In the initial stage of the English Press in Bengal the role of the editors in the management of papers and periodicals was unrecognised and ineffective.

J.A. Hicky was himself the proprietor, publisher and printer for his Bengal Gazette or the Original Calcutta General Advertiser. He also exercised the editorial management over it. But he made himself known in the Gazette as the printer (and neither as the proprietor, editor or publisher). Possibly with the designation of a printer he felt the most satisfaction. The correspondences with him, as published in the Gazette, were also addressed as "Mr. Hicky, Printer of the Calcutta Newspaper" (and not as editor). The same was the case with the India Gazette or Calcutta Public Advertiser. That was brought out by Mr. Peter Reed and Mr. B. Messinck. They were also the editors and the publishers for the same. But in the Gazette they notified themselves simply as Printers.

In the same way as in the Bengal Gazette of Hicky the correspondences for the Calcutta Gazette in the earliest years were also addressed by the public to the printer and not to the editor. This was natural as it was the printer alone who was

---

1. The Bengal Gazette, January 29, 1780 and subsequent issues.
2. The India Gazette, November 25, 1780 and subsequent issues for years.
duly noticed in every issue and had the largest public contact, on behalf of the management, as receiver of all articles for publication in the paper:

"Calcutta: Printed by Daniel Stuart, No.37, Larkin's Lane where Advertisements, Letters and Articles of Intelligence are received."

It was to printer that everyone was to notify their address for regular delivery of their copy of the paper:

"X X X X It is requested that whenever any Gentlemen are about to change their stations, they will take the trouble to signify their Intention to Mr. Stuart, who will pay first obedience to their Orders."

Government, however, did prefer to deal with the Editor instead of the printer where these were different individuals (like in the Calcutta Gazette) as the following notice would indicate:

"We are directed by the Hon'ble the Governor General and Council to express their entire disapprobation of some extracts from English newspapers which appeared in their paper during a period when the Editor was under the necessity of entrusting to other hands the superintence of the press. They (the Governor General & Council) will

2. Calcutta Gazette, March 10, 1785.
3. Mr. Francis Gladwin was the editor of the Calcutta Gazette about this time, vide Calcutta Gazette, March 3, 1785."
hold the Editor accountable to them, and expect that he does not publish anything that is improper.1

Gradually, however, the office of the Editor of an Anglo-Indian paper became well known to the public and we see that in the Calcutta Gazette for 1787 the correspondences were addressed to the Editor and this became the general practice in other papers also. But though letters were now being addressed to the Editor the responsibility for selection and publication rested with the printer as would appear from the following notice in the Calcutta Chronicle:

"The Proprietors of the Chronicle in justice to themselves seize the earliest opportunity to contradict a report which has been circulated respecting the printing of the scandalous and disgraceful letter signed A.R. As the sole management of the Chronicle Press was committed to Mr. Upjohn as printer, it was customary for him to receive several articles to be printed and perform them without reference to the other Proprietors."2

Since this time the Calcutta Chronicle had for long none noticed in its body as printer ad from the notice "Winterton" in the issue dated February 5, 1793 it appears that an Editor acted for it with responsibility instead of the printer.

2. Calcutta Chronicle, June 19, 1792.
In the hierarchy of the Press Establishment the printer gradually suffered loss of importance vis-a-vis the editor as would appear from the fact that unlike in the past the name of the printer was occasionally not even mentioned in the body of a paper. Thus we get:

"Printed for the Proprietors, Chitpore Road";

or

"Printed for the Proprietors, No. 8, Loll Bazar".

The Government generally acted on the principle that the editor would be held responsible for the contents of the paper. Number of cases mentioned in the letter from the Chairman and Dy. Chairman of the E.I. Co. to the Rt. Hon'le Charles Watkin Williams Wynn dated January 17, 1823 would lead us to this conclusion. A few of these cases are cited below:

(a) In 1794, Mr. William Dune, the editor of the World, was deported to Europe for "improper and intemperate articles and particularly an inflammatory address to the army".

(b) In 1796, Mr. Horsey, the editor of the Calcutta Gazette, was held up for inserting observations "relative to certain communications on the subject of peace which had passed between the Court of London and the French Republic".

1. Asiatic Mirror, December 20, 1797.
2. Calcutta Chronicle, June 19, 1792.
(c) In 1798, a letter appeared in the Telegraph which according to Government would tend to "excite discontent and disaffection in the Indian army". But as the author (Capt. Williamson) could be traced out as suitably penalised the editor was spared.

(d) In 1798 a letter from one Mr. Charles McLean was published in the Telegraph "animadverting on the official conduct of Mr. Ridge, the Magistrate of Ghazaspore." This time the Government called upon both the editor of the Telegraph and also Mr. McLean to apologise for the publication.

The Press Regulations of Lord Wellesley in 1799 which established censorship for Press in India made it compulsory for the printer to make his name public as he was "to print his name at the bottom of the paper."¹ But the editor or the proprietor was simply "to deliver in his name and place of abode to the Secretary to Government."²

They were, however, made responsible for compliance with the rules of the censorship. Thus in 1807 the editor of the India Gazette and in 1808 the editor of the Calcutta Gazette were blamed for non-submission of proof-sheets before publication for inspection of the Censor.

1. Ibid., p. 112.
2. Ibid., p. 112.
3. Ibid., p. 113.
The Press Rules of August 1818 by Lord Hastings substituted those of 1799. According to the new Regulations, the sole responsibility for observing the provisions of these rules rested with the editor. The temporary Governor General John Adam took action against James Silk Buckingham, as the editor of the Calcutta Journal, according to the provisions of these Rules of 1818. His proprietary right was, however, left untouched.

The Press Regulations of John Adam in 1828 providing for license for publication of newspapers and other periodicals, practically diminished the responsibility of an editor to the Government. The license was to be obtained through a regular process by the proprietor who would be responsible to see that in conducting the paper the Regulations were not violated for which the license could be revoked. The notice for cancellation of license for the Calcutta Journal was thus issued to Mr. John Palmer and Mr. George Ballard, the principal co-proprietors and agents of John Silk Buckingham (also a co-proprietor) on


the spot. The letter ran thus:

"You were apprised by letters of the 18th of July and 3rd of September last, of the sentiments entertained with regard to the repeated violation on the part of the conductors of the Calcutta Journal of the rules established by Government for the regulation of the periodical press. The Right Honourable the Governor General in Council has, in consequence, this day been pleased to resolve, that the license authorising and empowering John Francis Sandys and Peter Stone de Rosario to print and publish the Calcutta Journal is resumed, revoked and recalled accordingly,"

Same was the case with the Calcutta Chronicle. The license for the publication was cancelled by Government with notice to the proprietors.

1. Reply to Question No. 613, examination of James Silk Buckingham before the Select Committee on the Suppression of the Calcutta Journal, on July 1, 1834; Parliamentary Paper, House of Commons, 1834, Vol. 8, Paper 601, p. 79.


3. a) The Bengal Kbcdkaru, June 1, 1827. The letter was thus addressed: "To Mr. William Adam and Mr. Villiers Holcroft, Proprietors of the Calcutta Chronicle."

b) Copy of the letter submitted by Mr. James Sutherland before the Select Committee in course of his reply to Question No. 1088, on March 18, 1831; Parliamentary Paper, House of Commons, 1831-32, Vol. 9, Paper 735-1, p. 123.
The Government however would spare the proprietor for his vicarious responsibility when the editor with the primary responsibility could be sacrificed as was the case with the <i>Bengal Chronicle</i>. For an editorial article appearing in the <i>Bengal Chronicle</i>, December 8, 1828, the Government by a letter to the proprietor, Mr. Monta de Pozario, withdraw the license for its publication. But the editor (Mr. James Sutherland) came forward, admitted responsibility for the article and offered to withdraw from all connection with the paper and on that ground Government permitted the continuance of the paper under a new Editor.

Though the executive would thus spare the proprietor accepting the responsibility of the editor for articles published in a paper the judiciary would not act accordingly. Thus Mr. A. Wight, an Attorney in the Supreme Court, brought a suit for libel against the proprietors of the <i>Bengal Herald</i> for an article in the 12th Number of issue of Volume I and though the proprietors disclaimed all liabilities they were indicated. Four of the proprietors then withdrew from the publication with the following notice in the <i>Bengal Herald</i>:

"We have to intimate, that (we) have ceased to be proprietors of <i>Bengal Herald</i> viz. Rammohun Roy, Dwarkaonath Tagore, Frussuna COmar Tagore, ad Neil Batten Holder.

1. The <i>Bengal Harkuru</i>, December 11, 1828.
2. The <i>Bengal Harkuru</i>, December 12, 1828.
3. The <i>Bengal Herald</i>, August 8, 1829, p. 217.
4. Ibid."
and to reiterate what we have before expressed, that the Editor is alone responsible for what may have appeared in the columns of this Journal, since its establishment, and however, legally actionable for any transgression of the Law of Libel, yet, morally speaking, the Proprietors are guiltless of offence to any individual; it is therefore, to be regretted, that their names should have been dragged before a court of justice, although the Editor who is one of the Proprietors of the Herald, has avowed in print, in writing, and viva voce, his willingness and readiness to avow the publication of any articles that may appear in the columns of the Journal which he edits.

The proprietors could come out of the difficulty only through a compromise with Mr. Wight.

Such was also the case of the proprietor of the Bengal Record under the Press Regulation of 1823. He stood charged for libel for a 'letter to the editor' published in an issue in March 1827 and fined for Rs. 800/- and this was referred to in an editorial article in the Bengal Record for July 1st, 1829:

"The Proprietors, amongst other evils to which they are subjected in the Service of the Public have been (and are always likely to be) prosecuted for the inadvertent admission into their columns of letters which may be considered libellous *

To avoid any possibility of such difficulties proprietors like Dr. Bryce of the John Bull made it sure that nothing was

1. Ibid.
inserted in the paper without his sanction.

The Press Act of Sir Charles Metcalfe (Act XI of 1855) spared the Editors and the Proprietors from legal responsibility and bound down the Printer and Publisher in stead, as it provided (a) that the printer and publisher of every printed periodical works containing public news or comments on public news should sign a declaration before a Magistrate to that they were the printer and publisher of the same; and (b) that every printed book or paper should contain the name of printer and publisher and place of printing and publication.

This gave rise to prolonged discussion in the Press on the question of editorial responsibility. Thus, for example, the Englishman wrote:

".... the proposed rule .... limited the liabilities (for the matters appearing in the papers and periodicals) to the printers and publishers of journals, — a class of functionaries who .... from

1. Letter of Dr. Bryce to Attorney Mr. Dickens, extracted in the Bengal Harkaru, April 6, 1829.
the nature of their duties, ought not to be held responsible for a single article which may be published * * * * we do not hesitate to reiterate the opinion we have frequently expressed, viz., that the sole responsibility of everything printed and published in a newspaper should lie at the door of the Editor. Few proprietors of a public journal interfere in the smallest degree with the matter contained in its columns; they either embark in the business as a commercial speculation, or with the view of affording the means of maintaining political principles and public objects to which they are favourable * * * * The printer * * * is the mere servant of the Editor, and to vest him with the power of putting a veto on the publication of what may be sent to the printing office for that purpose, would so completely alter the relative positions of the parties as utterly to prevent the business from being efficiently carried on; and yet in common justice, such a veto he should have the power of interposing, or no man with the slightest regard to his personal safety would hold the office * * * * In this view * * * the Government should provide for the responsibility of the Editor and him alone.*

In reply to this the Calcutta Courier wrote:

"We * * * * do not concur in the opinion that the Printer should be absolved from all responsibility, since many cases of libel may be conceived in which he is the only guilty party * * * * we are somewhat surprised at the opinion now expressed in the Englishman, that the sole responsibility of everything printed and published in a Newspaper, should lie at the door of the Editor. There is no reservation of responsibility here for any possible control exercised by the Proprietors over the Editors."

The question of editorial responsibility again came up to the surface in 1857. Under the provisions of Act XV of 1857 Government revoked the license for the Bengal Harcaru and issued notice to Mr. William Sims, the proprietor, on September 18, 1857. Mr. Sims represented to Government for renewal of the license and wrote that under his engagement with Mr. Blanchard, the editor of the Harcaru, "the internal economy and management of the paper is entrusted to him" and that neither the letters nor the editorials passed under his review and he assured that he would change the Editor and would take care in these respects. It may be mentioned here that the license of the Bengal Harcaru was cancelled for publication of a letter "Militaire" in its issue of September 5, 1857, and editorial in the issues of September 14 and 15, 1857. The license was renewed with the following rejoinder in the letter of C. Beadon Esqr. to W. Sims, Esqr. dated September 23, 1857. "that the responsibility for what is printed at any press rests upon the proprietor of that press, and upon him alone. It is the intention of the Government to enforce the law, but it will not interfere with the proprietor's choice of an editor." This brings into clear relief the Government's conception of Editor's responsibilities vis-a-vis proprietor's liabilities.

3. Ibid.
In the case of the Friend of India Government took an identical stand. For the two leading articles in that periodical — "The Centenary of Plassey" appearing in the issue of June 25, 1857 and "The First Warning" appearing in the issue of July 2, 1857, the Governor General in Council "felt it necessary to direct the revocation of the license" which was issued under provision of Act XV of 1857 but ultimately this was not done "in consequence of an assurance ..... received, on the part of the representatives of the absent proprietor (Mr. J.C. Marshman, then in London), that the newspaper shall, during his absence, be carried on so as to avoid all cause of complaint, and within the terms of the licence."

