

बिहार राज्य अभिलेखागार



सत्तममेव जयते

संचिका संख्या
अभिलेखागार संख्या

4
L.V.-473
1944

१६

बिहार सरकार

बिहार सरकार

मंत्रिमंडल सचिवालय विभाग विभाग
(बिहार राज्य अभिलेखागार निदेशालय)

शाखा

कार्यवाही

१६

सं०

५८

विषयः

[CONFIDENTIAL.]

File No. 474.

1914 .

GOVERNMENT OF BEHAR AND ORISSA.

Political — **DEPARTMENT.**

Special Section. **BRANCH.**

B PROGS. FOR _____ 1914

Nos. _____

_____ PAGES.

SUBJECT.

vernacular Newspaper 'Fauji Akhbar' published weekly by
Messrs Rai Sahib Gulab Singh & Sons.

Purchase of Hindi, Urdu and Gurmukhi versions for supply
to the Military Police and schools in Bihar and Orissa.

File No. 474 of 1914.

SUBJECT.

2

Vernacular Newspaper "Gauji Akhbar" published weekly by Messrs. Rai Sahib Gulab Singh & Sons.

Purchase of Hindi, Urdu & Gurmukhi Notes and Orders. versions for supply to the Military Police & Schools in Bihar & Orissa

From Home Department D/o

No. 2423 Pol. dt 11. 11. 1914.

C.S.

Perusal & for consideration if this Govt. would subscribe the "Gauji akhbar" & make use of it for the circulation of reliable war news. The views of the Commissioners & the D.D. may perhaps be ascertained. The "Gurmukhi" version would not be wanted perhaps in this Province. H.H. & H.M. may see. (The Financial will have to be consulted also).

V.K. Ghosh
17/11/14

H.M. We may consider the advisability of the Hindi version for arming our military armed and reserve police & Landwehr Training Schools.
17. 11

D.P.I. if any, who
unhappily was to send by
supplying a copy to a
few selected schools -
Half a dozen copies in Hindi
& Urdu and to get so that
D.P.I. & I.G.P. may see what
the paper is like. Self
3 1911

Indra
1911

18711

बिहार सरकार

मंत्रि Issue the D.O. to the D. P. I. also
(बिहार सरकार के द्वारा)
write direct to the Publisher for half a
dozen copies of the Hindi and Urdu versions
and two of the Gurmukhi. The latter will
be for the Punjabis in the Military Police
Companies of I. G. P., to whom the file
should now be sent, thinks this advisable.

1127

19-11-1914.

page 3.

D.O. No. 825 Dated 19th Novem 1914.
To Hon'ble Mr. J. G. Jennings.

To Mr. Brown.

C.S.

4

Draft submitted. After

issue the file will go to I.G. as ordered.

KeB

19.11.14

11/12

19.11

page 4

To Messrs. Rai Sahib Gulab Singh & Sons
No. 834-C Dated 20.11.14.

To I. G. P. U.O.

22.11.14.

बिहार सरकार

C.S.

मंत्रिमंडल सचिवालय विभाग

(बिहार राज्य आचार्य विभाग)

The idea is excellent. If one of specimen copies in each language is sent to me I shall ascertain and report which will serve police purposes best.

To C.S. u/o.

24.11.14.

24/11

RA

11/12

14.11

lower piece
KeB
25/11/14

20, D.O.
T.C. of 2-11-14.

page 5

5

CS.
29/11

1/11/14

It may be authorized to
order the copies

1/11/14

24. 11

24. 11

24. 11

1/11/14
30/11

Hon'ble Mr. J. G. Jennings D.O. No. 960-C
30th November 1914

"Fauj Akhbar"

Specimen Copies of the
above paper have been re-
ceived, viz 6 Copies in Urdu, 6
in Hindi and 2 Copies Gur-
mukhi.

2 specimen copy of each
above may now be
J. G. P.

End all J. G. P.

4.12 1/11/14

Restore
NAB
11/12/14

Placed in
below
dept.

Serial No. 4749/14.

(5)

Serial No. in
File.

6

C.S.

Regarding the vernacular paper 'Fauj - i - Akbar' recommended for circulation among the Military + Armed Police : — Sup^d report that it will be appreciated and from the 1st April I shall arrange to supply one or two copies in Hindi or Urdu to districts other than those that have a original in the A.P. and to the Military Police.

बिहार सरकार
मंत्रिमंडल सचिवालय विभाग
(बिहार राज्य अभिलेखागार निदेशालय)

RD 25/1

25/1

(Papers)

KP— Could not subscription come more at once? men anxious to disseminate true news of the war among men of the fighting domes, through them to their families?

25/1/15 MR

C.S.

I have ordered the paper at once. The difficulty was to find the money, but I have now managed it by reappropriation

27/1

RD

Paper put up.

RD
23/1

To D.G. P. 90.
23/1/1915

7

Serial No. in
File.

DPI of

Has anything been done in your
dept please?

11/20

18/1

u. o. 9 117
28-1-15.

C.S.

22 copies (20 in Hindi & 2 in Urdu) have
been ordered for distribution among the (16) Dy.
Inspectors of the Higher & Chota Nagpur Districts, & the (1)
Special Inspecting Officer for Muhammadan Schools in Orissa,
& the (5) First grade Training Schools. The Dy. I/S
are to circulate their copies of the paper among the
subordinate inspecting staff.

18.1.

4 2/15

11/11

Source

11/11

5/2/15

el

5/2

11/11
5/1

Restone
K.B.
6/12

Under Secretary (Political Department).

8

U. O. No. 45- 108 7th April 1915:

Regarding Mr. Dundas' note dated

10.5.15

the 20th January 1915 in your file relating to the purchase of the "Fauji Akhbar".

As it was found that savings in the "Petty Construction" grant would enable an immediate supply, necessary copies of ^{the} paper were ordered from February 1915. In order,

however, for the Accountant-General to admit the charge, will you kindly issue

formal orders authorising the Inspector-

General to supply the paper to such

officers as may be considered necessary?

R. J. Hunt

P. A. to I. G. of Police.

U.
7-4

7.4.15

A draft is submitted.

11/4/15

11/4

To. J. B. Price No. 742-C dt. 12. 4. 15

To A. G. B. No. 743-C dt. 12. 4. 15

Replote
12.4

R. No. 606.
17/XI.

(8)

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL.

10 D.O. No. 2423 Political,
HOME DEPARTMENT.

Delhi, the 11th November, 1914.

Dear LeMesurier,

I am desired to bring to your notice the fact that ~~a certain~~ reliable newspaper exists in the shape of the "Fauji Akhbar" should the Lieut: Governor in Council care to make use of it for the circulation of ~~war~~ war news.

This newspaper is published weekly by Messrs. Rai Sahib Gulab Singh and Sons, Mufid-i-Am Press, Lahore, in Urdu, Hindi and Gurmukhi, and its present circulation in the three vernaculars combined is about 6000 copies. As, however, Gulab Singh's press is very large, practically any number of copies would be available.

The "Fauji Akhbar" is primarily intended for circulation in the Indian Army, but every endeavour is made to make the paper ^a real newspaper and not merely a service magazine, while there are sufficient guarantees that nothing objectionable appears in it.

The policy of the paper is, and always has been, to entirely ignore all questions of religion and politics; otherwise it is just as much an ordinary newspaper as any other vernacular publication.

The cost of a single copy of the "Fauji Akhbar" is Rs. 2/4 per annum, including postage: when a number of copies are taken by the same subscriber the cost is Rs. 2/- per annum, known as the concession rate.

9 4

Should the Lieut. Govr.in Council care to make
use of the suggestion, I am desired to say that all
arrangements for supply and distribution should be made
direct with the publishers above mentioned.

12

Yours sincerely

H. H. H. H.

The Hon'ble Mr. H. LeMesurier, C.S.I., C.I.E.,

Chief Secretary to the Government of Bihar and
Orissa.

बिहार सरकार
मंत्रिमंडल सचिवालय विभाग
(बिहार राज्य अभिलेखागार निदेशालय)

D.O. 825.
19/1

Draft.

14
My dear Jennings,

I am desired to enclose copy
of a D. O. letter received from the Home
Department regarding the "Fauji Akhbar" .
Arrangements are being made to circulate
copies among the Military and Armed
Reserve Police and Government would be
glad of your opinion whether any good
purpose would be served by supplying a
copy to a few selected schools. A few
spare copies are being ordered and will
be sent to you so as to enable you to see
what the paper is like.

