

tray of statues. I found the hall filled with these works of art, and 'Malia' tendering, with sweetest smiles, a few pence in exchange for them. It was a disagreeable job to have to persuade the man to depart in peace with all his images, even with a little money to console him. A friend of mine chanced to be returning to Natal, and proposed that I should spare my Zulu nurse to her. Her husband's magistracy being close to where Maria's tribe dwelt, it seemed a good opportunity for 'Malia' to return to her own country; so of course I let her go, begging my friend to tell me how the girl got on. The parting from the little boys was a heart-breaking scene, nor was Malia at all comforted by the fine clothes all my friends insisted on giving her. Not even a huge Gainsborough hat garnished with giant poppies could console her for leaving her 'little chieftain'; but it was at all events something to send her off so comfortably provided for, and with two large boxes of good clothes.

In the course of a few months I received a letter from my friend, who was then settled in her up-country home, but her story of Maria's doings seemed well-nigh incredible, though perfectly true.

All had gone well on the voyage and so long as they remained at Durban and Maritzburg; but as soon as the distant settlement was reached, Maria's kinsmen came around her and began to claim some share in her prosperity. Free fights were of constant occurrence, and in one of them Maria, using the skull of an ox as a weapon, broke her sister's leg. Soon after that she returned to the savage life she had not known since her infancy, and took to it with delight. I don't know what became of her clothes, but she had presented herself before my friend clad in an old sack and with necklaces of wild animals' teeth, and proudly announced she had just been married 'with cows'—thus showing how completely her Christianity had fallen away from her, and she had practically returned, on the first opportunity, to the depth of that savagery from which she had been taken before she could even remember it. I soon lost all trace of her, but Malia's story has always remained in my mind as an amazing instance of the strength of race-instinct. [...]

See also: Baughan; Clifford; Perrin; Sorabji; Steel.

## SAROJINI NAIDU

(1876–1949)

from *The Golden Threshold* (1905)

## Village-Song

Honey, child, honey, child, whither are you going?  
Would you cast your jewels all to the breezes blowing?  
Would you leave the mother who on golden grain has fed you?  
Would you grieve the lover who is riding forth to wed you?

Mother mine, to the wild forest I am going,  
Where upon the champa boughs the champa buds\* are blowing;  
To the kôil-haunted\* river-isles where lotus lilies glisten,  
The voices of the fairy-folk are calling me: O listen!

Honey, child, honey, child, the world is full of pleasure,  
Of bridal-songs and cradle-songs and sandal-scented leisure.  
Your bridal robes are in the loom, silver and saffron glowing,  
Your bridal cakes are on the hearth: O whither are you going?

The bridal-songs and cradle-songs have cadences of sorrow,  
The laughter of the sun to-day, the wind of death to-morrow.  
Far sweeter sound the forest-notes where forest-streams are falling;  
O mother mine, I cannot stay, the fairy-folk are calling.

## Humayun to Zobeida\*

(From the *Urdu*)

You flaunt your beauty in the rose, your glory in the dawn,  
Your sweetness in the nightingale, your whiteness in the swan.

from *The Bird of Time* (1912)

### Songs of my City

#### I. In a Latticed Balcony

How shall I feed thee, Beloved?  
*On golden-red honey and fruit.*  
 How shall I please thee, Beloved?  
*With th' voice of the cymbal and lute.*

How shall I garland thy tresses?  
*With pearls from the jessamine close.*  
 How shall I perfume thy fingers?  
*With th' soul of the keora\* and rose.*

How shall I deck thee, O Dearest?  
*In hues of the peacock and dove.*  
 How shall I woo thee, O Dearest?  
*With the delicate silence of love.*

#### II. In the Bazaars of Hyderabad

*To a tune of the Bazaars*

What do you sell, O ye merchants?  
 Richly your wares are displayed.  
*Turbans of crimson and silver,*  
*Tunics of purple brocade,*  
*Mirrors with panels of amber,*  
*Daggers with handles of jade.*

What do you weigh, O ye vendors?  
*Saffron and lentil and rice.*  
 What do you grind, O ye maidens?  
*Sandalwood, henna, and spice.*  
 What do you call, O ye pedlars?  
*Chessmen and ivory dice.*

What do you make, O ye goldsmiths?  
*Wristlet and anklet and ring,*  
*Bells for the feet of blue pigeons,*  
*Frail as a dragon-fly's wing,*  
*Girdles of gold for the dancers,*  
*Scabbards of gold for the king.*

