadily grew more scurrilous, more malignant, more seditious, until the penal law had to be strengthened, in 1898, but even that was not sufficient. Misrepresentation and vilification of Government, and even overt sedition, went steadily on until the Newspapers (Excitement to Violence) Act was passed in 1908, and it was only when that proved inadequate that the Press Act of 1910, now under discussion, really checked the flood that was spreading over the land.) Do not think I am framing an indictment against the Press of India as a whole or against journalism as it is now conducted. I am only recounting the facts that led up to the debates in the Legislative Council on the Act of 1910. Those debates did not touch the case of the many well-conducted and responsible papers then any more than I am doing now; but that the danger then was great and serious I do not think that you dispute, and if you say the danger has passed away I cannot agree with you; for (so long as there are papers in India, as there still are, that in pursuit of their own ends think it right to magnify the ills from which she suffers; to harp upon plague, famine, malaria, and poverty, and ascribe them all to the curse of an alien Government; so long as there are papers that play on the weaknesses of impressionable boys and encourage that lack of discipline and of respect for all authority that has done so much to swell the ranks of secret revolution; so long as it is considered legitimate to stir up hatred and contempt in order to foster discontent,—I feel that any relaxa-

tion of the existing law would be followed, as surely as night follows day, by a gradual increase of virulence, until we should come back to the conditions that prevailed before the passing of the Act.)

#### EXAMPLES QUOTED

There will be some that will hold up their hands in horror at the suggestion that (such things as I have indicated are still to be found in the Press, but here is an extract that I should like to read to you: "The meaning of Imperialism is that a powerful nation thinks that it is justified in depriving a weaker people of their liberty, and retaining that people under their rule in perpetual slavery on the plea of civilising them and bettering their lot." Here is another: "If the Indian rulers had given effect to the terms of the Royal Proclamation of 1858, India would not have been converted into a land of permanent famine and pestilence and its children into a race of effeminate weaklings." What is this but to exaggerate the ills of India and to ascribe them all to Government? Listen to this; it is part of a long article: "The same feeling of pity possesses the populace when they stand face to face with political crimes committed by youthful and misguided idealists. They know that these young men come fully prepared for sacrificing their own lives in the discharge of the work entrusted to them. The gallows have absolutely no terrors for them. To send them to the gallows would not hinder, but, on the contrary, very materially help their criminal propaganda. This has been the universal experience of history in these matters. Those who are already in sympathy with this criminal propaganda will not be cowed down by their chastisement, but will rather look upon their punishment as martyrdom, and draw fresh inspiration from it for carrying on their work. Everybody except the official machinist and the purblind publicist understands all this."

Now, hear, not what I think about it, but what a High Court Judge has to say about this article: "This seems

to me most pernicious writing, and writing which must tend to encourage political assassination by removing public detestation of such crimes. *New India* is presumably read by numbers, of excitable young men animated (and not unnaturally) by the same ideal which the writer ascribes to the assassins, but which it is impossible for any right-minded person to connect with their crimes. Such young men are practically told that the assassins are pursuing the same ideal as themselves with singular courage and disregard of self, and that such criminals should not be punished, but convinced of the folly of their ways. The article presents the assassins to such young men, and to the public generally, in a far more favourable light than any ordinary person would have viewed them in, and, although it may not amount to incitement, it certainly seems to me to give encouragement to the commission of crimes which undoubtedly fall within section 4(1)."

I do not wish to detain you, but I must still give you a few more extracts. A poet writes :

"How long will the blood of the innocent people be shed, and how long will we writhe in agony ?"

He prays God to release Indians from this miserable condition. He complains that they have lost their wealth, honour, and all good qualities. He inquires what can be worse than their present condition. Another poet says :

"When will the oppressions of the wicked cease in India ; when will the enemies of Indians be crushed, and how long will this cruel oppression of the weak continue ?"

