

FROM THE "FOREIGN CHRONICLE"

NOT only China, the whole of Asia is beginning to become aware of the "White peril." Look how swiftly the movement of the Indians for national liberation and against Britain's harsh tutelage is spreading.

Anglo-Indian relations are very clearly portrayed in the journal, *Indian Sociologist*, published in Paris by the nationalist Krishnavarma, a man whom the Indians are fond of comparing with Mazzini, and for whom they pre-
sage the future of Garibaldi. A recent issue of the journal reproduces a speech by Lord Hardinge, Viceroy of India.

"I believe," Hardinge said, "that the Indian people are law-abiding at heart. In the nine days Their Majesties spent in our midst the enthusiasm mounted from day to day and reached a magnificent and splendid climax. I have been in many capitals, but never have I witnessed such delight as was manifested in Calcutta. I feel that the royal visit has infused a new spirit of hope and faith in the people of Calcutta and of all Bengal, and that it will bear rich fruit. It has already dispelled the cloud of suspicion that has darkened the horizon in these past years."

But following on this optimistic speech, Krishnavarma prints a message from his correspondent in Calcutta, where the speech was made:

"The greatest precautions were taken during the Viceroy's visit to Dacca last week. (Dacca is 150 miles north-

east of Calcutta.) For two hours before the Viceroy passed through no one was allowed to leave his home without a printed permit."

A "spirit of faith" that has to be fortified by police measures is a bad spirit—that's known even in Russia!

"Britain!" exclaims Krishnavarma, "for more than two hundred years you have been playing the role of ancient Rome, devouring people. Rest assured that the fate of ancient Rome awaits you."

More and more frequently are voices being raised in India emphatically propagating the idea that the time has come when the Indians must take the work of social and political construction into their own hands, and that the British regime on the banks of the Ganges has outlived its day.

The character of this regime is indicated by the persecution instituted by the Government of India against the nationalist Savarkar. As we know, he was tried in secret, news of the trial was not allowed to be published, and he was sentenced to 48 years' imprisonment—until 1960; he is allowed to write to his wife only once a year.

All these extravagances are so discreditable to the traditional idea of British liberty and the British spirit of tolerance that one is involuntarily reminded of a Russian "case"—the story of N. G. Chernyshevsky.*

At the time of the coronation of King George, Maharajah Gaekwar of Baroda conducted himself rather independently. This was enough for the British Conserv-

* N. G. Chernyshevsky, the great Russian savant, writer, critic and revolutionary democrat, was accused by the tsarist government of composing revolutionary proclamations summoning the peasants to revolt. He spent more than twenty years in prison and as a convict in exile.

ative press to accuse him of particularism, demagoguery and similar horrors.

The influential *Daily Express* wrote that the Government of India had long suspected the State of Baroda of being an asylum for rebels and seditious elements, and that Gaekwar himself during his unofficial visits to Europe had often had close contacts with the revolutionary Krishnavarma. The *Daily Telegraph* went even further and demanded Gaekwar's deposal. The scared maharajah was forced to cable the *Times* that he had not met Krishnavarma since the time the latter had left England in 1907.

Such are the "political" relations between the Indians and the British. The visit of the venerable Socialist, Kier Hardie, only added oil to the flames by exposing the terrible condition of the Indians and the tyranny of British rule. It goes without saying that, apart from the Socialists, there are quite a number of people in England who think India must be granted autonomy. Their voices are growing ever louder and more insistent, and there is a hope that the Government of India is intelligent enough to cede when it sees that it is essential in the interests of the state.

But in the meantime, while the Indians are organizing for the struggle for liberty, they are being exterminated in ever increasing numbers by the conditions created by British capitalism. Since in the silk and carpet mills and on the tobacco plantations of India it is mainly females that are employed, they are being killed off by capitalism in vast numbers and literally in the "flower of life." This process is brought out with startling clarity by the census of the Indian population just completed by the government.

It is statistically established that in childhood and old age the number of females is almost normal, i.e., almost equal to that of males, but in the middle-age categories it falls very low. Of the 43,000,000 persons below the age of five in Eastern India, girls outnumber boys by 690,000, but there are 18,500,000 boys and only 15,200,000 girls between the ages of 10 and 12!

In the Punjab, one of the biggest of the provinces, on March 10, 1910—the day the census was taken—there were 13,314,917 males and only 10,872,765 females. From this it follows that every fifth male must remain unmarried. This is truly the destruction of a people!

Mr. Gait, chairman of the statistical commission, arrives at the conclusion that the sex ratio at birth does not differ very much from that in Europe, but subsequent conditions are highly unfavourable for females who live by physical labour, and this constitutes a grave social danger to the country.

A similar phenomenon is to be observed in America, also called forth by capitalism: in Maine, Indiana, Ohio and other states, the reservation Indians, i.e., those tied to definite territories, are rapidly dying out, and betray no tendency to absorb American culture; the non-reservation Indians, forced to migrate to the stern north—to Saskatchewan, Prince of Wales Island and Alaska—are similarly dying out.

But the United States government has long ago given up the problem, having lost all hope of "introducing the savages to the blessings of culture." It is now preoccupied with the "colour problem."

In 1850, of a total of 23,000,000 citizens in the United States, about 4,000,000 were Negroes; in 1910, when

the population was 92,000,000, only 10,000,000 were Negroes. It should be borne in mind that in these sixty years more than ten million Negroes were brought to America or came there voluntarily after the war between North and South. Dr. Stelzle, who has made a study of the "colour problem," writes that only the Negro was brought to America against his will; for 250 years coloured people were systematically imported into America, the most physically fit being selected for the purpose.

Now these "most physically fit" are being killed off by tuberculosis, caused by outrageous and inhuman conditions of labour and overwork—and, in addition, by the contempt of the "whites." The "Negroes," Stelzle says, "are forced to live in the worst sections of our big cities, often without drainage, plumbing or the most rudimentary sanitary conditions, without which I, a white, would refuse to live. We ourselves introduce into the Negro sections the most disgusting forms of vice, physical perversion and moral turpitude. We cynically declare that the Negro is good for nothing, forgetting that in the primary schools some fifty per cent of the teachers are Negroes."

"Enough of racial and national intolerance!" exclaims this American, overcome by shame.

Yes, it is high time to cry, "Enough!"—both to the "yellows" and the "blacks" the white peril is becoming too obvious. They see only the reverse side of the culture we have paid so much for, while its profound inner meaning is concealed from them. They have a legitimate right not only to doubt the creative power of culture, whose purpose is supposed to be to unite mankind, but also to reject it as being an oppressive burden on them.