

India

FOR THE

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1900.

[REGISTERED AS A PRICE..... 2d.
NEWSPAPER. { BY POST, 2½d.]

No. 144. NEW SERIES.
No. 238. OLD SERIES.

Notes and News	160	Major Evans Gordon and the	177
The National Grant	172	Electors of Stenney	177
The Exploitation of Conquered Races	173	The Famine in India	177
Our London Letter	174	3,163,000 on Relief	177
India and the General Election:		The <i>Imperialists' Review</i> Fund	177
The Indian Parliamentary Com-		Causes of Famine	177
mittee	175	The Proposed National Grant	178
India and the Fabian Society	178	Empire in India	178
Sir M. M. Bhowanagrace's Address	176	Lord Kimberley on India's Burdens	179
Mr. Brocklehurst in Manchester	176	Advertisements	180

NOTES AND NEWS.

LORD CURZON, in his telegram of Wednesday, reports that the rainfall was exceptionally heavy during the preceding week in Central Bengal and Behar, and that there had been general rain also in Northern India, the Central Provinces, and Rajputana. In view of the exceptional rainfall in certain tracts it is reassuring to learn that on the whole it has been beneficial and has secured satisfactory winter sowings. The prospects are now reported to be good, except in limited areas including the Deccan. Relief has been discontinued in the North-Western Provinces and in Bengal, and the total number on relief is stated as 3,163,000. Lord Northcote's telegram adds that rain has been absent, or light and scattered, over the greater part of the affected area in Bombay, and that in certain parts the crops are now in urgent need of rain.

We have something to say elsewhere of the proposed national grant towards the relief of famine in India. In the recent debate in the House of Commons, it will be remembered, the proposal was not so much rejected as postponed, and the Secretary of State used words which suggested that it might be considered anew in October. The matter is not now so easy to deal with as Parliament is not sitting. But if the India Office and the Treasury could overcome their prejudice against a grant which the people and the Press of the United Kingdom have approved, there are at least two ways in which the grant could forthwith be made. Lord George Hamilton has stated that the India Office in July had unexhausted borrowing powers to the extent of nine millions. Powers to the extent of nearly six millions still remain. Why then should not a loan of five millions be issued, on the understanding that when Parliament meets the Treasury will take it over? That is one way. Another and a more excellent way would be for the new House of Commons, so soon as it assembles, to vote the grant by the usual method. At present Parliament is summoned to meet on November 1. There is some doubt as to the amount of business, beyond merely formal business, which will then be transacted. But there can be no doubt whatever that if the Government were so disposed, the House of Commons could then vote a grant to India. Could any task be more urgent, or more appropriate to a majority which loves to call itself "Imperialist"?

The *Times* on Wednesday printed a leading article dealing with a series of three letters which it has lately published upon "Indian Famine Relief." The article was, to a great extent, a studied attack upon the Indian character. For example:—

The tenets of some of the religions of India and the habitual mendacity of many of the men whose lives are considered to be of exceptional holiness are said to have prevented the development of any notion that the receipt of alms is either disgraceful or even in any way humiliating to the recipient. There

is nothing which corresponds to the Western notion of independence; and even quite well-to-do people, when they see that doles are in course of being distributed, feel themselves to be only fulfilling their duty to their families in making efforts to obtain a share of whatever may be given to their poorer neighbours.

One would like to know upon what evidence the *Times* bases this sweeping and injurious accusation—an accusation utterly at variance with much notorious fact, and indicative of a character quite alien from the Indian character which is commonly rebuked for excessive proneness to extend help to the remotest kinsmen.

Again, the *Times* says:—

The chief difficulty of the administration depends upon the amount of judgment and of discrimination which must be exercised in dealing with individuals, or with exceptional cases. With regard to these, as a rule, little or no reliance can be placed upon Native officials, whether those of the village concerned or those specially appointed as assistants to the famine officer. The habits of Eastern life, and the tendency always to sacrifice truth for the sake of saying or doing only what it is thought the superior will like to hear or to witness, are too strong to be overcome, and are unfortunately complicated, in a large proportion of instances, by a tendency to peculation or to the receipt of bribes.

Here again is a sweeping indictment which, we maintain, ought not to be published unless it is supported by satisfactory evidence that the accused persons have an opportunity of meeting. What the purpose of this amazing article may have been we cannot conjecture. But it will hardly be surprising if it conveys to careless and ill-informed English readers the impression that Indians are, in the lump, a set of lying and corrupt mendicants. Yet it was to Indians that Lord Curzon was referring when he spoke of the series of calamities endured by "this patient and unrummuring population."

The Bombay Government has just issued an important declaration of policy in the "further instructions regarding the collection of land revenue." Therein they show a decided preference for the remission instead of the suspension of land revenue. Thus in the case of lands which have not been cultivated through want of means, it is declared that "in almost all such cases it will be in accordance with the principles which have been laid down to remit the arrears of previous years." Again, no distraint is to be issued by an officer below the grade of Assistant or Deputy Collector, so that distraints cannot be levied by Karkuns on their own authority, as we know happened some months ago in the Broach District.

The *Times of India* gives these new instructions a warm welcome and believes that the Government intends to insist on the sparing use of the power of distraint. The Collectors are warned by the authorities to make all subordinate officers clearly understand that the adoption by them of any measures which are not authorised by law or order will meet with punishment.

Our contemporary, however, considers that the fact that such minatory instructions have had to be given in order to guard against irregularity and harshness supplies only too plain a proof of the defects of the Bombay Revenue system as an organisation for the collection of revenue in such a time as this.

The process of distinguishing between individual cases, always risky, must usually be left to subordinates, imperfectly checked by the controlling agency. The *Times of India* thinks that the remission of rent should have been

put upon an automatic basis by dividing the cultivators into categories according to the percentage of their loss in cattle and the yield of their crops.

In the course of his speech at the half-yearly general meeting of the Delhi and London Bank, held on Tuesday last, Mr. D. H. Small, the Chairman of the Company, said:—

He was sorry to say that the demand for money in the East had continued to contract, while the rates obtainable during the whole half year had ruled very low; indeed the rate for money there had been cheaper than in London, and day-to-day loans had been freely offered at from 1½ to 2½ per cent. They looked, however, for a better state of things shortly, as the long-expected rains had come at last, and the consequence was that the crop prospects throughout most parts of India were very good indeed. Already the famine-stricken districts were greatly relieved, and it was not too much to hope that in a short time the dire visitation which had lasted for the best part of three years might vanish altogether. With a return to normal times they would no doubt see a revival in all branches of trade, including the cotton industry, which for some time had been under a cloud; and also a better demand for money at more remunerative rates. It had, however, to be confessed that the outlook and means of making profit were not all that they could wish.

It is rather odd, and by no means satisfactory, that the only Manifesto concerning India which has been issued for the present General Election, beyond that which has appeared in our own columns, should emanate from the Fabian Society. This latter document, which we reproduce on another page, has the disadvantage of coming from the pen of Mr. Bernard Shaw, who is not to be treated seriously. There is not a little in the Manifesto to cause offence. But we cheerfully recognise that it contains good points also. We do not know who has proposed "to confer a parliamentary constitution on the native population" of India. But the demand for simultaneous examinations and the protest against a system designed to provide "lucrative posts for Englishmen whose pensions add cruelly to the drain of rupees from a very poor country to a very rich one" are all to the good. Excellent, too, are the detailed proposals for—

1. An extension of the opportunities of Western "secondary education" for Natives capable of it.
2. A considerable further Indianisation of the higher grades of the Civil Service.
3. Multiplication of the provincial councils with limited powers under the guidance of the British Raj.
4. A wise development of the germs of self-government existent in the village councils.

It is satisfactory to find also that the Fabian Society "cannot be satisfied with the official optimism which is content with a demonstration that India would be worse off without our administration." And we welcome its co-operation in demanding—

1. An investigation of the social causes of Indian famines as distinct from the meteorological causes.
2. An investigation of the way in which the industrial revolution now proceeding is affecting the standard of life of the Natives.

Well may the Fabians ask: "Does anyone pretend that we already have the information such investigations would supply or that our ignorance is doing India no harm?" Meantime the Fabian Society thinks that "a more sympathetic attitude towards the aspirations, if not towards the precise programme, of the Indian Congress, and a more courageous toleration of the Native Press, may safely be recommended." One is curious to know what are the details in the Congress programme to which the Fabians take exception. Under the head of "Education" the Manifesto remarks:—

Bengal is prolific of young Natives who can commit to memory a whole volume of Mr. Herbert Spencer's Synthetic Philosophy with less effort than it costs an Englishman to learn the multiplication table; and this very docility and avidity for ready-made ideas enables them to pass examinations as effectually as it unfits them for governing men and coping with emergencies.

If these remarks are meant to apply to the Indians who have been successful in the competitive examination for the Indian Civil Service, nothing, we conceive, could be more unfair. The record of these men is before the public. Is the Fabian Society prepared to prove that they have shown themselves unfit for governing men and coping with emergencies? If not, it should abstain from a general indictment which does not fall far short of a slander.

At the time of going to press (Thursday) an analysis of the Election returns shows that 183 Conservatives and 29 Liberal Unionists have been elected, making 212 supporters of the Government. The opposition consists, so far, of 49 Liberals and 28 Nationalists—yielding a majority for the Government of 135 votes. The results, on the other hand, so far show a net Liberal gain of three seats, counting on a division 6 votes, and reducing the Government's majority in the last Parliament from 128 to 122. The remainder of the boroughs poll to-day (Thursday) and it is confidently expected that there will be further Liberal gains. Previous experience in recent years suggests that the strength of the Liberal party is in the counties, the majority of which poll next week.

We trace elsewhere the fortunes of members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee in the campaign. At the time of writing only three members—Mr. Hazel, Mr. Samuel, and Mr. Havelock Wilson—have lost their seats. It may be hoped that among the new members recruits will be found for the Committee. In the same connexion it may be noted that Sir Lepel Griffin, who contested East Nottingham in the Unionist interest, has been defeated by Mr. J. H. Yoxall, a member of the Indian Parliamentary Committee. Lord George Hamilton and Sir Henry Fowler have, as usual, been returned unopposed. On the other hand there is a certain element of consolation to be derived from the fact that of the Liberal members who have lost their seats a good proportion were opposed to the aims of the Indian Parliamentary Committee.