Yet another :

"Slavery has deprived Indians of wealth, honour, and freedom, and has reduced them to destitution and starvation. What further harm is it going to cause to India ? Will it drain their very blood ? It has paralysed their limbs and muzzled their mouths. Why is it so mercilessly



pursuing them ? God gave equal liberty to all. Why then should accursed slavery be oppressing Indians ? ”

And here is one more :

“ The arrest is legal, doubtless, but it is truly unlawful, the breaking of the sacred law of justice which holds society together. When injustice is perpetrated, when crimes are committed legally, when innocence is no protection and harmless men are treated as criminals, then we live in a condition of anarchy no matter what legal sanction may cover the wrong-doer. Civilisation does not protect us. We should be better off in a state of savagery ; for then we should be on our guard. We should carry arms and protect ourselves. We are helpless. We pay taxes to be wronged.” }

#### STIRRING UP HATRED AND CONTEMPT

What are these but stirring up hatred and contempt ? Do you come before me to-day as journalists to say that you do not regret that such sentiments should have appeared in the public Press ? Do you suggest that language like this can have no ill-effect, and that you are prepared to see such things said every day through the length and breadth of India ? Are these, I would ask you, the writings of persons whose loyalty and good intentions and honesty of purpose are unquestioned, but who have unwittingly fallen into a trap which the Act has laid for them ? Can I judge the tree except by its fruit ? These are not extracts from the old files of 1910 ; they are cuttings from newspapers of 1916. If the terrors of the Act to which you have so freely adverted are not sufficient to prevent the publication of such stuff as this, will you tell me what would happen if the Act were repealed ? Can you blame me if, with such publications before me—and I am afraid I could find you more in the same strain—I refuse to assent to your assurance that the Press of India has purged itself, and that the time has come to accord to it once again the freedom which should be its pride no less than its privilege ?

## APPENDIX V

SIR MICHAEL O'DWYER ON THE DANGER OF  
THE HOME RULE PROPAGANDA IN THE  
PUNJAB<sup>1</sup>

THAT brings me to the question of the Home Rule propaganda.

Honourable Members will remember that some two months ago my Government passed orders forbidding two gentlemen who were prominently identified with that propaganda from entering the province. I took that action not because I desire to stifle or repress any reasonable political discussion, but because I was, and am, convinced that an agitation for Home Rule in this province on the lines advocated by the leaders of the movement, and as it would be interpreted by those to whom it would be addressed, would stir up the dying embers of the revolutionary fires which we have almost succeeded in extinguishing, and set parts of the province in a blaze once more. I desire to make the attitude of Government in this matter quite clear. Government, while opposed to any sudden or catastrophic constitutional change, recognises that among a large section of the community there is a growing desire, and a natural desire, for an increased measure of self-government.

His Excellency the Viceroy, in the Imperial Council on February 7th, formally stated that the "expediency of broadening the basis of government, and the demand of Indians to play a greater part in the conduct of affairs in this country, are not matters which have escaped our attention." He added that proposals had been submitted to the Home Government, and asked the Council to remember that the consideration of certain constitutional questions affecting a portion of the Empire might have to yield place for a time to the more urgent task of so prosecuting the war as to ensure the preservation of the Empire.

See pages 137, 211.

But, gentlemen, the increasing measure of self-government by steady and orderly change for which this country will fit itself as education spreads, as causes of disunion diminish, and as large numbers of the vast population gain political experience, is something very far from the sudden upheaval, and the startling transfer of political authority into ignorant and inexperienced hands, which the protagonists of Home Rule contemplated in their extravagant demands. Such changes would be as revolutionary in their character, and, I believe, as subversive of the existing constitution, as those which the "Ghadr" emissaries endeavoured to bring about. Indeed, it is not without significance to find that the watchword of the thousands who participated in the dacoities of the South-west Punjab two years ago, and of many of the men who fomented the "Ghadr" Conspiracy on the Pacific coast, was *swaraj*, or Home Rule, and that the hundreds of emigrants who returned to the Punjab to spread rebellion in the province by fire and sword claimed that their object was to establish Home Rule. It may be urged that this was the crude interpretation of a legitimate and constitutional ideal by ignorant men. That may be so; but what we have to consider is not the ideal in the mind of the political philosopher in his arm-chair or the journalist at his desk, but the ideal conveyed to the average man, and we have had positive proof, based on judicial findings, of several experienced tribunals, that of the thousands of Punjabis to whom the *swaraj*, or Home Rule, doctrine was preached in America, some hundreds at least set themselves as early as possible to realise that ideal by the sword, the pistol, and the bomb.<sup>1</sup> Take even a more convincing case.