What do you cry, O ye fruitmen?  
*Citron, pomegranate, and plum.*  
 What do you play, O musicians?  
*Cithār, sarangī, and drum.*  
 What do you chant, O magicians?  
*Spells for the æons to come.*

What do you weave, O ye flower-girls  
 With tassels of azure and red?  
*Crowns for the brow of a bridegroom,*  
*Chaplets to garland his bed,*  
*Sheets of white blossoms new-gathered*  
*To perfume the sleep of the dead.*

### Song of Radha the Milkmaid\*

I carried my curds to the Mathura fair<sup>1</sup> . . .  
 How softly the heifers were lowing. . .  
 I wanted to cry 'Who will buy, who will buy  
 These curds that are white as the clouds in the sky  
 When the breezes of *Shraman* are blowing?'  
 But my heart was so full of your beauty, Beloved,  
 They laughed as I cried without knowing:

*Govinda! Govinda!*

*Govinda! Govinda! . . .*

How softly the river was flowing!

I carried my pots to the Mathura tide. . .  
 How gaily the rowers were rowing! . . .

<sup>1</sup> Mathura is the chief centre of the mystic worship of Krishna, the Divine Cowherd and Musician—the 'Divine Beloved' of every Hindu heart. He is also called Govinda.

My comrades called 'Ho! let us dance, let us sing  
And wear saffron garments to welcome the spring,  
And pluck the new buds that are blowing.'  
But my heart was so full of your music, Beloved,  
They mocked when I cried without knowing:

*Govinda! Govinda!*

*Govinda! Govinda! . . .*

How gaily the river was flowing!

I carried my gifts to the Mathura shrine. . . .  
How brightly the torches were glowing! . . .  
I folded my hands at the altars to pray  
'O shining Ones guard us by night and by day'—  
And loudly the conch shells were blowing.  
But my heart was so lost in your worship, Beloved,  
They were wroth when I cried without knowing:

*Govinda! Govinda!*

*Govinda! Govinda! . . .*

How brightly the river was flowing!

### An Anthem of Love

Two hands are we to serve thee, O our Mother,  
To strive and succour, cherish and unite;  
Two feet are we to cleave the waning darkness,  
And gain the pathways of the dawning light.

Two ears are we to catch the nearing echo,  
The sounding cheer of Time's prophetic horn;  
Two eyes are we to reap the crescent glory,  
The radiant promise of renaissance morn.

One heart are we to love thee, O our Mother,  
One undivided, indivisible soul,  
Bound by one hope, one purpose, one devotion  
Towards a great, divinely-destined goal.

See also: Aurobindo; Dutt; McKay; Sorabji; Tagore; Yeats.

## GEORGE NATHANIEL, MARQUESS CURZON (1859-1925)

### The British Empire (1906)

Our principal object in meeting here to-night has been to do honour to Lord Milner,\* and that object, after the speech of our Chairman\* and the magnificent reception that you have accorded to our guest, we may claim to have successfully attained. But on an occasion like this, when so many representative persons are present, and on a day like this, which is consecrated to the name and conception of Empire, it was thought by the organizers of this meeting that the opportunity should not be lost of proposing the toast of 'Our Dominions Beyond the Seas,' those dominions which have grown and spread by the self-sacrificing and often ill-requited labours of such men as Lord Milner, and which have never had a more brilliant or more devoted servant than he. That is the explanation of the toast which I have been instructed to propose.

No man can propose this toast—least of all any man who has borne a part in the task of governing the Empire—without a sense of great responsibility and almost of awe. For think of what this toast means. It embraces in a single formula more than one-fourth of the entire human race. It is a toast to no inconsiderable portion of the inhabited and civilized globe. The British Dominions Beyond the Seas include every colony and possession of the Crown, from the Federated Commonwealth of Australia, that great experiment so rich in promise, and the Dominion of Canada, with its heritage of glory and its future of hope, down to the smallest rocky island or coral reef over which the Union Jack may have been hoisted on the bosom of some distant ocean. It includes great self-governing communities who have left us far behind in experiments of government and economics, but whose heart still warms and whose pulse beats more quickly at the thought of the Mother Land. It includes the small but not uninteresting Crown Colonies\* to which we have given what is, in my judgment, one of the best forms of government in the world. It includes all those vantage-points and places of arms with which we guard the ocean highways and of which we have been told that the

