

The amazing advance of this idea in a single decade, recalls the words of Mazzini's prophecy:

And there is that on earth which no tyranny can long suppress—the people—the power and future of the people. Their destiny will be accomplished, and the day will surely come when the people—Samson of humanity—will raise their eyes to heaven, and with one blow of the arm by which thrones are shattered, burst every bond, break every chain, overthrow every barrier, and arise in freedom, masters of themselves.

* * *

THE SELF-GOVERNMENT DESIRED BY THE PEOPLE OF INDIA.

From The Indian Appeal for February, 1908.*

Our readers abroad may naturally desire to know the true meaning of the word "Swaraj," which has created great consternation among people who intend permanent British rule in India administered by officials almost all of whom are arbitrary and alien. "Swa" means self or own, "Raj" means rule or kingdom. So Swaraj means a kingdom governed by the people themselves, such as United States of America, France and Liberia. It also means self-government prevailing in the British colonies such as Canada and Australia. There are countries which, like Russia, are governed by autocrats; like Germany, are governed by absolute monarchs, partially controlled by Parliament; like Italy, which are governed by sovereigns who rule the country by the help of Parliament; like England, which are governed by the higher classes of its people, elected by the people themselves, with a kind of nominal powers. There cannot be the least doubt that the representative governments like that of the United States are the best governments that a nation may desire to have, and it is admitted by all that the present enviable position of the United States is entirely due to the formation of its government. Naturally the Indians may desire that some sort of self-government should be introduced in India, in lieu of a government conducted by officials composed mainly of the Indian Civil servants who are alien and have no sympathy for its people. It is true that we had absolute monarchs like that of Russians, but our kings lived in the country and spent the money here which they collected from the people. Englishmen look upon India as a field of money, and after harvesting for some years they go back to their own country, and they spend the same to their own country so taken away from the famine stricken people of India in the plea of administering justice and of subsiding chaos and confusion amongst them. But the most

beautiful part of their conduct is that men like Mr. John Morley, liberal of Liberals, say that the English people are here, not for their own benefit and gain but for the benefit and good of the people of India. India is the poorest country in the world. The average income of each person is not even two-pence per day, yet it pays its Anglo-Indian servants on a far more liberal scale than what is paid by the richest countries in the world. Viceroy gets Rs. 250,000 a year exclusive of other allowances; Lieutenant Governor, Rs. 100,000, and about Rs. 25,000 allowances. Chief Justice, Rs. 72,000, and other Judges of High Court about Rs. 50,000 a year. Each member of the Board of Revenue gets Rs. 4,000 a month; a District Magistrate and a District Judge gets 2,000 to 2,500 each per month. This money comes from the people who do not even get sometimes one meal a day. While the hungry children snatch away their mother's share of food under the pinch of hunger and leave her starved to die, our kind-hearted Anglo-Indian governors enjoy in the southern quarter of the town almost deaf to the piteous cries of the famine stricken people. Can any person with a grain of common sense and conscience in him say that any other nation than the Indians can tolerate such conduct on the part of their rulers? Mr. Morley says that he cannot climb up to the clouds and bring down rains, and we do not desire that he should in a fit of generosity take such a desperate attempt in his old age to save the hungry millions under his charge. But thousands of other means are open to him; did he try to avail himself of any of these? Could he not ask the Lord Mayor to invite charity at the Mansion house? Could he not ask the State Servants in India to give their three months' pay to these starving people? It is very difficult for an Indian gentleman who has a feeling for his countrymen to pass a single day in a village. The spectacles are horrible. Never in the annals of the world was such a spectacle even seen. India is subject to England, and a most expensive army is maintained at her cost to perpetuate this subjection. England, Christian as she is, starves India's capable children, of whom it has plenty, and imports men from distant countries ignorant of everything relating to India to take charge of most lucrative public offices. In short, English people are our shoemakers, our weavers, our ironmongers, our engineers, our builders, our railway engine drivers and guards, our doctors, our magistrates and judges, our soldiers, our governors, every occupation of gain is taken up by them, nay, by the Grace of God, one of them is our graceful King-Emperor. Under such circumstances can we not advocate a sort of self-government which we in our own language called "Swaraj"?

* * *

Don't offer charity to those to whom you refuse justice.—The Silent Partner, of Cleveland.

*The Indian Appeal is edited by Hira Lal Kumar, barrister-at-law; and is published from 8 Old Post Office street, Calcutta. We give this editorial article on "The Self-Government," exactly as printed in The Indian Appeal, believing that the somewhat quaint form only adds strength to the pathetic cry of a dominated people pressing forward in the world-wide movement toward popular self-government.—Editors of The Public.