The so-called "Dr." Mathra Singh, who recently suffered the extreme penalty of the law, was one of the most active and dangerous of the revolutionary leaders. He was the expert bomb-maker; he was also a man widely travelled and of superior education, very different from the ignorant dupes whom he enmeshed in the conspiracy. Yet this

<sup>1</sup> See pages 98, 187.

man, though his hands were steeped in crime, asserted to the last that he was merely acting as an advocate of Home Rule. We have to judge men not by their words, but by their acts; we have to judge movements not by the ideals that perhaps inspire their leaders, but by the results they have produced, or are likely to produce, on the community. Applying those tests, can any reasonable man say that the Home Rule propaganda is one which could be preached in the Punjab to-day without serious danger to the public peace and to the stability of the Government?

One more remark before I leave this subject.

The case of Home Rule for Ireland is often cited as an argument in their favour by those who advocate Home Rule for India. At the risk of entering into the thorny field of Irish politics, I may say there is no analogy between the two cases.

The Home Rule movement in Ireland aimed at the restoration of the status—a separate legislature and a separate executive, though with limited powers—which Ireland had enjoyed for centuries down to the Union of 1800. The great majority of the Irish people supported the movement, and many of those who wished well to Ireland, even if they did not count on any material advantages from Home Rule, were inclined to favour the scheme on sentimental and historical grounds, and looked forward to the time when the softening of racial and religious asperities would enable all classes to combine for the restoration and the successful working of the system of self-government, which in one form or another Ireland had for centuries enjoyed. That was a lofty and a generous ideal. Unfortunately, the nearer it came to realisation, the greater became the practical difficulties; the old feuds and factions were revived with increasing bitterness and threatened civil war. A year ago one section of the supporters of Irish *swaraj* (the Sinn Fein, or *Swadeshists*), following in the footsteps of our Punjabi *swarajists*, allied themselves with the king's enemies and brought about an abortive rebellion. That was speedily suppressed, but it has left a fatal legacy of distrust and

ill-feeling which all good Irishmen, whatever their creed or politics, deplore; for it has prevented Ireland from bearing the full share in the defence of the Empire. Well, gentlemen, the conclusion I would ask you to draw is this. If the Home Rule movement, after a hundred years of agitation, has so far produced no better results among a people fairly enlightened and homogeneous, in a country no larger or more populous than a single division in the Punjab, what result can we expect from it in this vast continent, with its infinite variety of races, creeds, and traditions, and its appalling inequalities in social and political development? What results would we expect from it even in our own province? In the matter of Home Rule, I fear the case of Ireland, in so far as it is analogous at all, conveys to us a lesson and a warning.

## APPENDIX VI

## DADABHAI NAOROJI

DADABHAI NAOROJI was a Parsi, born in Bombay in 1825. He came of a family of priests. He was a promising scholar of the Elphinstone College in that city. On reaching manhood, he at first devoted himself to educational work, and it is said that it was to his initiative that Bombay owed her first school for girls. In 1855 he proceeded to England as representative of Messrs. Cama and Co., and began to occupy himself largely in journalism and in bringing before the public advanced Indian views regarding political and economic questions. Subsequently he returned to India, and was appointed Diwan of the Baroda State. Resigning this post later, he served as a member of the Bombay Corporation, from 1881 to 1885, and rendered excellent service to that body. He was appointed an additional member of the Imperial Legislative Council, and was one of the promoters of, and partakers in, the First Indian National Congress.

In 1886 he left for England, determined to enter Parliament, and stood for Holborn. He was unsuccessful, and, returning to India, became President of the second Congress.<sup>1</sup> In 1887 he returned to England, and after some years was elected Member of Parliament for Central Finsbury. His election was hailed with much enthusiasm in India.

He retained his seat for three years, and, in 1893, induced Mr. Herbert Paul to move a resolution proposing that examinations for the Indian Civil Service should be held simultaneously in India and England. He also, with the assistance of Sir William Wedderburn and the late Mr. W. S. Caine, organised an Indian Parliamentary Committee. In 1895 he was appointed to the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, and did laborious service on that body. In 1893 he presided over the ninth Congress sessions, and received great ovations. In 1895 he lost his seat in Parliament, and afterwards devoted himself mainly to Congress propaganda. He was elected President of the memorable Congress of 1906,<sup>2</sup> but was unable to be present. His address was read out in that assemblage. He died at the ripe age of ninety-two, much respected.