And this brings me to my second and concluding reflection. If this great Empire of ours has not been built up without courage and endurance—and those who know its history best know well through what travail it has passed to its greatness—it is also not without a spirit of self-sacrifice that it can be maintained. We cannot have a world-wide Empire, with all that that means, without paying a price for it, a price in effort, in labour, sometimes in danger, but always in duty. Unless every individual citizen of the Empire is prepared to accept that particular form of sacrifice, be it great or small—and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred it is small rather than great—which he may be called on to perform, then our Empire is not a reality, but only a name. It is because I believe that the Empire is still an ideal to the best spirits within it, that it has a place in the consciences as well as on the lips of the majority of its peoples, and is a source of blessing to the world, that on Empire Day I think that any assemblage of Englishmen such as this may, not merely without compunction but with pride and satisfaction, be called on to drink the toast, which I now give you, of 'The British Dominions Beyond the Seas.'

See also: Chamberlain; Hobson; Kipling, 'The White Man's Burden'; Ruskin; Seeley.

## SRI AUROBINDO

(1872-1950)

*The widespread Swadeshi (self-help) protests against the Partition of Bengal in 1905-8 revealed to many Indians the immense possibilities of mass action. Using the upsurge as both an inspiration and an example, Sri Aurobindo elaborated a programme of large-scale passive resistance against British authority that anticipated yet also went further towards outright confrontation than Mohandas Gandhi's later did. In so doing he became at this time of upheaval one of the foremost Indian counter-voices to Curzon (q.v.), the Viceroy who propagated Partition. 'The Object of Passive Resistance' is the second in a series of articles published in 1907 in which Aurobindo looked forward to the ideal of national liberty secured through the 'new and mighty weapon' of an organized popular outburst. Despite his political radicalism, however, Aurobindo himself exhibited*

*some of the 'fixed ideas' of the English-educated 'native' that he here criticizes, as the marked contrast between his ardent activist prose and his classically influenced poetry clearly demonstrates.*

## The Object of Passive Resistance (1907)

Organized resistance to an existing form of government may be undertaken either for the vindication of national liberty, or in order to substitute one form of government for another, or to remove particular objectionable features in the existing system without any entire or radical alteration of the whole, or simply for the redress of particular grievances. Our political agitation in the nineteenth century was entirely confined to the smaller and narrower objects. To replace an oppressive land revenue system by the security of a Permanent Settlement,\* to mitigate executive tyranny by the separation of judicial from executive functions, to diminish the drain on the country naturally resulting from foreign rule by more liberal employment of Indians in the services—to these half-way houses our wise men and political seers directed our steps,—with this limited ideal they confined the rising hopes and imaginations of a mighty people re-awakening after a great downfall. Their political inexperience prevented them from realising that these measures on which we have mis-spent half a century of unavailing effort, were not only paltry and partial in their scope but in their nature ineffective. A Permanent Settlement can always be evaded by a spendthrift Government bent on increasing its resources and unchecked by any system of popular control; there is no limit to the possible number of cesses and local taxes by which the Settlement could be practically violated without any direct infringement of its provisions. The mere deprivation of judicial functions will not disarm executive tyranny so long as both executive and judiciary are mainly white and subservient to a central authority irresponsible, alien and bureaucratic; for the central authority can always tighten its grip on the judiciary of which it is the controller and paymaster and habituate it to a consistent support of executive action. Nor will Simultaneous Examinations\* and the liberal appointment of Indians mend the matter; for an Englishman serves the Government as a member of the same ruling race and can afford to be occasionally independent; but the Indian

