

YOUNG INDIA'S REPLY TO COUNT TOLSTOI

By Taraknath Das

Part I.

YOUR open letter to us in reply to our private correspondence is unique and ideal in the way you have discussed the question of non-resistance and love. The world expects to hear a message of the like nature from a soul like yours, you who have experienced the sweetness and blessings of universal fellowship and unity of souls. An individual who really realizes but not theorizes that "All that exists is One; people only call this One by different names"—to him there is no need of constitutions, revolutions, conferences, congresses; to him, arts and sciences are stupidity; anything material is repulsive. The stage of which you speak is the stage of being above all material qualities—what the Hindu philosophers call "Gunatita."

According to the teachings of the prophet Krishna in the *Bagavat Gita*, the epitome of Hindoo philosophy, and according to our common sense, we see there are four stages of existence in individuals, societies and states. They are (1) dullness, (2) activity, (3) serenity, (4) "The stage of Gunatita." As we

cannot expect William's coat to fit Evelyn, so we cannot expect the dogma relative to dullness to be fully applicable to activity, serenity and so on. The diet of a young man is quite different from that of an old man; so your ideas are different from ours. Your sphere is to live above the material plane and renounce it altogether, whereas ours is to perform the duties as long as we live in the material plane. To you, there is no duty, but *we* have duties. We are not worshippers of violence. Our mottoes, "Resistance to tyranny is service to humanity and a necessity to civilization," and "Resistance to aggression is not simply justifiable, but imperative; non-resistance hurts both Altruism and Egoism," are not inconsistent with the law of progress and service to humanity—theories in which you possibly do not believe. We advocate resistance. Resistance is an active effort to overcome obstacles. We would again like to say that our idea is progress and comfort to humanity at large. We never advocate, as you have supposed, that vio-

lence is the only possible way of uniting peoples into societies.

Our motto is not an absolute doctrine, but it is dependent upon the condition of society and state. If there is no trace of aggression and tyranny, there is no expression of our dogma. But, as long as good and evil exist, as long as the rights of the weak are usurped by the strong, and as long as there remains the diversity of nature among human beings, our principle stands true, and it will remain operative as the active expression and effort of love to humanity until the *millennium* comes.

Non-resistance is an absolute dogma. We deny the existence of absolute non-resistance. In fact, in the last analysis, non-resistance does not exist. From our standpoint, our mere existence is a struggle. And, sir, we see that you are a strong pillar to support our doctrine by your actions. You, as a lover of humanity and preacher of the blessed idea of universal fellowship, in which nearly all Hindoo political leaders—at least we—believe, have always raised your powerful voice against the oppression of the majority by the minority of a people. You, by your utterances and writings have strongly resisted the idea of special privilege which is tyranny and have preached the sacredness of equal rights. You have upheld the rights and dignity of human life; you are resisting the evil force and brute nature by your moral force, you are facing right and moving towards right, and thus resisting wrong in a beneficial sense. Your actions are all violence to the people against whose interests they are arrayed. Violence and benevolence are measured by the relative value of the actions and the motives underlying them.

The idea of absolute non-resistance is not always love, but often bespeaks dullness, weakness, leading to fatalism; and to establish this fact, I will give a concrete example as it is experienced in India.

A Hindoo gentleman with his wife was traveling in a train. They were alone in the compartment until two "Tommy Atkins" entered, as they frequently do. One of them reached the lady and

showed activity to ignore the purity of womanhood, while the other stood at the door to stop the entrance of anyone from outside who might resist their vile actions. All means of escape were cut off. Sir, would you in this case ask the husband of that lady to use love, which you think must be consistent with non-resistance towards the brute, or would you ask him, for the sake of love towards his comrade and love of morality to use his manly force to resist the brutal action? Would you, sir, ask the lady not to resist the infamous deed? No, we believe that you would ask the parties subjected to such treatment to resist it to the last. Our position is just the same. We are believers in universal fellowship, but we are intolerant of any action of exploitation of any nation, race, society, family or individual by others. We advocate resistance—it may be moral or physical, active or passive, it may be direct or indirect—never to uphold the base instincts and deliberate actions of robbery of one nation by another as it is done in India to-day by the British Government, but to denounce it, and if possible, to abolish it; and we are glad to see, sir, that you have advised us to adopt passive resistance. You have advised our countrymen not to participate in the violent deeds of administration, of law courts, of collecting taxes and aiding the military rule of the British Government in India by enlisting as soldiers. We appeal to our countrymen to follow your sound advice, as we think passive resistance is often more effective than active opposition. We will ask our countrymen to adopt measures of active opposition only when they see that passive resistance leads to imprisonment and deportation without any kind of trial, as it does to-day in India. We advocate that when passive resistance becomes futile, we ought to adopt active resistance to stop aggression and tyranny.

We want to establish a kingdom of love; but how can we do it under the existing circumstances? Sir, you will accept the axiomatic truth, "two things cannot occupy the same space at the same time," and it is equally true psy-

chologically with all ideas and incidents. In order to establish an order superior to the existing state of affairs it is first necessary to break down the undesirable system. And we advocate that we have to resist evil in order to uplift righteousness.