## APPENDIX VII

THE REFORMS SCHEME: SPEECH BY SIR HARCOURT BUTLER, LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR, UNITED PROVINCES, ON JULY 15TH, 1918<sup>1</sup>

I NEED not say more about man-power or war loan, but I have a few more words to say to you. I propose in the course of my present tour to deal in a spirit of hopefulness and, I trust, of helpfulness with some of the problems which have arisen out of this war. This afternoon I shall speak to you about the scheme of reforms which has just been published. It is early yet to appreciate fully the

<sup>1</sup> See page 38.<sup>2</sup> See page 66.<sup>3</sup> See page 226.

reception of that scheme. Some are favourable to it, a few seem hostile, many are reserving their opinion. You will not expect me to offer any opinion on the scheme itself. What I want to do is this. I want to impress upon you the enormous difficulties which beset this question of reforms. It is enormously difficult to graft the ideas of Western democracy on to an ancient social system of which a prominent feature is the institution of caste.<sup>1</sup> It is enormously difficult to harmonise the aspirations of a modern industrial Empire with the aspirations of an essentially spiritual and conservative land like India. It is enormously difficult again to devise a scheme which will suit the diverse masses of languages, opinions, creeds, and religious differences which go to make up India. But no difficulties have deterred or stayed His Majesty's Government and the Government of India. They have declared in the most unequivocal terms that there must be a real step forward in the direction of responsible government. The Secretary of State and the Viceroy have sought and heard opinions throughout the length and breadth of the land from representatives of every class. They are in possession of an amount of information which no one else in India has. Whatever may be thought of their definite proposals, it must be admitted that never before has any inquiry been conducted with such anxious care to ascertain the wishes of the diversified and heterogeneous peoples of India. It is the duty of every man in this province who takes interest in public affairs to give this scheme the fairest possible consideration, and I believe that they will do so. They may want some details altered, they may want this or that proposal modified, but they will, I believe, lay their heads together in a spirit of constructive statesmanship, and see through co-operation and compromise some adequate solution of the problem. I regard it as absolutely essential that we should work together, because if this scheme fails or is rejected, we shall have to face a situation which will be difficult and delicate and might deteriorate. But I

<sup>1</sup> See page 166.

need not dwell upon this contingency, especially in this province. If you believe, as I think you must believe, that the Secretary of State, and the Viceroy have made an earnest and honest and, may I add? a very able endeavour to deal with this difficult problem, then I beg you to go out and meet them half-way, to put aside any preconceived ideas, to throw off catchwords and phrases, to stick closely to things and not to words, and to concentrate your thoughts on the future well-being of India. We have seen how precarious and perilous has been the course of reforms in China, in Persia, in Turkey, and now in Russia. May I quote to you the saying of an able Chinese statesman? "To speak in a parable; a new form of government is like an infant, whose food must be regulated with circumspection if one desires it to thrive. If in our zeal for the infant's growth we give it several days' nourishment at once, there is small hope of its ever attaining manhood."

### THREE CARDINAL CONDITIONS

It seems to me that there are three cardinal conditions of healthy reform. The first is, that any reform must be a real reform, and must not be put out of shape and substance by too many safeguards, checks, and counter-checks. This is a canon of moral strategy. Reform must not be afraid of itself. The second condition is that any scheme of reforms in India must bear some relation to the reforms of the last fifty years. You have been told that the Minto-Morley reforms were doomed to failure and have failed. With all respect to those who hold this view, I must say that this is not my experience as vice-president of the Imperial Legislative Council, as Lieutenant-Governor of Burma, and as Lieutenant-Governor of the United Provinces. In my experience, and this was the expressed opinion of Lord Hardinge, the Minto-Morley reforms have been successful. They have been a valuable training to Indian politicians, and have prepared them for another forward move. The executive government has been far