civilian is a serf masquerading as a heaven-born and can only deserve favour and promotion by his zeal in fastening the yoke heavier upon his fellow-countrymen. As a rule the foreign Government can rely on the 'native' civilian to be more zealously oppressive than even the average Anglo-Indian official. Neither would the panacea of Simultaneous Examinations really put an end to the burden of the drain. The Congress insistence on the Home Charges\* for a long time obscured the real accusation against British rule; for it substituted a particular grievance for a radical and congenial evil implied in the very existence of British control. The huge price India has to pay England for the inestimable privilege of being ruled by Englishmen is a small thing compared with the murderous drain by which we purchase the more exquisite privilege of being exploited by British capital. The diminution of Home Charges will not prevent the gradual death by bleeding of which exploitation is the true and abiding cause. Thus, even for the partial objects they were intended to secure, the measures for which we petitioned and clamoured in the last century were hopelessly ineffective. So was it with all the Congress nostrums; they were palliatives which could not even be counted upon to palliate; the radical evil, uncured, would only be driven from one seat in the body politic to take refuge in others where it would soon declare its presence by equally troublesome symptoms. The only true cure for a bad and oppressive financial system is to give the control over taxation to the people whose money pays for the needs of Government. The only effective way of putting an end to executive tyranny is to make the people and not an irresponsible Government the controller and paymaster of both executive and judiciary. The only possible method of stopping the drain is to establish a popular government which may be relied on to foster and protect Indian commerce and Indian industry conducted by Indian capital and employing Indian labour. This is the object which the new politics, the politics of the twentieth century, places before the people of India in their resistance to the present system of Government,—not tinkering and palliatives but the substitution for the autocratic bureaucracy, which at present misgoverns us, of a free constitutional and democratic system of government and the entire removal of foreign control in order to make way for perfect national liberty.

The redress of particular grievances and the reformation of

particular objectionable features in a system of Government are sufficient objects for organized resistance only when the Government is indigenous and all classes have a recognized place in the political scheme of the State. They are not and cannot be a sufficient object in countries like Russia and India where the laws are made and administered by a handful of men, and a vast population, educated and uneducated alike, have no political right or duty except the duty of obedience and the right to assist in confirming their own servitude. They are still less a sufficient object when the despotic oligarchy is alien by race and has not even a permanent home in the country, for in that case the Government cannot be relied on to look after the general interest of the country, as in nations ruled by indigenous despotism; on the contrary, they are bound to place the interests of their own country and their own race first and foremost. Organized resistance in subject nations which mean to live and not to die, can have no less an object than an entire and radical change of the system of Government; only by becoming responsible to the people and drawn from the people can the Government be turned into a protector instead of an oppressor. But if the subject nation desires not a provincial existence and a maimed development but the full, vigorous and noble realisation of its national existence, even a change in the system of Government will not be enough, it must aim not only at a national Government responsible to the people but a free national Government unhampered even in the least degree by foreign control.

It is not surprising that our politicians of the nineteenth century could not realize these elementary truths of modern politics. They had no national experience behind them of politics under modern conditions; they had no teachers except English books and English liberal 'sympathisers' and 'friends of India'. Schooled by British patrons, trained to the fixed idea of English superiority and Indian inferiority, their imaginations could not embrace the idea of national liberty, and perhaps they did not even desire it at heart preferring the comfortable ease, which at that time still seemed possible in a servitude under British protection, to the struggles and sacrifices of a hard and difficult independence. Taught to take their political lessons solely from the example of England and ignoring or not valuing the historical experience of the rest of the world, they could not even conceive of a truly popular and democratic Government in India except as the slow result of the development of centuries,

progress broadening down from precedent to precedent. They could not then understand that the experience of an independent nation is not valid to guide a subject nation, unless and until the subject nation throws off the yoke and itself becomes independent. They could not realize that the slow, painful and ultra-cautious development, necessary in mediaeval and semi-mediaeval conditions when no experience of a stable popular Government had been gained, need not be repeated in the days of the steamship, railway and telegraph, when stable democratic systems are part of the world's secured and permanent heritage. The instructive spectacle of Asiatic nations\* demanding and receiving constitutional and parliamentary government as the price of a few years' struggle and civil turmoil, had not then been offered to the world. But even if the idea of such happenings had occurred to the more sanguine spirits, they would have been prevented from putting it into words by their inability to discover any means towards its fulfilment. Their whole political outlook was bounded by the lessons of English history,\* and in English history they found only two methods of politics,—the slow method of agitation and the swift decisive method of open struggle and revolt. Unaccustomed to independent political thinking, they did not notice the significant fact that the method of agitation only became effective in England when the people had already gained powerful voice in the Government. In order to secure that voice they had been compelled to resort no less than three several times to the method of open struggle and revolt. Blind to the significance of this fact, our nineteenth-century politicians clung to the method of agitation, obstinately hoping against all experience and reason that it would somehow serve their purpose. From any idea of open struggle with the bureaucracy they shrank with terror and a sense of paralysis. Dominated by the idea of the overwhelming might of Britain and the abject weakness of India, their want of courage and faith in the nation, their rooted distrust of the national character, disbelief in Indian patriotism and blindness to the possibility of true political strength and virtue in the people, precluded them from discovering the rough and narrow way to salvation. Herein lies the superiority of the new school,\* that they have an indomitable courage and faith in the nation and the people. By the strength of that courage and faith they have not only been able to enforce on the mind of the country a higher ideal but perceived an effective means to the realization of that

ideal. By the strength of that courage and faith they have made such immense strides in the course of a few months. By the strength of that courage and faith they will dominate the future.