* * *

It was generally the case, particularly in the earlier days of our period, that the proprietor himself (or one of them in case of a joint venture of many) had the editorial charge of the paper. But even when there was an editor the general practice was to keep it undisclosed, as far as practicable, from the public (and also from the Government except when it was mandatory to communicate under provision of the Press Rules of 1799). The Prospectus for a paper might announce that there should be an Editor for it but the name was almost invariably omitted. Thus the Prospectus for the celebrated Calcutta Journal.

1. Letter from C. Beadon Esq., Secretary to Government of India to A.R. Young Esq., dated July 3, 1857; ibid., p. 46.
nowhere mentions James Silk Buckingham as its Editor but simply gives out that the Proprietors "placed the management of the Journal in the hands of a gentleman who possesses a general knowledge of the duties of an Editor, and a particular acquaintance with some of the branches of information proposed to be treated of in their columns, besides considerable experience of most of the subjects which compose the essence of our Public Prints."  

but a few exceptions, e.g., the Prospectus for the John Bull in the East specifically named James Nackenzie as its Editor. But it was suspected that the real editorial person for the paper remained hidden behind this announcement. We may cite as another notable exception the Prospectus for the Kaleidoscope which was issued under the signature of the proposed Editor, Henry D'Arcy himself.

So much secrecy was maintained that even the professional brethren were often unknown to each other. An interesting relevant anecdote is related by W. Judge in his "Henry

Derczio, The Eurasian Poet and Reformer*. When Derczio was conducting the East Indian, Capt. R.A. Macnaghten was the editor of the John Bull. He was offended at an article published in the East Indian, called at its office armed with a cane. "I have come to take satisfaction", he announced to Derczio who replied, "Then take it". Finding his antagonist a mere youth (about whom previously he had no idea), the doughty Capt. contented himself with gently placing his cane on Derczio's shoulder. "Consider yourself assaulted, Sir!" he explained and walked out of the office (as if he would not have taken the trouble to come if he had known earlier that a mere youth, was the editor of the East Indian). James Silk Buckingham, the well-informed editor of the Calcutta Journal was in darkness even as to the identity of the most pronounced of his rivals, the editor of the John Bull and in August 1822 he wrote —

"..... the Proprietors of the John Bull are, we believe ..... gentlemen in the Civil Service, and the Editor an officer in the Company's Army as well as a Professor in the College ....."

But in fact the editor of the John Bull was then Mr. Charles Greenlaw, Coroner of Calcutta and Secretary of the Marine Board.

The case of Dr. D.J. O'Callaghan, Asst. Garrison Surgeon, Fort William, may be cited as an instance of the completeness

2. Calcutta Journal, August 24, 1822; p. 784.
3. The Englishman, Centenary Number, Supplement, July 2, 1921.
in secrecy as to the identity of an editor. Residing with his garrison in the Fort William he secretly carried on as the editor of the Calcutta Morning Chronicle for long. It was only accidentally that his association with the Morning Chronicle came to notice of Government and he became the subject matter of lengthy correspondences between the Governor General and the Court of Directors.¹

Not only the name of editor was kept undisclosed but attempt would also be made to mistify his identity. We may here quote the editorial comment of the Bengal Herald on the second number of the Calcutta Literary Gleaner of Mr. Carey:² "The number opens with an attempt to mistify the public respecting the identity of the editor of the Gleaner." We may cite an instance also from the Prospectus of the Bengal Times: "Its (Bengal Times) Editorial management will be entrusted to gentlemen well qualified for the task, not without some experience in local journalism, and who will employ the Bengal Times, neither as the organ nor the tool of any party, clique or individual"³ (the would-be incumbent remained unnamed in the whole of the Prospectus). And another instance from the Morning Chronicle: "We have for sometime past endeavoured to

² Bengal Herald, April 9, 1842, p. 3c.
³ Prospectus of the Bengal Times extracted in the Friend of India, June 6, 1850.
⁴ Morning Chronicle, February 8, 1858, extracted in the Citizen, February 24, 1858, p.
obtain for this paper an Editor, who could devote his whole
time, energy and talent to the conduct of it. . . . . It
affords us therefore particular pleasure now to inform our
readers that we have at last succeeded in securing the services
of a gentleman. . . . . We trust that readers will have already
perceived during the short time he has filled the editorial
chair a change in the tone and style of the paper . . . . " (this,
much advertised new find, was kept unnamed). The last of the
instances that we would cite is in respect of the Bensi Harkaru
of whom the Englishman wrote in May 1852 — "The Harkaru . . . .
is known for preserving a sort of mystery about the editor-
ship . . . . of his paper."

Hence, a writer in the Saunders' Monthly Magazine in
June 1852 wrote of the Indian editors as members of an
"anonymous order".

In the late fifties the practice in this respect appears
to be undergoing transformation and occasionally now we find the
identity of the incumbents of the editorial chairs disclosed.

This practice of non-disclosure of the name of editor
was initiated by the native proprietors of the English periodi-
cals and with success. For example, it was long in discussion
as to who the editor of the Reformer was and we are not even now

1. The Englishman, May 12, 1852, extracted in the Madras

Examiner, May 25, 1852.

2. "The Press in India" — Saunders's Monthly Magazine, June,

1852, p. 557.
certain who was in the charge of editorial management of the Hindoo Patriot prior to its purchase by Harish Ch. Hookerjee (discussed in details in connexion with the Reformer and the Hindoo Patriot).

* * *

The Editor, often in the background and beyond the public gaze, was the busiest man in the whole establishment of a Newspaper. The stress and strains which he had to undergo for the due discharge of his duties would be evident from a glance over the daily routine for an Indian Editor. The first instance we come across is from the pen of Buckingham of the Calcutta Journal:

"The Editor is most frequently at his desk at six O'clock, the morning hour for exercise; and in the two hours of quiet that he thus enjoys before the labours of the day, properly so called commence, the arrangements for that day's occupations are made. The daily dawk frequently brings a dozen private letters to be answered; often twenty public ones relating to change of stations, remittances etc. etc.; and seldom less than a half a dozen communications, besides all the Gazettes of the other Indian Settlements, for examinations previous to publications; besides 30 or 40 chits, as they are expressively called, from persons in Town, all of which must be answered. The private letters are necessarily replied to briefly; the public ones relative to accounts must all be answered.

accurately; and those enclosing Communications to be published must be examined minutely.

"For the illegible manner in which these last are often written, it frequently happens that they can only be deciphered by the Editor himself. Those must therefore be fairly written out and copied by his own hand for the Printers. In such as can be read by others, the defects of language, if any, with the punctuation, capitals, divisions of sentences and paragraphs, which those who first write for the public eye pay so little attention to, must all be remedied. An hour is sometimes in the middle of the day to write on original subjects; but more frequently whatever is written as Editorial matter is done at such short intervals of five or ten minutes as can be seized between the almost incessant interruptions of the day.

"Towards the close of the afternoon, the proof-sheets are brought to be read with copy; and from this copy being mostly manuscript in all kinds of handwriting, there are often unavoidably a hundred errors in a page. The second reading, or revising as it is called, lessens this number; but sometimes even after the third reading, it is necessary to look them over again.

"The Editor's labours thus seldom begin later than 6 in the morning -- rarely close before 7 or 8 in the evening, -- are often extended to 10, and occasionally till even midnight, before he retires."

Mr. J.H. Stocqueler, one of the most successful and renowned English editors in Bengal (editor of the John Bull in its last days and then of its successor, the Englishman) also gave us the daily routine of an editor of a diurnal in
Calcutta in the early thirties of the last century:

"Rise at half past five; — open the daily journals directly they arrive. Read, learn and inwardly digest; — note for extract; — write dissent, assent, or reflections suggested by contemporary 'leaders', or by letters of contemporary's correspondents. Ablution and la toilette ... Breakfast, brief and spare-toast, tea and a periodical — off to business at 9 A.M. At office summon the printer, supply him with extracts from English and Asiatic papers, made with care the previous night. At ten, the 'busy hum' begins — and as you prepare to write an article, two or three notes successively enter bearing reference to some of your sins of omission or commission in that day's paper. You answer them — and continue your article. The Shipping Report announces a ship from Europe; you are in a fever of excitement — other notes come in, — a frivolous visitor — the dawk, with letters, and Madras, Bombay, Ceylon and Mfuscil papers. You can only glance over all the latter and marking what your experienced eye discerns to be sufficiently meritorious you send them to the printer. But the substance of all is retained in your head, — you finish your article, — in the composition of which you have been seven times interrupted — and proceed to answer your correspondents, and comment on the news communicated by the country dawk. — 12 at noon, the Europe papers come up — twenty days' intelligence! and all to be gathered and condensed in time for your dawk edition. You systematically proceed. You are engaged in a Parliamentary

precis, wading through not less than 100 columns of the Times. The sircar brings his cash account, you are required to sign bills, answer letters, receive visitors, give orders and — it is three O'clock! You have just ten minutes to snatch an imperfect meal. The second country dawk comes in — a bundle of periodicals arrive — or a letter of a correspondent — or a police office report — or an angry letter from a subscriber. All, all must be noticed at once. It is now past four, and the proofs of your lubrications and those of your correspondents (the rest are read by the head printer) await your inspection and correction and to preface a copious summing of news from the new papers: — this is a serious task, mentally and mechanically and by seven in the evening your work is over and then with smarting eyes, and aching wrist, and almost empty stomach, and a breaking back wend your way to your home. Fatigue scarcely allows you to look at your wife and children — you fall asleep, and in a couple of hours, wake up again to bohea, proof-sheets, and preparation for the morrow!

No doubt there is much exaggeration in this daily diary of J.H. Stoequeler, e.g., the European arrivals were only periodical and the verification of cash accounts of the Sirkar and particularly reception of visitors (as the editor would often keep himself unidentified and concealed) were generally attended to by some one other than the Editor, as an agent of the proprietor. Jr. J.H. Stoequeler who was simultaneously the editor of two monthlies (The Bengal Sporting Magazine and the East India United Service Journal) and a hebdomadal (the Oriental Observer) besides the Englishman, himself wrote, "Up by five in the morning and working until midnight with the
interval of half an hour's siesta after a light tiffin, I managed not only to spend a couple of hours on horse back every day, but to study parts for the theatre (he was fond of acting and was an amateur actor of the Calcutta Theatre), carry on a large correspondence, and establish an army agency."

However, according to opinions recorded in the contemporary journals the duties of editor of an Anglo-Indian Journal were quite onerous and there were few posts "more utterly unenviable than that of an Indian Editor". He was "ill-renumerated" and "seldom understood" and the editor of the Eastern Star gave out that he would prefer "quill-driving in a government office, tailoring, sailoring or horsebreaking — anything in preference to the barren honours of editorship". The writer went on — "Anything would be better than finding one's self daily and hourly compelled either to lose caste by a confession of ignorance, or to enact a lie by passing confident opinions on subjects with which he is utterly unacquainted, or to descent still lower and effect anxiety about men and things in whom he can not feel a particle of interest."

This point is further dilated upon:

2. The Eastern Star, June 28, 1852, extracted in the Citizen, July 23, 1852.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
"He (the Editor) is expected to possess within himself the resources of half a dozen men. In politics, statesmanship, law, commerce and military statistics, he is supposed to be equally proficient. In one article he may be called upon to pronounce an opinion, which he must support by argument for or against the annexation of a conquered kingdom; in another he may have to criticise the operations of the invading force; while in a third he may be required to decide upon the validity of a Supreme Court judgement, and in the fourth to analyze the complicated mass of a Union Bank investigation."

Obviously no man of moderate abilities or even somewhat above that could possibly grapple with subjects at once so varied and intricate.

The editor of an Anglo-Indian newspaper could hardly get a holiday — not even during the days of Durga Puja when in those days as now, there was complete "cease work" in the Government offices, educational institutions and most of the Commercial Houses with which a newspaper was most intimately connected (e.g., for supply of paper and other stationeries). Thus the editor of the Friend of India wrote in October:

"This is the first day of the Holidays, which afford the dust suffocated denizens of Calcutta thirteen full days for breathing the purer air of the river of the country. Calcutta is out of town; nobody left but the druggists and editorial drudges."

The editor of the Morning Chronicle also commented on

1. Friend of India, October 17, 1889, p. 661.
the same topic:

"... we sincerely and heartily ...

suggest that it would be well if we could all close during the (Durga Puja) holidays, and go and amuse ourselves, as everyone else is doing. It would be a sensible plan, and we can not see why, for a few days, the births, marriages, deaths, accidents, and Semaphore arrivals could not take care of themselves, and give us a holiday. The only men who work half as hard as the daily editors, are the brokers, and there is not one of those gentleman in Calcutta at the present moment. Their tarts with outstretched neck and flatant nostril, are no longer to be seen in the vacant streets, their brownberries are laid up in silent shades, whilst their owners, no longer anxious to do anything at a half penny, are jigiticking at Berhampore, shooting waterfoul at Burdwan, or galloping about the park at Barrackpore. Everyone gets a holiday except an Editor... We sincerely wish that the Calcutta daily Editors would conspire to take a holiday, and follow the brokers into the Moffussil to shoot tigers."

This was undoubtedly written in a humour spirit but nonetheless it shows the editorial pining for holidays.

Not only the editors got no repose during the Paja holidays but during these days they had to workharder and we get from the Friend of India: "This is the week in the year in which our composers who are nearly all Hindoos, claim their annual holiday of us ..... We have taken the opportunity of bringing up our arrears of correspondence and working off our stock of editorial matter."

1. Morning Chronicle, October 3, 1851.
2. Friend of India, October 2, 1851, p. 625.
Even on the day of Christmas the editor would get no respite and if he could not furnish the normal quantity of editorial lubrications he had to account for this shortfall. Thus we get in the editorial column of the *Calcutta Star*:

"We need scarcely apologise to our readers for a deficiency of Editorial matter on the day after Christmas. Were an Editor disposed to take no holiday himself, he must allow at least one day in the year to his Christian establishment."

