

# India

FOR THE

No. 152. NEW SERIES.  
No. 246. OLD SERIES.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1900.

REGISTERED AS A NEWSPAPER. PRICE..... 2D.  
By Post, 3D.

Notes and News .....	265	The <i>Insurers' Review</i> Fund .....	272
The N. Lions' Grant .....	268	Mr. Dadabhai Naoorji at Ken-	273
The Amis of Afghanistan .....	269	nington .....	273
C. & London Letter .....	270	Merciless Tax Gatherers in India .....	274
Notes from Bombay .....	271	Public Medicine on Indian Que-	274
The Famine in India: .....	272	stions: The Work of the British	275
420,000 on Relief .....	272	Committee .....	275
The Mansion House Fund .....	272	Advertisements .....	275-6

that Mr. Naoorji had to confine himself to the just limits of his immediate subject. A statement that is good for a Canon may be good for other people, and so we quote "Altruist's" summary of Mr. Naoorji's position on the occasion:—

In the years 1897 and 1899 thousands of Indians died of want . . . . . The failure of crops was the minor cause; their destitution was the major one. . . . . The people of India are always in a chronic state of destitution, and therefore when there arises the slightest strain upon their resources they die. But they die as a result of famine of money, not of crops. And all this happens although it is admitted that India in a series of years, famine years included, produces enough food for her people. The "man in the street" must ere long ask: "How can this thing be?" "Is there no remedy for an economical condition so deplorable?" . . . . .

Mr. Naoorji's aim was to impress upon his audience that there remedy, and that the people of Britain have that remedy in their hands. He attributed the poverty of India to the faults in administration, and the mortality in years of scarcity to that poverty. He pointed out the cardinal fault of the administration by shot that it is almost wholly alien and enormously expensive, and a consequence it places upon India a burden of taxation which cannot bear. Mr. Naoorji's address at this point may aptly summarised by the notable words of the greatest of living statesmen, the Marquis of Salisbury, spoken when he was at the India Conference: "India is being bled."

It is surely strange that a man with kindly feelings for India, as Canon Johnson undoubtedly is, should not be ashamed, rather than proud, to state that "the thousands of pounds sent out by this country for the relief of the Indian famine, at a time when so many other calls were being made upon its bounty, is an answer to the statement that we drain India of money but contribute nothing." If we take charge of India, it is irrelevant, when her time of distress arrives, to refer to the calls made upon us from other objects of Imperial obligation. We are in any case—call or no call elsewhere—bound in duty and in honour to succour India in calamity. Else we fail in our trust. And what are a few hundred thousands in occasional years to the steady economic drain of say thirty-five millions every year? Really the Canon must take to figures and reconsider this extraordinary "answer" to Mr. Naoorji's complaint of the "drain."

We deeply regret to record the sudden death of Mr. Mervanjee Mancherjee Bhownaggee, barrister-at-law, eldest son of Sir Mancherjee M. Bhownagree, M.P., at the early age of 26. Mr. Mervanjee died on Sunday last (November 25) from failure of the action of the heart. The funeral took place on Wednesday (November 28) at the Parsi Burial Ground in Brookwood Cemetery. General sympathy, in which we respectfully desire to join, is felt for Sir Mancherjee and his family.

An Anglo-Indian correspondent writes to express his regret that, especially at this juncture, "Mr. Swinny (at Petersfield) or any one else should give renewed currency to certain official excuses and local prejudices, the tendency of which is to delay and obstruct the extension of water storage and provision against drought in India." He objects (1) to Mr. Swinny's remark that "the best things have already been done" in irrigation, but admits that it is "six or seven tenths" of the truth; (2) to Mr. Swinny's mention of the "attendant evils," but admits that they "may be taken as two or three tenths;" (3) to Mr. Swinny's assertion that "some parts of India could gain nothing by irrigation;" and (4) to Mr. Swinny's statement that "money is a necessity," which our correspondent calls the "weakest" excuse of all. Mr. Swinny, we believe, is just as anxious as anybody to promote all reasonable means of obviating drought in India. We submitted our correspondent's letter to him, and his reply is to the following effect. (1) is admitted in sufficiently large measure by our correspondent. (2) if the "attendant evils" are as much as "two or three tenths," the mention

## IMPORTANT NOTICE.

In future "INDIA" will be forwarded only to persons in respect of whom subscriptions have been actually received at the London Office. To this rule there will be no exception.