The new methods were first tried in the great Swadeshi outburst of the last two years,—blindly, crudely, without leading and organization, but still with amazing results. The moving cause was a particular grievance, the Partition of Bengal; and to the removal of that grievance, pettiest and narrowest of all political objects, our old leaders strove hard to confine the use of this new and mighty weapon. But the popular instinct was true to itself and would have none of it. At a bound we passed therefore from mere particular grievances, however serious and intolerable, to the use of passive resistance as a means of cure for the basest and vilest feature of the present system,—the bleeding to death of a country by foreign exploitation. And from that stage we are steadily advancing, under the guidance of such able political thinking as modern India has not before seen and with the rising tide of popular opinion at our back, to the one true object of all resistance, passive or active, aggressive or defensive,—the creation of a free popular Government and the vindication of Indian liberty.

### Charles Stewart Parnell, 1891 (1895)

O pale and guiding light, now star unsphered,  
Deliverer lately hailed, since by our lords  
Most feared, most hated, hated because feared,  
Who smot'st them with an edge surpassing swords!  
Thou too wert then a child of tragic earth,  
Since vainly filled thy luminous doom of birth.

### Transiit, Non Periit (1909)

[*My grandfather, Rajnarayan Bose, died September 1899*]

Not in annihilation lost, nor given  
To darkness art thou fled from us and light,  
O strong and sentient spirit; no mere heaven  
Of ancient joys, no silence eremite

## THE CONDITION OF INDIA.

ADDRESS BY MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

[FROM OUR OWN REPORTER.]

On Sunday last, May 29, the "Sunday Afternoon Conference" which is held from week to week at Westbourne Park Chapel, London, for the consideration of various subjects of religious or social interest and importance was devoted to the Indian question, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji delivering an address on the present political and economic condition of India.

There was a very large attendance, which included a fair proportion of Indian gentlemen.

The chair was taken by Mr. Wallis Chapman, who, in introducing Mr. Naoroji, said there were few more responsible duties imposed on the English people than that of the government of India. They were consequently the more indebted to Mr. Naoroji for his willingness to give them the benefit of the knowledge which he had obtained during a lifetime of devotion to the cause of his and their Indian fellow-subjects.

Mr. Naoroji, who was received with cheers, said it was clear that any subject which was thought worthy of consideration on such a day and in such a place must be regarded as a grave one, and a question affecting the weal or woe of three hundred millions of people surely came within that category. Moreover, the action of the English nation in regard to the people of India was of as vital importance to themselves as it was to India, and it was not even of less vital consequence to the whole human race. For a new element had lately come into existence in the councils of the nations. A country which had hitherto confined itself, under its Monroe doctrine, to its own continent was now coming forward to share in what was called the Imperialism of the world, and the question had already arisen which course that country should follow. The

From Dadabhai Naoroji  
The West of India London: Brooks, Day & Son, (1898)

American people would unquestionably look to the government of India by the British people to see whether that government was a model for them to follow or an evil example which they should avoid, and on that account the relations between England and India were becoming more and more important to the whole human race, irrespective of the interests of those great countries. Consequently it was the duty of every voter in Great Britain to know what his responsibilities were and what the condition of India had been during the century and a half of regular British administration. He would deal first with the political condition of India at the present moment, and would regard it in its two aspects—the legislative and the executive. There existed Legislative Councils in India, and it was generally believed that those councils gave to the Indian people something like what they in England enjoyed in the way of representative government, and that by those means the people of India had some voice in their own government. This was simply a romance. The reality was that the Legislative Council was constituted in such a way as to give to the Government a complete and positive majority. The three or four Indians who had seats upon it might say what they like, but what the Government of India declared was to become law did invariably become the law of the country. To take, for instance, the question of expenditure—when a Budget was brought forward in the House of Commons members went on contesting it, item by item, for six months—they saw that their constituents' interests were properly protected, and that the Government took no advantage of their power. Of course, in the British Parliament also the majority had the final word; but, whereas in that case that majority was subject to the people and could be turned out by them, in the Indian legislative councils the majority, instead of being given by the people, was managed and manipulated by the Government itself. But matters were even worse than this. The expenditure of the revenues was one of the most important points in the political condition of any country, but in India there was no such thing as a legislative Budget. The representative members had no right to propose any resolution or go to any division upon any item concerned in the Budget, which was passed simply and solely according to the despotic will of a despotic Government. The