Christian holidays on Good Friday and Christmas became an assertable right in the world of the Anglo-Indian Press since the year 1855 as we get from the following notice in the *Hindu Intelligencer* for December 24, 1855:

"The Editors of the daily journals give notice that they have resolved to give their establishments a holiday on Christmas-day and Good Friday and that no paper will in consequence be issued on Monday next, the 26th instant."

Mr. James Hume who was, according to his contemporaries, successful man in the editorial chair of the *Calcutta Star* thus wrote in the columns of his paper on the occasion of his relinquishing the editorship on succession to a vacancy on the Magisterial Bench in Calcutta:

"... reviewing the period that has elapsed (period of more than six years as

editor) it has been to us, one of unceasing labour — slavery would hardly been too strong a term.

Hence was the difficulty, more so in the earlier period, to get a competent editor for a first class paper and we get the proprietor of the Bengal Harbours writing on July 1, 1829: "Several Editors of this paper have abandoned their posts for more lucrative employment; others would not undergo the labour and responsibility of the office twice the sum the Proprietors could afford."

John Hewish, the Editor of the Citizen for several years, however, was of different opinion — "..... we can not conceive a more thorough life in clover than that of an editor of even a daily paper .... The greater part of his time is spent in that which is the favorite relaxation of men of intellect, reading, which he can doubly enjoy from the consciousness that his pleasant exercise is helping him on his business. He, however, would not be taken up too seriously. For, he 'took up the occupation of Editor, solely as a source of amusement during what are called non-business hours.'"

This was the outcome of the circumstances then prevailing in India. The proprietors of journals could not or would not provide assistance for their editors. They could not — the market for supply of editorial hands in the Anglo-Indian society of the time was limited.

2. Ibid.
This point was highlighted by the editor of the India Gazette in his article in the Calcutta Quarterly Magazine & Review when he wrote that the Indian Editor united "in his own person those functions which are divided amongst different individuals in wealthier countries and larger communities". In England, "where the field of editorial selection is wide, it is not difficult for the proprietor of a paper to raise a corps of editors, who hold the same opinion on leading questions, and resemble one another so closely in their style of composition as to give to the leading articles of a paper the appearance of having emanated from one party."

The proprietors would also not provide assistance to their editors for the financial stringency which they had to maintain to make their investment more profitable with a limited — a very limited — circulation of their papers.

In November 1839, the India Gazette published an estimate of the total circulation of newspapers in this Presidency — daily, semi-weekly and weekly — which was 3100. Commenting on this the India Gazette points out that this was due to the fact that Englishmen in India were mere birds of passage and that, while here, they would only look forward to the time of return to the motherland with the wealth amassed. It hoped that there would be

2. Ibid, p. 431.
3. India Gazette, extracted in the Bengal Harbarn, November 25, 1839.
improvement when colonisation in India would be accepted as a policy.

The Bengal Harbarn, however, differed with the India Gazette and observed in an editorial on November 25, 1829 that this low circulation was due to the "defective arrangement of the Proprietors for the editorial management" of their papers. It further dwelt on this some few years later and assigned as the second reason for this, "the prejudices common to all colonial societies in favour of home productions."

In 1838 the editor of the John Bull estimated the circulation of the papers of this Presidency thus: "There are 2205 subscribers (and perhaps 5000 readers) to the daily papers and their ter-weekly editions and 1500 subscribers to the other bi-weekly, ter-weekly and weekly journals."

1. Ibid.
2. Bengal Harbarn, November 25, 1829.
3. Bengal Harbarn, January 3, 1832.
4. "The Calcutta Press" in the Calcutta Quarterly Magazine & Review, No. III, October 1838, p. 482. The calculation made by him in this article was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily papers and their ter-weekly editions:</th>
<th>Daily edition:</th>
<th>Ter-weekly edition</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bengal Harbarn &amp; Chronicle</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India Gazette</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcutta Courier</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bull</td>
<td>306</td>
<td></td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                          | 1583           | 625               | 2208  | (p.482)
One of the reasons for the low circulation of the Anglo-Indian papers was the heavy import of English journals. In May 1845, the Editor of the Friend of India made an enquiry and wrote: "The number of newspapers imported month by month from England amounts to nearly 40,000. If each Editor of a newspaper receives an average 100, still the number to the address of the whole body can not greatly exceed 2500, leaving 37,500, as the number taken by the community, and this is by no means a small matter for so limited a body as the Europeans in India."

Of course, it was an object of pride for the Editors of Anglo-Indian papers that single-handed they would and could carry

Other bi-weekly, ter-weekly and weekly journals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Circulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oriental Observer</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Register</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformer</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gramanoshan</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enquirer</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saradhat Puran</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengal Herald</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1522</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Enquirer had a total circulation of 250, but as 100 were distributed by the editor gratuitously the same appears to have been omitted for this calculation (p. 417). Further, the Missionary Weekly, the Philanthropist, and the Literary Weekly, the Literary Gazette, have also been omitted.

1. Friend of India, May 8, 1845, p. 299.
on a task which required so many helping hands in England and
they would also assert this against their counterparts there:

"The inferiority of Indian Journalists
is rather an inferiority of establishment than
anything else. While noticing the ed-
torial department we might have mentioned that
whereas in London there are a body of writers
upon a first rate paper, it is quite as much as
a Calcutta Journal can do, to get one to assist;
and when we are weighing the respective merits
of Editors here and there, we should not forget
the multiplicity of subjects upon which the
we of Calcutta must write, while in London they
can command articles on any given subject from
the most competent hand, writing themselves only
on those within the range of their own knowledge... The
competent sub-editor, the educated reader,
the professional reporter — we know them not
and it is in their departments we must confess
an marked inferiority."

Rarely can we find such functionaries as Joint Editor,
By. Editor, Assistant Editor and Sub-Editor in the establishment
of an Indian journal. In 1819 Buckingham, the editor of the
Calcutta Journal, wrote, in meeting complaint of negligence from
some of his correspondents, "that he stands alone and unassisted
in any and every department of his duty as an Editor; — and
that there is not a hand to which he has ever yet delegated what
may be called his Editorial duties, whether in sickness or in
health — in his buoyant spirits or in despondency."

Hence when a proprietor would engage any one besides the editor, that would become an object of publicity for his paper. And as these offices were of uncommon occurrence the assignment of responsibility and a new hand be made the subject of editorial comment by the proprietor. To cite an instance:

"We have taken a gentleman as our Joint Editor .... No particular line is chalked out for him to pursue because .... such an arrangement would only serve to cramp his efforts; but we may mention that in general the European department will be under his supervision and that consequently the political articles and literary notices will emanate from him as often as from us, though it is not our intention even to distinguish them."

Then, in July 1833 a Sub-Editor was advertised for appointment who would "generally assist the Editor in his labours."  

From the Friend of India in September, 1840 we get that the Bengal Harbaru and Chronicle had at that time a Sub-Editor. Again in 1846 we get one Mr. Fawson as the Sub-Editor in that Establishment.

It however deserves to be mentioned that in those relevant periods the Harbaru had no Editor and Mr. Samuel Smith, the Managing Proprietor, was in the charge for its editorial management.

1. The Bengal Harbaru, January 6, 1825.
2. Bengal Harbaru and Chronicle, July 1, 1836, Advertisement.
3. Friend of India, September 17, 1840; p. 598.
In an editorial article the *John Bull* in September 1823 admitted that "it is impossible for any individual to attend to all the details of a daily publication ..... it therefore comes a matter of necessity that the Editor should have Assistants." But we are aware of appointment of any Assistant Editor by the proprietors of the *John Bull* during its whole tenure of life.

As the Editor had to carry on the duties of his chair unassisted and single-handed there were many notices in the pages of the contemporary paper of his default due to other preoccupations and illness as the following extracts would show:

(a) "The Proprietors of the *Calcutta Gazette* are sorry that, in consequence of the sudden and violent indisposition of the Editor, they are unable to publish the introductory remarks in this day's paper; but they sincerely hope, he will soon be restored to good health and resume his editorial office."

(b) "Unforeseen occurrences in the course of yesterday has prevented us from appearing, as we may say, before our readers in our editorial person. They will excuse us ....."

(c) "In consequence of the Editor's being laid up with the prevailing fever ..... (there is) the necessity of issuing today's number in its present incomplete form (i.e. without any editorial matter at all)."

2. *Calcutta Gazette*, March 5, 1818.
3. *Bengal Mail*, October 12, 1824.
4. *India Gazette*, July 28, 1824.
We have to ask the indulgence of our readers for the small quantity of editorial matter in to-day's paper. Illness having almost prevented our taking our pen in hand, we have unable to do more than add an item of news to the matter we already had in type.

Gradually the practice was coming into use that the Editors would accept contributions from outside for editorial columns of their paper. They would even publicly invite the same from their readers. This becomes evident from the following extract from the John Bull:

"When we first undertook the conduct of the John Bull we frequently received articles which were sent to us to insert at our pleasure editorially. We had no repugnance to the practice on any general principle, but in our own particular case, and situated as we then were, we felt it incumbent upon us to satisfy our Readers, that we had undertaken an office for which we were not altogether unqualified. We could only do this by refusing to insert any composition, but our own, editorially...... That object being now fully gained, by the length of time we have conducted the John Bull, we see no reason why we should any longer object to receiving such assistance which, we believe, is the constant practice at home. We shall therefore feel obliged to any of our friends, who may be disposed to indulge their pens on the passing occurrences of the day; we must of course be held at liberty to reject any communication for this purpose, which we can not strictly and conscientiously adopt...... For the length of time what we have edited the Bull, we presume ours......"

2. John Bull, July 31, 1833.
(principles) are well known and it is not, therefore, likely that any one would be disappointed. We, therefore, make it known to all when it may concern, that they are at perfect liberty now to speculate, as to whether or not the editorial articles are the productions of our pen, or of adoption."

This practice was not confined to the John Bull. It seems to have been common to others also. And, according to Mr. J.H. Stoqueler, "hence the alternate gravity and gaiety, of the Bull, — hence the mixture in the same column of almost interminable sentences and sententious periods, with occasional liveliness, and exceeding gravity: — hence also the smartness, decision, ease and vigour of two-thirds of the Harwar — the quaintness, humor, refinement, love of italics, quotations, foreign phrases ... of the remaining third."

The situation clearly called for a change and in the fifties we meet with Joint, Assistant and Sub-Editors with comparative frequency. This may be due to the change which had gradually come over the material structure of the Anglo-Indian papers. These were now to contain much more diversified Indian intelligence and proportionately lesser quantum of 'Selection' from the English and European papers and European intelligence which could be arranged more easily. We may cite a few such appointments as instances.

In 1861 we get Mr. Heatley, the erstwhile Editor of the

Eastern Star as the Joint-Editor of the Citizen. The association did not last long but the Editor of the Citizen then got an assistant Editor in February 1853 and it was advertised in that connection on behalf of the Editor, that "though he (the Editor) will still retain the lead, control and principal management of the paper, he would not wish to be identified as the author of every paragraph which may henceforth appear therein, some of which may perhaps have a hidden meaning or a personal bearing which may escape his perception at the time of their gaining admission into our columns."  

In June 1855, the Morning Chronicle engaged Rev. Mr. Moor as Sub-Editor. We also meet with two Sub-Editors of the Englishman, one of whom was Mr. MacDonald Stephenson and the other was Mr. P. Saunders who subsequently in January 1856 was entrusted with the editorial management of the Englishman. Jordan and Sullivan were then engaged as his Assistant Editors. Mr. G.R. Wilby acted as a Sub-Editor for the Friend of India.

1. Friend of India, February 13, 1851, p. 102.
2. Citizen, February 3, 1853.
3. Hindu Intelligencer, June 4, 1855.
6. Morning Chronicle, January 24, 1856.
What could be the pay for the incumbents of these offices — starting from the Editor downwards? The information on this point is very scanty. In the earlier period almost invariably the proprietors themselves were in the editorial charge for their papers and appropriated to themselves the surplus that remained after meeting the charge for printing and expenses of Establishment. In the contemporary records we do not get any mention of the quantum of this surplus. James Silk Buckingham, the proprietor-Editor of the Calcutta Journal, used to draw remuneration as Editor at a fixed percentage on this surplus and as such the total amount was subject to fluctuation. But we do not get the rate of percentage for this.

In a subsequent period, in the early thirties, we find the Editor of the Calcutta Courier had the monthly pay of eight hundred rupees. It is likely that besides acting as editor of the Calcutta Courier he had also to act as the superintendent of the Military Orphan Press which owned the Calcutta Courier. At that time the editor of the John Bull used to draw remuneration Rs. 500 p.m. In 1886 the Bengal Harball advertised for a

---

3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., p. 415.
Sub-Editor offering salary at "Co. Rs.300 and, under certain circumstances (not detailed out in the advertisement) 400 rupees per mensem." In 1839 the Military Orphan Society engaged a new editor (Capt. J.A. Currie) at a reduced salary of Rs.500/- per month. And in 1846, the Agra Paper, Mofussilite, advertised in the Calcutta Star for a Deputy Editor at rupees two hundred and fifty per mensem "which sum will be increased yearly, in proportion to his merits, till it reaches 500 rupees a month. House rent will also be found."

In the fifties, it so appeared, there was a comparative reduction in the rate of remuneration of all those who were engaged in the profession of the Press and in an article — The Indian Press — appearing in the Eastern Star we read:

"..... in every respect the prosperity of the Press had suffered a proportionate decadance (over the last 10 or 15 years). Then the regular employees on the staff of a newspaper were amply remunerated, and were not driven to the necessity of seeking extraneous means of support ..... now, in these degenerate days, editors' salaries are reduced to a fraction of what they once were ....."