Yours sincerely,

to a man, more than ever before, and all looks well for us, really well, though the Russians outnumber us three to one. Germany's financial condition is marvellous. They never required a moratorium even, and money just pours in for the war loan. The Americans here are mad with enthusiasm over the German nation. They say she cannot be beaten, and woe to France and England. They have food for years, so don't worry about famine!! They haven't begun to call out the reserves, and they have millions more to put in the field. R.— and B.— are well, and none of the people we know in Austria have been killed or wounded yet. I am so happy and so confident, and have the greatest admiration and respect for this marvellous nation. Their stories of French and Belgian atrocities are awful. Eyes of the wounded gouged out, &c. too horrible. Here even the Russian wounded are so well cared for that their names and numbers are over each bed with an X-ray picture of their wounds. Is this not remarkable for order and system? C.— and I go round doing the goose-step and shouting 'Deutschland über Alles'!! We are having the time of our lives, and both look rosy and years younger!! The past weeks in England are only a nightmare. N.— is crazy to write to the editor of *The Times* and tell him something of conditions here. He says it is pathetic to keep the English people in the dark as they do; but as a neutral he dares not. The three English cruisers were sunk by one torpedo, and every man on board has received the Iron Cross. Winston Churchill must be foaming at the mouth!!! Hip, hip, hurrah!!! There were 1,800 British lost. The people here are disgusted with the restrictions put on enemy aliens in England. Here they have very few restrictions, and Nurse D.— might perfectly have come with me. What a pity she didn't! —'s parting remark to me at the — office in London has become classic here! You remember he said to me, 'Well, you will find Vienna in chaos and the empire breaking up.' People shout with glee over this; it is so absurd, it is pathetic almost! Tell P.— only one Zeppelin has been disabled so far!! The *Times* declares to have received a great many letters with regard to this letter and says:—"As some of our correspondents, being surprised by the contents of the letter, doubt its genuineness, we may say that the letter is an absolutely authentic private letter. We are fully informed regarding the personality of the writer and of its recipient, and of all the persons referred to in the letter, their names having been deleted by us for obvious reasons."

Mr. MOHAMED ALI, Editor of the *Comrade* and the *Standard*, interviewed by a representative of the Associated Press and Reuter, on the subject of the action of Turkey and of the Allies said that the worst which he had feared for some months past had

Mr. Mohamed Ali's Interview.

to his deep distress at last come to pass. He had expressed his own views which he believes to be shared by the vast bulk of Mussalmans in the columns of the *Comrade* when writing on the *Times* article on "The Choice of the Turks" and there was nothing that he could add to it or take away from it? The Turks have now made their choice and it can cause Indian Mussalmans nothing but the deepest pain to find the armies of the servant of the holy places of Islam and of the King-Emperor, who rules over the largest number of Mussalmans, facing each other as enemies. But now that their worst forebodings had come true he had no hesitation in saying that the anchor of Indian Mussalmans holds as he stated in the columns of the *Comrade*. They must commend their souls to God and place their services at the disposal of the Government for the preservation of the peace and tranquillity of India. So long as as the Allies did not attack Arabia and endanger the protection of Islam's holy places by a really independent Moslem power, the conflict between the Turks and the Allies would have only a secular character. They should and he felt sure that they would consider the preservation of peace and order in India as much a duty of their own as of any officer of the Government but it is equally certain that the feelings of Indian Mussalmans in this awful crisis would be of the deepest distress. As he had already stated their position is that of the children of parents who had quarrelled with each other. Right may be on one side or the other, but the sorrow and suffering is in any case that of the children. Mr. Mohamed Ali's advice to the Mussalmans is that whatever their feelings, it was their clear duty to assist their Government to the fullest extent of their power in maintaining the peace of India at this supreme crisis, although it was his firm belief that the peace of India is as safe to-day as it has ever been.

The Comrade.

Indian Moslems and the War.

WHAT was dreaded most by every Mussalman in India and what had long kept them in a state of intolerable anxiety and suspense has at last come to pass. Great Britain is at war with Turkey. The reasons which have led England to break off diplomatic relations with the Porte are set forth in the *communiqué* issued by the Viceroy. It is no time to examine the grounds detailed in this document even if we had the will. Except for stray, brief Reuter's messages hinting at German intrigues in Constantinople and overt manifestations of Turkish attitude, we know nothing of the actual state of affairs in Turkey and of the forces that have guided the counsels of her statesmen. In an atmosphere of obscurity and mist it is idle to search for the necessary light that would enable us to understand the situation. According to all indications allowed us from afar, the omens were all unpropitious. There were reports of Turkish mobilisation, of the calling up of every able-bodied man fit to bear arms. There were stories of wholesale requisitioning of food-stuffs, clothing and other provisions, of horses and mules and carts. Various English correspondents had written about extraordinary military activity at various centres and particularly about military concentrations in Thrace, in Erzroom and near the Egyptian border. All these measures, if true, point to a deliberate policy and design; and though there have been persistent reports of extraordinary German pressure being exerted at Constantinople, we can not say whether the Ottoman Government has been altogether the victim of German hypnotism. At all events, the Sultan's Ministers have themselves to bear the responsibility for all to which their acts may lead; and, unless they are a set of lunatics or imbeciles, they must be supposed to have weighed the consequences.

Whether the Turkish Government is right or wrong in the decisions at which it may have arrived, whether it has been wheedled into its present attitude by German lures or coerced by German threats, or whether it has made a deliberate and careful choice after striking the balance between loss and gain and honour and interest, we are neither competent to judge nor have any desire to speculate about. The plain fact with which we are immediately concerned is the outbreak of hostilities between Turkey and England and the manner in which this unfortunate situation would affect the Mussalmans of India.

Now, we are using no conventional language when we say that war between Turkey and England is a calamity that the Indian Mussalmans would have given anything in the world to avert. They had hoped and prayed all these anxious days that it would somehow be averted, and had even gone out of their way to press advice on the Sultan and his Ministers in terms which would have seemed in some instances impertinent and inexcusable but for the stress of the deep anxiety and emotion under which they were framed. But the fates were disposed otherwise. The catastrophe they had feared so much has happened at last, and what is now left for them is to pray to God that they may be equal to this terrible and supreme trial.

It would be hypocrisy to disguise the facts that love of Turkey and her people is to the Indian Mussalmans a deep and abiding sentiment and that millions of them reverence the Sultan as their Caliph. The unity of culture and faith has consecrated these feelings of sympathy and devotion, and they have remained strong and vital forces through the ages. The Turks have often blundered in the past and have sometimes been misled into dangerous courses through the folly of their rulers; but the Indian Mussalmans, though they always condemned them freely for their follies and blunders, could never help grieving with them in their griefs and suffering extreme misery and anguish whenever disasters have overwhelmed them and wrought their secular ruin. It would not, therefore, be supposed that the Indian Mussalmans would be indifferent to the fate of Turkey even though she might herself bring it upon her head. Their plight then can be well imagined in the situation in which they find themselves to-day. Through a cruel conjunction of circumstances their feeling of Islamic fraternity and their reverence for their Caliph have been brought into direct conflict with their sense of plain secular duty.

For such heavy trials, however, his religion has amply equipped the Mussalman. Whatever his feelings may be, his path is simple and clear and not a shadow of doubt can darken his sense of the duty that he owes to his country and his sovereign. We have more than once stated fully and without reserve what the attitude of Indian Mussalmans would be in the event of an Anglo-Turkish war. We need not repeat those assurances again. From the point of view of Indian Moslems as loyal and peace-loving subjects of His Majesty the King-Emperor, we are confident no further assurances are needed on their part. The strain on their feelings may be great and terrible, but they can never forget that they

form a large and responsible section of the people of India and are subjects of the British Crown. What these two conditions prescribe they realise to the full. They are ready to do their part in a manly and ungrudging spirit and bear any sacrifices that the exacting and growing demands of the situation may from time to time entail. They have no difficulty in recognising that this is a mere secular conflict having unfortunately arisen out of the hopeless muddle of the European situation. They may sympathise with the Turks in their difficulties, but are not bound by any temporal or spiritual obligation to back them in every mundane quarrel of theirs which might as often as not be the fruit of a bad and blundering policy. Whatever the Turkish case may be in the present crisis, the Indian Mussalmans are fully aware that it does not bear any religious character. We regret that in their hurry to convince the Government of their loyalty some otherwise sane and sensible Mussalmans have attacked the Sultan of Turkey, and declared him to be unfit to be the Servant of the Sacred Places. The Sultan in his capacity of the Servant of the Sacred Places, is not required to deflect his temporal interests, and we emphasise this because when he believes, whether rightly or wrongly, that his temporal interests require him to act in a particular manner he must not expect that our temporal interests will invariably require us to act in the same manner as the Servant of the Sacred Places. Our religious duties are and must of necessity be the same. But our temporal interests may differ and in that case the Turks must pursue their interests and leave us to pursue our own. Such a contingency has now arisen to our deep grief and we must face the facts however ugly they may be. That, we make bold to say we are prepared to do. And as long as the Holy Places of Islam are free from hostile menace and the principle of the absolute and free Islamic protection over them remains intact, no Mussalman in India would shrink from any sacrifices that he may be called upon to undergo in the best interests of his country. The declaration made by his Majesty's Government about the safety of the Moslem holy places has, we are sure, been received with relief and gratification by Indian Mussalmans. In order to remove the least shred of anxiety in this connection we trust the principle of full, independent Moslem control over these places will be affirmed in the same unequivocal manner. The Moslem can be trusted to act on the precept of Jesus Christ whom he reveres as a Prophet of God, and render unto Caesar what is due to Caesar.

During this unhappy war many moments of dark anxiety and grief are bound to arise, and the whole period of its duration would be for the Mussalmans a time of acute and awful distress. The situation would make fearful demands on their patience and fortitude and we hope they will come out through the ordeal with an enhanced reputation for dignity and self-control. We trust that their friends in the Anglo-Indian press would abstain from causing any wanton and unnecessary offence to their feelings and thus adding to their difficulties and burdens, which are none too few or light as they are. The temptation to rant against the Sultan and his people proved irresistible to some of our contemporaries even in the Balkan war when our own empire was neutral. It may be still more irresistible to-day. We trust, however, that these journals have a better sense of their responsibilities at this crisis, and clearly realise the danger of uttering inconsiderate or reckless words which may put an intolerable strain on Moslem feeling. Indians Mussalmans know their duties. No one need be anxious on this score. They only wish that their unique plight in this crisis may win just consideration if not sympathy from those who profess to be their well-wishers and friends.