We, the Indian Nationalists, believe, and we think that you, sir, do not disagree with us, that the British Government in India is nothing but a commercial agency bartering the life-blood of millions of Indian people for mere pounds, shillings and pence. We do not care to go into the minute details of the matter, but will quote a passage from the issue of *Justice* for Feb. 27, 1909, to substantiate our statement:

"British rule in India is one long record of wrong and robbery. The people are being bled to death and made easy victims for the plague by our systematic extortion. Indians are deprived of all control over their own country. Free speech, free press, free trial, freedom of every sort is being relentlessly suppressed. Wholly innocent men are being transported and kept in prison without the chance of saying a word in their own defense, under enactments worthy of a Sergius or a Plehve. Young university students, guilty only of political offenses of the mildest character, have been publicly flogged by Liberal orders till the blood ran down their backs. Torture in British prisons, both before and after trial, has been quite common, and is admitted to have been so by British officials, and as a manifest deduction from all these facts, such a government as this of ours in India is wholly infamous, and a curse alike to the people of India, the people of England and humanity at large."

To substantiate the above remarks, we produce some authoritative views on the moral, educational, sanitary, economic and civil condition of India under the British Rule. In a paper entitled "Success of the British Government in India From the Moral Point of View," *The Harp of New York*, for May, 1909, cites the following from an exchange, which is of special value as containing the

official orders that reveal the shame of England's army:

"The British army in India recruits women for the purpose of harlotry with an almost brutal disregard for even the God of Appearance. On June 17, 1886, Sir F. (now Lord) Roberts, issued his 'circular memorandum' addressed to general officers commanding divisions and districts. In it he says:

"In the regimental bazaars it is necessary to have a sufficient number of women; to take care that they are sufficiently attractive, and to provide them proper houses."

"In furtherance of these instructions, the officer commanding the Connaught Rangers at Jullender, wrote to the assistant quartermaster as follows:

"The cantonment magistrate has already on more than one occasion been requested to obtain a number of younger and more attractive women, but with little or no success. He will again be appealed to. The Major-General commanding should invoke the aid of the local government by instructing the cantonment magistrates, whom they appoint, that they give all possible aid to commanding officers in procuring a sufficient number of young, attractive, and healthy women."

It will be observed that her magistrates are acting as procurers at the instigation of army officers.

When the British were introducing the opium trade into India, they sent commissioners into the territory they thought suited for the cultivation of the poppy, and summoning all the *ryots* (peasant farmers) before them, these commissioners compelled each to set aside as much of his land as the commissioners wanted for the culture of this accursed drug.

When the natives would not buy or use the opium, the government spent a vast sum of money in giving it away free in order to cultivate among them a liking for it. The drug has ruined millions, body and soul, but it has brought a great revenue to the British Government.

The effect of this opium cultivation

is demoralizing and disintegrating. "It depopulated the country and degenerated the people. From having once been a fine, manly race, the Assamees (natives of a province of the Hindustan) have become absolutely the most abject and worthless in all India. The growth of population among them was checked by it; the men became prematurely old; the women bore fewer children and the children rarely lived to become old men."

Truth can never be too strong. The British merchants and British government are the causes of the introduction of opium and liquor in Hindustan. Some years ago the distribution of free liquor was a common thing. Even today, the British government distributes liquor regularly in the native army, and the effect is to disintegrate our finest specimens of manhood. Opium is also secretly distributed among the people, and the Government has adopted the same plan as the British merchants did in China and Formosa. How opium was introduced into Formosa is thus set forth in Japanese Government records:—

"Opium was first imported into the island (Formosa) about thirty years ago and it was in the raw state. It was imported through Hong Kong by the English merchants who told the natives that their sickness would be cured if they took it as medicine. The natives were very glad to hear this and procured the same gratis from the merchants and for

a short time seemed to be cured. This is how they became accustomed to smoking, and according to the English merchants, they thought it excellent medicine and from that time on consumed large quantities of it. It was several years afterward that they found it to be poisonous."

A careful writer in *Free Hindustan* for August, 1908, says:—

"We have seen in Vancouver, B. C., at least two hundred Sikhs, who use opium even with tea, and they testify that they were told first that opium was good medicine for head-ache, gout, trouble with stomach, and thus they began to use it and now they are slaves to the poison." This official drugging in India is daily increasing and we produce a British parliamentary report about it:

"In reply to a question in the English House of Commons on April 27, asking for the total net revenues from excisable liquors and drugs in India for a series of years, the following statement was made by Mr. Hobhouse on behalf of the Under Secretary for India, Mr. Buchanan: The figures of net revenue, stated in sterling at the rate of 15 rupees to the pound, are as follows: 1874-5, £1,561,000; 1883-4, £2,538,000; 1894-5, £3,620,000; 1904-5, £5,295,000; 1905-6, £5,621,000; 1907-8, £5,163,000; 1908-9, £7,342,000; 1909-10, £6,717,000. For the last two years the figures are estimates."

YOUNG INDIA'S REPLY TO COUNT TOLSTOI

By Taraknath Das

Part II.

EDUCATION is the bread of the soul. A misconception for want of accurate information about the British educational policy toward Hindustan, is very widely spread among people of civilized countries. The British Government and press trumpet all along that the British occupancy of India has been a great benefit to our people, and cite the spread of education. We do not wish to pass any opinion, but we are quoting solid facts and challenge contradiction of them.