This reduction was possibly an all India affair. Mr. McLaughlin, Editor of the Cawnpore Central Star, had to go to

1. Advertisement in the Bengal Harcarun, July 1, 1839.
the Court for his pay in consequence of a dispute with the proprietor. He had his salary judicially adjusted at Rs.200/- per month. In Calcutta the rate did not go down to such a low level. For, we learn that the *Morning Chronicle*, offered Mr. Moor Rs.200/- a month as Sub-Editor and used to pay Dr. P.J. O'Callaghan Rs.400/- per month as its editor.

John Newmarch of the *Citizen* gives however a rosy picture when he writes: "as to the complaint of the poor remuneration of the Editors ....... It is generally understood that the present Editor of the *Englishman* receives 1,000 rupees a month with free quarters. Nor does this rest en masse rumour; the post was offered to ourselves by the late Mr. Swinhoe at that rate."

But we are constrained to accept Mr. Newmarch with a grain of salt for the apparent inconsistency in his behaviour — that though he declined Mr. Swinhoe's offer with a remuneration of rupees one thousand he "commenced editing a daily paper (the *Citizen*) on Rs.450 rupees a month with board and lodging free" and "afterwards had 300 rupees a month for editing the *Eastern Star*."

2. News Item dt.28,5,1855; *Hindu Intelligencer*, June 4, 1855.
5. Ibid.
Towards the end of 1851 we find the Bombay Times incidentally assessing the real income of the Editors of Anglo-Indian Journals. According to it the pay of such an editor even at the "marvellous" sum of £ 700 to £ 1200 per annum would in fact be lesser in terms of utility and comfort than which "the poor editors of provincial papers (such as the Kielshire Journal) secure at home — seldom amounting to £ 200 a year." For, the latter would add to it "literary or other earnings not incompatible with his editorial duties." Then, "he is in his own country, with a climate suited to his constitution; he lives in the midst of kindred and of friends, and is surrounded by those of occupations and disposition congenial to his own." But his counterpart in India "has a constant battle to fight with climate" and "sickness will in a few years for a time separate a married man from his family." Moreover, the "interchange of sympathy, congeniality of feeling, and community of pursuit, which give the grand charm to existence, to the intellectual man in India is a dream."

This reduction in remuneration was to some extent compensated by the enhancement of social prestige of the editors. It was now being held that the services of an editor had a high degree of social utility. We may cite the following extract from a correspondence on the subject from the Morning Chronicle in October 1851 as reflecting the current opinion on the point:

1. Bombay Times, November 18, 1851, extracted in the Morning Chronicle, November 20, 1851.
2. Morning Chronicle, October 24, 1851.
"It is clear that an Editor's duty to the public is not performed when he has secured priority of intelligence or written able articles on the question of the hour. He owes it to be public that the general tone of his journal should be moral; that neither from carelessness nor design it should be an engine of mischief; he owes it to be public that he should preserve a character in keeping with such tone. If it were true that the question of character in an Editor was of no moment, it is difficult to see how it could be held important in any other pursuit. Why should the priest be religious, the lawyer honest, the physician moral? All indeed is the influence either of these could exercise compared with the man who has a press at his command."

Naturally the question that arises in this context is, what was the accepted notion of required qualifications for a successful editor of an Anglo-Indian paper of the time? Very rarely was there any advertisement for candidates for an editorial chair which might have laid down a list of required qualifications. In the advertisement that we get in the Calcutta Star of 1846, for the Agra Chronicle, the proprietor did not spell out the qualifications that he would prefer but the candidates were "requested to address themselves with references and testimonials." In the advertisement in the Morning Chronicle in 1851, for an Editor for a Weekly paper the candidate for the post was simply required to be of "unexceptionable character". In the

1. Calcutta Star, June 6, 1846; Advertisement.
2. Morning Chronicle, October 27, 1851, Advertisement.
Bengal Hakarny's advertisement for a Sub-Editor in 1840 it was mentioned as duties and qualifications — "daily attendance, ability to make Selections from English and other newspapers; to arrange *for Press, reports of public meetings and generally assist the Editor in his labours. Active and systematic habits are essentials for the performance of these duties."

In the later years of our period occasionally we get the editors discussing amongst themselves the qualifications necessary for successfully conducting a journal. Thus the Editor of the Calcutta Star (then 'Mr. James Hume, a man of success in the profession) in an editorial wrote: "..... a mere literary man was likely to make a very inefficient Editor. Certain it is that many of the qualifications required in an Editor are precisely those than are ordinarily wanting in Literary men — knowledge of the world, activity, and industry. The style of the Novelist or Romance Writer is not that adapted to the columns of a daily paper. What is required is the power of condensation and the will to do it ....." In another context the Calcutta Star wrote in an editorial in May, 1846: "Our Editors (of the Anglo-Indian journals) are for the most part at home on the subjects they handle; some are deeply versed in the history of the people and the country in which they live — its capabilities and its wants ....."

The qualifications necessary for a successful editor in

1. *Bengal Hakarny, July 1, 1846; Advertisement.*
2. *Calcutta Star, January 22, 1846.*
India became the topic of long discussions in some of the leading Indian papers (viz. the Bengal Harkarn, the Morning Chronicle, the Bombay Times, the Bombay Gazette, the Bombay Telegraph and Courier and the Madras Atheneaum) during the months of October to December 1851. The discussion arose over the failure of the "Imported Editors" (the term was applied to mean the gentlemen who came to India on appointment to editorial chairs, solely to conduct news papers). Such gentlemen were, as we get from the editorial articles in the Bombay Times, September 11, 1851 and November 15, 1851 extracted in the Calcutta Star, September 23 and November 28, 1851, Mr. Reed and Mr. Bruce of the Madras Atheneaum, Mr. Burr and Mr. Glover of the Madras Spectator, Mr. T. Holcroft of the Bombay Telegraph & Courier and Mr. McKenna of the Bombay Times). And in this connection the Morning Chronicle wrote editorially on the qualifications for the editorial chair:

"There is no room for fine writing, classics, and profound learning in the columns of a daily paper in any country, and least of all in this. The great desiderata in an Indian daily paper are, news early and diversified; clear, rational and sensible exposition and view of local matters and of the affairs of the Government Services, the public interests and wishes, and the different departments of the administration."

The character of the man, both private and public, occupying the editorial chair was also an item for consideration as qualification — an essential item. 

1. Morning Chronicle, November 28, 1851.
one, dispense with a pure and unblemished name for him who undertakes to guide the public mind, direct the thoughts and opinions of the multitude, and adjudicate upon social and political questions, and decide upon points of principle, honor and morality?" — commented the Morning Chronicle editorially (Mr. J.H. Love who was then holding the editorial charge of the paper). We also get an advertisement from the proprietor of a Weekly who wanted an editor for his paper who must be a man "of unexceptionable character".

A native gentleman (a reader of English newspapers) also gave out his conception of the Editor's qualification in a letter to the Editor of the Hindu Intelligencer:

"Truthfulness and liberality of opinion ought to be reckoned among the most requisite qualities of a public journalist. An Editor without these qualities is looked upon by the public as a reporter of falsities and a dealer in fiction, unworthy of the high rank which he holds in the social circle. He who allows the instigations of his spite and calumny to acquire an ascendancy over the dictates of reason and humanity, forfeits his public credit as a just punishment for his unreasonable prejudices against a particular party."

Considering the long list of failures in India we may agree with the editor of the Citizen who wrote that "Editorship

1. Ibid., October 24, 1851.
2. Ibid., October 27, 1851, Advertisement.
3. Hindu Intelligencer, January 16, 1854."
in India was "almost the only profession in the East where success depends on ability" and that the "more eminent members" of the order such as James Silk Buckingham (of the Calcutta Journal), James Sutherland (of the Bengal Harbou), Dr. John Grant (of the India Gazette), Rev. James Bryce (of the Asiatic Mirror and the John Bull), J.H. Stoqueler (of the Englishman) and J.C. Marshman (of the Friend of India) "may claim a position as to intellect and attainment second to those of none in the land - superior most assuredly to a vast proportion of those who have risen to the rank of the governing classes by interest or seniority in the Service."

The Editors occasionally had also to face hazards of personal violence for conscientious performance of their duties. We may cite a few glaring cases:

First, the case of James Silk Buckingham of the Calcutta Journal. In the Calcutta Journal for September 30, 1819 appeared the "proceedings of the General Vestry Meeting of Inhabitants of Calcutta, assembled at the Town Hall on the 22nd September, 1819."

And in the Calcutta Journal, October 2, 1819 came out the following:

3. Ibid., October 2, 1819, pp. 247.
"Assault Extraordinary: On the evening of Thursday last, when the Course was crowded, the Editor of this Journal was taking an airing in his buggy with a friend. The young person who had distinguished himself at the Meeting at the Town Hall, by advocating the cause of the Select Vestry, and whose speech was reported happened to pass by on horse-back at the time, nothing peculiar was remarked in his appearance. Immediately after passing the buggy which was proceeding at a slow pace, the young man on horse-back suddenly wheeled round, exclaiming 'Your name is Buckingham, I believe' and coming up behind him struck him with a hard-whip.

The blow was instantly returned by Mr. Buckingham with severe cuts from the buggy-whip laid on with such affect as to induce the assaulter to drop behind, after which he said 'My name is Darwell'.

A second attack was apparently contemplated by Mr. Darwell, who again advanced from behind but the parties being now more guarded, invited his nearer approach. Mr. Buckingham, 'Do you wish anything further, if you do I'll give it to you'. To this Mr. Darwell made no reply. The parties in the buggy continued the usual drive. Mr. Darwell was not seen again.

The second instance also concerned the Editor of the Calcutta Journal, Mr. Buckingham, who thus related the case:

1. Reply to Question No. 613, of the examination of James Silk Buckingham on July 1, 1834, before the Select Committee on the Suppression of the Calcutta Journal. Parliamentary Paper, House of Commons, 1834, Vol. 6, paper 601, p. 64.
"... an individual, Dr. Jamieson, ... received from the Indian Government an appointment as superintendent of the school for native doctors; and as the same individual already held no less than six different appointments each of them sufficient to occupy the time and attention of any one man, I wrote in the Calcutta Journal an article tending to show, that even admitting Dr. Jamieson to be the most clever and the most meritorious man in the world, still, as he could not by any process expand 24 hours into 48, the mere impossibility of his commanding sufficient time to perform the duties of his new office without neglecting those of his old ones, ought to be deemed a valid objection against his being confirmed in it."

Dr. Jamieson took mortal offence at this and challenged Mr. Buckingham to a duel, which fortunately ended without any injury to any one.

The third incident of our citation relates to Mr. John Newmarch, editor of the Citizen, in the early fifties. We thus get it from the pen of Mr. Newmarch: "On Wednesday (14.7.1852) morning Mr. Edmund Onslow rushed into my office, where I was busy pursuing some law papers; and, before I had time to rise from my chair, gave me a single cut over the shoulders with a horse-whip". The employees then in the office came and thrashed Mr. Onslow.

The case went up to the police and dragged on disadvantageously for Mr. Newmarch.

2. Citizen, July, 16, 1852.
3. Citizen, July 17, 1852.
The reason for this assault was thus given out by Mr. Newmarch: Capt. Onslow insulted Baboo Peary Chand Mittra, the then Librarian of the Calcutta Public Library. Mr. Newmarch took side with Baboo Peary Chand and wrote in his paper vindicating him against Capt. Onslow which enraged the latter and goaded him to this act of violence.

Fourthly, the following notice of caution given out by the Madras Examiner for the Editors in India also highlights the issue:

"We advise all Indian editors to keep a sharp look out, when they happen to be in the neighbourhood of Chandernagore or Pondicherry. By a recent law, all persons, foreigners or otherwise, who in their own countries commit acts which in France would incur punishment, may be punished when found in French territory. The Indian papers have frequently published opinions about Louis Napoleon which in France would have exposed them to punishment. Ergo, if any of them go to Chandernagore they may be seized, tried, and imprisoned, unless the Government chooses to risk a war for their liberation."

Finally, we can take note of the following notice in the Hindu Patriot in March 1857:

"Another correspondent reports an instance of an editor of a native paper having been imprisoned on a charge of adultery trumped up by a Magistrate in revenge for the publication of some truths unpalatable to the official."