The Third Lesson.

THE PREVIOUS LESSONS.

On the third of November the keeper of "The Comrade and the Hamdard Press" and his legal adviser were asked by the District Magistrate of Delhi to meet him, and when they met him he handed over to the keeper of the Press the Notice which we publish elsewhere. It was an order of forfeiture of the security deposited by Mr. Farooq Ali as the keeper of our Press some months ago. This is the third lesson taught to us. The first was taught us when in July, 1913, the Pamphlet entitled "Come over into Macedonia and Help Us" and all copies of the issues of the Comrade in which it had been reproduced, and of the Hamdard in which its translation was published, were declared forfeited under section 12 of the Press Act. The second lesson was taught when in August, 1913, immediately after our applying to the Calcutta High Court to set aside the order of forfeiture, the District Magistrate of Delhi cancelled the order exempting us from the deposit of any security which he had passed in October, 1912, and ordered the keeper of the Press to deposit Rs. 2,000, the maximum amount of security that can be demanded under section 8 (1) of this Press Act. In each case the lesson has to be taught to us for our efforts to have justice done to the Turks, though in demanding security from us in August, 1913, the District Magistrate was also influenced by our action in getting justice done to the unfortunate Mussalmans of Cawnpore. If in such cases there can be better and worse, we must be thankful that we have not been made to suffer like a co-temporary of ours. But even if we had been hit just as hard as the Zamindar, it would

it is, the poet's interpretation of his sighs and wails to his "cruelty-creating" object of love has often proved to be equally applicable to the grievances of journalists.

نالہ جز حسن طلب ای ستم ایجاد نہیں می تقاضای جفا شکوہ یداد نہیں

(My wails are no more than an excellent method of asking for more, O, inventor of cruelties! It is only a demand for more unkindness, not a complaint of cruelty.)

The same poet whose name, existence and work cast a glory over our city and will survive every vicissitude of fortune through which this monumental capital of India may pass truly analysed the diverse feelings of human beings, and his analysis of chagrin to which we owe the order of forfeiture to-day warns us against giving or a expression even to the most subdued complaint.

شکوہ کی نام سی بی مہر خفا ہوتا ہی * یہ ہی مت کہہ کہ جو کہی تو گہ ہوتا ہی

(My unkind love gets wroth with the very name of complaint. Nay, say not even that, for if thou sayst that it becomes a complaint.)

If, then, we say anything on the subject it is more in the nature of an explanation which we feel we owe to ourselves as much as to the Government of His Majesty the King-Emperor for the accusation implied in the order of forfeiture is as grossly unjust to our intelligence as to our sense of duty. We ask the officials for nothing but a hearing, and we cannot imagine that the solid sense of fairplay which has characterized the British nation throughout the long course of history could have deserted them in a crisis in which every virtue of the race even more than every able-bodied male must be mobilized. Nazim, better known as Nawab Yousuf Ali Khan Bahadur, who ruled over the Rohilla State of Rampur during the Mutiny and saved British dominion in the North-Western Provinces during that great cataclysm, may well speak for us now.

فسانہ غم دل ہی یہ کہہ سوال نہیں نہ دو جواب سنی جاو کچھ ملال نہیں

(It is but a narrative of the grief of my heart, not a request. Vouchsafe no reply; only hear me; I shall not take it ill.)

THE EFFECT OF FORFEITURE.

If our readers do not yet comprehend the all-comprehensive character of section 4 (1) of the Press Act, it cannot be our fault, nor that of the High Court of Calcutta. Under that section "whenever it appears to the Local Government that any printing press in respect of which any security has been deposited as required by section 3 is used for the purpose of printing or publishing any newspaper, book, or other document containing any words, signs or visible representations which are likely, or may have a tendency, directly or indirectly, whether by inference, suggestion, allusion, metaphor, implication or otherwise" to do a number of things enumerated in six clauses of the sub-section, "the Local Government may, by notice in writing to the keeper of such printing-press, stating or describing the words, signs or visible representations which in its opinion are of the nature described above, declare the security deposited in respect of such a press and all copies of such newspaper, book or document wherever found to be forfeited to His Majesty." That is exactly what the Government has done by means of the notice served on Mr. Farooq Ali, the keeper of "The Comrade and the Hamdard Press." Sub-section (2) of section 4 lays down that "after the expiry of ten days from the date of the issue of a notice under sub-section (1) the declaration made in respect of such press under section 4 of the Press and Registration of Books Act, 1867, shall be deemed to be annulled." As the notice was issued by Mr. Wheeler on the 2nd November, though not handed over to the keeper of the Press till the afternoon of the 3rd by Major Beadon, the District Magistrate of Delhi, we may take it that on the expiry of ten days, that is after midnight of the 12th of November, the declaration made by Mr. Farooq Ali some months ago will be annulled, and either a declaration will have to be made for another Press under section 3 (1), or a fresh declaration will be made for "The Comrade and the Hamdard Press." That is to say, if the Comrade is to continue its existence and also continue to be printed at its own Press. As no other Press is ever likely to undertake the responsibility of printing it under existing circumstances, we may take it that the existence of the Comrade now depends on its having its own Press, whether a new one, with or without a security which may extend to Rs. 2,000 or the old one, with a security that may extend to Rs. 10,000.

Obviously the matter cannot lightly be dismissed, for the financial condition of the Comrade so frankly explained in our last issue makes the deposit of security of even a couple of thousand rupees the last straw on the camel's back. Half a dozen high officials have for some time past been drawing at least a part of their salaries from the public exchequer, by realising every issue of the Comrade from cover to cover, and we do not mean it is a compliment to ourselves if we say that no doubt the "Governor-General in Council" (which may or may not mean the Viceroy) by whose order the security of our Press has been declared forfeited was fully aware of the extent to which the order of forfeiture would damage the Comrade when he authorized Mr. Wheeler to issue the notice to the keeper of our Press. Every person is presumed by law to intend the likely consequences of his

that the "Governor General in Council," whatever the phrase may really signify, must have intended that the *Comrade* should cease to exist. In that case, may we not ask : *بای ذنب قتلتی*

(For what sin didst thou kill me ?)

WHAT WE HAVE NOT DONE.

Section 4 (1) applies, in the first place, to the case of inciting to murder or to any offence under the Explosive Substances Act, 1898, or to any act of violence. Instead of doing that we have consistently supported the cause of peace even in Europe and have prided ourselves on being in the right with two or three than in the wrong with two or three hundred millions who have been clamouring for war. But as Mr. Wheeler's notice does not mention incitements to murder, whether by soldiers or civilians, as among our many sins, we need not trouble ourselves with that.

In the next place, this section applies to the case of seducing any officer, soldier or sailor in the Army or Navy of His Majesty from his allegiance or his duty, and far from doing that we have reminded Indian Mussalmans in the same article to which Government has taken exception that they must be ready, if need be, to shed the blood of their own blood in Egypt or Turkey, just as they had not hesitated ere this in shedding the blood of their brothers on the border at the bidding of England. But Mr. Wheeler's notice does not accuse us of this offence either, and we pass on.

Similarly, we have not been accused of putting any person in fear or causing annoyance to him, and thereby inducing him to deliver to any person any property or valuable security, or to do any act which he is not legally bound to do, or to omit to do any act which he is legally entitled to do. The suggestion that Egypt may be evacuated to shame the Germans cannot certainly come under this head.

Again, we have not been accused of encouraging or inciting any person to interfere with the administration of the law or with the maintenance of law and order. On the contrary, we stated in the very first issue of the *Comrade* after England's participating in the war that—

"Even if England may not need us, we have need of her. Believing in political purity rather than in political prudence, we have entered the lists with her biggest bureaucrats in India in time of peace. But in time of war the clash of steel in civic battles must cease and the voice of controversy must be hushed, and if we can not hastily command in others an enthusiasm for this war which we ourselves do not feel, let us once and for all assure the Government that so far as we and those within the orbit of our influence are concerned, they can sleep in peace. Let alone provincial satraps and the still greater despots of their districts, their meanest, if not their humblest, policeman will find us at his beck and call whenever civic excitement has to be allayed. More than this we cannot proclaim. Less than this we shall not confess. This is and has always been our creed and to that we shall adhere."

So much for law and order, and if even this does not convince we have documentary evidence that we placed our services at the disposal of the Local Government and received its full and generous appreciation of our offer. Lastly, it goes without saying that we did not convey any threat of injury to a public servant, or to any person in whom that public servant was believed to be interested, with a view to inducing that public servant to do any act or to forbear or delay to do any act connected with the exercise of his public functions. We have, alas, long ceased to be on such intimate terms with public servants of any importance as to be able to induce them by cajolery to do any act or to forbear or delay to do any act connected with the exercise of their public functions, and those with whom we have been most intimate and for whom we have done much and forborne to do still more, have unfortunately sometimes proved to be most anxious to do us harm, often officially and still oftener demi-officially. As for threats, with what could we who do not even possess a walking stick or an air-gun intimidate them ?

THE CHARGE AGAINST US.