“When in 1792, Wilberford proposed to add two clauses to the Charter of the year, for sending out schoolmasters to India, the directors of the company strongly objected to the proposal. On that occasion one of the directors stated that they had just lost America through their folly of having allowed the establishment of schools and colleges, and it would not do for them to repeat the same act of folly in regard to India: if the natives required anything in the way of education, they must come to England for it.”*

“This policy still exists at the bottom

*J. C. Marshman's Evidence, Lord's Second Report, 1853.

of the educational system established by the British Government in Modern India. Although this policy, or rather fear, has apparently been modified and schools colleges and universities have been founded, still the Government of India does not feel safe in giving the natives substantial higher education of the same nature as can be obtained in England, Europe and America.”**

To clear this last remark, we would like to say, that even to-day if we desire the higher education, we must go to England or some other western country. This is not all: We must also go to England to qualify ourselves as Indian Civil Servants, because the Indian Civil Service examinations are held *only* in England, so that poor countrymen of ours may not get any opportunity of governing our own country. How noble it is!

Rev. J. T. Sunderland, after a long residence in India, says:

“Much credit has been given to the Indian Government for education. It has done some good work in this direction, for which let it have full praise;

***India and Her People*, by Swami Abhedananda. Pp. 190-191.

but how little it has done when compared with the need, or compared with what the people want, or with its ability if it would only use its resources primarily for India's good! Why has so little of the people's money been spent for education? The munificent sum of one penny and a fifth, i. e., two cents per head of the population! Think of it. Is it any wonder that after a century and a half of British dominance the number of persons in India who can read and write is only about eleven out of a hundred among males, and one in two hundred among females? With their native industries badly broken down the Indian people have special need of industrial, technical and practical education, but the rulers are giving them almost nothing of this kind. Britain's neglect of education is a dark stain upon her treatment of India."*

Mr. Keir Hardie, M. P., spoke at Arbroath in Scotland in April, 1908, in the following way: "Take for instance, education in India: How much were they spending for education? One penny, i. e. two cents per annum. How much for military? One shilling per annum. One meal in two days was a common experience for hundreds in the Indian Empire, yet there was no public school system and children were charged for being taught."

The average income of our people according to different authorities, is \$10 per annum at the *very highest*, and down to \$6. The Government High School tuition fee is \$1.75 per month. Now you can easily realize whether the people will fail to educate their children or starve.

We would like to compare the Russian educational policy with the British, which might be interesting. *The Times* for April 17, 1908, contained the following: "The Duma has passed the first reading of a bill introduced by the minister of education, providing for the grant of 6,900,000 roubles annually for

the introduction of universal elementary education."

The Russian Government has granted a large sum of money for educational purposes; but according to the Budget debate and financial statement of the Viceroy's council for the years 1908-9, we do not find the grant of a single cent for adopting the system of free and universal elementary education; but we see the Government enormously extravagant for military affairs by sanctioning 20.75 million sterling, out of 59.19 million sterling, the total revenue of the country.

The British Government in Hindustan is not only inferior to the Russian Government, but also to native states in India (which the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy regards as extremely autocratic). The Gackwar of Baroda has made elementary education free and compulsory in his state, while the British Government of India under the *régime* of Lord Curzon passed University Acts which abolished the autonomy of the universities and higher education. To stop private educational enterprise or national life, the British Government is persecuting teachers and students of private schools and colleges even for singing our national song "Bande Mataram" (Hail, Mother-land).

It is known to all that since 1901, India has been annually ravaged by bubonic and pneumonic plague and these fearful diseases have become as common as malarial fever, smallpox or cholera there. The highest medical authorities of the world have pronounced that the plague in India is caused by want of proper sanitation and want of sufficient food among the people. If want of proper sanitation is one of the undeniable causes of plague, we would like to place before our intelligent readers the government statistics concerning sanitation in India, as revealed by Hon. Mr. Gokhale, C. I. E., in his budget speech in March, 1908.

"These figures show the amount contributed by the several provincial revenues as grants-in-aid to the municipalities towards the capital outlay on drainage and water-works during the last five years, i. e., from 1902-3 to 1906-7

*Paper on *The Causes of Famines in India*, before the Canadian Institute, by Rev. J. T. Sunderland. Page 21.

Total amount in dollars in five years:

Madras (exclusive of 3 lakhs given to the city of Madras)	\$215,666 00
Bombay	35,133 00
United Provinces	189,445 00
Punjab	75,000 00
Burma	nil
Eastern Bengal and Assam	4,666 00
Central Provinces	13,666 00
N. W. Provinces	nil

Total for all Provinces in five years

\$533,576 00

"This gives an annual average of a little over \$100,000 for the whole country (where the population is about three hundred millions). It may be noted that during these same five years, while the government contributed a mere pittance of a little over five hundred thousand dollars towards the sanitation of our own towns, which were being decimated by annual visitations of the plague, His Excellency, the Commander in Chief, was able to obtain for Military charges a sum of about \$90,000,000 above the level of the military expenditure.

"In 1901-2, nearly 60 crores, i. e., \$200,000,000 were spent as capital outlay on railways, of which one-third, i. e., \$66,666,666 was found out of current revenues. My Lord, this treatment of sanitation as though the government has no responsibility in regard to it, has hitherto been one of the most melancholy features of the present scheme of financial decentralization, under which sanitation has been made over to the Local Bodies as their concern, *though they have admittedly no resources for undertaking large projects of improvement.* The analogy of England is often quoted to justify this arrangement, but on the same analogy, railway construction should have been left to private enterprise, but it is not."