1. Citizen, July 17, 1852.
2. Madras Examiner, August 17, 1852.
3. Hindoo Patriot, March 5, 1857, p. 73.
In a newspaper Establishment in our period next to the editor stood the (Head) Printer with his contingent of the subordinate Printers or Compositors. From J.H. Stocqueler, the editor of the John Bull and then of the Englishman, we come across the following pen-picture of the Head Printer with his body of Printers or Compositors in action in a newspaper establishment:

"The Editor of a paper on reaching his office, calls his head printer and delivers to him such manuscript, or extracts from other papers and periodicals, as are to constitute the contents of his journal for the day following. The (head) printer then distributes this matter, or copy, as it is technically called, to the different compositors, and each is expected to set up about a column, or something less, forming a sufficiency to fill what is called a galley—a narrow brass or copper slap, with a raised wooden edge, occupying three sides, to prevent the type from falling out. While in this form impressions are taken off on slips of paper sufficiently broad to admit of the introduction of alterations or notices of errata, and the galley proof, as such impressions are termed, is then delivered to an individual, designated a reader, to examine and correct. This duty is performed, or at least superintended, in most offices, by the Head Printer. The galley proofs being examined they are collected together late in the evening, when there appears no

The probability of more news, correspondence, or advertisements reaching the office. The greater part of the compositors being at that time dismissed, the Editor or his deputy, proceeds to select such portion of the matter thus composed (or possibly the whole) as it is important should appear in the paper of the following day, and indicates the order in which it is to be arrayed. From this, the subordinate printer proceeds to make up, by dividing the galley into columns and placing them in consecutive order, four on a frame, so as to form a page of the paper. When the four pages are thus arranged -- a business in which the pressmen assist -- they are placed two and two on a flat stone belonging to the press which were locked up in an iron frame, the pressmen proceed to cover them with ink by means of balls composed of sheep skins and filled with cotton or coarse wool (...... at some of the presses, patent rollers are employed for this purpose). A proof impression of the pages is then taken off and they are again carefully read by the head Printer and the Editor, after which the printing of the whole impression commences. Two presses are simultaneously employed in this work, and three pressmen to each. One Press strikes off pages 1 and 4 and the sheet is then transferred to the other where pages 2 and 3 are printed. One pressman at each press is engaged in laying the paper on the frisket or upper frame, another in drawing it under the weight and producing the pressure, while the third, the devil, stands by with his ball to supply the type with fresh layers of ink. In this way the work proceeds until the whole town edition is struck off and delivered to the peon in charge for the night. The dock edition is generally kept open until about three o'clock in the afternoon when articles of news which may have reached the Editor since the
morning issue are inserted, and the printing commences, concluding by a quarter or half past four, so as to enable the peons to fold up and envelope the copies for dawk before the Post Office hour of reception (5 P.M.) has expired.

The Head Printer of a large newspaper Establishment would be "generally an experienced European" but not always, as we come across the advertisement in the Bengal Harbaru for one for its own Establishment: — "if educated in England, Scotland, or America it would be a recommendation, but no objection would be made to an experienced country Printer."

The volume of business and the extent of supervision that a Head Printer had to attend would become evident from the following advertisement inserted in the Bengal Harbaru for one for its own establishment:

"Wanted a Printer, who is able to manage the business of an extensive Printing Establishment where a Daily and a Weekly Newspaper and several Periodicals, besides other Book and Job Work are constantly in hand."

"He will be required to keep from 80 to 100 compositors at constant work, upon about 10,000 lbs. of Type."

"He will be held responsible by the Proprietors for the whole office and will be allowed a Foreman to each Department of it X X X X.

1. Ibid., p. 424.
2. Bengal Harbaru, May 24, 1835, Advertisement.
3. Ibid.
Besides the superintendence over the subordinate printers and compositors the Head Printer was often entrusted with various other works. Thus Mr. John Caw of the Bengal Establishment was entrusted to receive the advertisements and to attend the directions respecting them. Then, often the Head Printer had to supervise delivery of the paper to the subscribers. Thus we get occasional notices in the Calcutta Gazette (e.g., in the issue of January 3, 1788 and in the subsequent issues for a time), the Calcutta Chronicle (e.g., in the issue of January 31, 1792 and the subsequent issues for a time), and the Asiatic Mirror (e.g., in the issue of May 22, 1793) requesting the subscribers to communicate their change of address to the Printer who would pay attention to such requests and arrange to transmit the paper accordingly. The Weekly Examiner notified for its subscribers — "Notwithstanding the utmost precaution and exertion, we are afraid some blunders will occur in the distribution by the Peons and we request that any discrepancy may immediately be brought to the notice of the Printer, who will effect instant redress and take means to ensure future regularity". Such was also the case with the Morning Chronicle — "We have secured the services of an able professional Printer, who will superintend the whole Establishment, and attend to the typographical accuracy of our

1. Bengal Gazette, July 1st, 1829.
2. Weekly Examiner extracted in the Friend of India, March 19, 1840, p. 185.
paper, as well as its regular and punctual delivery to subscribers". In the John Bull (subsequently the Englishman) Establishment the Head Printer combined in him the functions of the Reporter (though there were some other Reporters who were only on contingent employment) and also of the Publisher to the paper. In the earlier period when the Editor could hardly get a Deputy or an Assistant, the Head Printer had to provide him the relief in case of sudden exigencies. Thus "the Editor's being laid up with the prevailing fever, the (Head) Printer of the India Gazette is under the necessity of issuing to-day's number .......". It would thus appear that head printer besides his specific duties had often to do the work of circulation manager, reporter, etc., of a modern journal.

We have no definite information as to the pay of a Head Printer in many a newspaper Establishments of the time. In a monthly account of disbursements in the John Bull Establishment we get an item of expenditure of Rs.300/- against "Head Printer and Reporters" (number of Reporters not indicated). Probably

1. Morning Chronicle, February 28, 1858, extracted in the Citizen, February 24, 1858.


3. India Gazette, July 23, 1894.

the Head Printer and the Reporter (the Chief Reporter, the other Reporters being only on contingent employment) shared most of this sum of Rs. 300/-. The "liberal salary" which the Head Printer in the Bengal Harfara Establishment used to get (along with "a comfortable apartment on the Premises" if "a single man") was possibly not much above this and definitely much below Rs. 500/-. For, Mr. John Gray, the Head Printer of the Bengal Harfara Press applied for the post of the Superintendent of the Military Orphan Press in Calcutta, carrying a salary of Rs. 500/- per mensem and a house to live in. However, Mr. Carbery, of the Englishman was selected for the post as a "first rate Printer in England would not come over to India for being appointed on a salary" like that.

\[
\text{\textit{Compositors}}
\]

Next to the Head Printer came the subordinate printers or the compositors in a newspaper Establishment. In the Bengal Harfara Establishment in 1825 there were as many as 30 to 100 of them and in the John Bull Establishment in 1839 there were

1. Bengal Harfara, May 24, 1825, Advertisement.
3. Ibid, October 9, 1851.
4. Ibid.
5. Bengal Harfara, May 24, 1825, Advertisement.
no less than 31; of these 16 for the John Bull (a Daily), 5 for the Oriental Observer (a Weekly) and 10 for the Sporting Magazine and the United Service Journal (monthlies) with a circulation of 336, 230, 270 and 180 copies respectively.

It would appear that the rate of payment for the compositors for a daily newspaper was higher than the same for a Weekly or Monthly. Thus the compositors for the John Bull were paid at the rate of about Rs.27/- per man-sen (16 compositors were paid Rs.435/- per month) while the rate for the others was Rs.14/- per month (5 compositors for the Oriental Observer were paid Rs.70/- per month and 10 for the Sporting Magazine and the United Service Journal Rs.147/- per month).

The compositors were mostly "Portuguese of the country (i.e., Indo-Portuguese in origin) and Hindoos" but seldom native Christian. The Hindu compositors could not read English at all but acquired "surprising expertness" in their work. The Calcutta Review, No. III, October 1888, p. 415.


2. Ibid, p. 423.


4. Reply to Question No.1120 of the examination of James Sutherland on March 16, 1839, before the Select Committee on the Affairs in India; Parliamentary Paper, House of Commons, 1831-32, Vol. 9, Paper 735 I, p. 126.

5. Reply to Question of 1133, ibid.
Journal used to keep the entire Establishment closed on Christmas Day and Good Friday to allow the compositors "who are chiefly Christians of the Catholic Communion ..... an exception from labour, on the great festival of their Church." The Dacca Harbarn also used to do the same occasionally to allow them "to conmemorate in remembrance of the Nativity of our Beloved Saviour." In the same way, during the "Hindoo Holidays" (Doorga Puja) the Reformer had to admit "absence of a part of our establishment."

It so appears that gradually the native Hindoo compositors outnumbered the Christians. This possibly is borne out by the notices of the Doorga Puja holidays in the Friend of India.

In 1830 we get in the column of the Weekly Epitome of News in the Friend of India bearing the date as October 135:

"This is the first day of the holidays, which will this year extend to next Wednesday week ..... Calcutta is out of town; nobody left but the druggists and the editorial drudges." (It is supposed that the Printing Establishment of the Friend of India was open.)

2. Ibid, April 21, 1821, p. 612.
3. "Compositors Petition to the Editor of the Dacca Harbarn"
   in the Dacca Harbarn, December 27, 1824.
4. Reformer, October 20, 1833.
5. Friend of India, October 17, 1833, p. 661.
Years later, in 1845, we get:

"We must again make our annual apology to our subscribers for the paucity of editorial remarks in the present number. The compositors in the office, who are almost to a man Hindoos, look for the indulgence of a holiday at the present season of the year, and we have too strong a fellow feeling with them, to disappoint their expectations ...."  

Then, we get from the *Calcutta Christian Advocate*:

"We have to apologise for the small quantity of editorial this week. It is not our fault but that of the Durga Puja. All our Hindoo compositors have gone to worship .... Madame Durga."

Mr. James Hume, Proprietor-Editor of the *Calcutta Star* was not satisfied with the performance of his native (Hindoo) compositors but nonetheless could not dispense with them as would appear from the following observation:

"We need scarcely apologise to our readers for a deficiency of Editorial matter on the day after Christmas. Were an Editor disposed to take no holiday himself, he must allow at least one day in the year to his Christian establishment, and native compositors make a sorry work of manuscript copy."

Mr. Hume could not dispense with the native compositors. May be they were either comparatively cheaper in remuneration or the Indo-Portuguese compositors were limited in number.

It needs to be mentioned that the performance of the compositors as a whole was not rated high in London and this we get in the *Asiatic Journal*, a London publication:

"The gross mechanical inaccuracies, conspicuous in those papers (Anglo-Indian periodicals), constitute a very serious drawback upon their value. The source of these errors is the ignorance of workmen; and from this very circumstance it necessarily happens that the most elaborate and recondite articles, in fact those in which accuracy is most desirable, abound with the greatest number of typographical mistakes .... These occurrences show a remarkable deficiency of good compositors in India; and they are perhaps attributable, in a certain degree, to a relaxation of vigilance on the part of the editors."

In the columns of the contemporary newspapers some stray references are available which would go to show that the printers and the compositors as a unit of labour force became self-conscious of their united strength in advance of the other units. We may cite the following instances on this point:

First, we have on record the following notice in an extra issue of the Calcutta Gazette in March 1816:

"The Proprietors of the Calcutta Gazette are, by the pressure of circumstances of an unforeseen and unavoidable nature, compelled to acknowledge their inability to publish ..... the important intelligence received by the Orient from Europe. This accident has arisen from a great number of the hands, employed by them, having in consequence of the carrying into effect of some necessary curtailments in the expenses.

1. The Calcutta Gazette, extra issue dated March 8, 1816.

2. Possibly, this curtailment became necessary due to the fact that since the publication of the Government Gazette, since contd .......
of the establishment, suddenly embraced the resolu-
tion of striking work. The Proprietors of the
Gazette, whilst craving the indulgence of the
Public towards this unprecedented and very un-
pleasant dilemma, trust that it will be of no
long continuance...."

Secondly, there is also in evidence an address from the
compositors of the Bengal Harbarn Establishment to the Editor-
proprietor of that paper throwing light on the issue (The back-
ground story may thus be related. Mr. J. Stoqueller of the
Englishman by application to the Government got an order on the
General Post Office that whenever the overland European mail
might reach the Post Office the packets of newspapers addressed
to the editors should at once be delivered to their men. It
would enable the editors to print the chief heads of intelli-
gence from those in the papers for the next day which would save
then the troubles and expenses of Extra issues. Approaching
that this would be disadvantageous to the compositors the
latter submitted the address):  

June 1815, the Calcutta Gazette lost the sole right of pub-
lication of the Government Notifications and Sheriff's Sale
Notices involving a considerable income.

1. This would be gleaned from (a) letter of Mr. J.H. Stoqueller
of the Englishman to Mr. S. Smith of the Bengal Harbarn dated
October 7, 1839, (b) letter of Mr. H.T. Prinsep, Secretary to
the Government dated October 2, 1839 to Mr. Stoqueller, (c)
letter of Mr. S. Smith to Mr. Stoqueller dated October 7, 1839;
(d) Editorial in the Englishman dated October 2, 1839 — all
these republished in the Bengal Harbarn, October 2, 1839.
"Compositor's Appeal

"To the Editor of the Bengal Harilal,

"Honoured Sir — The Editor of the Englishman, pampered by the success which has attended his endeavours, which, but for the unremitting exertions of his Compositors, would have proved abortive now, with a characteristic disregard for the feelings and sufferings of those very men, to whose industry he is so much indebted, surreptitiously obtained the sanction of the Government to a measure, which will bear on them and on us, with peculiar hardship. Under the spurious plea of saving the Compositors' extra labour; but, no doubt, to save himself the expenses of issuing an extra — this conscientious Editor has actually resolved on making his hard worked and ill-paid men starve away their very existence, by trying to force on them, as a reward for their assistance, much additional labour. If we were sure, Sir, of the hour in which any Overland Mail would reach the post office, nothing would be better than the arrangement proposed by Mr. Stoogeler — But the uncertainty of the Mail's arrival, would entail on us the necessity of setting up enough matter to fill the paper, in the event of the Mail disappointing us; and, very probably, when we had, about midnight, finished our paper, or retired to our homes, the Mail would come in, and thus force us back from our domiciles and keep us engaged for the remainder of the night, and until, at least, 8 O'clock the next morning. In a couple of hours afterwards we would have again to attend, to set to work with the paper for the following day, and this would, in itself, be considerably harder work than the present system of issuing extras compel us to endure; but how immeasurably greater will be our fatigue and pain, if we have to keep up for two, three, four or six nights consecutively, in expectation of the Mail, — which is not unlikely, for it has always been more than a week later in coming, than has been expected!!
We, Sir, would find impossible, not having the power of endurance of a Steam-engine, to go through such labour; and we think, that the man who would try to make us undergo it, unless compelled to do so, would be, AT THE BEST, MOST UN-FEELING. Of course, Sir, while Mr. Stoogueler can obtain the despatches at any time at night, and harass his men to death by working at extras, we can not expect otherwise, than that you must endeavour to make us work as hard likewise; and we therefore through you, beg most humbly to appeal to Government, whose consent Mr. Stoogueler has fraudulently obtained to the measure against which we complain, to disallow it, and not permit any mails to be opened, or their contents issued after gun-fire at night, and before daylight, or 5 O'clock in the morning.