more influenced by the discussions in Council than is popularly imagined, and the debates have been maintained at a really high level. Occasionally time has been wasted, occasionally feeling has run high. Of what assembly cannot this be said? I was led to believe that in our Legislative Council I should find a spirit of opposition and hostility to Government. I have found, on the contrary, a responsive and reasonable spirit. Indeed, I go so far, gentlemen, as to say that it is the very success of the Minto-Morley reforms that makes me most hopeful in regard to the future course of reform. The third condition is that any scheme of reform that can hope to reach maturity must fit in with the general administrative system of the country. It is often not realised how exceedingly ancient and powerful that administrative system is. The British found it in being in India. Its roots go down to the time of Asoka. Remember that in the Eastern Roman Empire a system of scientific and bureaucratic organisation, animated by ideas very different from ours, kept back the tide of invasion from Europe for many hundred years. Only when you disturb an administrative system can you realise how far its tentacles have spread. I know there are some who think that all evils will come to an end if only democracy is substituted for bureaucracy. I ask them to think what things they mean when they use these terms. Except in the smallest communities such as the city states, democracy never has meant and never can mean direct government by the people or an electorate. Every modern democracy is dependent even in times of peace for its successful working on the services of a body of trained administrators; and the need for such services tends to become greater rather than less with the growth, extent, and complexity of the state's activities. In France, in America, and in England this truth is more and more realised and acted on.

Not least important is the spirit which animates and informs discussion. No reform can be achieved without some rise in political temperature. That rise may be greater

now owing to the prolonged strain of the war. Let us see things clearly and quietly. Let us approach the scheme of reform with a desire to make the best of it. I can assure you that this Government will assist you in all reasonable endeavours to secure political, industrial, and educational progress; I have already instituted a reform which I believe to be far-reaching and beneficial. I refer to the reconstitution of the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council. They now meet monthly, and the more important schemes of provincial expenditure are referred to them for advice, and great importance is attached to their advice. This reform may be swallowed up in larger schemes, but it is an important and encouraging commencement. I entreat you, with all my heart I do entreat, to keep up hope. You have a proverb—"Dunya omed par qaim"—The world rests on hope. Be sure of this, that a great responsibility rests on anyone now who is in a position to influence opinion, whether on a large or small scale, to create and develop an atmosphere of large progressive hope. You will not find the officials of this province unready to meet you half-way. Let us work together. Faith and action and the future are ours.

## APPENDIX VIII

(a) AND (b)

SPEECHES AT THE DELHI WAR CONFERENCE,<sup>1</sup>  
APRIL 1918, BY H.H. THE MAHARAJA OF ULWAR  
AND THE HONOURABLE MR. W. A. IRONSIDE

(A)

BRITAIN AND INDIA: SPEECH BY HIS HIGHNESS THE  
MAHARAJA OF ULWAR AT THE DELHI WAR  
CONFERENCE

SPEAKING at the War Conference at Delhi held in April 1918, in support of the resolution endorsing the recommendations of the sub-committees and recommending them

<sup>1</sup> See page 152.

to the early consideration and adoption by the Government of India and His Majesty's Government, His Highness the Maharaja of Ulwar said :

" On an occasion so solemn and unique in the destiny of the Empire as the present, I rise to speak under a deep sense of responsibility. We have eagerly responded to the trumpet-call of the Empire at the present moment by assembling here, not because it is a bare duty, but because it is a privilege to assist in her hour of need the great country who has wished India well and has guided her destinies for 160 years. What is real friendship ? What are the bonds of partnership ? With the words of the gracious message of the Emperor of India ringing in our ears, with the Prime Minister's appeal fresh in our minds, is it likely, I ask, that the heart of India can lie dormant at this time ? Is it possible to conceive that India is going to let this opportunity go by to prove, as she has proved in the past, that, according to her power and circumstances, she is true to herself, and so is determined to be true to the Empire of which she forms an integral part.

" It was truly put once by one of Your Excellency's predecessors when talking to India ; he said, ' You cannot do without us. We should be impotent without you.' If this is so, and it is so, then let this sacred union be a consecration at the altar of divine love for the advance of both countries to the highest purpose of life. India is proud of her connection with the country whose love of justice and liberty is now being practically tested on the anvil of the battle-field, and every blow is adding lustre and glory before the world to the steel foundations on which her structure is built. With such a country our destinies are bound, and with her we rise, with her we fall.