The above report proves that the British Government in India spent annually an average of a little more than \$100,000 of the revenue collected from the people for the sanitation of a population of about three hundred millions. Is this the best efficiency of the British ideal of sanitation? Is this the best sign of skill and devotion to improve the sanitary condition of the people of India?

The civilized world generally thinks that the British Government is doing a splendid work of irrigation in India to improve Indian agriculture and the sanitary condition of the country; but it is really a myth when we get into the motive and details of the action. We quote a part of the speech of Rai Bahadur Satanath Roy, one of the merchant princes of Bengal, delivered before the last annual meeting of the National Chamber of Commerce, Calcutta:

"There is no country in the world which is blessed with such a magnificent river system as Bengal (including, of course, Eastern Bengal). These rivers served most useful purposes. They were not only useful from a sanitary point of view, but also from an economic point of view; they not only supplied good drinking water to the people, but served as arteries through which flowed the commerce of the country. But for some time these rivers, channels and creeks have been silting up and most of them have dried up, *with the result that many once flourishing towns and villages have been devastated by cholera and malarial fever.*"

He further observes, and very rightly: "Everywhere both in Europe and America, rivers are being kept open and navigable by means of powerful dredgers, but except in the case of the river Hooghly near Calcutta, no really useful and powerful dredger has ever been utilized in removing the silt deposits and for keeping up the natural flow of water through the numerous rivers in Bengal. While several countries in Europe and America have been spending millions for the improvement of their respective rivers, our Government, while so lavish in all other things, including railways, has been very slow in spending money on the improvement of the waterways of the country."

This is not all. I am a Hindu and I wandered for over two years in different parts of India to study the real condition of the people, and what I have experienced is unimaginable by the American people. Except in a few big cities, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Lahore, Alahabad

and some others, it is very hard for the people to get pure drinking water. There is no water supply system in the Indian towns and villages. In villages, where ninety per cent of the people live, there are tanks, or reservoirs, dug by the people, and in most cases the water in those tanks, where the washer-man washes dirty clothes, the dish-washer cleans the dishes and people in general take their baths, is used for cooking and drinking purposes. The British Government does not help materially to remedy these evils. It is regarded as a case of rare fortune if the villagers get any help from the government to dig a well when the reservoir is dried up. I thoroughly agree with Mr. Russell, the eminent sociologist and author of *The Uprising of the Many*, who observed that millions of people in India live in huts and hovels whose sanitary condition is worse than that provided for cattle in this country.

Mr. William Jennings Bryan, after visiting India, remarked wisely: "So great has been the drain, the injustice to the people and the tax upon the resources of the country, that famines have increased in frequency and severity. Mr. Gokhale, one of the ablest of India's public men, presiding over the meeting of the last Indian National Congress held in December, declared in his opening speech that the death rate had steadily risen from 24 in the thousand in 1882-1884 to 30 in 1892-1894, and to 34 at the present time.

"I have more than once, within the last month, heard the plague referred to as a providential remedy for over-population. Think of it! British rule justified because 'it keeps the people from killing each other,' and the plague praised because it removes those whom the Government has saved from slaughter!"

Here we want to emphasize the fact that in England the death rate is decreasing, and the statistics read thus:

"England has become successful in bringing down her death rate from 20 to 15.5 per thousand during the last twenty years."

Some people make the indiscreet remark that the people of India have no idea of sanitation, and that they never lived in a sanitary way; but such is not the case. Students of ancient history testify that when the Anglo-Saxons were living in caves, then India had her days of prosperity. Medical science, astronomy, ethics and philosophy flourished there. Megasthenes, an early Greek historian and contemporary of Alexander the Great, has fortunately left a very valuable testimony to this early Indian civilization.

Under the existing economic conditions, the people of India cannot undertake independently any work of sanitation, because they are poor — they are taxed to death. There are districts where the people are forced to pay a land tax of 65 per cent of the products. The average income of the people is now one and one-half cents a day, while it was four cents some fifty years ago.

All nations condemn the Spanish exploitation of South America, as they also condemn her treatment of Cuba. Under Spanish rule, Cuba was in a state of horror, but under the progressive and benevolent influence of the United States, the conditions are changed; there shines forth the success of the American democracy which raised Cuba, a country of enslaved people, a resort unfit for human habitation, to a land of free people, blessed with all the latest sanitary developments.

The United States saved the Cubans from the yawning jaws of yellow fever, while the British Government has become the cause of plague, malaria and famine in India. Then shall we call the British Government in India a colossal success?

YOUNG INDIA'S REPLY TO COUNT TOLSTOI

By Taraknath Das

PART III

THE economic condition of the people is the sure test of the success or failure of a government.

India, under British rule, is suffering from the worst kind of economic evil that any country has ever faced on earth. India is the poorest country, with vast resources, in the world.

Here is the table of average income of the people of the principal nations per capita per annum: United States, \$220.00; British Isles, \$180.00; France, \$156.00; Germany, \$124.00; Austria,

\$84.00; Italy, \$80.00; Holland, \$110.00 (1900); Belgium, \$14.00 (1900); Norway, \$100.00; Spain, \$80.00 (1900); Russia, \$55.00 (1900); British India, \$5.00 (1900).