We have hitherto purposely left out one clause of this sub-section, and it is just that which is the charge against us. But that is the most comprehensive and the widest clause. The offences under it are not connected with overt acts such as murder or desertion or wrongful acquisition of property or valuable security, but relate only to certain feelings which the offending publication may create or excite. If a publication incites its readers to commit murder or to make a bomb, or puts a person in fear or causes him annoyance to such an extent that he thereby delivers to any person any property, or encourages a person to break the law, or intimidates a public servant in a manner to induce him to neglect his duty or act against its dictates, we may have an opportunity of testing the character

of the publication by seeing if the murder has been committed, the bomb manufactured, the property delivered, the law broken or the public servant's duty neglected. Panic-stricken officials may imagine anything no matter how horrible and far fetched, and unscrupulous officials may pretend to fear the most unlikely consequence; but if the consequence itself for fear of which the machinery of the Press Act had been set in motion does not come to pass the world at large could know how to appraise the fears of the officials. That may or may not explain why the other five clauses of section 4 (1) are seldom—in fact, never—used. But, at any rate, clause (c) of section 4 (1) is the happy hunting ground of the bureaucrat in search of a short-cut for sending to perdition men who do not please him. The sections in the Penal Code which were incorporated in this clause are vague enough, but the way in which they have been incorporated in it makes them vaguer still. The offences included in this clause are:

(1) the bringing into hatred or contempt of—

- (i) His Majesty, or
- (ii) the Government established by law in British India, or
- (iii) the administration of Justice in British India, or
- (iv) any Native Prince or Chief under the Suzerainty of His Majesty, or
- (v) any class or section of His Majesty's subjects in British India; or

(2) the exciting of disaffection towards—

- (i) His Majesty, or
- (ii) the said Government, or
- (iii) any such Prince or Chief.

This is a formidable enough list, and we are much relieved to find that, unlike the order of forfeiture of the Macedonia Pamphlet, the present order does not accuse us of exciting at one and the same time the diverse and dissimilar, and, in fact, mutually exclusive, feelings of hatred and contempt, whether conjointly or in the alternative. We may, therefore, rest assured that Government does not believe that we have excited either hatred or contempt, or both against any of the five objects enumerated above. What we are accused of in Mr. Wheeler's Notice is the exciting of "disaffection towards His Majesty and the Government by law established in British India." We are relieved to know that no Native Prince or Chief has been alleged in any way to have been adversely affected by our article. Perhaps our readers would like us to refute this charge on this occasion; but although we have a most excellent defence we do not desire to disclose our hand. At the proper time and in the proper place we shall certainly do so, and unless we desire to bring the administration of justice in British India into hatred and contempt we shall add that we have every hope of getting back every one of the two thousand rupees of our security that has been confiscated.

What we need not, however, postpone is an examination of the charge itself, for such an examination would in itself be a sufficient refutation of such a serious accusation. Now Explanation I of this section, while it does not define it, says that the expression "disaffection" includes disloyalty and all feelings of enmity, and we may presume that the condemned article exhibited at least some instances of our disloyalty and feelings of enmity towards His Majesty and the Government established by law in British India. On the other hand, Explanation II states what the expression "disaffection" does not include. It says, "Comments expressing disapproval of the measures of the Government . . . with a view to obtain their alteration by lawful means, or of the administrative or other action of the Government . . . without exciting or attempting to excite . . . disaffection do not come within the scope of clause (c)." Therefore, we must presume that our accusers have carefully examined our article and not included in the words stated or described in the notice to the keeper of our press any "comments expressing disapproval of the measures of the Government with a view to obtain their alteration by lawful means."

Now we come to the condemned article itself. We are told in Mr. Wheeler's notice that the "whole tenour" of that article "is likely or has a tendency, directly or indirectly, whether by inference or suggestion"—and to cut the long string of "allusion, metaphor and implication" short—"or otherwise, to excite disaffection." That, we are told, is the opinion of the Governor General in Council, and as such it has to be referred to with extreme respect. But had it been the opinion of Mr. Wheeler himself or of any of the law officers of the Crown, we would have asked them to consult an oculist immediately and change the glasses that they use. Whatever may be the case with bureaucrats, ordinary human beings with some pretensions to common-sense would not view the condemned article in that light. Such a judgment shows an utter lack of understanding of what passes under the brain-caps of human beings. It betrays a warped intelligence wholly unable to comprehend the psychology

of normal men. There may be stray passages in the article which show some British transactions in a bad light; but unless we are told that during a war the law requires us to put the glass to the blind eye when viewing the seamy side of some British transactions, we maintain that this judgement clearly contravenes the view embodied by the legislature in Explanation II which excludes from the connotation of "disaffection" comments expressing disapproval of the measures of Government with a view to obtain their alteration by lawful means, or of the administrative or other action of the Government without exciting or attempting to excite disaffection.

BEATING THE BAT.

In a paragraph of that article which bore the cross-heading "What Must We Do?" we said:

"What shall be our attitude towards our Government is a simple question and presents to us no difficulty. He who goes by principles and not by consequences should have not the slightest hesitation in answering it. We have of our free will and as masters of our destinies chosen to remain in this country as the subjects of our King and Emperor and the fellow-citizens of our neighbours. We have done this because the benefits of his rule and their co-operation exceed whatever discomforts we may have felt at any time or we may be likely in future to feel. To be more particular, we had taken no pledges from England that she shall not shed the blood of our brothers even in an unrighteous war. That was not in the bond. In fact, we have not hesitated ere this in shedding the blood of our brothers on the border at the bidding of England. We have therefore given a pledge of obedience to English behests as binding as that which guaranteed the neutrality of Belgium and more binding than that which assured Egypt of its complete and early evacuation. This much must be presumed of all reasonable and intelligent beings. When we entered the field we must have known all the rules of the game. And whatever the fortunes of the game, we must abide by the rules and take both defeat and victory in the manner of sportsmen. Sir Syed Ahmad's clean cut logic must come to the rescue of every one who finds his situation distressing. He said in his own inimitable way: 'Our attitude towards the Government established in this country must be governed only by one consideration—the attitude of that Government towards ourselves.' Every other consideration is foreign to the subject, and whether we fight the Turks or the Russians, our services we must place at the disposal of our Government and our souls we must commend to God."

To say of such an article that its whole tenour is likely to excite disaffection against His Majesty and the Government established by law in British India is to beat the bat at its own game. Blindness could go no further.

GOD HELP THE WRITER OF HISTORY.

To get to closer grips we must quote the condemned passages particularised in the schedule attached to the Notice. The first of the passages quoted by Mr. Wheeler runs as follows:—

"Turkey, hated and oppressed all her life by one of the Entente trio, neglected and in practice deprived of her rights by the other two since the eighties of the last century, spoliated by two of the Alliance Powers and only flirted and played with by the third, all of a sudden discovers herself to be a person whose affections are of some consequence and are neither to be slighted nor altogether taken for granted."

If this is sedition, then God help the writer of history. For our part we are content to leave the decision to the Faculty of History at the University of Oxford, for it was at the feet of the men who compose it that we learnt our respect for facts and the method of comprehending their bearing. They at any rate cannot be accused of being pro-German.

PREMIUM ON ESPIONAGE.

In another place, contrasting its threats to Turkey with the tactful tempting of Italy by the *Times* to do against Germany exactly that which Turkey has been so heartily condemned for doing against Russia, we said:

"Let us now turn to the tact displayed by the *Times* in trying to help the Turk to make his choice. Although we have already expressed it as our emphatic opinion that from the Turk's own point of view—after all the only point of view that the Turk could appreciate—it is better that he should maintain the strictest neutrality in the present struggle, it is with a pang of regret that we peruse the *Times* article on 'The Choice of the Turk' and fail to find the least trace of the possible existence of a third alternative besides the (a) neutrality and support of Germany—the alternative of supporting the Ally of the Crimean War and of the Berlin Conference. To the extent that the Turk has wantonly

destroyed the capital of goodwill that stood to his credit in England in the days of Palmerston, of the 'Great Elchi' and of Disraeli, he stands guilty and condemned. [But how many Mussalmans are convinced that not an iota of responsibility lies at the door of the England of fanatical Gladstone of cynical Salisbury, of sleepy Lowther, and of a whole host of present day Ministers, both of the silent and the blabbing varieties, for the deplorable estrangement of to-day?] But let that pass. This is not the time to apportion praise or blame. We have launched our bark on this perilous sea for another and a more practical purpose. Whosoever may have been responsible for the present state of Anglo-Turkish relations, we desire that instead of there being no trace of a possibility of Turkey throwing in her lot with the English there should at least be no trace of the possibility of throwing in her lot with the enemies of England. But that, is the tact of the *Times*—the other quality—the most effective method?"

The lines we have now enclosed within brackets have been declared to be seditious, and the only test that we can suggest of our loyalty is to pick out a dozen Mussalmans at random and ask the C.I.D. to ascertain in the customary manner which way they are convinced. To pay the C.I.D. to ascertain the convictions of Indian Mussalmans and to mulct us in a heavy fine for giving the authorities exactly the same information free of charge seems to us to be putting an undue premium on espionage and unduly discounting journalism. How it can be seditious, and in what way His Majesty and the Government established by law in British India are affected by this passes at least our understanding.

SYMPATHY AND SEDITION.

We do not like to quote from our article more than is absolutely necessary, and we trust readers would pay due attention to the context. But even if the following sentence stands by itself, can any one call it seditious?