Sir William Harcourt, who has been the most conspicuous figure on the Liberal side during the present campaign, made the following statement of Liberal policy at New Tredegar on Wednesday night:—

The claim of the Liberals was that they came before the country representing the still-needed and valuable principles of peace, retrenchment, and reform, which had in the past accomplished so much in securing a higher life and a happier future for the people. These were still the fundamental principles of the Liberal party, and they were the principles for which it had fought successfully in past generations. The greatness of the Empire and the welfare of the people largely depended on the proper and reasonable application of the principles of peace, retrenchment, and reform. The Liberals, when supported by majorities, had in the past effected great reforms, and for needed reforms they would continue to labour with hope and steadfastness. If he had any claim to the confidence of his countrymen it was founded upon the fact that in his time he had endeavoured to be faithful to the principles of the Liberal party—a cause for which he would still labour as long as ability and health and strength were continued to him.

"Peace, retrenchment and reform" is a programme no less urgently needed in India than in the United Kingdom.

There is much food for reflection in the report of Mr. A. H. Hildebrand on the decrease of population among the Karens of Burma. He speaks with very exceptional authority as he has known the people for 25 years and has held his present appointment, that of Superintendent of the Southern Shan States, since 1887. The *Pioneer* says:—

Mr. Hildebrand therefore may be said to occupy towards the country under his rule the same sort of position that the original officers of the Punjab Commission occupied towards their districts. They had been with them from the beginning; they had brought them out of chaos into order; they had directed them into the paths of progress and prosperity, and had grown to be so thoroughly identified with the interests of the country and the people that these formed their own chief concern in life.

But in these days of frequent transfers all this is changed,

Mr. Hildebrand's career offers one of the few existing exceptions.

Mr. Hildebrand reports that the Karens have diminished during the last ten years by 33 per cent. He says:—

Vast plains that were cultivated on my first visit to Karenni in 1875, many of which were still cultivated on my next visit in 1888, are now a sea of grass. There is not a house and not a vestige of cultivation.

In 1875

There was not a square yard of ground that was not tilled, and not a scrub or anthill that had not its use.

And what makes the case more peculiar is that no very obvious reason for the loss of population is apparent; for the people are said to be well-treated and lightly taxed, the harvests good and the supply of food plentiful.

Mr. Hildebrand rejects the suggestion that the decrease is due to emigration fostered by the better and safer means of communication. This would not at the most account for more than 10 per cent. of the loss. He is rather inclined to think that it is owing to the effects of a too quiet life. The old wild life of war is over and "they seem to have lost all heart." Whether or no this be the true reason, one curious fact appears. The Anglo-Indian press has long attributed most of the ills of India to over-population. Among the Karens, a great decrease of population has occurred amid plentiful food. Therefore the Anglo-Indians should point to that race as realising their highest hopes. But the *Pioneer*, far from offering its congratulations, actually commiserates the position of the Karens. Is not this a glaring inconsistency?

The Imperial Institute would doubtless have been long ago forgotten in India were it not that a considerable amount of Indian money has been spent on that Imperial white elephant. As a large part of the building is now in the occupation of the new teaching University of London, some redistribution of the rooms has been necessary. The premises in future to be devoted to the Indian section will be put into repair by the British Government, "but all charges for subsequent repairs, decorations, and for lighting will devolve upon the India Office." So that India is very far from having got rid of this useless and costly incubus.

That it is useless is not merely the contention of the Indian papers, but even of the Anglo-Indian *Madras Mail*. The officials endeavour to explain the smallness of the number of visitors and enquirers by rumours that, in consequence of so much space being given up to the University, the Indian Section was to be closed. But the *Madras Mail* prefers to assign the decline to

the increased reluctance of anxious enquirers about Indian products to betake themselves to the official theorists of the Institute, instead of to the practical business men of Mincing Lane, Manchester, Liverpool and elsewhere.

It adds:—

A great deal must be done before men of business in need of business information will feel induced to haunt the dreary galleries of the Institute.

The "principal enquiries" of the year were just four in number. First, a London firm enquired for a large supply of white lined; but unfortunately white lined is cultivated only to a very small extent as a separate crop. Secondly, a Manchester firm asked for a supply of silk cotton, and were put in communication with a firm in India. Thirdly, a retired Indian official called on behalf of a friend who was desirous of finding a fibre plant to cultivate in place of indigo. Eventually, the friend was referred to the Reporter on Economic Products in India. Fourthly, designs, prices and specimen panels were obtained for an individual who was desirous of decorating his hall and staircase with Indian carved wood-work. It is to be feared that the volume of Indian trade was not much increased by this twelve-months' work at the Imperial Institute. We are inclined to agree with the *Madras Mail* that it was not worth the Rs.28,500 which India has to pay yearly for its maintenance.

The Balfe Point Light at Perim needs improvement. The Government of India, while willing to bear their share of the cost, have pointed out that the British

Treasury ought to contribute. As the *Times of India* says:—

Except on the assumption that all the ships that pass through the Straits of Persia are engaged in the Indian trade alone,

half the expense at least should be borne by England. But the home authorities declare that they can provide no funds at all and that India in her poverty must bear the whole expense of making the navigation of the Red Sea safe. Well may our contemporary allude to this as "a remarkable instance of the meanness with which the British Treasury can comport itself in the presence of a claim to deal fairly with India."

"The selection of Lord Amptill," says the *Pioneer*, "for the Governorship of Madras is quite in keeping with the way in which these appointments are habitually bestowed." It goes on:—

The Governor designate is of the ripe age of 31. If he had happened to enter the Indian Civil Service he would have had by this time, perhaps, eight years' service, and with good fortune might have been looking out for the officiating charge of a district. . . . However, instead of going into the Indian Civil Service Lord Amptill became Private Secretary to Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, which fact, together with his family influence, may possibly go some way to accounting for his selection.

Thus are appointments made under the best of all possible systems.

The *Tribune* congratulates Scindia on being permitted to take part in the Chinese War, a permission which it describes as a "momentous departure fraught with far-reaching consequences." It goes on to speak of the Native chiefs as "wasting away from inanition":—

They have no interest in life, because their position in life is so artificial, so to say. When one begins to feel that he lives on sufferance, he ceases to take any interest in life.

It adds that with the re-opening of the career of arms a new sense of usefulness and dignity will arise, which may well prove their moral salvation.

The *Mahratta* draws attention to a practical grievance on Indian railways. The number of Indian passengers who are willing and can afford to use the present refreshment rooms is very small. The platform shops, too, although the food they sell is usually nasty, are by no means cheap, the rent being very high in proportion to that charged for the refreshment rooms. What is wanted is an additional refreshment room at each important station, built Indian fashion, let to Indians and supplying food at a price such as can be paid by the ordinary third-class passenger.

The report of the Commissioner of Chinese Customs at Yalung, in the Chumbi Valley, on the trade between India and Tibet, through Sikkim, shows a slow though steady growth in the volume of that trade since Yalung was opened in 1895. In the five years it has risen from 10½ lakhs of rupees to nearly 18 lakhs. Although the damage done to roads and bridges by the cyclone of last autumn in and around Darjeeling affected the trade considerably, it was nearly 2½ lakhs last year in excess of the previous one. But the Commissioner thinks that any substantial improvement in trade with Tibet must depend on an increase of exports, and so long as foreign traders are denied access to the country, it is impossible to know what its resources are. At present the list of exports consists of a little over thirty items, few additions being made to it in the past five years. Wool, yak-tails, and musk are the main exports. It is well to remember that there is in existence a determined school which seeks to enforce a "forward" policy in the direction of Tibet.

Remittances on India for 20 lakhs were on Wednesday offered for tender by the India Council, and applications for Rs.4,30,70,000 in bills were received at prices ranging from 1s. 3½d. to 1s. 3¾d. The following amounts in bills were allotted—viz., Rs.11,54,000 on Calcutta and Rs.6,82,000 on Madras at an average of 1s. 3-937d., and Rs.1,64,000 on Bombay at an average of 1s. 3-950d. Tenders at 1s. 3¾d. will receive about 4 per cent. Last week remittances for Rs.27,69,281 were sold for £184,011, making the total disposed of from April 1 to Tuesday night Rs.6,38,06,175, producing £4,244,281. Next week the amount to be offered will be increased to 25 lakhs.

THE NATIONAL GRANT.

The proposed grant was not intended to relieve the Indian Government of the duties it has undertaken, and, according to the Secretary of State, is not unable to discharge. If the Indian Government were unable to discharge them, the Secretary of State has himself acknowledged that it would be permissible and desirable to make an appeal to the generosity of the Imperial Legislature. But there is another range of duties, outside the sphere of Government action, and largely independent of it, which is imposed not so much on the Indian Government as on the people of this country in particular, and more generally on the subjects of the Queen at large. . . . We owe a debt to India not of money only, nor of succour, but of gratitude, of sentiment, of Imperial sympathy and affection. Let us discharge it at the proper moment, at the moment of India's direst need, and we shall reap the reward a thousandfold, even if no penny of the gold we give ever returns in kind.—*The Times*, August 27 last.

Great Britain and Ireland owe a debt to the Indian peasant, a debt of millions upon millions.—MR. DONALD SKEATON, in April last.

WE shall soon have reached the period at which Lord George Hamilton, according to his announcement in the course of the recent debate on the Indian Budget, will be prepared to consider once more the question of the proposed national grant towards the relief of famine in India. It is to be regretted that, as Parliament is not sitting, the question cannot be brought before the Government with the publicity and the emphasis which a debate in the House of Commons is able to afford. But that fact should only quicken Lord George Hamilton's sense of personal responsibility—a responsibility well-nigh terrible enough any time these past five years to break the stoutest heart. In his career at the India Office, as even the Anglo-Indian journals most prone to defend under any circumstances official acts and official personages have been compelled to avow, Lord George Hamilton has missed many great opportunities. But we shall not believe until the belief is forced upon us that he intends permanently to thwart the offer, in which the British public and press have united, of a grant to the relief of the famine-stricken. Latterly, no doubt, the telegrams from the famine districts have brought somewhat reassuring news. Rain has fallen, the numbers in receipt of relief have declined, and there are many signs that the rigour of the famine has abated. But these facts, welcome as they are, do not touch the proposal for a national grant. There has been much misapprehension—sometimes of a rather deliberate kind—as to the purposes for which the grant is intended by those with whom the proposal originated. The official replies in the recent debate, for example, were based upon the entirely gratuitous assumption that the grant was asked to enable the Government of India to discharge the duties it undertakes in time of famine at the Indian taxpayer's expense. The misapprehension was corrected at the time, but it may well be corrected again and again, until there is not a shadow of excuse left for those who insist upon evading the issue. A national grant is asked, as Sir William Wedderburn said last April, not in aid of the Indian Exchequer but for the same purposes as those to which the Mansion House Fund is applied. That and that alone is the proposal, and all arguments directed against a grant to the Government of India are completely beside the mark.