Natives of India had not the slightest voice in the expenditure of the Indian revenues, and the idea that they had was the first delusion on the part of the voters of England which he wished to correct. It would be seen in what an absurd position the so-called Native representatives of India were placed. In the expenditure of the revenue they had, as he had explained, not the least voice, but when the time came for the imposition of taxes they were quite welcome to impose what taxation they could upon their countrymen. Yet if they did impose additional taxes these countrymen blamed them, while if, on the other hand, they resisted any particular Bill of taxation the Government officials turned round and said, "These Indians seem to think it possible to govern a country without revenue," and this they made an argument against the capacity of the Natives to take an adequate part in the government of their country. The Legislative Council was simply and solely, he declared, a delusion and a farce, and its working constituted a worse despotism than was ever exercised by any Native ruler even in the old days. An Oriental despot, when he misgoverned, acted, so to speak, like a butcher, and people were astounded and horrified; this new despotism of civilisation rather resembled a murder effected by a clever but unscrupulous surgeon who drew all the blood from his victim while leaving scarcely a scar upon the skin. Moreover, if under Oriental despotism the results to the individual were serious, they at least were not so terrible to the country. A particular victim was no doubt often despoiled of his fortune, but some favourite benefited, and the money at least remained in the country; whereas the British—or rather un-British—system of despotism took away year by year a greater portion of the wealth of India, with the result that at the present day the Indians under British rule were the very poorest people in the world. And it was not as if there were any necessity that this should be the case. British statesmen had in the past recognised that by a different and more righteous system of government the situation of both India and England might be vastly improved, and that the latter might make ten times more money out of India by benefiting the latter country than was at present drawn from her destruction and impoverishment. With regard to the executive portion of the Government of India, they found most emphatically realised the old saying that

taxation without representation was tyranny. But he did not wish to suggest for a moment that it was the desire of the British people that this state of things should continue. On the contrary, he was so absolutely convinced that the British people did not wish that India should go on being governed on wicked lines, for they had done all they could—all save one thing—to secure that the Government of India should be carried on upon lines of righteousness. After the terrible exposures of British mis-government in and before the days of Warren Hastings the British people made a firm stand and strongly declared that India should not be subjected to such treatment any longer, with the result that in 1833 the British Government openly and decidedly stated that the Government of India should be a righteous one, and that the people of India should be treated in the same manner as the people of Great Britain. That, by the way, was the era of emancipations, among others of that which had enabled him to stand before an English constituency and, by obtaining their suffrages, to go to the House of Commons to plead his country's cause. (Hear, hear.) However, all the great statesmen of the time to which he referred declared with one voice that the Bill must pass, no matter what the consequences might be, and it did pass, its general effect being that no Native of India should by virtue of his religion or descent be disabled from holding any place, office, or employment under the Company. It might be asked what more than that the Indian people wanted, and he replied that they wanted nothing more—except that the British people should carry into effect honourably the Act they had passed. In 1853 there was a revision of the Act, when Lord Stanley of that day—the late Earl of Derby—Mr. Bright and other true Britons protested that the measure was completely and wholly a dead letter. But the Government of India and the Indian authorities nevertheless continued to act upon the one principle that the Indian Services were their monopoly, not to be encroached upon by any other persons, and the representations of Lord Stanley and Mr. Bright were not listened to. Then came the Mutiny, upon which he did not wish to touch beyond saying that if it was anyone's fault it was the fault of the British Government and their Indian Governor-General. However, it was for the most part Indians who,