"And if ever a judge was guilty of gross partiality it was the Powers to whom Turkey appealed repeatedly in her need and appealed invariably in vain."

If this is really seditious, then we ask His Majesty's Ministers to lay a charge at once against Lord Lamington, formerly Governor of Bombay, and the Hon. Aubrey Herbert, M.P., and Mr. Walter Guinness, M.P., who repeatedly spoke in Parliament on the wrongs of Turkey and the interference of the Powers to her urgent appeals. Their speeches were called to India and published broadcast here. Are we then to believe that what is sympathy for the weak and the suffering in a Tory M.P. is sedition against the strong in an Indian journalist?

LEGAL LEGERDEMAIN.

Dealing with Turkey's losses in the recent war and comparing them with those of France 44 years ago, to which M. Ernest Lavisse, the eminent French historian, had alluded in an eloquent article, we said:

"If France can remember the loss of five thousand square miles and a million and a half of her population for forty-four years, and cannot forget that her 'permanent duty towards the lost provinces' is summed up in the one word 'Revenge'—a schoolboy's sum in arithmetic ought to tell us how long Turkey should keep the memory green of fifty thousand square miles and four and a quarter million people. The poet thought only of a single life when he wrote:

فی اگر بگره میسر شدی وصال * صد سال میتوان به تنای گریستن

(Urbi, if union could be secured through tears, it would be possible to weep through a hundred years).

[But what is the life of an individual, specially in the East, to the life of a nation? For nearly six hundred years the Turks have ruled over Europe, and the House of Osman may well shed tears over its recent losses for a thousand years if it can shed nothing more manly. But its tradition, even as its traducers must admit, has always been to shed blood instead of tears, whether it be its enemies' or its own,] and without the efforts of eminent historians to explain to them their 'permanent duty' to their lost country hundreds of thousands of little children in schools remember twice a day, with all the fervour of patriotic song, the Balkan hills where the sun is still bleaching from day to day graveless bones of their fathers and brothers, their mothers and sisters. How could they dry their tears before the blood of their martyrs is dry on the Balkan soil? Chauvinists! Why, the Turk would be something more than angels, if not something less than British beasts, if they could forget their loss, or the divine truth: 'In Revenge there is Life.' Being men, they have not forgotten it, and within a week of mobilization enough of them had flocked under the flag to satisfy the first requirements of the army."

The notice has particularised the lines we have now enclosed within brackets. If this should have caused annoyance or remorse anywhere in Europe it should have been among the Balkan Allies of the last war against Turkey, and particularly in Greece. Where His Majesty and the Government established by law in British India come in is beyond or non-official comprehension. And we should give much to know the name of the lawyer who deceived the Governor General in Council with such legal legerdemain.

AS SUBJECTS OF THE HOLY TSAR.

The same applies to the following extract of which it is not quite clear which four lines Mr. Wheeler particularises.

"Hitherto we have discussed the question of a conflict between the Turks and the Greeks. Let us now turn to the question of a conflict between the Turks and one or more of the Allies. Against Russia the Turks have innumerable grievances, for after the Hungarians and the Poles had stemmed the tide of Turkish advance the Russians found them an easy prey and have ever since been assailing them in their retreat from the walls of Vienna."

Even if we were the subjects of the Holy Tsar, we do not think we could have been called seditious for stating a true historical fact such as this. But, thank God, we are not the subjects of the Tsar or we would have found this to be an excellent opportunity to organise a rebellion against an unchanging tyranny wholly unlike British methods of governing, instead of working, as we are doing, to the knowledge of Government, for the continued existence of Pax Britannica, and we are amazed at the selection of this passage even more than those that have gone before as a particularly offensive sample of our seditious.

WORTHY OF THE LEGION OF HONOUR.

Again what shall we say of the next choice bit of seditious?

"Is the Turk likely to stand up for France to-day or spare the French when he can regain the suzerainty over Tunis?"

Would a Frenchman or even an Algerian Turco have been punished for writing this to-day? After the acquittal of Madame Caillaux we should imagine that the man who could state anything so commonplace would have been awarded the Legion of Honour for being so eminently ordinary in a country where originality is worshipped above truth.

MYSTIC WORDS.

The next passage is a puzzle, for the schedule attached to the Notice particularises on page 237, second column, line 40 only, and if it is not the cross-heading "Turkey, England and Egypt," it must be only the words, "As regards England, her attitude towards Turkey in the," which mean even less than the cross-heading. Mr. Wheeler would perhaps condescend to explain which of these mystic words contains the poison that would kill the loyalty of three hundred and fifteen million Indians, or, at least, of seventy million Indian Mussalmans.

THE HEAD AND FRONT OF OUR OFFENDING.

Then we come perhaps to the head and front of our offending. The next passage declared to be pointedly seditious, when read with the quotations reproduced on page 237 second column and 238 first column, runs thus:—

"We have never disguised our views about the British Occupation of Egypt and have no desire to recant to-day. But no purpose would be served by going over old ground once again, and it might be thought that we desire to excite the Turks and Egyptians or the Mussalmans of India with a view to embarrass the authorities in India and in England. So we refrain. But we do not like to play hide-and-seek with the authorities or with our readers. If we are asked whether the Turks or the Egyptians would have a moral justification in urging on the British the evacuation of Egypt our reply must unequivocally be that in view of the following clear and emphatic pledges of British statesmen we cannot consider such a request unjustifiable. Now that Europe seems to have regained her respect for old pledges and guarantees, the following should be read with interest."

The quotations that followed were from the speeches and writings of Sir Beauchamp Seymour (1882) Mr. Gladstone (1882, 1883, and 1893), Lord Granville (1883 and 1884), Lord Dufferin (1883) Lord Derby (1885), Lord Salisbury (1887 and 1889) and Sir Eldon Garst (1903). What have we said in all this to excite disaffection against His Majesty or the Government by law established in British India? If seditious does not mean in our own words, then, is it seriously contended that it lurks in the words of His Majesty's Ministers, of the Admiral Commanding the British Fleet at Alexandria, or of the Agents of His Majesty in Egypt? Also, that the Government of India, that His Majesty's Government in Council, that the Governor General in Council to be likely to be brought into hatred or contempt by the words deliberately spoken by the most distinguished members of His Majesty's Government. We can defend our own words and actions, but it is too much to ask us to defend the actions

and words of His Majesty's Ministers and dignitaries of State, and we decline the invitation. What would have Englishmen said if the Kaiser had punished the *Vorwärts* for sedition merely for reproducing their treaty guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium signed among others by the King of Prussia?

"QUITE CONTRARY."

In the original passage which we prefixed to the pledges given by British Ministers and others we had stated that if we were asked whether the Turks or Egyptians would have a moral justification in urging on the British the evacuation of Egypt our reply must unequivocally be that in view of the clear and emphatic pledges of British statesmen we could not consider such a request unjustifiable. This was our crime, and for this reply we are mulcted in a fine of Rs. 2,000. But the "Mary" of the English nursery rhyme could not have been half so "contrary" as the intelligence which, while condemning our moral justification of a certain Turkish action, condemned in the same breath our opinion that such action on the part of Turkey was wholly inexpedient at the present juncture. We must apologise for reproducing so long an extract from our article, but we are compelled to do so in the face of so cruel and unjust an accusation, and we appeal to every Briton who claims to be a just and upright man to judge between us and those who have accused us of disloyalty and enmity towards His Majesty and the Government established by law in British India. The portions enclosed within brackets are those which the Government Notice characterises as particularly seditious.

WHAT SHOULD THE TURKS DO?

"So much about moral and legal justification. But the matter does not end there. Every act that is not illegal or immoral is not on that account obligatory. The expediency of an act has also to be taken into consideration. When morality and expediency are opposed to each other no one who values principles can say that morality must be sacrificed to expediency. But where morality is not opposed to expediency, he who does what is both expedient and morally permissible does better than he who does what is inexpedient though morally permissible. [For the Turks or Egyptians to demand by force the evacuation of Egypt is to our mind morally permissible but wholly inexpedient at this juncture.] Before England intervened in the Egyptian troubles she asked the Suzerain to join her in the enterprise. Abdul Hamid Khan did not join England and France also held back. That does not by any means deprive Turkey of her rights as a Suzerain of Egypt, and it certainly did not deprive France of the power to intervene later—a power that she exchanged for a "free hand" in Morocco. [But when British intervention was not forcibly opposed by Turkey nor by the Khedive himself, it is more expedient to ask for the fulfilment of British pledges in a friendly manner rather than a hostile manner.] Had Mr. Redmond asked for the Home Rule Bill, the whole Bill and nothing but the Bill at this juncture as the price of peace in Ireland, England would have been compelled to purchase peace on his own terms. But England's difficulty was, in a sense other than that generally understood, Ireland's opportunity, and in acting as he has done Mr. Redmond has made the best of Ireland's opportunity. Mr. Balfour's churlish attitude on a recent occasion will bring in its train its own Nemesis and we feel certain that Mr. Redmond's bread cast upon the waters will return to him not after so very many days. [We say the same to Egypt and Turkey. Howsoever just their demands, howsoever great their need, howsoever long they may have waited for the fulfilment of British pledges, howsoever weak the present day statesmen's sense of the solemnity of promises made in the sight and hearing of the entire world, if they give England one more opportunity to redeem her pledges and fulfil her promises they would do that for which none will blame their generosity of heart, even though some may blame their judgment.] England has gone to war with the noblest sentiments on the lips of her statesmen. No one can predict the end of such a struggle. [But if England emerges out of this supreme trial of her manhood, resources and organisation a stronger and a still more beneficent Power, then the Turks and the Egyptians just as much as the Irish and the Indians will pin her down to her promises even if she showed the least disposition to wriggle out of them. No one can say that even such a struggle would be final. The settlement may only prove—as so many settlements have proved—the seed of another and still more terrible war, and unfulfilled promises have an inconvenient habit of coming home to roost. Nations do not generally trust twice without good grounds and un-deemed pledges provide their own punishment. In asking the Turks to defer the pressing of their demands by force we wish to remind them

that] something is even to-day due to the Allies of the Crimean war and the supporters of the Berlin Congress. Palmerston and Disraeli's assets of military and diplomatic support ought to be able to balance the liabilities of the foolish word recklessly uttered and the wise word heedlessly left unsaid by some of their successors."