The *Times*, in the admirable article from which we cite a passage above, sets forth anew the series of propositions—"indisputable" propositions it rightly named them—upon which the Indian Parliamentary Committee founded their request. Those propositions were as follows:—

(1) That funds are required to feed, clothe, and house the cultivators in their villages until their crops are ripe, to provide them with plough cattle, seed, and other requisites of cultivation, and to restore them to their normal economic condition; (2) that these requirements cannot be adequately met from Indian revenues raised from the suffering Indian people, and within the necessarily restricted field of ordinary relief operations; (3) that the funds subscribed by charity are altogether insufficient for these purposes; and (4) that a large

and generous free grant ought therefore to be provided by Parliament to assist in meeting this unprecedented calamity.

These statements are no less indisputable to-day than in July. And indeed the rapid diminution of the number of persons in receipt of Government relief marks the arrival of a season which brings special demands of its own. The Mansion House Fund, for reasons which are easily understood, is utterly inadequate to meet the need. The Fund still lingers well below £400,000, though three years ago, in a calamity of far less intensity, it provided a round million sterling. Individually the British public has failed in its appointed task of charity. But it can still retrieve the failure as a nation. Nor is there any good ground for hoping that the total of the Mansion House Fund will greatly exceed the present figure. The war in South Africa has many times been said to be over. But when the annexation of the Transvaal was officially proclaimed, some newspapers expressed the hope that the private liberality which had hitherto been almost wholly diverted into the War Funds might at length do justice to the claims of India. The hope was vain. There has been no sensible increase of the kind suggested in the Lord Mayor's Fund for the famine.

It ought not to be necessary to recapitulate the grounds for the vote of a national grant. As the need exists in India, the British nation owes to itself the duty of not failing to meet it. Some Indians, it is true, have deprecated a national grant—or, to be accurate, they deprecated it many months ago when the unprecedented severity of the famine had not been felt and could not be foreseen. A public debt, they said, savoured of humiliation. The feeling did them credit. But what could be less creditable than for those upon whom the duty of rendering succour falls to seize upon the reluctance of Indians to ask as a pretext for failing to give? We would not suggest that the British people have been guilty of this meanness. On the contrary, all the available evidence goes to show that a grant to India would be thoroughly popular in this country. It has been urged in resolutions by scores of public meetings, it has been advocated—in spite of the active opposition of Ministers—by newspapers of all political parties, it has formed the basis of memorials and petitions from public bodies like the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce, and when a party division upon the matter was forced upon the House of Commons by the Government Whips every Conservative member who had any special knowledge of India refused to vote in the Government lobby. The nation, in short, has sought to impress upon the Cabinet by every means in its power that the proposed grant is equitable and ought forthwith to be made. Why, then, does the Cabinet fail to give effect to what is so manifestly the national will?

We should be reluctant to believe that so strong a claim to charity, even if it were a claim to charity alone, would be rejected by Englishmen. But in the present instance the claim to charity is also a claim for justice. "India," as Mr. Mehta said last March, "would fain appeal to England's sense of justice rather than of generosity." Mr. Mehta made special reference to the Chitral campaign—an Imperial operation beyond the Indian frontier, of which, nevertheless, India was required to bear the whole cost. On that occasion, too, the British public was not only willing but anxious that, as in the case of the Afghan War, part of the burden should be borne by the British Treasury. The injustice was perpetrated, not by the people, but by the Government. Mr. Mehta referred also to the work of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, and suggested that its enquiries might lead to a just re-apportionment of common charges between England and India. Since that time the Report of the Commission has been issued, and even the official majority declare that the present charges upon India must in equity be reduced

by at least a quarter of a million sterling per annum. The Majority Report, as we have frequently pointed out, is niggardly and timid enough. But even on its showing the debt which England owes to India is enormous. These unjust charges were not invented yesterday. When a fairer scale is approved, is no account to be taken of arrears? And if arrears are to be taken into account, say, for the past twenty years, there will have to be a refund of five millions—the very sum which has been suggested as the national grant for the relief of famine. And here, be it remembered, we are dealing with but one small portion of one department of India's claims upon England. "Great Britain and Ireland," as Mr. Donald Smeaton, a member of the Viceroy's Council, said last April, "owe a debt to the Indian peasant, a debt of millions upon millions." How, then, can the national grant be refused?

The arguments, if that is the right word, by which the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Balfour, and Lord George Hamilton have sought to meet the proposal are melancholy enough. Fundamentally these pleas were vitiated by the misapprehension to which we have already referred—that a grant was being asked towards the Indian Exchequer. With the removal of that misapprehension the arguments which were based upon it also disappear. For the rest, Mr. Balfour and Sir Michael Hicks Beach are on perilous ground when they suggest that England is debarred from making a grant to India (1) because it would be a bad financial precedent, and (2) because the South African War has proved very costly. The *Times* brushed aside these bits of irrelevant special pleading with suitable scorn when it pointed out the exceptional nature of the occasion and the impolicy—to put it no higher—of presenting the Imperial Government in the character of Mr. Gradgrind. The South African War has much to answer for. But, costly as it has proved, not in money alone, no sane person will suggest that it leaves England too poor to contribute, if her Ministers are so minded, to the relief of famine in India. The talk about financial precedent is more subtle, though it must be said at once that it comes with singularly bad grace from a Ministry which has made itself notorious by voting away three and a quarter millions annually in the form of "doles" to favoured sections of its own supporters. Ignorant and incautious hearers and readers are no doubt easily led astray when British Ministers talk about making India financially self-supporting. She is already that, and something more. What is really apprehended is not a condition of financial dependence but, as the *Pioneer* and Colonel Milward have frankly shown, the increased British interest in Anglo-Indian administration which might reasonably be expected to follow a vote of public money. For our part we should regard that increase of interest as pure gain not only to India but to the United Kingdom also. As for any danger of mischievous interference in India's finances, that is purely imaginary. Even if it were not so, it could not be said to arise from a vote of money for charitable purposes, under the Viceroy's personal control, and upon the lines of the Mansion House Fund.

THE EXPLOITATION OF CONQUERED RACES.

THERE has recently been published a small volume containing essays by three members of the Liberal party who have not bowed the knee to Baal, or worshipped in the Temple of "Imperialism"—three voices raised against the abnegation of all that has hitherto been held most sacred by Liberalism—justice, honesty, and peaceful progress. It is encouraging, in these days of the worship of force and the omnipotence of money, to find that the old spirit that more than a hundred years ago animated Fox and Sheridan in their opposition to the madness of the hour still animates those who claim to be their political descendants. History will justify these as it has

long ago justified those; and the men who now uphold the banner of peace and equity will hand on to the future the great traditions which have been left us by the early friends of freedom and reform. It is impossible to deal with all three essays in the space at our disposal. We must leave on one side what Mr. Francis W. Hirst has to say of "Imperialism and Finance," and what Mr. J. L. Hammond has to say on "Colonial and Foreign Policy," and confine ourselves to Mr. Gilbert Murray's paper on the "Exploitation of Inferior Races."

Mr. Murray begins with an account of the rise of slave industry in the ancient world; the economic forces that favoured it; especially the preference of the capitalists for cheap, submissive, and "fully exploitable" labour, which could not be obtained from the free citizens of the Greek republics, and had therefore to be sought in the shape of "captive or destitute aliens." Mr. Murray then turns to ask if there is anything analogous in modern times, and more particularly in the British Empire, to the slavery of the ancient world. The general reply would be that there is not, and that if such a condition was ever found among us, as in the days of negro servitude, it was abolished once and for ever after many struggles and at a great price. But of this Mr. Murray is not so sure. He goes back to the old definition of Aristotle, that a slave is a "live tool," and asks if this does not cover the same ground as our modern word "exploit." In fact he finds in the present day and in the British Empire two forms of industrial organisation which, though of course far from being a reproduction of the ancient slavery, have many social and economic analogies therewith.

The first of these forms, and the one with most points of resemblance to what existed in Greece and Rome (if we leave out of account the acknowledged slavery still existing in the Congo State, some German colonies and a few other places—now even in the form of *corvées* quite exceptional) is "the importation of destitute or semi-destitute aliens into countries where they can serve us." Here is Mr. Murray's description of this case:—

The simplest case is the system of indenture as applied to Indian and Chinese coolies, and to Polynesians or *Kauakas*. The labourer voluntarily signs an agreement for a term of years, and is shipped off to a foreign country, where he is, for most purposes, not under the ordinary law, but under special indenture regulations. His freedom is curtailed in every direction; but, on the other hand, his wages are secured and his general condition inspected by Government. He is looked after when he is sick, protected against extremes of cruelty and dishonesty on the part of his master, and taken home again at the end of his time. The system works well in places like Fiji, where the area is small, supervision easy and the government not dependent upon the employers. It works ill in large continental regions, such as Queensland, where these conditions are reversed. About 15,000 indentured coolies leave India every year.

But "the great field for the working of the alien in modern times is the alien's own country." This is the second and much the most important form of modern exploitation, and is evidently much less like that which existed in the ancient world, for under that civilisation exile was more disagreeable, and therefore the masters were unwilling to go to the slaves; they wanted the slaves brought to them. Moreover in their own country it was easier for the slaves to rebel or escape. Now communication is much easier, and Governments are much stronger, so that the masters neither fear exile for themselves, nor revolt on the part of their slaves:—

The whole of tropical mining, and almost the whole of tropical agriculture—the raising of rice, coffee, sugar, and the like—are carried out by gangs of cheap labourers of inferior race under the rule of white men. And not only in India, where it is a natural outcome of the system of government, but in most of the semi-civilised nations of the world, white men can be found directing the ill-paid and often forced labour of the inhabitants.

Here it may be pointed out that Mr. Murray expressly warns us that the words superior and inferior have in this connexion "little, if any, purely moral connotation":—

One race is "up," and the other is "down"; and the "ups" not

only often use their position like fiends, but usually tend to suffer a good deal of moral deterioration from the mere fact of that position.