Sir William Digby in his exhaustive work, *The Prosperous British India*, has proved from the parliamentary documents of the British Government that the average annual income of the people in British India is \$5.00 per annum. Lord Cromer some twenty years ago estimated that the average income of our people in Hindustan was \$9.00 per

year per capita, not deducting taxation. If we take Lord Cromer's estimate as correct, it proves that the people of Hindustan are daily getting poorer and poorer under the British rule. It has been very clearly shown in *Prosperous British India* (1901) that in 1850 we had an average income of 2d. (4 cents) a day. In 1880 it lowered to 1½d. (3 cents), and in 1900 it had been reduced to less than ¾d. (1½ cents).

This poverty of India is caused by the British plunder and legalized pillage and destruction of Indian industries. Poverty has become the source of chronic famines in India. There people are dying like flies, and the famines are caused by the British commercialism and exploitation. Try to realize that over thirty millions of people died for want of food, starved to death, while the British merchants were daily carrying away ship-loads of food from the people who worked hard to provide it. Humanity is suffering from the effects of slow poison. The civilized world abhors war, but compare the mortality of famines in India for ten years, from 1891 to 1900, with that of all the wars in the world from 1793 to 1900! The figures are nineteen millions and five millions respectively. The famines in India, I repeat, are the result of British exploitation, and are not, as may be supposed, caused by lack of rain or lack of production, or by over-population.

It is an economic famine of an enslaved nation caused by merciless plunder of at least \$175,000,000 a year, without a cent in return. The British Government in India is more oppressive than the Russian.

People are generally misled to think that India was always a famine-land; but it is not a fact. Before the advent of the British rule in India, famine was occasional, but the British plundering policy has made it chronic. The area of famine districts is increasing yearly, and not a year passes that millions do not fall victims of the dreadful calamity. We produce below statistics taken from Sir William Digby's *Prosperous British India*, to convince our readers of the true situation:

Two British subjects passed away from starvation, or starvation-induced diseases, every minute of every day and night from January 1st to September 30th, 1901.

Rev. J. T. Sunderland, in his work *The Causes of Famine in India*, like all impartial writers, has conclusively proved that neither "failure of rains" nor "over-population" is the cause of famines in India. He has stated that the real cause of famine is the extreme, the abject, the awful poverty of the Indian people caused by "enormous foreign tribute," "British Indian Imperialism" and the destruction of Indian industries.

Sir William Hunter, K. O. S. I., the

FAMINES BEFORE THE BRITISH RULE.

In the Eleventh	Century, 2 famines, both local.
“ Thirteenth	“ 1 “ around Delhi.
“ Fourteenth	“ 3 “ all local.
“ Fifteenth	“ 2 “ both local.
“ Sixteenth	“ 3 “ all local.
“ Seventeenth	“ 3 “ general; area not defined.
“ Eighteenth (to 1745)	“ 4 “ Northwestern provinces: Delhi, Sindh (twice), all local.

FAMINES UNDER THE BRITISH RULE DURING THE NINETEENTH CENTURY:

“How completely famine has gained a hold on the Empire may be judged from this summary:

1800 to 1825,	5 famines, perhaps	1,000,000 deaths
1825 “ 1850,	2 “	“ 500,000 “
1850 “ 1875,	6 “	“ 5,000,000 “
1875 “ 1900,	18 “	estimate 26,000,000 “

historian of India, formerly of the Viceroy's Council, says: "The government assessment does not leave enough food to the cultivator to support himself and his family throughout the year."

Mr. Herbert Compton, in *Indian Life*, has this to say:

"There is no more pathetic figure in the British Empire than the Indian peasant. His masters have ever been unjust to him. He is ground until everything has been expressed, except the marrow of his bones."

Hindustan is an extensive agricultural country and the average land produces two crops a year, and in Bengal there are lands which produce thrice a year. Bengal alone produces such large crops that they are quite sufficient to provide *all the population of Hindustan for two years*. It is therefore easy to understand that before the advent of the British in India, lack of means of transportation was the cause of famines; but since their coming, owing to their unjust and merciless taxation, willful destruction of native industries and *never ending plunder*, it would not make any difference if all of India produced a hundred crops a year; our people would still know the gnawing pain of hunger. So we may say that the modern means of transportation has become an instrument for carrying crops away from India to the outside for Great Britain's interest, rather than helping the famine-stricken districts of India.

We will quote a few authoritative statements to support the above facts:

The theory of over-population in India is a myth and we produce a part below from the statistics of the U. S. Government, covering area, population and foreign commerce of the principal countries or the world:

Of the plunder of India Adam Brooks, in *Laws of Civilization and Decay*, says: "Very soon after the Battle of Plassey (fought in 1757) the Bengal plunder began to arrive in London and the effect appears to have been almost instantaneous. . . . Probably since the world began no investment has yielded the profit reaped from the Indian plunder. The amount of treasure wrung from the conquered people and transferred from India to English banks between Plassey and Waterloo (57 years) has been variously estimated at from \$2,500,000,000 to \$5,000,000,000."

The methods of plunder and embezzlement by which every Briton in India enriched himself during the earlier history of the East India Company, gradually passed away, but the drain did not pass away. The difference between that earlier day and the present is, that India's tribute to England is obtained by "indirect methods" under forms of law. It is estimated by Mr. Hyndman that at least \$175,000,000 is drained away every year from India, without a cent of return.