CAUTION.

"We are not unappreciative of the temptations and trials of the Turks; but even here a word of caution must be uttered. They must not be lured by the blandishments of those opposed to England and her Allies. They must remember that "War is Deceit." We desire from the bottom of our heart that this may be the last of the wars, and that human intelligence and human sense of justice may never know such constantly recurring eclipses. [But we are bound to admit that as things are to-day there are some things worse than war. We shall not, therefore, pretend to believe that the Turks must have peace at any price. They must beware of entering into a quarrel, but once in it they must not come out of it till the claims both of honour and self-interest are satisfied. God knows they will have enough occasions to fight, for they have to contend against numerous army corps of prejudice and passion. That is all the more reason that they should fight only their own battles and not those of another. At present the fear is that they may be led into the firing line in a quarrel only outwardly their own. The Turks are not wanting in gratitude. In fact, few nations could equal the Turk in those characteristics which have extorted for him even from his enemies the title of "The Only Gentleman in Eastern Europe." To quote the old Arab saying mentioned by Gibbon, their women know not how to grant favours and their men know not how to refuse. Every Indian whom we know who has had any relations with them is loud in praises of their courtesy, which is as natural to the peasant as to the prince. But if courtesy is one of their great qualities, they also possess the defects of that great quality. In matters of business they are imposed upon, and often imposed upon knowing that they are being imposed upon. Now nothing is a more serious business than war in which a nation can destroy in a month in the way of life, energies and resources what it had taken a generation to build. The Turk knows not what fear is, but life can be valuable only to those in the lowest scale of humanity. It is a rich treasure and a divine gift which we are not permitted by our Maker to squander. We must learn in war even more than in peace the importance and value of economy in human life. As regards material resources, the Turks have never had even so much as could balance their peace requirements. All these considerations point the way in the direction of peace. This is not all. Almost every other great nation of Europe has had peace for a generation or more. Even Russia with her immense resources did not find herself equal to a second war three years after her first in which she had to fight only a small island kingdom. She has launched this new enterprise no less than a decade after her last war. France, Austria and Germany have each enjoyed nearly half a century of peace. England has not fought in a continental war for a century, and her little war against two little peasant States of South Africa, which was enough to prostrate her for many years after, was fought no less than fifteen years ago. Servia and Montenegro alone are fighting soon after their last war. But only a child could believe that they are paying their own way. [Turkey must therefore proclaim a moratorium against her warlike instincts and her clamant revenge. But if she cannot do so, and must enter this terrible business, let her make sure that the quarrel is her own, that her good nature and courtesy are not being imposed upon,] and that she is not hatching a cuckoo's egg believing all the time that it is her own."

SAMPLES OF SEDITION.

Does this indicate disaffection, disloyalty, and feelings of enmity towards His Majesty and the Government by law established in British India? If so, words have changed their meaning or men have lost their senses. In particular we ask for the esoteric significance of the following sentences which have been selected as particularly seditious:—

"For the Turks or Egyptians to demand by force the evacuation of Egypt is to our mind morally permissible but wholly inexpedient at this juncture" (p. 238, col. 2, lines 47-49).

"But when British intervention was not forcibly opposed by Turkey nor by the British Government itself, it is more expedient to ask for the fulfilment of British pledges in a friendly manner rather than in a hostile manner." (ibid, lines 55-58)

"In asking the Turks to defer the pressing of their demands by force we wish to remind them that something is even to-day due to the Allies of the Crimean War and the supporters of the Berlin Congress (p. 239, col. 1, lines 3-6)

"Turkey must therefore proclaim a moratorium against her warlike instincts and her clamant revenge. But if she cannot do so, and must enter this terrible business, let her make sure that the quarrel is her own, that her good nature and courtesy are not being imposed upon, and that she is not hatching a cuckoo's egg believing all the time that it is her own". (ibid, lines 59-64)

ABUSE YOUR ENEMIES.

If this is sedition, we cannot complain if the following is also sedition:—

"We cannot withhold our admiration from the German nation that is facing the odds against itself with such courage and determination, and we sometimes find it hard to repress the expression of disgust against the campaign of vilification that is being carried on with greater vigour and persistence than is deserved by German actions, harsh and ruthless though they undoubtedly are."

But in that case Field Marshall French, who knows to fight with the sword better than with the pen, and has rebuked those who exaggerate German harshness and ruthlessness and deny him courage and organisation, is equally seditious. Verily we are emending even divine commandments to-day, and instead of learning to love our enemies have learnt to abuse them. However, abuse cannot kill, and by abusing our enemies we shall not certainly be breaking another divine commandment, which says, "Thou shalt not kill!"

The next passage which is condemned has been carefully detached from its context, but anyone can see that this cannot be done without lacerating the whole paragraph. We, therefore, take leave to reproduce another long extract. We wrote:

"[Lest any one should suspect us of being isolated in having these views and expressing them in order to excite others, let us assure him in advance that he is woefully misled if he believes that a vast majority of Indians think otherwise. Had the country not been demoralized by the constant condemnation of unpalatable truths and the repeated rewarding of cheap lies, everyone in India would be confessing such admiration and sympathy openly.] But admiration and sympathy are one thing, making the cause of Germany our own is another. *It any cause can be it is the British, and if Germany counts on us she is grievously mistaken. It would be bad business for Turkey also to lavish on Germany the lives and energies and resources that she needs for her own quarrels and that Germany never spared for her when she was beset by still greater perils. We do not wish to be cynical, and selfishness has not yet come to be regarded by us as a virtue. But self-preservation is the first law of nature and nature is inexorable and ruthless in punishing disobedience to her decalogue. Germany has nothing yet for the Turks to deserve the sacrifice of a single Anatol, much less a street riot in a single town or village of India by the Moslem sympathisers of Turkey with a view to embarrass their own Government.* This is what we had felt impelled to tell that level-headed Turkish statesman, Talaat Bey, in private, and through him that astute diplomat, His Highness Prince Said Halim, and that soul-inspiring soldier, Damad Enver Pasha. This is what we said to the Turkish nation publicly in brief on a recent occasion. This is what we say to-day in greater detail and without the least effort at disguise."

The passage within brackets is condemned, but no allowance has been made for the passages which we have now italicised. And this is called justice!

SETTING THE EXAMPLE.

As the above passage closes with a reference to a message which we sent to Turkish Ministers, we should like to reproduce it here, and to say that it was sent by Dr. Ansari and Mr. Mohamed Ali with the knowledge and through the assistance of Sir Charles Cleveland, the Director of Criminal Intelligence Department, who fully approved of it, although he had no hand in framing or initiating it. It was sent on the 23rd August, and was, so far as we know, the very first message sent to Turkey from India on this subject, the Calcutta cable and others following it after an interval. It ran thus:—

"His Excellency Talaat Bey,
"Minister of the Interior,
"Constantinople."

"Having most carefully considered the situation, we emphatically believe it would be disastrous for Turkey and the entire Moslem world if Turkey does not maintain the strictest neutrality. We entreat you to think a thousand times before launching into war. We

“case of war between Turkey and England our condition
“also will be extremely sad. Please convey this our
“respectful and earnest message to Sadr-i-Azam (Grand
“Vizier) and Enver Pasha.

“ Ansari,
“ Mohamed Ali.”

And yet the *Comrade* excites disaffection, disloyalty and enmity against His Majesty and the Government by law established in British India. After this what can we say but echo the question of the poet:

چاہ کا نام جب آتا ہی بگر جانی ہو * وہ طریقہ تو بتادو نہیں چاہیں کیونکر
(You get wroth at the mention of love.
Then tell us the way we should love you).

It is at times such as this that the iron enters into a man's soul and his reason deserts him. It is such a condition of mind that *Ghalib* has depicted for us in his well-known verse.

وفا کیسی ! آگہان کا عشق مجب سے بڑھ کر ! تیرے لیے سنگدل تیرا ہی سنگ آستان کیوں ہو
(What fidelity and what love! When it has come to battering one's head, why then should it be the stone of *thy* threshold O, stone-hearted one!).

What we did was in the interests of Turkey, of Islam and of Indian Mussalmans, and if it was also meant to help Government, it was our plain duty to help it. We do not even after the treatment now meted out to us regret what we did on that occasion, and should occasion ever arise again we would still do it. Our only regret is that we could not induce the Turkish Cabinet to keep Turkey out of the vortex of war. But it does confound one a good deal and perplex him when such efforts are branded as sedition and enmity.