Now in the opinion of our author, though the legal status of slavery no longer exists, the essential object of that system is attained by these "modern makeshifts":—

The ancient employer did not specially want legal slaves; he wanted cheap alien labour, and that could only be had in the form of slaves. The modern employer can, as a rule, get his cheap alien labour by processes less wasteful, less shocking to outside opinion, and less disastrously cruel. But the essence of the demand is the same, and the essence of the thing supplied is the same.

Mr. Murray proposes three tests by which real slavery can be recognised—all three being points noted by the ancients in the actual slaves of those times. (1) Free men despise the work that is usually done by slaves. (2) The enslaved grow degraded and immoral. (3) They tend to despair and die out. And one or other, sometimes all, of these are found reproduced under the exploitation of modern times. Nay the third has become much intensified, for what was true of individuals in the old times now applies to whole races:—

One remembers the complaints in Roman writers of the ridiculously frivolous pretences on which slaves would commit suicide. A slave accidentally lost a napkin. "Why, if I had found it out," says his master, "I would only have given him half-a-dozen cuts with a whip, and the fool must needs hang himself!" You see what it means! That life is so low, and poor, and vile, and hopeless, that a feather in the scale makes the slave throw it away.

This is the kind of thing that has been happening to whole nations under our modern exploitation:—

Those men and women who look broken down by the time they are thirty, who leave no children behind them, who have forgotten their fishing and their hunting and their old rude forms of art, who sit (as I have seen one or two) with heads bowed, doing nothing, saying nothing, in a world in which there is no longer anything they can call their own—those men and women are, I think, engaged in a process that we sometimes read about but do not often see: they are dying of despair.

This is the glorious result of our Imperial mission—the destruction of those peoples who cannot be made to work for us, and the exploitation of all the others.

One point is brought out very clearly in the essay, and that is the great extent to which the British Empire depends for its fighting upon men of alien race, "more possibly than any State since Carthage." In Africa, before the present war, and in India, nearly all our fighting has been done for us by natives of the country:—

We cannot spare more of the ruling race to fight. We take instead some naturally warlike savages, train them, officer them, and make them do the fighting for us. They like it, they are cheap, and we do not so much mind when they are killed.

But some day they may fight against us, and the employment of "uniformed savages," as in some of our African wars, may tend to make British warfare rather too like that of "savages without uniform."

Excellent as is the greater part of Mr. Murray's paper, there is a pessimism about his views of the future which one would fain hope events will not justify. He scouts the idea that the English settler among subject races is a being of a different nature from other Europeans; and, indeed, he gives some terrible instances of the cruelties committed by Englishmen. Yet he believes that the exploitation must still go on. Equal laws for the stronger and weaker races when in contact he believes to be idle or even dangerous. At the best he hopes that the home Government and home opinion by not interfering too much, and by humouring the oppressors, may be able to keep the oppression within bounds. As for the idea of training up the subject peoples to share our freedom, that hope he sadly admits is no longer held by any save a few dreamers, and is no longer countenanced by any political party. He makes light of any material injury to the workers at home through the exploitation of the

workers of the Tropics. He thinks that "on the whole, many necessities and conveniences of life will be cheapened and the standard of comfort raised for the white working-man." This is the bait—a bait analogous to that which tempted the free worker of antiquity to countenance slavery—the hope that one day he might himself possess a slave. But we are not so sure as Mr. Murray that the modern workman will succumb to the temptation of gaining a share in the exploitation of the Tropics. The Revolution has bequeathed some inextinguishable hopes, however much for the moment they may seem to be forgotten. Is it so very certain that the workers will sell their birthright for a mess of pottage? Is it so very certain that the belief in human fraternity is dead, because a capitalistic press has succeeded in making the Empire popular, and in persuading its readers that the Empire's expansion is a sure road to prosperity? The leaders of the workers have for the most part stood firm amid the madness of the hour; and where the leaders are to-day may not the whole mass be to-morrow?

OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

APPROPRIATELY enough, the extraordinary election in which the country is now engaged is producing some astonishing results. London and Manchester have been submerged by the khaki tide, but in other parts of the country the constituencies seem to be remaining high and dry. King Chance demonstrated his fickleness by giving on one day all the new votes to the Liberals and most of the insecure seats to the Conservatives, while on the following day the Conservatives, notwithstanding an overwhelming accession of voting strength, surrendered as many as six seats to their opponents and captured only three. To-day's pollings should be decisive so far as the boroughs are concerned, but at the time of writing the results are still a matter of speculation. The remaining contests in London will almost certainly yield a Ministerial majority equal to that obtained in 1895, when the Unionists captured all but eight of the metropolitan constituencies. In the country the fortunes of war are likely to be of a more equal character. One of the stiffest fights is in West Leeds, where Mr. Herbert Gladstone has conducted a vigorous defence against unusual odds. He has represented the seat since 1885, having before that been one of the members for the united borough in succession to his illustrious father.

Some of the contests have produced most unexpected results. Thus, Mr. Keir Hardie has been returned as one of the members for Merthyr Tydvil in place of Mr. Pritchard Morgan—a piece of good fortune which he owes to a personal squabble between Mr. Morgan and his former colleague, Mr. D. A. Thomas. Hastings, of all places, has rejected a Tory in favour of a Liberal. Mr. Winston Churchill divides the representation of Oldham with a Liberal. Northampton has proved more than faithful to Mr. Labouchere, for it has given him a Liberal instead of a Conservative colleague to work with. Derby, Sir W. Harcourt's old seat, has reverted to its Liberal allegiance. Despite his unsparring condemnation of the war Mr. John Burns has been re-elected by an increased majority. Mr. Bryce retains his seat, while Mr. Havelock Wilson, a Labour Imperialist, is utterly defeated. Never was there an election so fruitful in surprises or so unexpected in its caprices. What the end will be it is quite impossible to imagine. At present one is inclined to say that the balance of parties will scarcely be disturbed.

Of the numerous forecasts issued by self-proclaimed experts few are founded on knowledge. Mr. Algernon Ashton, whose labours in another field have earned him the nickname of "Old Mortality," predicts a Unionist majority of between 170 and 190. Captain Middleton's prophetic vision is less sanguine. He is said to have foretold an exact repetition of the result of the election of 1895—namely, a Government majority of 150. A pessimistic Liberal who holds an official position in his party has also drawn up a table of probable wins and losses, the effect of which is to give Lord Salisbury a majority of 200. On the other hand an experienced electoral astrologer on the U-

side, whose horoscopes have generally been justified by the event, can only see his way to a Ministerial majority of ninety-five. Perhaps the most interesting feature of these forecasts is their mutual destructiveness. They only agree in crediting the Unionist hosts with victory—and most of us, without being able to read the stars, could make as good a guess. Until the counties begin to poll, the result must still be uncertain. More than once the slow-moving rural voter has transformed the whole complexion of an electoral contest.

If the Government is confirmed in office some interesting changes in its personnel may be looked for. Mr. Chamberlain has so completely overshadowed his colleagues throughout the contest in the country that it would be almost ludicrous to find him continuing to play second fiddle to Mr. Balfour in the House of Commons. Some way out of the dilemma must be found. Mr. Balfour may possibly try to save his face by seeking refuge in the House of Lords, leaving Mr. Chamberlain in possession as First Lord of the Treasury. For a time, at least, Lord Salisbury will continue to act as Prime Minister, but whether he will retain his portfolio as Foreign Secretary, or hand it over to Mr. Balfour, or call Lord Cromer in to fill the position, or appeal to Lord Curzon to come home and take it up, remains to be seen. Conservatives declare that on one thing they are quite determined, and that is that Mr. Chamberlain shall be made neither Prime Minister nor Foreign Secretary.

An incident of the election which even the Unionist party in time to come will recall with satisfaction has been Lord Roberts's emphatic disclaimer of sympathy with either side in the struggle. The repudiation was provoked by an indiscreet remark attributed to a military friend of the veteran Field Marshal to the effect that Lord Roberts had expressed a desire for the success of the Unionists. Sir George Newnes cabled this amazing assertion to the British headquarters in South Africa and was fortunate enough to elicit an immediate disclaimer. "I always hold aloof from politics," Lord Roberts replied, a message which he supplemented a day later by a telegram to another Liberal candidate saying, "I never mix in politics." Indirectly, those messages convey a reproof to the Colonial Secretary, who, in speech after speech, has sought to identify the British army with the interests of a party.

On the eve of the first polling day official announcement was made of the appointment of Lord Roberts to succeed Lord Wolsley as Commander-in-Chief. The pretext for this curiously prompt intimation, which anticipates the date of Lord Wolsley's retirement by nearly five weeks, was that the day on which it was made happened to be Lord Roberts's birthday. What a sentimental Government to be sure! Many people were uncharitable enough—or shrewd enough—to suggest a more sordid motive for Lord Salisbury's haste. From the very beginning of the election there has been a brisk agitation in the Unionist press for a reorganisation of the War Office, of which the starting-point was to be the dismissal of Lord Lansdowne. The Prime Minister may have hoped to appease the malcontents by his decision to install Lord Roberts at Pall Mall. If so, he must have been disappointed, since by his own supporters the appointment has been bitterly resented as a proof of the Ministerial determination to make no immediate changes in the Cabinet. Non-partisans, however, warmly approve the Prime Minister's selection. It is said that Lord Roberts will be the first Commander-in-Chief who has been promoted to that supreme position after having held the chief command in India.

Rumours of political litigation fill the air. Mr. Philip Stanhope has challenged Mr. Chamberlain to a prosecution for libel in connexion with the Hawksley dossier. An action against Mr. Chamberlain is spoken of for his unauthorised publication of certain private letters written by Mr. John Ellis, Mr. Labouchere, and Dr. Clark—a proceeding stigmatised by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman as a breach of honour and a breach of law. Mr. Lowles has threatened Mr. Cremer with legal proceedings. There has been talk in Carnarvon of the terrors of Holloway Gaol. Writs are passing between rival candidates in other constituencies, and many petitions are on the stocks. Surely there must be some fire beneath all this smoke. The lawyers are rubbing their hands in gleeful anticipation, but it is just possible that they may be disappointed. The bitterness of a general election often die out as suddenly as they

INDIA AND THE GENERAL ELECTION.

THE INDIAN PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE.

Mr. C. E. Shaw has been re-elected for Stafford by a majority of 155 votes. His majority in 1895 was 12.

Mr. D. F. Goddard has been re-elected for Ipswich by a majority of 350 votes. His majority in 1895 was 177.

Sir John Leng has been re-elected for Dundee by a majority of 2,469 votes. His majority in 1895 was 2,202.