The following extract from *India and Her People*, by Swami Abhedananda, will give an idea of how the Indian revenue is used for the interest of the British people, and how our people are

Country	Area.	Population	Population per square mile	Year
Austro-Hungary	241,333	47,355,000	196.22	1905
Austria	115,903	27,241,000	233.03	1905
Belgium	11,373	7,161,000	627.95	1906
Denmark	15,360	2,574,000	167.58	1905
France	207,054	39,300,000	189.51	1906
German Empire	208,830	60,478,000	289.60	1905
Italy	110,646	33,604,000	303.71	1905
Japan	147,655	47,975,000	324.91	1906
Formosa	13,468	3,059,000	227.30	1905
Netherlands	12,563	5,592,000	445.12	1905
Switzerland	15,976	3,459,000	216.51	1906
United Kingdom	121,371	43,221,000	356.11	1906
India	1,766,642	294,361,000	166.62	1906

really debarred from higher offices:

"India pays interest on England's debt, which in 1900 amounted to 224 millions sterling, and which annually increases. Besides this, she pays for all the officers, civil and military, and a huge standing army, pensions of officers, and even the cost of the India Building in London, as well as the salary of every menial servant in that house. For 1901-2 the total expenditure charged against revenue was \$356,971,410.00, out of which \$86,843,275.00 was spent in England as Home Charges, not including the pay of European officers in India, saved and remitted to England. These charges were as follows:

1. Interest on debt and management of debt.....	\$15,262,050.00
2. Cost of mail service, telegraph lines, etc., charged to India...	1,136,440.00
3. Railways, state and guaranteed (interest and annuities).....	32,081,865.00
4. Public works (absentee allowances, etc.).....	256,070.00
5. Marine charges (including H. M. Ships in India nSeas)....	866,510.00
6. Military charges (including pensions)	14,728,070.00
7. Civil charges (including Secretary of State's establishment, Cooper's Hill College, Pensions, etc.).....	10,176,850.00
8. Stores (including those for defence works).....	10,289,670.00
Total	\$84,797,525.00

The following again, is a comparative table of salaries paid out:

	Natives	Eurasians
Civil Department	55	10
Military	1	1
Public Works	3	4
Incorporated Local Funds	1	...
	60	15

We find 421 natives in the civil department, as against 1,207 Europeans and 96 Eurasians. In the military department 25 natives are employed, 1,699 Europeans and 22 Eurasians; while in the department of Public Works, there are 85 natives as against 549 Europeans and 3 Eurasians.

Mr. Alfred Webb (late M. P.), who has studied the subject with care, says: "In charges for the India Office (in London); for recruiting (in Great Britain, for soldiers to serve in India); for civil and military pensions (to men now living in England, who were formerly in the Indian service); for pay and allowances on furloughs (to men on visits to England); for private remittances and consignments (from India to England); for interest on Indian Debt (paid to parties in England); and for interest on railways and other works (paid to shareholders in England),—there is annually drawn from India, and spent in the United Kingdom, a sum calculated at from £25,000,000 to £30,000,000." (Between \$125,000,000 and \$150,000,000.)

Taxation in the British India, as observed by the impartial British writers:

"The present condition of affairs undoubtedly renders the struggle for existence a hard one, as may be realized when it is considered that a vast population of India not only from the inevitable droughts which so frequently occur, *but also from a narrow and short-sighted imperial policy which places every obstacle in the way of industrial development and imposes heavy taxes on the struggling people.* According to various authorities Russia's demand upon land owners in her Central Asian possessions are not so exacting as are ours in India, *for the British Govern-*

	Total Salaries of			
	Natives	Eurasians	Europeans	
	1,211	\$316,000	\$50,333	\$8,424,666
	854	4,000	3,666	4,422,666
	239	11,000	15,000	1,138,353
	9	3,333	37,666
	2,313	\$334,333	\$68,999	\$14,023,351

ment insists on a fifth of the produce, making no allowance for good or bad years; while Russia is said to ask only a tenth and allow for variations of production."

The condition of the people of India is worse than it was fifteen years ago when Sir Archibald R. Colquhoun made

the above statement. The taxes imposed upon the people had, been unbearably heavy and since then the demand is growing unbearably heavier. In the twentieth century, when people are advocating the "single tax," there are provinces in British India where the poor peasants are forced to pay 65% of their net income as land-revenue alone.

To substantiate our remarks we quote these lines from *The Causes of the Present Discontent in India*, by C. J. O'Donnell, M. P.:

"In replying to a question of mine (Mr. Donnell's) in April last (1907), Mr. Morley (now Lord) stated that 50% of the net assets is the ordinary standard of assessment of land revenue alone throughout India. Net assets means the annual profit after paying the cost of cultivation, the income, in fact of the former. So we have it admitted that the normal land tax is ten snillings in the pound. The word 'alone' needs explanation. It means that the farmer has, besides his land tax, many other rates and taxes to pay for roads, police, irrigation, public works, etc. Mr. Morley's answer suggested that 50% is the higher limit of land tax throughout India; so a few days later I questioned him definitely in regard to the Central Provinces, giving date and number of the Government of India's order. The reply I received runs thus: 'The rule at present in force in the Central Provinces is that the assessment should not be less than 50% and should not exceed 60%, but in exceptional cases, if the existing assessment has hitherto exceeded 65% and *been paid without difficulty*, it is provided that the assessment shall be fixed at 65%.' It therefore appears that 50% is the lower limit, and it may be 65% if it can be paid without difficulty. We are always assured that the land tax is light and paid without difficulty, which perhaps explains the fact that in the Central Provinces over a million people disappeared—died of starvation, between 1891-1901, as admitted in the census report of the late years."