OUR ANCHOR HEADS.

If any doubt still exists about our motives or the tendency of our writing it ought to be cleared up by the last two passages particularly condemned by Government and the conclusion that followed them. We wrote:

THE TEST OF CONSCIENCE AND OBEYANCE.

But the truest test of conscience and of courage for England is not so much to declare war on Germany for a breach of Belgium's treaty rights as to evacuate Egypt of her own free will even before a diplomatic demand is formulated by Turkey or Egypt. Nothing would shame Germany so well as this act of clear justice. The embarkation of the last English soldier from Alexandria will put the fear of God into the heart of the Kaiser more assuredly than the disembarkation of the last English soldier available in the Empire at Boulogne or Havre. The Uzbegs had treated the Moghals a great deal on the borders of India when Shah Jahan sent Aurangzeb to punish them. The battle was at its hottest when the hour of evening prayer arrived. With characteristic coolness Aurangzeb spread his prayer mat on the ground in the thickest part of the battle and bent his head in silent submission before the Lord God of War. The Chief of the Uzbegs was an unobserved witness of this simple scene, and when Aurangzeb had finished his prayers, he came and laid down his arms before him. "To fight against such a man?" said the Chief of the Uzbegs, "is madness. I'll have none of it." [It is this really a war of Right against Might, of Conscience against soul-crushing Militarism, of the Sacredness of Treaties and the Dignity of Law against their treatment as mere "Scraps of Paper" and Moral Impedimenta in the advance of Brute Force, and Clean Hands are sincerely adjudged better than Countless "Hordes, then England must go to the Land of the Sphinx and solve the new riddle of this war in the only way it can be solved. She must leave Egypt. Need we say this will win over to her side the Mussalmans of the world better than all the threats of the tactful *Times* and the promises of destroying Turkey's contracts with Germany? Germany has already been destroyed.] This is the path of self-interest. This is the path of duty. This way lies the path of peace. What is the reason that England in Egypt this morning prefers the route of Lyons to India to that of Vasco da Gama. Germany needs only a temporary right of way through Belgium. England should in all conscience be satisfied with a permanent right of way through Egypt. But to come as friend, of the officer of the land and to protect him from unruly remnants, and then not to be satisfied even with the right of way through his fields but to

claim a practical ownership is neither friendly nor honourable. Let England have the *iter*, but the *dominium* must remain with Turkey and the usufruct with the Khedive. Will not England be satisfied with the easement?

NO BRIBES !

“We have already filled many pages, but before we conclude let us repeat that, *whatever England may do to Turkey or Egypt, our anchor holds.* All truly loyal people have closed the chapter of civic controversy with the officials and into that book they are likely to look no more. Whatever our grievances, whatever reforms we desire, everything must wait for a more seasonable occasion. Even if the Government were to concede to us all that we ever desired or dreamt, if, for instance, the Moslem University were offered to us on our own terms, or the Press Act repeal were to be announced, or even if Self-Government were to be conceded to us, we would humbly tell Government this is no time for it, and we must for the present decline such concessions with thanks. Concessions are asked for and accepted in peace. We are not Russian Poles. We need no bribes ! ”

After perusing all these passages which have been declared to be particularly seditious, all that we can say of our crime and its punishment is that:

اس گدہ پر مجھی مارا کہ گنگار نہ تھا

(I was killed for the crime that I was not a criminal.)

AN APPEAL TO CHRISTIANITY.

In this war few evidences of Christian charity have hitherto been given, but we shall not be so unjust or uncharitable ourselves as to suggest that Christianity does not exist in Christendom to-day. We appeal not to the official conscience of bureaucrats and parliamentarians for has not the poet said :—

شرع و آئین و مدار سہی * ایسی قاتل کا کیا کری کوئی

(One may depend on law and constitution ; but what is one to do with such a murderer?)

We appeal to the Christian principles of both and ask them to consider every word that we have written and then say if justice has been done to us in this matter. To us the whole thing appears to be the result of petty chagrin, and some persistent intriguers have managed to obtain a half reluctant consent from those in authority by playing on their exaggerated fears. But at no time was Burke's warning, that little minds and great empires go ill together, more needed than to-day, and nowhere more than in India.

TIMELY?

We ask, was this the time to wreak vengeance for criticism of the bureaucracy which acquired all its pungency and sting through its essential sanity and truth? Apart from the justice of it, was it expedient to exasperate the Mussalmans of India immediately on the declaration of war against their co-religionists? To quote Nawab Yousuf Ali Khan Bahadur of Rampur once more,

وفا شعاری ناظم یقین نہیں تہ سہی
بہ کون شخص ہی اسکا بھی کچھ خیال نہیں

(Even if you distrust the fidelity of *Nazim*, let it pass. But do you not even heed what kind of man he is?)

God knows we have enough to do in these days to keep events in their proper perspective. Of course we get no credit for it, and we ask for none. But when will stupidity cease? We have had a series of blunders each more thoughtless and petty in its origin than the other. Under the circumstances, it would be well if Lord Hardinge became for the time being the dictator of India in a crisis which cannot adequately and safely be met with the brains and the hearts used to deal with nothing more serious than street brawls and non- too satisfactorily even with them. Although democratic at heart and in every pore of our body, we are not sticklers for form.

Ah God, for a man with heart, head, hand,
 Like some of the simple great ones gone
 For ever and ever by;
 Whatever they call him what care I,
 Aristocrat, autocrat, democrat, one
 Who can rule and dare not lie !

So much by way of our justification and appeal to the British nation. A word now to our subscribers. In our last issue we had told you that unless our dues were paid considerably before the expiry of that period, and the paper put on a sound financial basis, the *Comrade* would cease to appear at the end of this year. We had said that it was to us a painful alternative as perhaps even you could realize. But it was the only one that was possible and it was no use regretting the impossible. After four years of vigorous living we should not regret the task of writing our obituary, for one can live intensively as well as extensively, and we had lived in four years

e, obviously because it would have been preposterous to make machinery etc., a *damnosa hereditas* suffering eternal punishment for the original sin of printing an article to which it occurred to some one in office to object under an Act which made the publication even of the Bible, the Vedas and the Quran an offence. If he had declared that the "sameness" of the press did not lie in the machinery but in something else, the utility of the Press Act as an engine for crushing all opinion unpalatable to the bureaucracy would have disappeared that instant. Secure in the fact that there could be no appeal from his decision a magistrate could pass any order he pleased, and Major Beadon's order does not in the least come as a surprise to us.

With reference to his visit to the premises of the *Comrade* and the *Hamdard* Press and inspection of the machines, etc., we fail to see the purpose thereof unless Major Beadon wanted to be able to swear that he had done so. How did it, and how could it affect his order? Mr. Mohamed Ali's own statement was clear enough on the point and there was nothing to see in particular. The *Comrade* and the *Hamdard* Press is still working in full swing, and Major Beadon could only expect to find the *Comrade* and *Hamdard* Press indistinguishable from itself. It must work till the 12th as it has hitherto worked, for the law allows ten days for making new arrangements. How then on the 9th instant could it have been different under section 3 (1) and yet the same under "the benevolent provisions of section 4 (2)"? Whatever changes the law required for a change of identity would have been made when the period of ten days allowed by section 4 (2) had expired at midnight on the 12th. This was explained in anticipation to Major Beadon, but he had already completed the order on his return from the Press and the finger of fate having writ moved on. Not a line or word could now be altered by any human being in an Empire of four hundred million souls. Such is the law. It is not in the bond.

But there is something more serious than all this. To refuse to apply section 3 (1) to the declaration and not to explain under what circumstances that section becomes applicable is to revert to the days of the college of pontiffs in ancient Rome, when only the pontiffs knew the law that they applied. Such regression is preposterous in the 20th century and tends to bring the administration of justice into contempt.

Major Beadon was wrong in some of his facts also, as for the example his statement that Mr. Sadiq Ali's security was transferred to Mr. Farooq Ali. That was not so and if any benevolent provision of the law allows him to correct his own mistakes, we hope he would do so after a perusal of his office file. And it is hardly a profitable task, and may sometimes be even puerile to try to decipher what had already been erased in an application before it was presented. If it could have any legal significance surely another application could have been prepared to avoid the searching of lynx-eyed law. But as it was, no attempt was ever made to make the writing erased illegible. As these are mere details it would serve no purpose to discuss them any further.

There is one point, however, which the learned Magistrate may learn even from a journalist. The keeper of a press is not necessarily also its proprietor, and if the two are not the same the keeper of a press must needs be the representative of the proprietor. Messrs. Sadiq Ali Khan and Farooq Ali were the proprietors of the *Comrade* and the *Hamdard* Press. As Mr. Mohamed Ali has always been the proprietor, the two other keepers mentioned in his order by Major Beadon could not avoid being the representatives of the proprietor to that extent. So is the Manager of the *Comrade*. So also is the Manager of the *Hamdard*. The same is also true of the Superintendent of the Press. As not the keepers of the Press, the *Times of India* and the *Hamdard* Press are named only a few—the representatives of their respective proprietors, some of whom may not be within the jurisdiction of even the Government established by law in British India. If this simple fact is borne in mind the discovery of Major Beadon's order is not so much in mind the discovery of a few signatures of Beadon followed by the footsteps of Christopher Columbus some centuries after that traveller or the discovery of America rather than he habitually spoke prose!