Mr. F. Maddison, not a member of the Indian Parliamentary Committee but a good friend of India, has been defeated at Sheffield (Brightside). He was one of the "stalwarts" against the war. They make war materials in Sheffield!

Mr. William Field has again been returned unopposed for the St. Patrick's Division of Dublin City.

Mr. George Harwood has been returned unopposed for Bolton. At the last election his majority was 552.

Mr. Timothy Harrington has again been returned unopposed for Dublin Harbour.

Mr. D. Brynmor Jones, has been returned unopposed for Swansea. His majority in 1895 was 1,832.

Mr. H. E. Kearley is again senior member for Devonport. His majority was 232 against 268 at the last election.

Mr. Geo. Lambert has been returned unopposed for the South Melton Division of Devon. His majority at the last election was 1,360.

Mr. Batty Langley has again been returned unopposed for the Attercliffe Division of Sheffield.

Mr. E. J. C. Morton has been re-elected for Devonport. His majority was 144 against 209 in 1895.

Mr. George Palmer has held his seat at Reading by a reduced majority.

Mr. John Burns has been re-elected for Battersea by a majority of 254 votes. His majority in 1895 was 244.

Mr. Thomas Lough has been re-elected for West Islington by a majority of 19 votes. His majority in 1895 was 1,463.

Mr. J. Havelock Wilson has been defeated at Middlesbrough by 55 votes. His majority in 1895 was 2,020. Mr. Wilson was one of the group of Labour members, and especially watched the interests of working sailors.

Mr. W. Hazell has been defeated at Leicester by 538 votes, owing to a split in the Liberal and Labour vote. His majority in 1895 was 99.

Mr. J. Compton Rickett has been re-elected for Scarborough by a majority of 107. His majority in 1895 was 24.

Mr. F. J. Horniman has been re-elected for Plymouth by a majority of 20 votes. His majority in 1895 was 49.

Mr. J. H. Yoxall has been re-elected for Nottingham (East) by a majority of 334 votes. His majority in 1895 was 513.

Mr. C. E. Schwann has been re-elected for Manchester (North) by a majority of 26 votes. His majority in 1895 was 445.

Mr. J. Lloyd Morgan has been returned unopposed for West Carmarthenshire. His majority in 1895 was 1,040.

Mr. J. Bryn Roberts has been returned unopposed for South Carnarvonshire. There was no contest in 1895.

Captain Donelan has been returned unopposed for East Cork. There was no contest in 1895.

Mr. John Roche has been returned unopposed for East Galway. There was no contest in 1895.

Mr. T. J. Condon has been returned unopposed for East Tipperary. There was no contest in 1895.

Mr. J. Samuel has been defeated at Stockton-on-Tees by 389 votes. His majority in 1895 was 472.

Mr. S. F. Mendl, Mr. Augustine Birrell, and Mr. W. Runciman, Liberal "Imperialists," three of the seven Liberals who followed Sir Henry Fowler into the lobby on August 8, 1899, against Sir W. Wedderburn's motion for the exercise of effective Parliamentary control over Indian finances, have been defeated at Plymouth, North-East Manchester, and Oldham respectively. They were not members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee.

INDIA AND THE FABIAN SOCIETY.

Under the title "Fabianism and the Empire" (London: Grant Richards) the Fabian Society has issued a Manifesto, edited by Mr. Bernard Shaw. It would probably be a mistake to treat the document seriously. The following passages refer to India:—

"The primary conditions of Imperial stability are not the same throughout the Empire. The democratic institutions that mean freedom in Australasia and Canada would mean slavery in India, and the Sudan. We are no longer a Commonwealth of white men and

baptized Christians—the vast majority of our fellow-subjects are black, brown, or yellow; and their creed is Mahometan, Buddhist, or Hindoo. We forbid the sale of the Bible in Khartoum, and punish British subjects in India for blasphemy against Vishnu. We rule these vast areas and populations by a bureaucracy as undemocratic as that of Russia. And if we substituted for that bureaucracy local self-government by the white traders, we should get black slavery, and, in some places, frank black extermination, as we have had in the 'back blocks' of Australia. As for parliamentary institutions for native races, that dream has been disposed of by the American experiments after the Civil War. They are as useless to them as a dynamo to a Caribbean. We thus have two Imperial policies—a democratic policy for provinces in which the white colonists are in a large majority, and a bureaucratic policy where the majority consists of coloured natives. Consequently the Empire cannot be governed either on Liberal or Conservative, democratic or aristocratic principles exclusively; and cannot be governed on Church of England or Nonconformist principles at all. An Imperial issue between these parties and creeds is necessarily a false issue.

"So far, the broad divisions seem simple and well marked. But it happens that in the two provinces of the Empire which have just been visited by the most terrible of calamities—war, plague, and famine—neither method of government can be applied in its integrity.

"Take the case of India, famine-stricken and plague-stricken. At present we govern India despotically and bureaucratically, treating the native as a child who must be governed for his own good. This is the kind of government that really deserves the epithet grand-motherly. Unfortunately, it has hitherto been criticised in our Parliament on home-made principles, the remedy proposed being to confer a parliamentary constitution on the native population. Without raising the question whether Indian subtlety understands parliamentary institutions too well or does not understand them at all, it is certain that they are, for many reasons, impracticable in India. But that is no reason for placing thousands of miles between the capable, educated Indian and the examinations for the Indian Civil Service, and maintaining it so as to provide lucrative posts for Englishmen whose pensions add cruelly to the drain of rupees from a very poor country to a very rich one. For India, therefore, we need:—

"I. An extension of the opportunities of Western 'secondary education' for natives capable of it.

"II. A considerable further Indianization of the higher grades of the Civil Service.

"III. Multiplication of the provincial councils with limited powers under the guidance of the British Raj.

"IV. A wise development of the germs of self-government existent in the village councils.

"These, however, are merely reforms of political machinery. With the really horrible responsibility of the famines upon us, we cannot be satisfied with the official optimism which is content with a demonstration that India would be worse off without our administration. The same kind of optimism, leaning on idle literary contrasts of 'the nineteenth century' with 'the dark ages,' shielded the degradation of our manufacturing and mining population by the industrial revolution in England, and held back Factory legislation for half a century. To tell us that there is no village problem in India; that there is no manufacturing-district problem in India; that there is no excessive taxation in India; that village communism has decayed through its own rottenness, and not through Anglo-Indian ignorance of its nature and value; that the financial transactions between Great Britain and India are perfectly equitable; that, in short, the famines, the conditions of labour in the spinning mills, the poverty and hopelessness, are 'the act of God,' mitigable only by the vigilance of Lord George Hamilton, is to tax our patience too far. Such official apologetics can reassure no sensible citizen until we obtain some reasonably credible information through:—

"(a) An investigation of the social causes of Indian famines as distinct from the meteorological causes.

"(b) An investigation of the way in which the industrial revolution now proceeding is affecting the standard of life of the natives.

"Can it be doubted that the conclusions from such investigations would create an Indian industrial programme, and add considerably to the Indian political programme? And does anyone pretend that we already have the information such investigations would supply, or that our ignorance is doing India no harm?

"In the meantime a more sympathetic attitude towards the aspirations, if not towards the precise programme, of the Indian Congress, and a more courageous toleration of the native Press, may safely be recommended.

"These changes cannot be brought about until we cease to sympathise with the strong caste feeling of the European, both official and merchant. That it exists, and that it has influenced for the worse the conduct of some of the Western Powers towards Japan in the Chinese crisis, is plain enough. Now an Indian is a man; and to be treated as 'half devil, half child' is intolerable to every

man, white or brown. Yet this attitude on the part of the ruling white aristocracy of India daily finds expression in unconscious contumely and sometimes in acts which are open outrages. The Indians live in an atmosphere of conquest; and to fight against an atmosphere is a task of such infinite difficulty that it makes them despair of all constitutional efforts to emancipate themselves.

"It is important that Indian reforms should be taken in hand promptly, if only because of their importance as Imperial experiments. For we shall find in Africa as well as in Asia that the races we have to govern no more consist exclusively of ignorant and helpless tribesmen, capable of nothing but pure tutelage, than our own population consists exclusively of ignorant and helpless agricultural labourers. And if we persist in the lazy policy of treating them like children, and adducing their submission as a proof that they are incapable of a share in government, until they rebel (meanwhile training regiments of them, be it remembered, in the use of modern weapons), then, after a long period of ill-will, during which they will be a menace to the Empire instead of a buttress, they will rebel; and their rebellion will prove our incapacity for governing, not theirs for being governed. In fact, our first duty to our subjects is to make them as independent of our guidance, and consequently as appreciative of our partnership, as possible."

Elsewhere the Manifesto has something to say upon what it calls "the question of the worthlessness of our present examinations as a test for Indian capacity" :—

"We point out the need for a reformed Consular Service, and for a greater Indianization of our Eastern bureaucracy. But how are we to select our reformed consular staff, or our Indian officials? We have no test but the test of an education which is no education. The competitive examinations by which we obtain our upper division civil servants would be as likely as not to exclude the sort of man who would be successful in organising British trade in a foreign market. Bengal is prolific of young natives who can commit to memory a whole volume of Mr. Herbert Spencer's Synthetic Philosophy with less effort than it costs an Englishman to learn the multiplication table; and this very docility and avidity for ready-made ideas enables them to pass examinations as effectually as it unfits them for governing men and coping with emergencies. Yet we have no better means of estimating capacity than the educational test, applied by examiners who are its own products. It is only within the last few years, and mainly on the initiative of men whose public conscience has been awakened by Socialism, that political science has at last obtained official recognition as a subject of public education. A year ago, if a County Council, Vestry, or Municipal Corporation wished to secure a clerk certified by a University as properly instructed in statistics, taxation, and municipal constitutional law, it could not do so, nothing of the kind being available except the familiar University examination in obsolete political economy treatises compiled by professors for professors without any reference to or knowledge of the problems of practical administration. The new London University has a Faculty of Political Science which at last supplies this need; but it is only a fragment of our educational system, whereas it should be the most important part of it. The real educational problem which confronts our statesmen is not the struggle of the Church with the Nonconformists for the souls of our elementary scholars, but the establishment of quite new subjects and methods having for their object the technical training of the public servants who will constitute the executive of the Empire, and the education in citizenship of those upon whose votes their authority will be based."

SIR M. M. BHOWNAGREE'S ADDRESS.