A convenient Order Form for the use of subscribers is printed on page 276.

## NOTES AND NEWS.

THE Viceroy's telegram this week announces a further decrease of the number of persons in receipt of relief, yet a decrease of little more than half that reported in the previous week. The number is stated to have fallen from 555,000 to 420,000. Considerably more than half are registered in the Bombay Presidency. "Rain is still wanted in Bombay, the Karnatic, the Deccan, and Gujerat." Thus for several weeks in succession the insufficiency of the rainfall over the most of the famine-stricken territory has been repeated. The needs of the people are evidently still pressing. The Mansion House Fund, however, while still kept open, is unhappily languishing. On another page we again advocate a National Grant in sympathy.

We are glad to learn that the Calcutta Congress Committee have adopted the following resolutions:—

(1) "The Calcutta Congress Committee convey their most hearty congratulations to Mr. William S. Caine on his election as a member of Parliament for the Camborne Division in Cornwall, and wish him health, prosperity, and success in the furtherance of every good cause."

(2) "The Calcutta Congress Committee record their deep sense of satisfaction at the return to Parliament of Mr. W. S. Caine by the electors of the Camborne Division in Cornwall, and beg to convey their sincere thanks to the electors of that division for their choice having fallen on him. They feel that in having sent Mr. Caine to Parliament as the representative of their interests, they have at the same time chosen a member who will further the interests of the unrepresented millions of their fellow-subjects in India, and cement in a closer bond the relations subsisting between Great Britain and this most important dependency of the British Empire."

Mr. Dadabhai Naoorji's address at Shepton Mallet (Nov. 14) on the famines in India and the mortality consequent upon them, appears to have stirred the local waters not a little. Two days later (Nov. 16) Canon Johnson, who presided, thought it necessary to confide to the editor of the *Shepton Mallet Journal* his opinion that Mr. Naoorji's picture of India's wrongs was "greatly exaggerated," and that his statements "virtually implied an impeachment of some of the most liberal statesmen and Viceroy's who laboured as earnestly for the welfare of India as of England." Strangely enough, he based his judgment on citations from Mr. Romesh Dutt's work entitled "Civilisation in Ancient India"—citations acknowledging certain advantages to India from the British connexion, which, of course, Mr. Naoorji had never denied. On the other hand, the Canon overlooked the fact that Mr. Dutt, in the same volume, has emphasised the very points on which Mr. Naoorji laid stress. "In the midst of exuberant prosperity in all parts of the British Empire," writes Mr. Dutt, "India alone sends us a tragic tale of poverty, famine, and death."

Then comes a correspondent signing himself "Altruist" (November 23), who sets the Canon right. He points out

of them ought not, in fairness, to be omitted. (3) is borne out by the report of Mr. Santo Crimp, the eminent engineer (see INDIA, vol. xiii, p. 73). (4) seems incontrovertible; money should be saved from military and other unnecessary expenditure, but it is to be feared that such savings would not be invested in irrigation—and they have yet to be made. In fact, on full explanation, we are pretty certain that our correspondent and Mr. Swinny would be found to be in absolute agreement.

Sir Henry S. King, in an appeal for subscriptions at home towards the Lockhart Memorial Fund which has been opened in India under the patronage of the Viceroy, recalls two very striking incidents in connexion with Sir William Lockhart's latest expedition and last illness. He writes:—

It is unnecessary to set forth Sir William Lockhart's merits as a military genius, and a man who obtained a singular influence and authority among the tribes of the North-West Frontier. Every one will remember the extraordinary demonstration which, at the close of the last successful campaign in which he was engaged, was offered to him of their admiration and affection by the Afridis he had vanquished, when they crowded to see him off, and, taking the horses out of his carriage, dragged him to the station. A more pathetic tribute even was the telegram of enquiry they sent when they heard that he was lying ill at Calcutta.

His own countrymen can scarcely desire to be heard his defeated but admiring foes in offering some tribute to his memory.