even in the Mutiny, saved the British Empire in India. Lord George Hamilton talked glibly of the manner in which the British Empire had been built up by the expenditure of British treasure and the spilling of British blood. Well, much of the blood spilt in building up the Empire had been Indian blood, while with regard to treasure the British people had not spent a single farthing in creating or upholding it so far as the Indian portion of it was concerned. They had, on the contrary, constrained the wretched Indian Natives to contribute the whole cost, and were still drawing from India year by year millions upon millions to the still greater impoverishment and destruction of the Indian people. That, however, was somewhat by the way. After the Mutiny, when British power was re-established, the true British spirit was at once aroused, and once more the generous declaration went forth in the shape of a Proclamation from the Throne. "We hold ourselves bound to the Natives of our Indian territory," the Proclamation ran, "by the same obligations of duty which bind ourselves to our other subjects, and those obligations, by the blessing of Almighty God, we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil. And it is our further will that, so far as may be, our subjects, of whatever race or creed, shall be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties which they may be qualified by their education, ability, and integrity duly to discharge. . . . In their prosperity will be our strength, in their contentment our security, and in their gratitude our best reward. And may the God of all Power grant to us and those in authority under us strength to carry out these our wishes for the good of our people." But did the British people feel that in the impoverishment of India they could be strong or that they could be secure while India, far from being content, was terribly suffering? As to their reward he would not say at that moment what cause there was for gratitude or how much of it prevailed, but he would repeat that even putting matters on the very low platform of selfishness, the British nation would derive ten times more profit from India than was the case at present if they would only alter their treatment. (Hear, hear.) Similar proclamations had been issued since—when the Queen was declared Empress of India and at the Jubilee, but all these solemn obligations and Acts of Parliament had been and were being scattered to the winds in order that Anglo-Indian

officials might keep in their hands the monopoly of Indian Government and might provide for their boys. (Hear, hear.) What were the economic consequences of this state of things? They were summed up in the declaration of Lord Salisbury himself that India must be "bled," and was the principle on which the whole present system of Indian government was based. Lord Salisbury coolly and deliberately, in the memorandum to which he referred, admitted that India was injured by the drain that was constantly going on in the way of the exportation of so much revenue without any direct equivalent, and went on to say that as the great mass of the people, the agricultural community, had no more blood remaining in them, the lancet should be applied to those parts where the blood was congested or at least sufficient. He had said enough, he thought, to show how the unhappy Indian Natives were regarded by Anglo-Indian officials. The lot of the former, indeed, was somewhat worse than that of the slaves in America in old days, for the masters had an interest in keeping them alive, if only that they had a money value. But if an Indian died, or if a million died, there was another or there were a million others ready to take his or their places and to be the slaves of British officials in their turn. Who, he asked in conclusion, was responsible for all this? The British people might ask: "What more can we do? We have declared that India shall be governed upon righteous lines." Yes, but their servants have not obeyed their instructions, and theirs was the responsibility and upon their heads was the blood of the millions who were starving year by year. For their own sakes, as well as for the sake of the Indian people, it was time that they awoke. They were so taken up at present by the extension of their Empire that they little dreamed of a day which might come at any moment when their existing Empire might suffer an upheaval and explosion which would shatter it to pieces. He held out no threats, but that would be the natural consequence of an iniquitous and unjust system of government, as had been declared by Lord Salisbury when he said that injustice would bring down the mightiest kingdom. (Applause.)

Subsequently a series of questions were put to Mr. Naoroji, who answered them in considerable detail. He declared that famines were far less harmful in the feudatory States than in that part of India which was under direct British rule, because

those States lost nothing by their subjection to Great Britain except the small tribute paid yearly, and were consequently improving their position every day, and were enabled to establish a reserve fund and Treasury balances, out of which the people could be helped in time of need. For these feudatory States he admitted that British supremacy was a blessing. The average annual income of the Natives of India per head had, he said in answer to another question, been estimated by the present Lord Cromer as not more than twenty-seven rupees, but his own belief was that, at the present rate of exchange, it was not more than 25s. Let them contrast that with the average annual income per head of the people of Great Britain, which was estimated at £41.

A vote of thanks to Mr. Naoroji was moved by Miss Annie Lee-Brown, secretary of the local Women's Liberal Association, and seconded by Mr. Martin Wood, late of Bombay, who said the best method in which those present could express their thanks would be to study the subject and bring to bear such influence as they possessed with a view to remedying the condition of things of which they had heard.

The vote was heartily carried, and Mr. Naoroji having briefly returned thanks the meeting concluded.