Sir M. M. Bhownagree's Address to the electors of North-East Bethnal Green contains the following passage:—

"Our operations in the battlefield of the Sudan and the Fashoda incident have not only avenged the unfortunate Gordon massacre, but removed all doubt for the future as to our influence in the region of the Nile; the firm treatment of the belligerent tribes on the Afghan frontier has been of equal effect in fixing our hold on our Indian Empire and rendering remote the chance of an invasion in that quarter by any aggressive Power; and to the active part which British arms are taking in quelling the disturbances in China will be due the restoration at an early date of peace and the maintenance of our large commercial interests in the far East."

The Address makes no mention of the Indian famine or of any question arising out of it.

MR. BROCKLEHURST IN MANCHESTER.

The defeat of Mr. Brocklehurst in South-West Manchester is to be regretted, as he has made Indian questions a feature of his campaign. Criticising the votes of his opponent (Mr. Galloway), Mr. Brocklehurst said:—In answer to the question as to why he was absent from the House of Commons when the grant was proposed for the starving millions of India, Mr. Galloway had said that "the only proposition put forward was a suggestion of Sir Henry Fowler that to save the starving millions of India from dying like rats a grant of £1,000 should be made." Such an answer, said Mr. Brocklehurst, was a revelation of colossal ignorance and abounding impudence. "It was an insult to the intelligence of the electors of Hulme, and a

facts which had become historic. The fact of the matter was that on Thursday, the 28th of July last, Mr. Souttar moved a resolution the object of which was to make a grant of five millions sterling to our starving subjects in India. The motion was defeated by 119 votes to 65, and the importance of the debate might be measured from the fact that Sir Michael Hicks Beach and Mr. Balfour took part in it. Yet now, in order to shuffle out of a straight answer to a straight question, Mr. Galloway denied that any such motion was made or division taken. In the view of Mr. Brocklehurst a man so colossally ignorant of public affairs ought to be sent back either to a boarding school or to his mother's nursery. He has obviously undertaken to represent an intelligent community of his fellow-men in the House of Commons. The reason he (Mr. Brocklehurst) had entered into this fight so keenly was as waging warfare against the idea that a man who had nothing but money to recommend him was a fit and proper person to represent a great working-class constituency.

MAJOR EVANS GORDON AND THE ELECTORS OF STEPNEY.

The *Morning Leader* wrote on Tuesday last (October 2) :—

There is a matter to which we wish to direct the attention of the voters in Stepney. When they are asked to believe that Major Evans Gordon is a fit and proper person to represent them in the House of Commons, they ought to remember the peculiarly despotic part which he played in India. The influence of an Anglo-Indian training upon the average Englishman is an interesting political study. How much of the recent reactionary tendency in our politics is due, one wonders, to the effects of a system under which so many Englishmen learn to regard themselves as Oriental tyrants, to despise those whom they rule, and to claim for their personal caprice the effect of law? Certainly it would be hard to conceive a system less likely to fit men to become popular representatives in a popular assembly. But if this is true of Anglo-Indian administration generally, it is peculiarly true of its most secret and most despotic department—the department of Political Agents. Now it is in this school—more Russian than English in spirit—that Major Evans Gordon has been trained. He it was who in 1895 was sent to Jhallowar, a small Native State in Rajputana, as Political Agent. From the first he appears to have been on the worst possible terms with the Native ruler, and he sent some hostile reports to his official superiors—raising up everything that the faction opposed to the Native ruler, or Maharajji Rana, could be found to say to his disadvantage—that within twelve months the wretched man was deposed without a trial or any public enquiry, and driven forth as an exile from his country. The affair excited great indignation in India at the time, and Major Evans Gordon's conduct in the matter was brought before the House of Commons on a motion for adjournment. It seems well-nigh inconceivable that such a man can be regarded by the working men of Stepney as a suitable champion of their interests.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

3,163,000 ON RELIEF.

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Viceroy, dated October 3, on the subject of the Famine :—

“Rainfall exceptionally heavy during the week in Central Bengal and Behar. General rain also in Northern India, Central Provinces, Rajputana. Rain has been very beneficial on the whole, as securing satisfactory winter sowings. Prospects good, except in limited areas, Bombay Deccan. Number of persons in receipt of relief :—Bombay, 980,000; Punjab, 29,000; Central Provinces, 1,446,000; Berar, 192,000; Ajmere-Merwara, 28,000; Rajputana States, 72,000; Central India States, 48,000; Bombay Native States, 106,000; Baroda, 50,000; North-Western Provinces, relief discontinued; Punjab Native States, 12,000; Central Provinces Feudatory States, 28,000; Hyderabad, 169,000; Madras, 3,000; Bengal, relief discontinued.—Total, 3,163,000.”

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Governor of Bombay :—

“Following are figures for week ended September 22 :—Famine-stricken districts, 423 cases of cholera, of which 305 were fatal. Native States—cases of cholera, 651; deaths from cholera, 433. Total number of deaths among numbers on relief works or gratuitous relief—British districts—3,292, or 3 3-10 per mille. Rain has been absent, or light and scattered, over the greater part of affected area. Crops are now in urgent need of rain in parts. Numbers relieved are diminishing.

THE “INVESTORS’ REVIEW” FUND.

The *Investors’ Review* writes (September 29) :—

“The following letter states what we had hoped would be the amount of our little fund raised to help the distress

of India, through Indian Congress channels. At times we have felt inclined to abandon this hope, but have never altogether done so. Not much attention can be expected from benevolent people during the next week or two, when all minds will be drenched in platform oratory; but we shall keep the fund open at least until the end of the year, trusting it will not be forgotten when quietness is re-established. Meanwhile, hearty thanks for any mite :—

To the Editor.

September 25, 1900.

Sir,—You have pleaded so long and so eloquently on behalf of the poor Indians that, though in common with many others I have already found local channels of contributing, I cannot resist your appeal to keep the ball rolling.

I should like to see your Fund mount up to £1,000, and, with wealthy London at your door, that ought not to be difficult.

Herewith I have the pleasure of enclosing a cheque for a guinea.—Your obedient servant,

PROVINCIAL READER.

Here is another letter which appeared in the current issue of the *Reformer* which is also worth reading as showing the spirit in, as also the care with, which the money entrusted by us to a high-minded and philanthropic committee is administered :—

Nepcan Sea Road, Malabar Hill, Bombay.

August 4, 1900.

Dear Mrs. Bradlaugh Bonner,—It gives me pleasure to acknowledge the receipt of your postcard of July 2 and your letter of the 9th idem. The remittance of 412 referred to in the letter has duly come, and has been handed to the committee which has charge of the famine fund collected by the *Investors’ Review*. The Honourable Mr. Justice Ranade and myself are members of that committee, and you may rely upon our utilising the amount for the purpose for which it was collected. Meanwhile, I enclose the receipt for the sum and have to request you to convey the thanks of the committee to the donors for their kind sympathy for my distressed countrymen and countrywomen.

It was indeed exceedingly kind of you to have given them a thought and interest yourself in their relief when you and your friends have other charitable demands to satisfy nearer home, in connexion with the unhappy struggle still going on in South Africa, which we all so deeply lament. Now that there has been a fair fall of rain it is expected that the destitute will return to their homes and fields, though their condition till harvest time will, it is to be feared, be not much better off than it is now. The interest you have so actively displayed in this matter was not unexpected from the daughter of one to whom India is not a little grateful for that memorable visit he paid to our National Congress at Bombay in 1889, and the energy, ability, and eloquence with which he advocated her cause in and out of Parliament till almost the very end of his busy life.

As for your kind sentiments towards me personally I may say that I am not conscious of having done aught for your lamented father beyond what duty prompted me. India felt that some recognition was due to him for the noble service he had rendered here, though I must say that he has left a permanent memorial of himself in the heart of every Indian by the way in which he followed in the footsteps of that other noble friend of India, the late Prof.-sr Fawcett, and devoted like him most unselfishly, but liberal mindfully, to the welfare of the almost voiceless millions of this country.

Again thanking you for kind interest and sympathy,—I remain, yours sincerely,

P. M. MENITA.

This fund is administered through the Native and other gentlemen connected with the Indian Congress, a body of the utmost value as an indication of Indian aspirations and opinions on domestic affairs. It goes without a farthing deducted, either in this office or by the administrators, for expenses, to help the poorest and most necessitous in places selected by the committee in Bombay, and ought, we humbly submit, to have had a larger measure of support from those who desire to establish a feeling of common interest and common citizenship between different sections of the Empire. Most grateful are all interested in the effort for the help so many have generously accorded, but we want more, for the distress continues great and will continue for many months to come. Cheques, etc., should be drawn to A. J. Wilson, Union Bank of London, Famine Fund Account.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBTIONS.

Amount acknowledged last week	£851	10	7
Provincial Reader	1	10
J. H. P., per INDIA	1	00
“Thank Offering”	1	00
Total to date	£854	11	7

CAUSES OF FAMINE.

In a further paper in *Britannia* upon Social and Economic Causes of Famine in India, Mr. J. W. Root writes :—

In another way the even-handed administration of justice has fallen with hardship on the poorer classes. Their dependence on the banniah, or Native money-lender, is notorious, and in many instances this individual becomes the virtual owner of the bodies, and almost of the souls of his numerous clients. However hard may be the conditions he imposes, the law courts are always ready to confirm his

rights, provided he has not strayed beyond the bounds of absolute legality. The bunniah is no doubt a necessity of modern Indian life, and he can only pursue his calling if assured of protection against fraud and dishonesty. During the stress of famine, however, the Government itself has, in numerous instances, to render assistance and afford credit, either for payments due to it, or for money actually advanced. While the conduct of such business and the resulting competition with private enterprise can scarcely be regarded as legitimate in normal times, there ought to be some middle course whereby, under the auspices or indirect guarantee of the Government, facilities can be afforded for financial help on reasonable terms. The Government has always found an extreme readiness on the part of its small debtors to honourably discharge their liabilities, and the losses resulting from the confidence and credit given are remarkably small. The difference between the two methods is, that while Government is anxious for its debtors to clear themselves as quickly as possible, the bunniah is determined to keep them involved, and regulates his charges and conditions with this object in view. There is sometimes more justice than equity in the legal decisions that enable him to maintain his hold. English law may be a magnificent institution for guarding the property of those fortunate enough to possess it, but it may be used as a grinding tyranny against those who have none, and almost debbar them from the chance of ever obtaining any.