" Our Fatherland, like any other country in the world, has her domestic needs. She requires many adjustments of her present conditions. She aspires, and legitimately so, to strengthen, if possible, her position within the Empire, so that she may no longer go forth before the world with bent head. India is now eager to raise her head on an equality with her sister dominions, but Your Excellency and your Government know her wants, and you are aware of her urgent needs. If I like to think that for the present my country reposes these sacred charges in the trust of

the British people, it is because we have a more urgent duty to fulfil. Trust begets trust, and we know if we can, with the mercy of Providence, succeed in doing what the occasion demands us to do for Old England, on whom we repose our confidence, she will not be slow to respond to our needs. The responsibility at this moment is ours, and when there is a silver lining to the clouds, the responsibility will be hers. For the present India is enthusiastically bent on sharing the glories in the common cause of the Empire which is being fought out on the battle-fields. In this vast gathering which readily assembled at Your Excellency's invitation, I see no British India or Native States before me to-day. It is one India, a united India with a singleness of mind and purpose. Two busy days have been spent by the members of this Conference in devising the best means for the adoption of urgent measures to meet the situation arising out of the crisis through which the Empire is passing at the present time. There are certain remedies which I may mention, particularly such as the free granting of the King's commissions to Indians, the raising of the pay of the Indian soldiers; the establishing of institutions in India as military training colleges for its sons, which have to be dealt with in the resolutions, and which, if applied in a generous spirit of trust, are calculated to produce instant results in accelerating recruiting.

"In cordially supporting the resolutions which cover these and other points, I would join earnestly in commending it for the early consideration of, and adoption by, the Government of India and His Majesty's Government.

"Before concluding I will say only a few more words. In this hall we hold the fair name and fame of India in our hands. Here we come to resolve to perform what we ought, and hence we go to perform without fail what we resolve. Our countrymen have their eyes fixed on us. The people will ask, 'What have you given?' and 'What have you asked for?' The answers can be summed up in one word—'trust.' I may not be a British Indian, but I am an Indian, and as such I say that, in this supreme hour of the need of the Empire, for the fair name of our mother-country this is the opportunity to close our ranks and to prove to the world that we can respond to trust and confidence in a manner which can become the envy

of others. Then when sunshine comes again, and the clouds of war disappear, we shall have reason to look back upon a past on which we can await the verdict of history with legitimate pride and confidence. In the dutiful message which goes in reply to the message from the Throne we all combine in emphasising once again our assurances of loyalty and attachment to the person of His Majesty, and we send with it our prayers for victory."

(B)

SPEECH BY THE LATE MR. W. A. IRONSIDE, REPRESENTATIVE OF THE CALCUTTA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AT THE DELHI WAR CONFERENCE, IN THE PART OF THE EUROPEAN COMMERCIAL COMMUNITY

After the flow of eloquence to which we have listened, I feel, Sir, that any endeavour of mine adequately to express, on behalf of the great community I have the honour to represent, an outward and visible sign of our desires and hopes, of our determination and our faith, must sound at least weak and ineffective but none the less genuine. Few of us have knowledge or experience in oratory and rhetoric, and we are not students of dialectics, but I am sincere in every word that I utter. We are proud in the claim that we are men and women of British birth, not merely, as some would say, strangers in a strange land. We are as much part and parcel of the Empire as though we lived in London or any other little corner of His Majesty's dominions. Every man and woman, Sir, places himself or herself unreservedly at your disposal; and order us, tell us what you require of us, what you want us to do, and there will, I assure you, be no faint-hearted response. Take of our man-power, take of our resources. We wish to range ourselves on equal terms with our people from the other parts of the Empire.

I am not going to descend to politics, but would like to take this great opportunity to assure my Indian neighbours and fellow citizens that the future welfare of India and her people, when the present great adventure has been finished and final victory attained, will be by frank and

honest endeavour, in co-operation with them, our first concern. The men of my community in increasing numbers view India's necessities through different glasses, and are ready, when their hands are free of this sterner work, to take a hand in making her future.

Your Excellency, no words are necessary to spur us to greater effort. The heroic examples of our men and women are surely enough to those of us who are left. Our dearest and our best have died that England should live. The men of the *Vindictive* and her escort vessels last week left behind for us to follow an example for all time. They gave all for their country. So, surely, this is no time to place restrictions on our duty. The road to conquest must mean greater trials and sacrifices, but we will endure until the end, fortified by a great and abiding faith in justice and right and in the God of our fathers to bring us to final victory.

In my poor way, Sir, I have given you a message from the people of my community and race. You will not find us wanting to act our part and justify ourselves as true citizens of His Majesty.