An able writer in the *Advocate of India* (November 9) may be taken to represent very fairly the Indian appreciation of the work and attitude of the Viceroy. He thus enumerates the main points in Lord Curzon's "achievements":—

He has been greatly instrumental, thanks to his personal and intimate knowledge of our frontiers and trans-frontiers, not only in restoring tranquillity on the borders, but in conciliating the more recalcitrant tribes and bringing them into a line and within the pale of British influence—a restoration which alone, in our opinion, enabled him to spare for Imperial purposes part of the troops to South Africa and, later on, to China. In domestic affairs he has been conscientiously endeavouring to wake up the various fossilised departments of State from their traditional lethargy. He has laid low the genii of Red Tape and Circumlocution. He has infused some of his own enthusiastic energy and spirit of despatch and punctuality into them. He has even reproved erring functionaries, and courageously striven by executive orders to keep the wells of British Justice pure and undefiled. He has, moreover, respected non-official public opinion, a striking evidence of which is to be discerned in the abandonment last year of the Telegraphic Press Messages Bill.

We trust our contemporary judges aright of Lord Curzon's understanding of educated India, as he certainly does judge aright of the attitude of the Native leaders.

Lord George Hamilton, speaking to his constituents at Ealing (November 23), paid a tribute to the native Indian troops in China, declaring them to be "second to none with whom they were co-operating." He went on to say:—

I have heard from an authentic source that that distinguished officer, Field-Marshal Count von Waldersee, was immensely struck by the physique and bearing of our Native regiments. And those other distinguished foreign officers and diplomats now in China will come back with the knowledge that this Empire is one of far greater strength and power than they had believed it to be, and that in time of trouble, so far from India being a source of difficulty and weakness to Great Britain, it will prove a source of strength.

There can be no doubt that the Native troops fully deserve such meed of recognition, and that it would be well if foreign observers were impressed with the power and solidarity of the Empire. Nor, it may be anticipated, will Lord George forget that the real bases of strength are not to be overlooked, whatever the appearances to foreign observers, and that they do not grow of themselves but need to be carefully fostered.

Lord George was scarcely fortunate in a quasi-personal complaint he made. "One of my difficulties in the House of Commons," he is reported to have said, "is that there is a number of persons there belonging to the Radical party who seem to think that India is a convenient instrument with which to assail the Government." This is one of those things that were better left unsaid. It would really be hopeless for Lord George to refer to any facts that could reasonably support such a complaint. We dare say it is very tiresome to be plied with questions and amendments, but that is part of the price that a statesman pays for the dignity of office; and, not only so, it is a

most necessary part of the duty of Members of Parliament—and Lord George, who "has been an Imperialist all his life," ought to sympathise with them in this respect, even if they belong to the Radical party—to see that the Government of India is being satisfactorily conducted. There is no "assailing" in the matter. The fact is that if the Government were more ready to satisfy the public desire for information Lord George would find his office much less uncomfortable.

Though the Punjab Land Alienation Bill has passed into law, the hopefulness and assurance of its advocates has not survived the hour of triumph. Even so staunch a supporter as the *Pioneer* admits this. It says:—

The difference between the opening and the closing speeches of the Bill is most marked. The exuberant hopefulness of the former has been tempered by a sense of a grave responsibility in the latter, and the work in Committee has doubtless caused many misgivings.

Nor does the *Pioneer* refuse its praise to Sir Harnam Singh for his conduct of the opposition:—

In spite of its exaggerations and forebodings, less marked in his final as compared with his previous efforts, Sir Harnam Singh's speech itself was a worthy contribution to the debate, and there is no one who will not give him the credit which he justly claims of fighting for what he believes to have been "his duty to Government and his countrymen."

It is interesting to note how greatly the supporters of the Act have shifted their ground. Even the *Pioneer* says "we no longer hear of the retired warrior and his encumbered acres," and yet the salvation of a heroic body of men, born soldiers of the Empire, was at first put in the very forefront of the reasons for the Bill. Nay, the *Pioneer* is now ready to allow that the old system is doomed, Bill or no Bill. In the Eastern Punjab co-proprietary tenures have already broken up, and the forces acting in favour of individual ownership throughout the Province are too strong to be stayed. The new law is intended not to crush the forces of individualism, but to regulate them. It is to be hoped that the regulation is not a leap in the dark. According to Mr. Rivaz it is an experiment, and as such open to the possibilities of error and the probability of amendment.