Allusion was made in the previous article to the circumstance that the deterioration in the welfare of the people, as far as it is evidenced by revenue returns, has taken place under currency conditions that the Government of India hold to have proved eminently successful and satisfactory. But here, again, whatever advantages have resulted have fallen to the already prosperous classes. A moderately high and steady rate of exchange may suit the Government financial arrangements and assist the development of overseas commerce; but has it benefited the rayat? The introduction of the gold standard was declared seven or eight years ago to be absolutely essential if India was to be saved from an increased taxation which she could not bear. Yet this increase was subsequently imposed in the form of import duties, and has remained operative to the present day, with little prospect of remission, and that portion at least bearing upon cotton goods is likely to be felt by the people of all grades. Many millions have meanwhile been added to the sterling debt in England, and to the rupee debt in India, and while some of them have been expended on profitable as well as productive works, a great many more have gone to cover deficits produced by Exchange manipulations, and so have become a permanent burden on the revenue, which the general taxpayers have to bear. At the same time the great majority have been placed in a worse position for doing so. For while the gold standard has not to any appreciable extent raised the value of the rupee within the confines of India itself, it has very seriously depreciated the value of the silver of which it is composed, and which also constituted, very largely, the savings of the people. They have been made to realise this loss to the full during the distress of the famine periods. Such of them as were willing to fall back on their own reserves before applying for Government help found them to be nominally worth only about two-thirds of what they were a few years before, actually perhaps no more than half by the time they had bartered with the money-changer, who was no longer willing to weigh out coined rupees, or base the transaction upon them. We are apt to lose sight of the enormous loss the peasantry must have incurred in this respect alone, and though in some instances it may only have hastened the time for assistance, in a multitude of others it resulted in an unnecessary impoverishment.

This, means that are claimed to have benefited India materially, and which have, without doubt, favoured the ruling and capitalist classes of that country, have been silently and imperceptibly working in the opposite direction upon a great mass, possibly the majority of the population. Facilities for trade and security for capital have helped to enrich the few, but have not yet, as with us, established a condition of things in which the many have participated; there has been a sucking up and abstraction of the wealth of the country faster than it has been possible to replace it.

THE PROPOSED NATIONAL GRANT.

The *Morning Leader* of Tuesday last (October 2) printed the following letter from "A Working Man"—

India's sons are in China ready to fight side by side with the British soldier if the occasion should arise.

India's sons have been bearing our soldiers out of the range of Boer fire. Six millions of stricken India are officially reported starving. Our humane Government has repeatedly refused to give a penny, though one penny will keep a soul alive one day. Now the working man's hard-earned penny has been asked for and taken for the Indian Famine Fund and for our gallant soldiers' wives and children. Beer, tobacco, and tea (without mentioning anything else) has been taxed, and yet one of the first things this Government of doles and disaster did was to give £3,000,000 to the poor starving landlords (including the poor Irish landlords), and not forgetting their own dear selves.

As a hard-working man I am always willing and ready to do my little to alleviate any distress or suffering, but I frankly confess that I have given my pennies with a very bad heart, when I know that these are admitted and positive facts. Again they promised old age pensions and the housing of the working classes. Here was a grand

opportunity to carry out their promise. Sir William Harcourt had even left them the money. But did they do it? No, but they gave it to their friends—gave the starving landlords the money that would have given 18,000 veterans of industry 8s. a week for the remainder of their lives. Again, they might have put it by for our mained soldiers. They might have given it to our poor hospitals, or to anybody but the greedy, bloated landlord. As a working man I can plainly see that I am doubly robbed.

EMPIRE IN INDIA.

The *Humane Review* for October opens with an interesting article by Mr. Edward Carpenter, entitled "Empire: in India and Elsewhere." With reference to India Mr. Carpenter writes:—

There is no need to deny the advantages—the potential advantages—of British rule. The *Pax Britannica* is a fact; and our rule might undoubtedly have afforded a shelter for the prosperity of the Indian peoples—if, alas! any prosperity had come to them; the admittedly high principle of the civilian officials might have ensured good administration, if the civilians had had any sympathetic understanding of the people with whom they had to deal, or any general standard of life higher than that of an overgrown schoolboy; and commercial enterprise would doubtless have brought well-being to the people if the profits of it had not (as in the West) gone to the very few, and those few, Britishers living far away from India.

The main explanation of the sad plight and worse prospects of our great dependency lies in the fact that we are steadily and systematically draining away her resources; we have our hands perpetually in her pocket. Refer to the current number of the *Statistical Abstract Relating to British India*, which brings the accounts down to 1897-98; and to pp. 112-113; and you will almost wonder that our Government has the hardihood to print the figures! This table gives the annual charges made by our Home Government upon India—claims of various kinds, some of them presumably for expenses incurred on behalf of India. There is first of all (of course) the interest on Indian State loans, and the interest and annuities on State railways and guaranteed lines, which all have to be paid through the Banks of England and Ireland, practically to British holders. These altogether amount to £8,770,000 for 1897-98. Then there are the charges made by our Government for military establishments in England supposed to be connected with India, but largely availed of for South Africa and other uses; also for pensions for retired officers, &c.; these together total up to £3,717,000. Then similar charges for civil establishments in England and pensions for retired civilians, &c., which come to £2,289,000. There are a few other charges, on account of post-office, telegraphs, political and other departments, amounting to over £1,000,000; and thus the whole charge made by England totals up to £16,195,000.

This, remember, is not Indian revenue to be spent in India, but it is Indian revenue paid over to England to be spent here. Which of its items really benefit India and to what extent they do so, I must leave the reader to judge. What we cannot get over is that the yearly tribute exacted from this poverty-stricken population is stated by our own Blue-books to be this enormous sum; and that, be it remembered, in gold. Collected as it is in silver, the exchange alone is a huge item; and the total in tens of rupees figures out at Rs. 25,320,000.

Yet this only represents Government charges. To estimate the total drain we must include the enormous private remittances home made by civilian and military officials, and the interest on private loans and commercial undertakings, similarly sent home. With regard to the first item, Mr. Hyndman, in his "Approaching Catastrophe in India," puts the total salaries of the English officials in India at £15,000,000 a year. The salaries are mostly on a handsome scale, and possibly one half of them is saved and sent home for use in England; but if we put down £5,000,000 we shall certainly not be in danger of exaggeration. With regard to the profits on commercial undertakings and what portion of these is yearly remitted to England, it is difficult to arrive at any certainty, but from the figures available one may conclude that a similar sum of £5,000,000 is not too high. Thus we have some £10,000,000 to add to the £16,000,000 Government charges—giving an approximate estimate (probably under the mark) of £26,000,000 a year for the total drain from India to England—or in tens of rupees, say Rs. 40,000,000.

Now, if for a moment we put all other causes aside, it is not difficult to see that a drain of this kind steadily going on must bring ruin behind it. Think what a drain of twenty-six millions annually

¹ Mr. Hyndman is the one Englishman who has gone thoroughly into this great question of India's bankruptcy; and his work is ignored with almost ludicrous care by all the official people.

² Mr. J. M. Maclean, M.P., in his evidence on East Indian Finance before the House of Commons, 1873, placed "the amount of the annual earnings of Englishmen connected with India which are admitted home," at not less than £20,000,000.

on the wealth of England would mean! But on poverty-stricken India it is crushing. The mass of the peasants of India are so poor, even in average years, that they have to go on one meal a day, and even then the vast numbers of them cannot afford rice, but content themselves with some coarser grain. To see their poor thin bodies it is to wonder how they have strength to work. Broken down with boils and blains from insufficient food, many of them tramp long distances to the nearest hospital, recover under the better conditions there, and are soon discharged—only to return again when the same causes bring on the same results. Destitution may be said to be the normal condition of the Indian peasant of late years.

Yet he has to pay (calculated in tens of rupees) Rs. 26,000,000 in land revenue to the Indian exchequer annually. And the Government is ever pressing for more. At its wits' end to find cash for its railways, forts, frontier expeditions, military establishments, and home charges, it neglects measures and expenditure which might be really verifiable for the prosperity of the peasant, and is only occupied in considering how to extract more out of him. It is simply killing the goose for the sake of its eggs.

For instance it may be noticed that the land revenue has gone up from Rs. 23,016,000 in 1888-89, to Rs. 25,683,000 in 1897-98, or over 2½ millions in ten years. Over a large portion of Bengal the land-tax is permanently settled, but outside that region re-assessments are periodically made, and generally at a higher figure (with the result, that while the retail prices of food grains (see *Stat. Abstr.*, table 108) and the general condition of the cultivator have steadily gone up, the levy has been increased by the amount indicated.¹ The reserve stock of the peasant is constantly falling, and this makes the danger of bad seasons so much greater than it was. At the same time the land is being exhausted. Fallowing is discouraged by our system, on which lands without crops are taxed the same as lands with crops (while in some Native States they are only taxed one-eighth); and thus overtopping results. Manure is burnt for fuel. In a little time things will have come to such a pass that even a diminution of taxation will be of little use. Says Sir James Caird in his Report on the Condition of India (dated October 31, 1879):—

"An exhausting agriculture and an increasing population must come to a deadlock. No reduction of the assessment can be more than a postponement of the inevitable catastrophe."²

But nothing shows the desperation of our efforts to obtain money more than the salt-tax. To tax a necessary of life of this kind—and at the rate of some ten or twenty times the value—an absolute outrage; and indeed a thing no Government in its senses would do, if it could possibly invent any other way of obtaining money. But I suppose it is well understood that the limits of taxation have been reached in this unfortunate country. We obtain a little over Rs. 8,000,000 annually from salt, and as we have no intention of diminishing our expenditure the tax is maintained, in face of the discontent which it engenders.

But when the revenue, thus ground out of the Indian people, has been collected, there are two grave questions which arise with regard to its expenditure. One is that which has been touched on already, the drain of a large portion of it out of the country. The revenue from a people may not be very wisely spent by its Government; but if it is spent in the country it returns to the people in some form. The money circulates back among those it was taken from. This is one reason doubtless why the Native States of India are more prosperous and, on the whole, far less famine-stricken than those directly under our rule. Their taxes are lighter, and in many cases considerably heavier than in British territory, yet practically all is spent in the province from which it is drawn; but in the case of British India there is a dead loss to the people every year.³ What this means with regard to the recurrence of famine is obvious enough. Every country suffers from fluctuations of harvest, and in a country like India, a failure of crops (except in very well-irrigated regions) must every now and then be expected. But then in every country the peasant depends for these occasions on his storage power, his banks, his reserves, his actual stocks and stores of grain. In every village in India you see those enormous earthenware jars standing by the side of his cabin, in which the peasant stores his grain. But now if the country is drained every year, there is so much loss of storage power. If, taking the above figures, there is a drain say of £250,000,000 in ten years, this enables us to realise the loss of storage power to the peasant. But if his grain jars are empty, if he has already mortgaged his crops and sold the heavy silver bangles off his wife's arms to pay his taxes, how can he do but die when the year of famine comes, and how can it other than happen that the famine years get more frequent?