In our opinion the Press Act is a defective piece of legislation even from the point of view of the Government officials that underestimate the value of a free Press in India, and it is true that Local Governments and Magistrates were freed from the duty of devising legal fictions and from dangerous makeshifts.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

54 AUCTION SALE

Estate :—Currim Cassum Nanjee.

Under instructions received from B. N. Lang Esquire, Bar-at-Law, Official Assignee of Bombay, Messrs. Crawford & Co. Auctioneers of No. 16, Apollo St. Bombay will sell by Public Auction at Delhi the right title and interest of the insolvent in the undernoted immoveable property belonging to the above estate on Monday 16th November 1914 at 11 A. M.

Two houses No. 473 and 315 at Mundi Pan, Sadar Bazar Delhi, occupied by Munsii Abdul Karim's Ink factory and Esmail Ebrahim & Sons.

CONDITIONS OF SALE.

The sale will be held at the site of property No. 473 and will be subject to the sanction of the Official Assignee. The successful bidder shall have to pay 25 per cent. advance on the fall of the hammer.

For conditions of Sale &c., apply to—

CRAWFORD & Co.,

Auctioneers.

WOOD LAND HOTEL,

DELHI.

FOR SALE:

A complete turn-out, consisting of Victoria Phaeton, Chestnut Gelding 14 feet 2 inch (quite sound) and new harness, all in very good condition Rs. 660. Open to reasonable offer.

Apply

C. D. VIGERS,

Deputy Superintendent, Telegraphs,
AGRA.

as much as some do in forty. We had played our part at least to our own satisfaction and we should have bowed ourselves away cheerfully enough when the curtain was rung down. When we wrote this we meant every word of it, but we did not know at the time that the poor player would not be allowed even to strut his hour upon the stage before he was heard no more. But a hand more powerful than ours has pulled down the curtain even before the play was over and the actor had made his exquisite farewell speech before plunging the dagger into his bosom and ending another of the daily tragedies of life. But if it be so, so be it. What matters when and how? The readiness is all. Unless you play the Messiah and breathe new life into us we go the way of things past their appointed hour. But let there be no sadness of farewell. The poet had already anticipated us when he said :

غالب ختمه کی بغیر کون سن کام بند ہیں * روئی زار زار کیا کیجی ہی های کیون

(What is there that cannot go on just the same without *Ghalib*? Then wherefore weep fast falling tears and why make mean?)

To us it is a satisfaction that our last breath was spent in the cause of truth, justice and righteousness, and what is true of men is also true of institutions:

ولا تقولوا لن یقتل فی سبیل الله اموات بل احياء وليكن لا تشعرون *

(And of those that are killed in the way of Allah say not they are dead. Nay, they are alive, although you do not know it.)

We began our career with the words of hope and courage that have appeared for close upon four years on our title-page:

Stand upright, speak thy thought, declare
The truth thou hast, that all may share;
Be bold, proclaim it everywhere;
They only live who dare.

Whatever truth we had we have declared freely and shared it with all. Everywhere that we could we have proclaimed it, and even if truth has not always been proclaimed from the house-tops, untruth has not been even whispered. No; we shall not die in the real sense of life and death. We have lived because we have dared, and we shall still dare and we shall still live.

Magisterial Makeshifts.

Just as we were going to press we came to know of the order passed by the District Magistrate on the application of Mr. Mohamed Ali. We give it in full below :—

"The declaration of Mohamed Ali S/o Abdul Ali Khan that he is the keeper of a press situate in Kucha-i-Chelan, Delhi, having been duly made in accordance with Section, Act XXV of 1867, the question arises as to the furnishing of security agreeably to the provisions of Act III (71) of 1910. The petitioner claims that an order should be passed by me under section 3 (1) of the Act, but I have also to consider whether an order under Section 5 is not more appropriate.

"The file in my office shows that a certain press known as the *Comrade* and *Hamdard* Press situated in Kucha-i-Chelan, Delhi, was opened by Mohamed Ali as the registered keeper in October 1912. About the time (in 1913) that he left British India, one Sadiq Ali Khan became the registered keeper and finally one Farooq Ali registered himself as such. The press in question undertook the printing and binding of at least two papers, the *Comrade* and *Hamdard*, of which Mohamed Ali has been and is the Editor.

The security (Rs. 2,000), which was lodged under Section 3 (1) Act originally by Mohamed Ali was continued by transfer in the name of Sadiq Ali and Farooq Ali in turn, and this security* has been forfeited under Section 4 (1) by the order of the Government of India recently on November 3rd 1914. With these facts on official record I have examined the petitioner Mohamed Ali and have recorded his statement which he has signed. He is now willing to admit that the press which is the subject of his declaration is the press (known as the *Comrade* and *Hamdard* Press), the security of which has forfeited. The new press, he alleges, has not yet been named, but it is located admittedly in the same building as that in which the *Comrade* and *Hamdard* Press is at the present moment, the machinery is admittedly the same machinery as is now being used by the *Comrade* and *Hamdard* Press under the benevolent provisions of Section 4 (2), and the keeper of the new press is the man who was the first registered keeper of the *Comrade* and *Hamdard* Press.

"The *Comrade* and *Hamdard* Press, owing to the unsatisfactory tone of some of its productions, has been for many months under close

observation : there is quite sufficient on official record to show that although Sadiq Ali and Farooq Ali have been its registered keepers they have been in reality the petitioner's representatives. It is a somewhat significant fact that the petition which introduced this declaration under my consideration was made out in the name of Sadiq Ali Khan and was signed by him, but before presentation in Court the name and signature of Mohamed Ali was (*sic*) substituted and those of Sadiq Ali Khan erased.

"Now the petitioner urges that the keeper of the "new" press can be required to furnish the enhanced security only if the declaration refers to "such press" as has been subjected to an order under Section 4 (1). A considerable amount of forensic argument has been applied to the meaning of the words "such press" which it would be wearisome to set forth in detail, but of which the general trend is that any deviation in form, name, location or substance from those of the former press would render the petitioner immune from the more drastic provisions of Section 5.

"The petitioner urges that as an applicant on whom the Press Act weighs heavily, he is entitled to avail himself of any flaw in the wording of the Act, and that Section 5 is so worded that the Magistrate cannot demand the enhanced security, so long as the declarer does not admit his liability.

"I need not deal with these arguments and contentions. My duty as controlling Magistrate in this case is not to decide hypothetical questions of law, but to decide one issue of fact and that issue is whether or no the press referred to in the declaration of the petitioner is a press, the security given in respect of which has been declared forfeit under Section 4.

"To decide this question of fact I have visited to-day the premises in Kucha-i-Chelan accompanied by the petitioner. He conducted me to the *Comrade* and *Hamdard* Press building where work was in full swing. He stated that his declaration before me referred to only three of the machines in the building. One of these machines is new, but the other two were being worked, one (or both) of them being used at the moment for printing the *Hamdard*.

"It is quite clear to my mind that the press which petitioner declares to be kept by him is indistinguishable from the press which is known as *Comrade* and *Hamdard* Press: So I am forced to reply to the issue framed in the affirmative.

Accordingly I find that the petitioner in respect to his declaration has qualified for treatment under Section 5, Act I of 1910 and I direct that before utilising his press, he shall furnish a security of Rs. 10,000 (Ten thousands only).

"(Sd.) E. C. BEADON,

"District Magistrate."

We find that Major Beadon has altogether avoided the questions of law involved in the case. He has failed to show in his order that he had considered the important question whether he was entitled to go behind the applicant's declaration under section 3 (1) of the Press Act and apply section 5 to it as if that section applied not only to the case of a press of which the security had admittedly been confiscated but also to the case of any other press which was the same in substance. Section 10 gave him full discretion to examine the declaration of the publisher of a newspaper with a view to find out whether the newspaper was or was not the same in substance as the one of which the security had been forfeited. In the case of a press he had no such discretion and is recording the statement of the applicant and inspection of the premises and machines of the *Comrade* and the *Hamdard* Press was absolutely *ultra vires*. He has altogether avoided in his order the expression of any opinion on the applicant's contention that he must accept and authenticate the declaration as made before him without any further enquiry, obviously because he could not base the justification of his action on any provision of the law. We know that judges and magistrates are not there to deal with hypothetical cases but to decide those they have before them. But judicial decisions have to be based on legal principles which have to be explained in the judgment or order if there is any doubt or ambiguity about them. If judges and magistrates cannot do so, why not toss up for the result rather than leave things to the whims of judges and magistrates? The result, in fact, may possibly be no worse. Orders of forfeiture were bad enough because the reference to the High Court had already been made in the law. But orders on applications regarding security are far worse, because there is not even the fiction of an appeal to the High Court. Local Governments have known that they are practically the masters of the situation, and no one should be surprised if they are arbitrary in their orders of forfeiture. But magistrates are masters of the situation in theory as well as in practice, and no wonder Major Beadon paid no heed to Mr. Mohamed Ali's contention that the magi-

* The learned Magistrate is clearly wrong in this. Mr. Mohamed Ali's security (Promissory Note for Rs. 2,000) was duly returned to him some months ago by Mr. Connolly, who was acting for Major Beadon.

no jurisdiction to question the correctness of the declaration under section 3 (1) of the Press Act, if the declaration was not made