The *Pioneer* passes by the speech of Sir Mackworth Young with the remark that it introduced a discordant note, but, as the *Friend of India* says, it was really delivered under very unusual circumstances:—

In the first place, it is but rarely that, in legislating for an Indian Province, the views of its ruler are so completely set aside by the Supreme Government as those of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab have been in the present instance; in the second place, it is still more rarely that, when this happens, the local ruler has the courage to take the public into his confidence so completely.

Sir Mackworth Young repudiates all responsibility for the measure, and declares his disbelief in its success. Nor is it a secret that some of the ablest revenue officers in the Punjab share the views of the Lieutenant-Governor on the Act.

Lord Curzon declared that he had been struck by the absence of any alternative scheme, save that of doing nothing in face of an admitted evil. The *Friend of India* cannot admit that this is a correct view. Sir Dennis Fitzpatrick put forward a proposal that the Act should be tried in some selected district instead of applying it at once to the whole of the Punjab. As Mr. Rivaz admits that the measure is only an experiment which may fail and will probably require amendment, this would seem an excellent way of minimising the evils of possible failure, while if it were successful in the one district, it could be applied in others with such amendments as experience dictated. Again, Sir James Lyall proposed a scheme on the lines of the Deccan Agriculturists' Relief Act of 1879, and this Sir Mackworth Young was willing to accept. Whether these suggestions were good or not, it cannot be said that there were no counter-proposals in the field.

It is a sound rule that the service of the State should be open to men of all religions on the same terms. This does not mean that the number of officials of each religion should be proportionate to the numbers of each religion in the community, but that the fittest men should be chosen without regard to the religion they may profess.

We have, therefore, been unable to support the claim to exceptional treatment put forward by some Mahometans on the ground that without such treatment they would not have their due part in the service of the State. If the Mahometans of India have not as many appointments in proportion to their numbers as some other communities, it is assuredly not because they are unfairly treated by the Government, any more than it is because they are wanting in intelligence and character. It is rather because they have shown less adaptability to the new conditions of Indian life and less readiness to avail themselves of the new facilities of education.

But though we cannot sympathise with the claims of Mahometans when put forward by themselves on the ground that they suffer an injustice in not receiving special treatment, the case is rather different when those claims receive the support of other sections of the community on the ground of the public advantage. The *Hindu* and the *Indian Spectator*, newspapers which represent those who would most suffer by the granting of special privileges to Mahometans, declare that "there is no greater stimulus to education in India at present than appointments in the Government service, and if, by means of some concessions, the Mahometan community can be lured on to higher educational standards, the gain will be that of the whole country." The *Hindu* even goes so far as to say that in view of the smallness of the number of qualified Mahometans they ought to be specially and more largely encouraged than other classes who are already well represented in the public service.

The *Hindu* continues:—

A backward Mahometan community must more or less always remain a clog in the wheel of India's progress; and the larger employment of them in the public service may be one way of advancing them generally to a higher conception of public duty and public service.

Such words as these have all the more weight when the circumstances which gave rise to them are taken into consideration. The Mahometans of Karachi, in addressing Lord Curzon, begged for greater favours for Mahometans, adverting, among other things, to their small representation in the municipality; and, not content with pointing out the disadvantages under which they laboured, they complained of the success of the Hindus. Our Madras contemporary has taken a noble revenge.

Leaving aside the question whether it can ever be wise to depart from the sound rule of equality among members of different religious communities in order to stimulate the more backward, it must be admitted that the position taken up by the *Hindu* is full of promise for the future of India. Whether the opinion it expresses is sound or not, it is certainly a sign of the times to find the claims of one section of the Indian people to special privileges supported for reasons of general advantage by the organ of another section, and that a section which has evoked a certain amount of jealousy by its successes in the field of open competition. It is one of the many signs that the unity of India is continually growing firmer, and that the inspiring idea of "India a nation" is gradually overpowering the tendency to form separate groups and to prefer the interests of those groups to the interests of the whole people. We recall also the friendly accommodation in practice between the Hindus of Calcutta and the Mahometans on occasion of the municipal elections in the days before the municipality was last "reformed."