In the native provinces it would seem that the revenues (with the exception of what goes to the rajahs and their courts) are spent with considerable regard for the general prosperity of the people. And this brings us to the second question—namely whether the same can be said of our territory, whether that part of the revenue which is spent in the country, and not drained away, is wisely spent? And to this I fear we must answer No.

[We propose to give some further passages from Mr. Carpenter's article next week.]

¹ See notes by my late brother, C. W. Carpenter, B.C.S., in the Report of the Deccan Riots Commission, 1878.

² In this year of Famine, 1900 A.D., I have a letter from a small proprietor in S. India, saying that his lands have not produced enough this year even to meet the Government taxes, which he has consequently to pay out of his reserve.

³ Lord Curzon has issued a strongly-worded circular with regard to the growing practice of native chiefs to neglect their States and visit Europe. The new reports of absence, says the circular, are regarded as a dereliction of duty, and in the future leave for travelling will only be given where it will result in personal and public advantage.⁴ In view of the above remarks, and of our own absentee landlordism on an enormous scale both in India and Ireland, this circular of Lord Curzon's may be regarded in the light of a pleasant little repartee.

LORD KIMBERLEY ON INDIA'S BURDENS.

The following letter appeared in the *Manchester Guardian* of September 18:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "MANCHESTER GUARDIAN."

Sir,—The important debate that took place in the House of Lords on July 20 on the report of Lord Welby's Commission at the instance of the sympathetic Earl of Northbrook, deservedly known as the "Father of Indian Viceroys," has been read with great interest in India. Nothing could have been better than the speech made by Lord Northbrook on the occasion, and the noble Lord has richly earned the thanks of a grateful nation for raising the debate, as well as for the excellent speech he made on the occasion. The speeches of Lord Welby and Lord Onslow, who followed Lord Northbrook, were indeed disappointing, and contained several misstatements of facts; but even they, as also Lord Salisbury's speech, were distinctly better than the speech of the noble Earl, who of all others, should have said most on behalf of India, not only because he is the leader of the Liberal party in the House of Lords, but because he was thrice Secretary of State for India in Mr. Gladstone's Administrations. Lord Kimberley's speech has caused general disappointment. To begin with, Lord Kimberley says that "he had never taken the view that India was unfairly treated by this country." Speaking on the occasion of the important debate on this question that took place in the House of Lords in May, 1893, on a motion brought forward then, as now, by Lord Northbrook, Lord Kimberley, who was then Indian Secretary, said: "The India Office has no particular desire that the question should be re-opened and discussed anew, for bitter experience has taught the department that the re-opening of a question of this kind generally results in the imposition of additional charges." Lord Kimberley went on: "The reasons why proposals that must throw fresh burdens on the Government of India are so frequently made in the House of Commons is that those who make them know that their own pockets will not suffer in the desire to make things agreeable and comfortable. (Laughter.) The taxpayers of the country exercise no check upon such proposals, and the consequence is that charges are sometimes imposed upon the Government of India which that Government thinks unjust and unnecessary." Surely a strange contrast between Lord Kimberley of 1893 and Lord Kimberley of 1900!

Lord Kimberley then said: "It was said that the object of the expenditure of millions of money on the army of India was to maintain the supremacy of British power in the East, and that the policy which dictated the whole treatment of India by this country was an Imperial policy. But India was part of the Empire, and consequently she must bear her share of the Imperial burden. He assumed that on the whole our presence in India was advantageous to the Indian people, and, assuming that, he could not see that India, on account of her connexion with us, was really exposed to any danger that she would not be exposed to if she were entirely independent." "India is part of the Empire," says Lord Kimberley. Yes; she is, and is proud to be; but as the Hon. Mr. Mehta, one of the greatest of living Indians, said on a memorable occasion, let India be treated as part of the Empire not merely when any new burdens are to be thrown upon her or only when any existing unjust impositions are sought to be justified, but also when any new privileges are to be conferred. India is part of the Empire undoubtedly when she has to maintain an army far beyond her needs and requirements; when the army reserve in India is to be utilised for wars in China and South Africa; and when the dumb, suffering Indian taxpayer is to pay for the costliest and most exclusive government in the world. But she is not part of the Empire when justice is to be done to the Indian settlers in South Africa. The loyal Indian subjects of her gracious Majesty living in that part of the Empire cannot even be permitted to attend a meeting held to do honour to our revered Empress-Mother, and Mr. Chamberlain cares not to move his little finger on our behalf. Nor is she part of the Empire when she should be relieved of a portion of her crushing heavy military expenditure, her extravagant civil administration and unjust "home charges," or when a famine grant is to be made to India by your "Government of doles," even at a time when a famine of unparalleled magnitude is doing its work of destruction in this fabled land of wealth. If Lord Kimberley's argument—if argument, indeed, it can be called—is to be pushed to its logical conclusion, India may be burdened with all the expenditure of the British Empire, for the permanence of that Empire is supremely necessary for the well-being of India. Lord Kimberley said towards the end of his speech: "It was being constantly said that the Indian army was the reserve of this country. But was not the army of this country the reserve of India? If the Indian Government had to maintain an additional number of troops equal to that reserve, it would mean a very large additional expenditure indeed." If Lord Kimberley calmly and dispassionately considers the facts about the number of times England has lent her troops to India and the number of times she has borrowed Indian troops, the material savings effected to the English Exchequer by borrowing Indian troops, and the little or no profit that has accrued to India by a loan of English troops; and the wealth of England and the pinching poverty of India, he will, I doubt not, recede from the untenable position he now seems to occupy.—Yours, etc.,

C. Y. CHINTAMANI, Editor *Indian Herald*.

Vizianagram, August 15, 1900.

CONGRESS GREEN-BOOKS.

Nos. I., II., & III. NOW READY.

- I. **THE SKELETON AT THE (JUBILEE) FEAST,**
By SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN, Bart., M.P. (being a Series of Suggestions for the Prevention of Famine in India). Price 7d., post free; in India, by V.P.P., 7 annas.
- II. **ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE:** Evidence-in-Chief of the Five Indian Witnesses. Price is 10d., post free; in India, by V.P.P., R. 1. 4.
- III. **THE PROPOSED SEPARATION OF JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE DUTIES IN INDIA.** Memorandum to the Secretary of State for India. With Two Appendices. Price is 2d., post free; in India, by V.P.P., 14 annas.

LONDON: Published by the BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS, 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, S.W.
IN INDIA: Copies may be obtained from D. E. WAGHA, Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay.

Open Letters to Lord Curzon ON FAMINES IN INDIA.

By ROMESH C. DUTT, C.I.E.

London: KEGAN PAUL & Co., price 7/6. Obtainable in India through any bookseller.

"Mr. R. C. Dutt's volume is extremely opportune at the present time, and his position, that an excessive land tax renders the agricultural population unable to face two or three successive years of drought, calls at least for careful examination. . . . Mr. Dutt is on less debatable ground in pleading for a reduction of the annual drain to England and for the more extended employment of the Indians in civil employ."—*The Times*.

"Mr. Dutt succeeds in showing that, on the whole, areas of recurrent famine have been identical with those of excessive assessment."—*The Daily News*.

"Nothing could be better than the book on Indian Famines which Mr. Dutt has just published in the form of some Open Letters to Lord Curzon. It is thoroughly informed, well-reasoned, and temperate; it tells the inquiring man exactly what he ought to know."—*The Daily Chronicle*.

"We would draw special attention to Mr. Dutt's own convincing and eloquent plea, hidden away in the final pages of the appendix, for the creation of such representative institutions as should enable the Government of India to utilize native services and keep abreast of native opinion."—*The Manchester Guardian*.

"His recommendations are that the land tax should be moderated, that irrigation works should be constructed, and that the public debt and the public expenditure of India should be reduced. These proposals he supports with a wealth of detail of all kinds, which proves his mastery of the subject and makes his good claim to the attention of the governing authorities."—*The World*.

"His view that it is inequitable to make India pay for the maintenance of a large army to be used for the general purposes of the Empire has the support of many high authorities who are by no means to be described as Little Englanders."—*Advertiser*.

LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq., PRESIDENT.

Above Society on receipt of 5 anna stamps will give information regarding course of study and cost of living in England.

Apply, Dr. MULLICK,

85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.



is what its name implies **FEVER DESTROYER,**
and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER.
G. E. WOOD, Capt. 2nd North Staffs. Regt.
"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for a dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than made in it.
G. L. NARAYANA BOW.

FOR DIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Sundlers Municipal Councillors Office—"I have much pleasure in stating that your 'Omm-Carpoor' was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage.
Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans. Rs. 1/8 Rs. 2/12 Rs. and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,
HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.



"INDIA," JAN.-JUNE, 1900. VOL. XIII.

NOW READY.

Bound in Cloth (post free)
7/6 each net cash.

The following volumes of "INDIA," bound in cloth, can also be obtained:—

Vols. V. (1894), VI. (1895), VII. (1896), VIII. (1897).
Price 8/6 each, post free.

Vols. IX. (Jan.-June, 1898), X. (July-Dec., 1898), XI. (Jan.-June, 1899), XII. (July-Dec., 1899). Price 7/6 each, post free.

Remittances should accompany order.

Apply to the Manager, "INDIA,"

84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

To Political Associations, Literary Societies, Ethical Societies, Etc., etc.

LECTURES and ADDRESSES ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

The British Committee of the Indian National Congress (84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.), is now making arrangements for lectures and addresses on Indian questions.

Associations or individuals that desire the services of thoroughly competent speakers on Indian questions are requested to communicate as early as may be with the Secretary to the British Committee at the above address. The services of a recent visitor to the Famine districts are available.

For a limited number of lectures lantern slides can be provided.

No charge will be made for the services of speakers with whom engagements are made through the British Committee.

Address, **THE SECRETARY,**
BRITISH COMMITTEE of the
INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—21st March, 1899.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MEERUT.