To Mr. Stoogueler's compositors we would say a word or two. Let not a few paltry rupees induce you to sell that precious boon you possess — your invaluable health. When racked with disease, or disabled by your exertions, Mr. Stoogueler will neither feed nor clothe you, however he may take advantage of your present ability to serve. Give to your employer all the labour he can in reason expect from you for your remuneration, and more too; but let no unjust and unreasonable being, screw from you, as it were, your heart's blood, drop by drop.

"We entreat of you, Mr. Smith, to second us in our appeal, if to you it should appear reasonable. The Compositors of the Bengal Harikarn Press. 8th October, 1833."

The above address dated October 8, 1833, is comparable in spirit of humility and tone of submissiveness with another dated December 22, 1824, by the Compositors of the same Establishment, praying for a day's leave on Christmas Day. This

1. Printed in the Bengal Harikarn, December 27, 1834.
we quote below:-

"Compositor's petition:

"To The Editor of the Bengal Monitor,

"Respected Sir, We your most obedient servants, beg to remind your honour that on Saturday next being Christmas Day, a day which we ought to commemorate in remembrance of the Nativity of our Beloved Saviour as a tribute of our love. It is not our wish to displease you nor see you should any way sustain a loss, but we could justly leave this to your serious consideration that by some means or other we may obtain a general permission to attend Church and spend the Christmas with our family. The Compositors of the News Department, dated 22 December, 1824."

The address dated October 8, 1839 might have been tacitly encouraged by Mr. S. Smith who also disfavoured the arrangement proposed by Mr. J.H. Stegqueler (may be out of offended vanity at the success of a professional rival) but nonetheless the difference between the "Appeal" and "Petition" is distinctly noticeable.

The third instance is perhaps more striking as it would appear from the following Extract from the Indian Standard (quoted in the Citizen):

"Our Readers and Subscribers by referring to the bottom of our last page, will find that our printer's name is changed. Last week increased wages were demanded and refused; and
all our hands struck work. They only punished themselves, as they got dismissed in consequence.

Unfortunately further particulars regarding this interesting human drama are missing in the contemporary papers.

---

Pressmen and Harcarahs (Delivery Peons)

Next to the Compositors came the Pressmen and the Harcarahs or the Delivery Peons — both belonging to the rank of unskilled labour and as such poorly paid. In the John Bull Printing Establishment there were 13 Pressmen who were paid a total amount of Rs.83/- as remuneration, per month. Theirs was the manual labour mainly for running the Press and we have earlier described them on their duties along with Head Printer.

The Harcarahs were also poorly paid. In the same Establishment of the John Bull there were seven of them and the total charge for them was only Rs.44/- per month. But their role was by no means unimportant. They served as the primary link between the management and the subscribers. A brief note of

2. Discussions on pp. 48-49 in this chapter.
any newspaper Establishment depended at least partly on them. Timely and punctual delivery of papers to the subscribers was an object to be aimed at by the proprietors and insisted upon by the subscribers even in those days. For most of the subscribers (excepting those who resided at a distance and got their copies by post) timely delivery of paper depended exclusively on the Hurcarahs.

Originally service of the Hurcarahs appears to have been confined to the city of Calcutta. In 1852 Government established daily dawn to be carried between Hooghly and Calcutta touching the Settlements at Chandernagore, Barrackpore etc., starting from Hooghly very night at 9 O'clock and reaching Calcutta the ensuing morning. Gradually the newspaper Hurcarahs were also introduced along this route for daily despatch of paper upto Chinsurah.

The services of these Hurcarahs were not always unto satisfaction of the Management regarding punctuality in delivery and often we come across such notices — "Gentlemen in Calcutta... to whom the Peons may not deliver the Paper in due time, are requested to send Notice."

The following two notices from the Bengal Directory in 1825 would give us an idea of the problem which the management had to face on account of the Hurcarahs and the various steps taken to grapple with it.

1. Notification in the Calcutta Gazette, June 24, 1832.
2. Asiatic Mirror, December 20, 1797.
(A) "The Bengal Harivar is or ought to be delivered every morning at 8 O'clock in Calcutta and at nearly the same hour in the Suburbs at Dacca, Dum and Barrackpore, as papers for the most distant subscribers are first despatched. A list of the Peons and the hours at which the paper ought to be delivered everywhere within the limits we have fixed for distribution by our Peons shall be speedily published. The hour of publication shall in future be invariably stated in a notice in the Editorial Column, to enable our readers to know whether the delay, if any, is occasioned by late publication or from the negligence of the Peons in delivery."

"Since the next issue of the Bengal Harivar, on May 20, 1825, and for a long time thereafter appeared a notice indicating the time of publication and delivery to the Harivaraha. It was placed just at the top of the editorial column. The notice in the issue dated May 20, 1825:

"The Bengal Harivar of this morning sent to Press at 8 O'clock. The publication for despatch to Cossipore, Dacca, Dum, Barrackpore, Serampore, Chandernagore, Chinsurah and Hooghly commenced at 8 O'clock and the Environ and in Calcutta at 5 O'clock."

(B) "By the kindness of some of our subscribers it has been brought to our notice that the Bengal Harivar are not frequently delivered in Calcutta and its adjacencies at such an early hour as our arrangements are calculated to effect. We have adopted every measure which appeared to us likely to insure its early delivery."

1. Bengal Harivar, May 19, 1825.

2. Ibid, May 20, 1825.
delivery and it is only of late that we have discovered the cause of those measures still being, at times, ineffectual. We have found, that the peons are in the lavish habits of selling the 'Harilmu' to those who are mean enough to procure in this fertile way what they either will not or can not procure in the regular one. We are likewise pretty well informed that some people, in the suburb and foreign settlements abusively obtain the daily perusal of a subscriber's paper, which bears evident marks, as we hear, of having been previously read. Among other methods of prevention of those infamous practices, we some months ago gave the Office Peons a 'livery green edged with red and square Chupress, upon which is engraved the 'Harilmu Library and Peon' in English, Persian and Bengalee. The Peon's number is also conspicuously placed in the centre of the plate, and he is directed never to appear without that. We have likewise printed cards which ought to be presented by the Peons to the subscribers out of Calcutta, every Monday morning, for the signature of such subscribers in the environs as will take the trouble to signify upon them the hour at which they received the paper during the preceding week. Our Peons are stationed at the following places. Two (Nos. 26 and 27), at the Shorah Bazar, near Cossipore, to whom the papers are forwarded from the office, so as to reach them by 4 to 5 O'clock every morning when No. 26 proceeds to Dullgauchea where he ought to deliver at six, Dum Dum at seven and Cossijpore at eight O'clock. No. 27 ought to deliver at Benhooghly at six O'clock, making over the bags for advance to the Peons stationed there. No. 28 stationed at Benhooghly should deliver at Hingarh at seven O'clock and in the like manner make over the bags to the Peon stationed there.
Nos. 29 and 30 are posted at Titagarh. The former proceeds to and deliver at Ichapore and Serampore as the tide permits, at seven or 8 O'clock. No. 30 proceeds to and deliver at Barrackpore at half past 7 and Hauh Ghat at nine O'clock where he makes over the bags to Nos. 31 and 32 stationed there, who forthwith proceeds to and ought to deliver at Chandernagore at half past ten, Chinsurah at 12 and at Hooghly at half past one O'clock.

"The above are the hours which the Peons themselves have fixed and at which they assure us they regularly deliver the papers although we have no doubt they generally deliver them much later . . . . To our contemporaries likewise some of the foregoing remarks may prove beneficial and induce them to join us in eradicating a system which is alike injurious to their interests and to ours. They will be surprised to hear that we have heard and firmly believe to be true, that arrangements are made between the Peons of the different Houses, by which one Peon . . . . delivers on certain occasions, and in certain places, all the papers, although each office, we are aware keeps an ample establishment for this single duty."

The dissatisfaction over irregular and delayed delivery persisted all along our period. In 1846 we get the Calcutta Star crying out in despair — "We know enough of our own

1. Bengal Naskar, 10, 30, 1825.
2. Calcutta Star, September 26, 1846, extracted in the Friend of India, October 1, 1846 under "Contemporary Selections", p. 631
peons, and we dare say — our Contemporaries can say the same — to be able to understand the difficulties, almost insuperable which stand in the way of regular delivery ..." Then, in 1849 we get the Hindu Intelligencer to notify for subscribers that they would "be pleased to intimate any irregularity in the delivery of this paper."

In 1857 the Dacca News (a paper published in the Presidency of Bengal) opened up counter-delivery to solve the problem of irregular and delayed delivery by the peons:

"Parties who wish to send their own servants for the Dacca News on the morning of publication, are requested to send their name for registration at the office. Those who are not registered must wait till the delivery peons go round ..."

"... ooo ...

Reporters

In our period the newspaper Reporters had no very respectable standing in the Establishment. This, according to Mr. J.R. Stocqueler was so, first because "public deliberations are as yet too rare and unimportant in Calcutta to furnish such

1. Hindu Intelligencer, January 22, 1849.
constant employment to reporters as to induce them by perseverence, or enable them by practice, to attain to any great perfection"; and secondly, in the affairs of the natives "we have not yet learnt to take any very great interest."

Further, from Stooguler we learn that there were then two methods of payment for a Reporter — either to give him a small salary and to allow him to "occasionally employing himself otherwise" (i.e., to engage him on a part-time basis) or to remunerate him so much per line in type, which "yields in a general way, about 180 rupees per mensem." We have already seen that the Head Printer in the John Bull Establishment also acted as the Reporter. In the same way Mr. S. Arnot was engaged by Mr. James Silk Buckingham in the Calcutta Journal Establishment (a) to make report of the proceedings in the Supreme Court, (b) to write essays for the Journal and (c) to correct matters for the press (proof reading) at a monthly salary amounting to Rs. 300 to Rs. 250. In 1839 the Military

2. Ibid.
3. Discussion on p. 52.
5. Ibid, reply to Question No. 211, p. 11.
Orphan Society engaged a Reporter (probably a part-time hand) for the Calcutta Courier on a monthly payment of rupees fifty only.

The situation might have improved for the Reporters towards the close of our period — when the Anglo-Indian papers had to allow larger coverage for the affairs of the natives. But we have no definite information on this point.

-- 000 --

Newspaper Proprietors

It is a pertinent question for us to probe — who were the proprietors of the newspapers in this period? The answer that we get in a general way is that prior to the order of the Court of Directors, Notified in Calcutta in 1823, prohibiting relation of their servants with the Press, most or at least many of these were under the proprietorship of the servants of the Company. We have very meagre direct information on this point. But the circumstantial evidence goes to support this contention.

In 1825, the Court of Directors ordered prohibition on the association of their servants with the Press (except

1. Friend of India, February 28, 1823, p. 133.
periodical works of literary and scientific nature) on pain 
even of dismissal from service. But a long period of 6 months 
had to be granted for its implementation so that their servants 
could get back the full amount of their investment. The order 
must have concerned many of their servants, definitely for a 
considerable sum. The Calcutta papers editorially recommended 
either the extension of this period further so that the short-
ness of the period did not compel under-selling or exclusion 
of certain sections from the operation of this order. Thus the 
Bengal Harhkaru wrote, "when it is publicly known that they 
not must sell their property — at any sacrifice within so short a 
period, who will give them their price for it" and the Columbian 
Press Gazette observed: "The Civil Surgeons of the Company are 
notoriously poor paid, and it is with a view to make up for 
this, that they have been permitted to trade ...... it is not 
hard that they should thus suddenly without any offence be 
visited with a withdrawal of a source of income, that of their 
editorial salary, on which they had been accustomed for years 
past ......"

The servants of the Company possibly turned to the 
Press for investment of their savings with the expectation 
of good return both in money and prestige.

1. Ibid.
2. Bengal Harhkaru, May 24, 1886.
3. Columbian Press Gazette, quoted in the Bengal Harhkaru, 
May 24, 1886.
The association of the servants of the Company with the Press prior to the Charter Act of 1813 was possibly a necessity. The arrivals in India from Europe was then strictly restricted by the East India Company in the interest of their monopoly. Consequently, of the English population in India the elites — in birth, association and refinement — were mostly the Company's Civil Servants. So, in public eyes, the estimation for any paper would be higher by the association of Company's servants with it. Possibly, this was the consideration for Hickey to describe himself in his Gazette as the "First and late Printer to the Hon'ble Company". The account of his career as we get in the Memoirs of William Hickey, the contemporary Attorney in Calcutta, and as given out in Buckland's Dictionary of Oriental Biography, do not contain any mention of him in the service of the East India Company.

The not very high estimation in which the Editors and Newspaper Writers in India (other than those who were also in the service of the Company) were held would be evident from an article on the Indian Press in the Morning Post (a London paper):

1. Hickey used this expression in his paper since the issue No. XI, dated April 1, 1780.
"X X X X By the last returns, they (British born subjects in India) amounted to 31,000 persons. Of these 22,000 are soldiers .... The civil officers of Government, of all descriptions, amount to about 2,500 .... Another class of people, about 5,000 in number, consist of free merchants and free mariners, who reside in India, under the privilege of a convent with the Company .... The officers and practitioners in the Court of judicature, at the three presidencies, amount to about three hundred; and the remaining 1,700, consist of adventurers who have smuggled their way to India, on board of foreign ships, or in the capacity of gentlemen's servants, on board our ships of war and Indians. Of these adventurers, some find employment as subordinate clerks in public offices, some shop-keepers; some in various trades and a few as printers; and about twenty as editors and writers of newspapers. All these persons reside in India, contrary to the law X X X X".