To give an adequate idea about the way the land revenue is increased even

in famine years, we reproduce the following from the same work:

"The explanatory memorandum to the Indian Budget issued last July by the Secretary of State, gives on page 12, that the total land revenue of the Indian Empire collected in 1905-1906, was \$90,647,860.00 and his own budget of land revenue for the following years, 1901-8, \$97,726,000.00. The increase is \$7,078,140.00, or nearly eight per cent in twenty-four months—roundly at the rate of forty per cent in a single decade."

The following statement by Mr. O'Donnell will prove the real motive of the British Government about the so-called "benevolent irrigation work" in India:

"The capital of \$35,000,000.00 invested in the Punjab canals, yielded in 1906-7 the large net profit of 10½ per cent, whilst in the case of the Chemel Canal it rose to the extraordinary and unhealthy figures of nearly 22 per cent. It was in the Chemel Colonies the bitterest discontent existed."

"The so-called famine relief fund is nothing more nor less than a mere subterfuge of taxing the starving to save the dying. This fund does not rain from heaven, nor does the British exchequer give it. If the British Government spends, says £5,000,000, on the present famine, they will simply squeeze it out of the poverty-stricken surviving tax payers, who would, in turn, become victims of the next drought.

"The British people stand charged with the blood of the perishing millions and the starvation of scores of millions. . . . Under the British Indian despot the man is at peace, there is no violence; his substance is drained away, unseen, peaceably and subtly; he starves in peace with law and order! I wonder how the British people would like the fate? The condition of the Indian people to-day is worse than that of the chattel slaves; because slaves used to get food to eat when they served their masters, but the Indian people work hard, produce and die without food, which the British enjoy."

In speaking of the British policy of bleeding Indian people, Lord Salisbury

says: "The injury is exaggerated in the case of India where so much of the revenue is exported without a direct equivalent. As India must be bled, the lancet should be directed to the parts where the blood is congested, or at least sufficient, not to those already feeble for the want of it."

Shall the people of India and the world at large calmly endure the bleeding of Indian people? If not, where is the remedy? In resisting it.

Says Sir William Hunter: "The government assessment does not leave enough food to the cultivator to support himself and his family throughout the year."

"There is no more pathetic figure in the British Empire than the Indian peasant," writes Mr. Herbert Compton.

"His masters have ever been unjust to him. He is ground down until everything has been expressed except the marrow of his bones."

"The number of human beings in India who subsist in perennial hunger, usually on one meal a day, was estimated by *The Pioneer*, at one hundred millions."

Much has been said by the British officials about the "Famine Relief in India," but it is really a mockery as far as the British Government is concerned. But we are grateful to the American people and others who have contributed to save the life of the starving people of India. No famine relief fund will save the people from the horrible calamity unless the British policy of exploiting the people is stopped.

YOUNG INDIA'S REPLY TO COUNT TOLSTOI

By Taraknath Das

PART IV

RECENTLY about a dozen Indian Nationalist leaders have been deported from India without any trial. They were deported under the regulation of April 7, 1818. This regulation has different sections and it is an exhaustive one. I quote the principal part of the preamble to show whether or not the regulation is expressive of the greatest amount of self-government consonant with the retention of the dependent status of the people of India.

"Whereas reasons of state embracing the due maintenance of the alliances formed by the British Government with the foreign powers, the preservation of tranquility in the territories of native princes entitled to its protection and the security of the British dominions from foreign hostility and from internal commotion, occasionally render it necessary

to place under personal restraint individuals against whom there may not be sufficient grounds to institute any judicial proceedings, or when such proceeding may not be adapted to the nature of the case, or may for other reasons be inadvisable or improper, and herein referred to; the determination to be taken should proceed immediately from the authority of the Governor General in Council."

From the letter and spirit of the above regulation we see that persons may be put in restraint, against whom there is no sufficient ground to institute judicial proceedings. This idea is contrary to the principles of civil right, and the practice of restraining people without proper judgment is shocking to all who have any sympathy for the principle of civil rights. An individual is supposed to be innocent unless proved guilty of certain crime, and

the innocent must not be punished or be deprived of personal liberty.

People in general are inclined to think that the British Government in India is a blessing to the people there, because it has guaranteed the people the enjoyment of civil rights; but the enforcement of a law of such an autocratic nature indicates that the people of India under British rule enjoy less liberty in the twentieth century than the British people enjoyed in the thirteenth. In the British Isles the right of trial by jury has long been regarded as one of the bulwarks of liberty.

In the celebrated Magna Charta, granted by King John in 1215, we find the following clause: "No freeman shall be taken or imprisoned or disseized or outlawed, or banished, or any way injured, nor will we pass upon him nor send upon him, unless by the legal judgment of his peers or by the law of the land."

It is against the principle of humanity and justice that because a people are in a dependent state they may be deprived of the privilege of defending themselves from arbitrary executive orders. On this point the British constitution holds that no freeman shall be imprisoned without cause shown, to which he may make answer. The people of India are not slaves; they too are freemen.