Hence it would be natural that the association of the Company's servants with newspapers was eagerly sought for as enhancing the prestige of the papers.

The extent of association of Government Officers with the Press in the early part of the 19th century is borne out by the statement of Buckingham in his examination before the Select Committee on the Suppression of the Calcutta Journal.

1. Reply to Question No. 613 of Buckingham's examination before the Select Committee on the Suppression of the Calcutta Journal on July 1, 1834; Parliamentary Paper, House of Commons, 1834, Vol. 6, Paper 601, p. 50.
"there were then [in June 1618, when Buckingham landed in Calcutta] existing at Calcutta five or six different newspapers, each of which was conducted by an editor in the service of the Government."

The situation undergoing a change on enactment of the Charter Act of 1618:

"The Council of India Act of 1618 led to influx and settlement of persons unconnected with the service of the Hon'ble Company — free merchants and mariners. But as colonisation was not permitted most of them did neither seek nor expect a voice, under any shape in the Government of the country, nor lay claim to control over its measures, even as a part of the English public. But there were a few exceptions and to these the Public Press presented itself as the high road to fame and wealth."

The two most notables of these "few exceptions" were James Silk Buckingham and James Sutherland. Both came to India piloting a ship, took to journalism and thereby immortalised their names in the history of English Press in India — Buckingham for his Calcutta Journal and Sutherland through his association with Buckingham and then as editors of the Calcutta Chronicle, Bengal Chronicle, Bengal Harbora and Bengal Herald.  

How far was investment in the Press profitable during this period? For a reply to this we need to ascertain the capital that had to be invested for setting up a paper. We have little specific information on this point. In his Good Old Days of John Company, W.H. Carey wrote that if anyone "intend to set up a newspaper, he must possess very considerable capital; for that purpose, six, eight or ten thousand pounds were requisite." This however appears to be an exaggeration, from the information that we have regarding Hickey's Bengal Gazette and the Calcutta Journal of Buckingham.

The circumstance in which Hickey commenced the Bengal Gazette appears to be unrealistic for an assumption that he could command such a huge capital for his paper. According to Mr. William Hickey, the contemporary Attorney in Calcutta, J.A. Hickey was in Civil Jail for upwards of two years as an insolvent debtor. He had by this time seven year's residence in India. During the period of confinement he came across of a treatise from which he learnt printing. On his coming out of prison he succeeded in cutting a rough set of types with which he printed hand-bills and common advertisements. "Having scraped together by this means a few hundred rupees he sent to England for a regular and proper set of materials for printing." With these he set on foot his Bengal Gazette in January 1730.

It does not appear that subsequently Hickey made any considerable investment on the Bengal Gazette.

Mr. Buckingham commenced his celebrated Calcutta Journal with a capital investment of Rs 30,000/- and this sum he could get as "contributions being from 30 Gentlemen who each advanced 1000 Rupees as a Loan."

Return from the investment on newspaper — if the paper could be made a success — was enviable. Hickey could carry on his Bengal Gazette for about a year and a quarter. And according to his contemporary, William Hickey, the emolument arising from it "became immense and with common prudence he would have made a large fortune."

Buckingham's success with the Calcutta Journal was spectacular and he could refund his loan within a short period as he himself said — "in the short space of three months its return of profit were sufficient to enable me to repay the whole of the 30,000 rupees advanced and leave a surplus beyond that in my possession". Moreover, by July 1828 when Buckingham issued 400 shares on the Calcutta Journal each priced at

3. Reply to Question No. 613 of Buckingham's examination before the Select Committee on the Suppression of the Calcutta Journal on July 1, 1884; Parliamentary Paper, House of Commons, 1884, Vol. 8, Paper C01, p. 51.
Rs.1000/-, the assets of the Journal were "at a moderate estimate 1,00,000 rupees."

About fifteen years later the return from the investment on the Bengal Harbary was calculated by a contemporary editor to be "little short of 20 per cent on the annual outlay." The capital outlay on the Bengal Harbary was also considerable. In 1821 Mr. Samuel Smith purchased it at Rs.1,00,000/- and in the next four years he further added Rs.1,00,000/- to that investment. We may well suppose that this addition was out of the profit earned by the Proprietor.

In this connection it is to be kept in mind that the Darwinian law of the survival of the fittest reigned supreme in the contemporary world of Indian Press. The long list of failures would bear out this point. There was constant shifting of support. Thus on successful appearance of the Calcutta Journal disappeared a number of papers that successfully held the ground for decades till then. The most notable of these were the Asiatic Mirror and the Oriental Star. Any miscalculation on the part of the conductors in catering to the taste of the subscribers, any indiscretion on their part to support the popular cause (be it in the sectional interest of

1. Reply to Question No.630 of Mr. T. Love Peacock's examination on July 31, 1884, before the Select Committee on the Suppression of the Calcutta Journal; ibid, p. 160.
3. Bengal Harbary, September 10, 1625.
some or in the general interest of the government and society would bring ruin even to an established and popular paper like the John Bull. To illustrate this point we may furnish an extract from the article, "The Calcutta Press", by J.H. Stoqueler in 1888 (by this time he had become the proprietor and editor of the John Bull on purchase):

"... the John Bull first made its appearance as a daily paper in June 1621 ... It proclaimed itself on its entrance the supporter of Church and King — the contemner of private scandal — the counterpoise of the pernicious influence of other journals ... For the first two or three years it maintained a conspicuous place in the regard of a large party, who were opposed to the politics and principles of Mr. Buckingham ... it acquired a large circulation ... it is sufficient to say that these themes were for long the stock in trade of the John Bull and that, as they died away, the paper maintained its popularity by great attention to its intelligence department and an adherence to Tory & Anglo-Indian conservancy politics until 1829, when the Half-Kata question tested its affection for the army. From that moment the John Bull began to decline in popularity. From 600 subscribers and upwards it rapidly went down to 400, but as if, this was not a sufficiently expedient descent the Editor of 1830-31 took occasion to assail the Trade Association, which led to another defection of subscribers to the amount of nearly 100 and, what was worse, the withdrawal of the trade advertisements. Facilis descensus Averni. To the years of offence succeeded the era of dulness and pitiable

neglect; correspondence relaxed, supplies of intelligence fell off, editorial confidence waned and the paper must have expired altogether but for the clergy, and the remnant of the Tory party amounting in all to about 290 who continued to support the only journal which dealt largely in extracts from the Morning Post, Blackwood and the Standard and affected a detestation of Reform."

In 1833 J.H. Stoqueler purchased the proprietary right of the John Bull with a subscription list of 383 names, of whom at least half were hopelessly in arrear.

The monthly Establishment charge for any first-rate paper of this period was quite considerable. "Monthly Disbursements of the Calcutta Journal" amounted to "nearly Eight Thousand Rupees". Of course this was not comparable with any other paper. Buckingham charged the highest rate for his Journal and for keeping up its high standard also maintained the costliest Establishment. For the month of June 1822 we get from Buckingham the following account of receipts and expenses on account of the Calcutta Journal:

### Receipts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Town Subscription</td>
<td>Rs. 4,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Country Subscription</td>
<td>Rs. 5,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Advertisement</td>
<td>Rs. 3,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Asiatic Dept.</td>
<td>Rs. 0,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Madras &amp; Bombay Bill</td>
<td>Rs. 1,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Rs. 14,530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of Printing Paper</td>
<td>Rs. 1,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage paid on Newspaper &amp; letters</td>
<td>Rs. 1,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office expenses in various outlays</td>
<td>Rs. 271.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Stenars and Translators</td>
<td>Rs. 140.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Rent</td>
<td>Rs. 500.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printer's Bill, for wages etc.</td>
<td>Rs. 1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary of Accountant</td>
<td>Rs. 273.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary of the Librarian (The Calcutta Journal Library was a rich one and open to Subscribers)</td>
<td>Rs. 135.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary of the Head Printer</td>
<td>Rs. 135.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Editor</td>
<td>Rs. 1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Reporter &amp; Corrector</td>
<td>Rs. 300.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal of Stock</td>
<td>Rs. 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engravings and Newspapers</td>
<td>Rs. 500.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Rs. 8,103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Buckingham would neither reduce subscription rate nor the establishment charges of the Calcutta Journal. Thus he
once wrote in reply to a demand for reduction in the rate of subscription:

“If the price of the paper were reduced, some portion of the Establishment must be discharged. The first consequence would be, that the Journal could no longer be made as early, as full, or even as interesting in its intelligence, as a combination of liberal support now enables it to be. The addition of a few subscribers would not only not recover the loss occasioned by diminution of price but it would be nothing compared with the loss that would be sustained by discontinuance of many on account of the paper’s being inferior in all particulars of its former standard. This would continue progressively, until it would at last come down to the reduced price and reduced circulation of the cheaper prints, or perhaps disappearing altogether.”

The establishment charge of the Calcutta Journal was however not fixed. It fluctuated to some extent with the circulation of the paper. For, Buckingham used to meet up these charges with 75% of the total receipt and used to set aside the rest 25% as the profit of the concern. His remuneration as Editor was covered by this 75% while he used to accept the rest as his profit out of his investment.

The Bengal Harikara Establishment was also a large one

and J.H. Strobeley in 1833 calculated its annual charge to be exceeding rupees one lac of rupees. But besides the Bengal Halliary and some other periodicals such as the Calcutta Literary Gazette, the Bengal Chronicle, and many other miscellaneous publications such as Army List Annual Directory, Price Currents, Shipping Lists, Souvenirs, Almanacs, etc., were undertaken there.

The charges of the John Bull Establishment (the standard being moderate at the time) in 1838 was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Per Month</th>
<th>For Annua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Head Printer and Reporter (both in the same person)</td>
<td>Rs. 300</td>
<td>Rs. 3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Compositors for the John Bull</td>
<td>Rs. 456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Compositors for the Oriental Observer</td>
<td>Rs. 70</td>
<td>Rs. 7,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Compositors for the Sporting Magazine and the United Service Journal</td>
<td>Rs. 147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sircar Establishment</td>
<td>Rs. 160</td>
<td>Rs. 1,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Pressmen</td>
<td>Rs. 83</td>
<td>Rs. 996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Raos</td>
<td>Rs. 66</td>
<td>Rs. 732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Distributors</td>
<td>Rs. 44</td>
<td>Rs. 528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duptory, Carpenter, Sweeper, Distiy (Water carriers) and Durwans</td>
<td>Rs. 38</td>
<td>Rs. 556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial remuneration</td>
<td>Rs. 500</td>
<td>Rs. 6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Establishment charges</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Rs. 38,256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the early months of 1848 the prospect of profit out of investment in the Press became a topic for speculation in

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., p. 415.
the columns of the papers of the time. And according to the editor of the Calcutta Star (fairly renowned Mr. James Bine) it was not so profitable as in the past:

"There have been times when men might and ought to have made a fortune with their papers, but they have gone by ... The increase of newspaper subscribers has not been proportionate either to the increase of journals or the increase of expense attendant upon them."

Without giving out the details of expenditure he calculated the Establishment charge for a daily paper at Rs.5,000/- a month.

The Friend of India attempted to calculate the circulation of different Calcutta Papers, ascertained the total dawk circulation of the daily papers and came to the findings that "the circulation of these journals, which involve the largest outlay of capital, and the greatest mental and mechanical labour has not increased ..... instead of increasing they have fallen off." In support of this contention the figures of dawk circulation of the daily papers were cited. "The total dawk circulation of the three daily papers in 1837 was 892. The entire dawk circulation of the four daily papers now issued, was in the last week of March 1848, only 818." The three

1. Calcutta Star, April 4, 1848.
2. Ibid.
3. Friend of India, April 16, 1848, p 241.
4. Ibid.
dailies in 1837 were the Bengal Harbary, the Englishman and the Calcutta Courier. In 1848 there were the Bengal Harbary, the Englishman, the Calcutta Star and the Standard. The exact circulation was taken up as the basis for speculation possibly because of the fact that the circulation by other means could not be precisely determined, the proprietors and editors being likely to give out inflated figures.

Friend of India thus speculated upon the reasons for this:

"This decrease has been occasioned in some measure by the social revolution which has taken place during the last ten years in the North-West Provinces which comprise more than one half the newspaper readers on this side of India. The establishment of a separate Government at Agra was the first step towards a separation of interests between the two divisions of the Presidency, which has been gradually increasing, and is now more extensive and evident than ever. The North-Western Provinces have now their own tradesmen, and their own banks, the ladies have their own milliners independent of the metropolis; and the community at large has its own Press, and its own organs of opinion. The North-West Press is not only the advocate of local interests, but it supplies all those wants which have been created by the establishment of a regular steam communication with England; and it is enabled to supply them with superior speed, through the Port of Bombay, and with greater economy. Hence the dependence of North-West community upon the Calcutta Press has been diminished, and the circulation of the
daily journals in these provinces has been proportionately reduced. Nor, in estimating the cause which have affected this circulation must we forget the very great start which Bombay papers have taken, the result of which has been to draw off from the patronage of the Calcutta papers a considerable body of those subscribers who reside nearer to Bombay than to Calcutta. To the growth and competition of these new interests, we trace in a great measure the stationary position of the Calcutta daily press, amidst the increasing excitement and the general progress of the age."

Prior to the setting up of the celebrated Calcutta Journal of James Silk Buckingham there is no information of the involvement of the mercantile interest in the Press in Calcutta. We may well suppose that prior to the Court of Directors' order in 1825 prohibiting their servants from having relation with the Press, the investment in this field came mostly from the savings of the Company's servants. Some capital might have also come from the Agency Houses, purely on business terms and on calculation of business interest of the parties involved. We get the first instance of extra business

1. Published through Notification in the General Department dated May 11, 1823; the Government Gazette, May 16, 1823.
involvement of mercantile interest in the Press in the foundation of the Calcutta Journal. We get the details from Buckingham himself. In June 1818 Buckingham came to Calcutta. "... there were then existing at Calcutta five or six different newspapers, each of which was conducted by an editor in the service of the Government, and wholly subject to its control; but while the Government interests were thus well protected and taken care of, there was no journal among all the number in which the merchants of the city could find admission for any communications calculated to call in question either the wisdom or the justice of any regulation, order or law affecting their peculiar interests. It was believed, therefore, that a public journal conducted by an independent gentleman, neither in the service of the Government nor under any party control, would afford that medium of free discussion, or be greatly advantageous to the mercantile community in particular .......". Soon after Buckingham's landing in Calcutta Mr. Palmer (of the House of Palmer & Co.) applied to him to know whether he would be


2. Reply to Question Nos. 326 of Buckingham's examination on May 23, 1883, before the Select Committee on the suppression of the Calcutta Journal, p. 19.
willing to undertake the editorship and management of the proposed public journal. After initial hesitation Buckingham agreed to the proposal. Necessary fund (Rs. 30,000/-) was provided to him by 30 gentlemen, each a sum of Rs. 1,000/-. We would presume that these thirty gentlemen represented the Commercial Houses which patronised Buckingham in setting up the Calcutta Journal. This might have been a camouflage to cover the participation of the mercantile capital in the field of journalism. In any case, according to Buckingham himself he repaid this sum out of the profit of the Calcutta Journal. But possibly the mercantile interest in the paper continued and at some stage Mr. John Palmer of Palmer & Co., and Mr. George Ballard of Alexander & Co. got into joint proprietorship of the Calcutta Journal with Buckingham. This contention is borne out by the fact that the notice of cancellation of license for publication of the Journal was thus addressed: "To Messrs. John Francis Sandys, John Palmer, Mr. George Ballard, and Peter Stone de Rosario," Mr. Palmer and Mr. Ballard were "the principal co-proprietors and agents of James Silk Buckingham."


2. Ibid.

on the spot,"

The persistency with which the Calcutta Journal was persecuted during the period of its publication might be indicative of the jealousy of the government officials at the encroachment of mercantile interest on the Calcutta Press so long almost an exclusive preserve for themselves. Besides the actions initiated in the name of the Governor General in Council (these have been discussed in details in the Chapter on "Struggle for Freedom of the Press") in one instance all the six Secretaries to the Government unitedly and in their name launched a prosecution against Buckingham (which however ended in dismissal on the verdict of the jury) and in another instance Buckingham had to fight out a duel being challenged by Dr. Jamieson, Superintendent of the School for native doctors (this has been discussed in details in this Chapter earlier in the Section 'The Editor'; p 46).

Certain other facts may also be mentioned as indicative

1. Reply to Question No. 619 of Buckingham's examination before the Select Committee on the Suppression of the Calcutta Journal; Parliamentary Paper, House of Commons, 1854, Vol. 8, p. 79.


of the rivalry between the officialdom and mercantile community over this issue. These are:

First, all the abuses which Buckingham revealed through his Journal concerned omissions, commissions and misdeeds of the Government officials right down from the Lord Bishop of Calcutta. But there was no exposure of any mismanagement in any of the Agency Houses. We may presume such mismanagement out of the simple fact that not long after Buckingham's deportation, in the early thirties, many of the big Houses in Calcutta went bankrupt.

Secondly, the John Bull in the East was set up as a counterpoise of the Calcutta Journal with open proclamation of its intention in the prospectus. It was owned by John Trotter, Esq., Opium Agent; R.C. Flodden, Esqr., Salt Agent; T. Lewin, Clerk of the Crown in the Supreme Court; C. Greenlaw, also a Covenanted Servant of the E.I. Company.

Thirdly, the utter disgust and hatred with which the Calcutta Journal received the appearance of the John Bull may be regarded as an additional pointer. Since the issue of the Prospectus on June 7, 1821, till its appearance on July 2, 1821, the John Bull was denounced in the columns of the Calcutta

2. Proceedings of the Special General Court of Proprietors, held on July 23, 1824; Asiatic Journal, September, 1824, p. 279.
Journal nine times in seven issues is the form of letter to the Editor, editorial, mimic sketch and parody. An Extra Sheet was issued with the Calcutta Journal of June 25, bearing the title — "John Bull in the East: A specimen of the manner in which John Bull's Materials are to be procured: worthy the perusal of all who take an interest in John Bull's defence." In its columns it was asserted that in the plan "there is a deadly animosity deeply seated, and a feeling of enmity that will shrink from no means of doing us every possible injury, and impeding the fair pursuit of our duty in the public service."

In the contest between the mercantile and official interests over the Calcutta Press, the initial victory rested with the officials. Buckingham was deported out of India, the Press Regulations were passed which would silence the Press from criticising the Government (and thus exposing the officials of the Government) and finally the licence for publication of the Calcutta Journal was cancelled. Not satisfied with all these they ultimately ruined the entire properties of Buckingham invested in the Calcutta Journal by systematically refusing licence for any publication out of the Calcutta Journal.

1. Calcutta Journal, June 16 (pp. 555-58), 19 (pp. 597-62), 21 (p. 622), 25 (Extra Sheet without page number), 27 (pp. 632-38), 31 (p. 683 and p. 708) and 29 (p. 713), 1821.
2. These actions have been detailed in the Chapter on "Struggle for Freedom of the Press".
Establishment which would bear out any profit to Buckingham. Ultimately license was issued to Dr. Muston, a son-in-law of Mr. Harrington, one of the Secretaries to the Government who would soon become a member of the Governor General's Council, for publication of the newspaper, the Scotman in the East, out of the Calcutta Journal Establishment on an arrangement which ensured that no profit would accrue to Buckingham. So complete was the financial ruin of Buckingham that a public appeal for financial aid "to the relief of a man on whom misfortune has fallen with a heavy hand" was issued by a group of philanthropic and public men:

But ultimately in the contest the Government officials proved losers. By the order of the Court of Directors of the

1. Reply to Questions numbering 243 and 248 to 464 of the examination of Mr. J.C.G. Sutherland (on May 19 and 24, 1826) and Mr. S. Arnot (on May 23 and 24, 1826) before the Select Committee on the Suppression of the Calcutta Journal; Parliamentary Paper, House of Commons, 1824, Vol. 8, Paper 601, pp. 13, 20-24.
2. Reply to Question No. 360 of the examination of Mr. Sanford Arnot on May 24, 1826 before the Select Committee on the Suppression of the Calcutta Journal; ibid, p. 24.
3. Reply to Question No. 330; ibid.
4. Reply to Question No. 460 of Examination of Mr. J.C.G. Sutherland; ibid, p. 23.
5. This point has been dealt with elaborately in the Chapter on "Struggle for Freedom of the Press", pp. 154-155.
East India Company in 1685 the servants of the Company "Civil, Naval, or Military, Surgeons and Chaplains included" were completely debarred from having any relation with the Press

"whether as Editor, Sole Proprietor and Share in the Property."

Many in Calcutta viewed this as outcome of the efforts of Buckingham and in this connection we may quote the editorial remark of the Bengal Harbarn:

"It is well known in London that though the Directors entertain a great horror of Mr. Buckingham, not altogether unmixed with apprehension, yet they sedulously study his monthly lubrications in which the names of certain Civil, Military & Medical Servants have lately appeared under the general title of 'Peace, Order and Harmony of Society in Calcutta'. Now, from the pages of the Herald some hints have already been taken towards the good government of India, it is therefore not improbable that, in these their distant dominions, the Directors have issued the above mandate with the laudable intention of removing from their trusty but somewhat choleric servants, so abundant a source of contention."

1. Published through Notification in the General Department dated May 11, 1826, in the Government Gazette, May 10, 1826.

2. Bengal Harbarn, May 20, 1826.

3. Oriental Herald, the monthly periodical paper undertaken by Buckingham in London shortly after his deportation out of India.
The encroachment of the Mercantile Houses upon the Press was through advance of capital to proprietors of Newspaper Establishments and naturally all dealings were kept closely guarded secrets. Hence there would be speculations through assertions and denials both as to the amount advanced and influence exerted.

Thus it was asserted by J.H. Stocqueler that the firm of £/s. Alexander & Co. advanced £60,000 to £/s. Samuel Smith & Co. for the Bengal Marhur Establishments and this obliged Mr. Smith to appoint Col. James Young, a retired Artillery Officer and a principal member of that House as the Editor of the Bengal Harbarn on a fat salary when that House became bankrupt in 1822.

Prior to this in 1827 there appeared an insinuation in the John Bull that the £/s. Samuel Smith and Co., were under heavy financial obligations to two Agency Houses in Calcutta and this affected the editorial policy of the Bengal Harbarn who had employ an Editor of their choice. An emphatic denial was made by £/s. Samuel Smith & Co. immediately:

"Notice to the Public: X X X X
The insinuations conveyed by the Bull"

yesterday ..... We meet both insinuations with direct denial ..... The gentleman who now conducts the Harkarn was not even recommended to us by a member of any house of agency, or by any person whatever; his peculiar position, his worth and talent, pointed him out to us, as the most qualified individual ..... for the task of editing our paper ..... To leave the ball no inch of ground to guile or misrepresent with respect to the Proprietorship of this paper, we beg to add, in the most distinct and unequivocal manner that the Bengal Harkurn Newspaper is the sole and undivided property of Samuel Smith who manages it with the other branches of the Harkurn concern under the firm of Samuel Smith & Co."

We get the question again to come up for discussion in the last part of 1882. It was asserted in the Calcutta Courier that the daily papers of this Presidency were in "bondage" to the Commercial Houses and that however they might boast of freedom of discussion they were "gagged whenever they presume to touch upon subjects affecting the commercial welfare of those houses". And on this the India Gazette wrote:

"X X X X As we do not know to what extent this impression may exist, we think it right to state, for the information of our supporters, that in so far as the India Gazette is concerned, the assertion is wholly unfounded. We repel this


2. India Gazette, June 6, 1882."
allation, not from an apprehension that our readers would be led by it to misunderstand our character and that of this paper, but for unwillingness that an assertion against the merchants of Calcutta, of exercising an undue influence over the press, should go forth uncontradicted. That we do not allow ourselves to be controlled by their supposed dictation, we leave the public to judge; but in justice to them, it belongs to us to say that they do not attempt to exercise any such dictation. We owe much to them occasionally for valuable information, and we have pleasure in making this acknowledgement; but neither on this nor on any other ground, have they acquired the right, or ever sought to exercise the power, of controlling our judgement, or of improperly influencing the character and tone of this paper, on commercial or on any other question. That we have friends and correspondents in most of the commercial houses of Calcutta, as well among the members of the civil and military services, is most true, and their suggestions we always highly appreciated; but our readers may be assured that in the final adoption or rejection of them, and in the expression of any opinion which is published as that of the Editor, we are guided by our own uncontrolled judgement. X X X X

This explanation of the Editor of the *India Gazette* could not convince all its readers. This becomes evident from a letter to the Editor of the *India Gazette* which was published, in spite of a different opinion expressed in it, in the issue of June 9, 1832:
"Sir — In your paper of this morning, I observe a denial on your part, that the different Editors are under the thraldom of the Mercantile Body. There has certainly been a pretty general impression on this subject of the nature alluded to; though not exactly, Mr. Editor, as you have stated the question. No idea, I believe, is entertained of a combination or collusion of any sort, between the Merchants and Agents as a Body and the Calcutta Press; but when any question affecting certain individuals among the former is in danger of too close a pressure by a public discussion, I ask whether you, and the other Editors, are not liable in such cases, to be influenced to silence by parties; and this too, however important to the public at large, such question may chance to be? ...."

Whatever might be the influence of the Mercantile Houses over the editorial pens there is no doubt that involvement of some of the newspaper establishments with a few of the Mercantile firms was too deep for their independent existence. From J.H. Stoqueler we hear that after the financial disaster of 1832 the assignees of one of the bankrupt Houses sold away the John Bull to him. Such was also the case with the India Gazette as we learn from the following notice in the Englishman:

"The India Gazette — The three shares of this press, for sometime advertised for


2. Englishman extracted in the India Gazette, September 30, 1884."
sale, were disposed of by public auction on Saturday (28.9.1834) and fell to Dwarkanath Tagore for 84,000 rupees, though only 15,000 had been previously offered. The result is very satisfactory it ensures to the creditors of Mackintosh & Co., and Ferguson & Co., a pretty contribution towards a dividend Dwarkanath Tagore is now the sole proprietor of the India Gazette, and the last remnant of that influence which the mercantile body was supposed to exercise over the metropolitan press may now be said to be extinguished. Dwarkanath is, we should say, one of the last men who would attempt to fetter an Editor in the exercise of his sacred and responsible duty."

The failure of many of the chief commercial and banking firms in Calcutta during the years of 1833-34 such as Alexander & Co., Mackintosh & Co., de Cruttenden Mackillop & Co., Ferguson and Co., and some others involving millions of rupees possibly ended the encroachment of the Mercantile Houses on the Press. For, subsequently we do not come across any allusion to this in our period.

---