Lord Morley, the eminent philosopher, is the Secretary of State for India now. Every line of his books breathes the idea of liberalism and the dignity of human rights. We of India do not understand why under his *régime* a law has been enforced in India which cannot be justified in any case except when the country is under martial law. Then are we to suppose that India is under martial law?

We see that the Russian Government gives some kind of trial to Russian revolutionists. We have seen that the British Government gave the Zulu leaders a chance of judicial trial. *Why, then,* will not the British Government give the Indian Nationalists a chance of defending themselves before tribunals of justice instead of subjecting them to arbitrary deportation? No people enjoying civil

rights and liberty can justify the measures taken by the British Government in India. A state of dependency which denies the people civil rights cannot be justified.

We believe in spirituality, and without spirituality there cannot be a nationality, and this spirituality of nationality is closely akin to service to humanity in general. Love is exquisite, and it is limitless; but self-preservation is also the first law of nature. When all means of escape are cut off, shall we embrace a deadly, poisonous snake, leave it alone, or resist it? The British Government is a deadly, poisonous snake in its inner nature, although outwardly covered with the garments of civilization, a deadly civilization, which you have denounced in your letter.

For the sake of self-preservation of the Indian people as well as others, and for the sake of love for humanity, we need activity in resisting aggression from without or within. Attainment of true manhood and womanhood is our aim and aspiration. We declare with all the emphasis that we can command, that it lies in the attainment of our national freedom. Slaves can never acquire ideal manhood or womanhood, simply because they are slaves, simply because they cannot get the opportunity. There is no question about the theory that slaves may have the same quality, power and faculty latent in them that are in a free people, but they cannot get any opportunity to cultivate and make the best use of them. This is not all; we hold the view that cultured men or women lose manhood or womanhood if they are put in slavery for a long time. Imprison a full grown sky-lark in a cage for a few years, and you will see that the sky-soaring bird has lost the power to fly even a few yards. Try to make it fly; it will not like to do it. It is the same thing with a nation as it is with an individual. Put a nation in slavery and the people lose their finer instincts. *Attainment of perfect manhood and womanhood through national independence is our goal.* We want to reconstruct the social, political and economic machines in operation in India

which have forced over thirty millions of people within the last forty years to an untimely death by starvation. If we cease to exist, who will practice love? If the Indian people want to live, they must get rid of the British Government.

Sir, you have stated: "In the absence of the true religious consciousness and the guidance of conduct flowing from it, lies the chief, if not the sole cause of enslavement of the Indian people by the English." The true religious consciousness is, according to your estimation, "manifestation of love with non-resistance"; but history does not prove it to be so. We see the flourishing days of India in the first part of the Buddhistic age and prior to that time, but as soon as the Indian people began to lose their active spirit, with the growing spirit and practice of non-resistance, preached by the Buddhist monks, there came the downfall. India saw again her brighter days when Sankaracharya denounced the corrupt Buddhistic practices and preached the active religion of Vedanta philosophy. The idea of non-resistance has led the people of India to dullness and fatalism, and fatalism has led them to ignorance and superstition, and there is the remote cause of our downfall. We want to eradicate by activity the superstition of fatalism arising from the idea of non-resistance.

We are not complaining that the British have enslaved us, but we are enslaved because of not resisting the wrong principle of tyranny which you have so well described. You have made no distinction between the oppressive rule and the government of the people. We believe in the government of the people, which must not be oppressive. As soon as we advocate resistance, we are not submissive to tyranny or coercion, and you have said: "The submission of the Hindoos to coercion is the cause of their enslavement to the British Government." According to your letter, we understand that the British Government in India is a self-inflicted calamity of the Indian people, and we want to avert this calamity by the performance of our self-imposed duty towards our country. We

have chosen, once for all, the liberation of India from the foreign yoke as our solemn duty to our country, and shall ask our countrymen to take up the work as long as they are within the limit of duty. We firmly hold to our principle and declare with you that Love is God, but at the same time assert that the Divinity is best represented in humanity, and *resistance to despotism is the first of all human duties*. We do not know what were the guiding principles of the people in days of yore, but according to history, we think we are progressing. We cannot believe that the world was once governed by love only and has retrogressed to its present stage, because we believe in the law of eternal progress. The economic history of the world provides us with accounts of cannibalism, feudalism, slavery, serfdom, civil war, religious torture, and so on, which are no more in existence. We find instances of Christ dying on the cross, Buddha preaching love, Krishna and Ram fighting to do away with the tyrannical form of government, as a sure proof of the prevalence of some principles other than love at all periods of the world's history.

We are not influenced so much by the Western teachers as by our own teachers, Ram and Krishna. Krishna taught us in *The Gita* to "give up your lethargy and effeminacy and rise up to fight the battle for the right." He also says: "Whenever the righteousness is dwindled by the acts of the unrighteous, I incarnate myself in the shape of popular spirit to save the followers of the right and truth and destroy the evil." Modern psychology dictates that reintegration and creation are correlative, so we again say that the principle of resistance to tyranny is *not* inconsistent with the spirit of love.

We advocate freedom of India for the sake of service to humanity and resistance to tyranny, and shall continue to do the same as long as it exists.

Our program is: (1) absolute self-government; (2) national education; (3) development of Indian industries, agriculture and commerce; and (4) no starvation caused by foreign exploitation.

We pray aid from humanity at large.