When Lord Curzon addressed a Durbar in the Oudh Talukdars at Lucknow in December last he raised hopes which it seems improbable that he will ever fulfil. He compared them with the Feudal aristocracy of England, and in eulogising their loyalty implied that it gave them a claim to special privileges. It is not wonderful, therefore, that they hoped for some opportunities of showing this loyalty, especially in the career of arms, which such comparisons naturally suggested. All the more, then, must they have been disappointed by the answer which they received to their offer to form a militia of their retainers. The Government, after carefully considering the proposal, while expressing their gratification at the loyalty which

prompted it, have come to the conclusion that they are not in a position to accept it. We are far from blaming this decision of the Government—indeed, the details of the scheme are not before us—but it does seem unfortunate that the Government can find no outlet for the martial valour of such classes as the Talukdars of Oudh.

A curious and unfortunate mistake of the police is reported from Cawnpore. According to the *Tribune*, on October 24, twenty policemen led by Sergeant Bonner raided the house of a wealthy and esteemed banker, Rai Bahadur Lala Madhu Ram, and arrested him and a large number of his guests on a charge of gambling. The prisoners were taken to the police station and admitted to bail; and it is unnecessary to say that the arrest of so many persons of the highest respectability created a great sensation throughout the city. But on the case coming before the District Magistrate it was found that a great mistake had been made by the police, the warrant under which they acted having had reference to another Lala Madhu Ram, who, as the document itself showed, had no claim to the designation of Rai Bahadur. This was pointed out to the police sergeant at the time the arrests were made, but without avail. The Rai Bahadur and his friends deserve much sympathy. And what is to be said to the police sergeant?

In a paper by Sir Norman Lockyer and Dr. W. J. S. Lockyer, which was read by Sir Norman before the Royal Society (Nov. 22), attention was drawn to the relation between sunspots and rainfall. It was concluded that India has two "pulses" of rainfall, one near the maximum and the other near the minimum of the sunspot period, and that all the famines recorded in the Famine Commission Reports as having devastated India during the last half century occurred in the intervals between these two pulses. Mr. Eliot, the Meteorological Reporter to the Indian Government, who has studied the results of the enquiry, "gave it as his opinion that they accorded closely with all the known facts of the large abnormal features of the temperature, pressure, and rainfall in India during the last twenty-five years, and that hence the inductions already arrived at would be of great service in forecasting future droughts in India."

In his Indian Budget statement (July 26), Lord George Hamilton remarked that "in recent years the Meteorological Department has established a direct connexion between the fall of rain in India and the height of the Nile flood in Egypt." Famine years were usually years of low Nile flood, and now Sir Norman Lockyer points out that "the highest Niles followed, at an interval of one or two years, the years of the plus and minus pulses." As to the present famine, the *Times* report states:—

The widened line curves [in the spectra of sunspots], so far from having crossed in 1897 or 1898, as they ought according to the few precedents available, had not crossed even now; in other words, the condition of the ordinary solar mean temperature had not even yet been reached. Now, India in a normal cycle was supplied from the Southern Ocean during the *minus* sunspot period, and the rain was due to some pressure effect brought about in high southern latitudes by the sun at *minus* temperature. But as this temperature condition was not reached in 1899, as it would have been in a normal year, the rain failed. Thus the only abnormal famine recorded since 1836 occurred precisely at the time when an abnormal effect of an unprecedented *maximum* of solar temperature was revealed by the study of the widened lines.

It is well to be forewarned. Let us also have such economic enquiry as will make the people forewarned.

Remittances on India for 30 lakhs were on Wednesday offered for tender by the India Council, and applications for bills amounting to Rs. 5,95,00,000 were received at prices ranging from 1s. 3½d. to 1s. 4d. The following amounts in bills were allotted—viz., Rs. 17,72,000 on Calcutta and Rs. 2,97,000 on Bombay at an average of 1s. 3-968d., and Rs. 9,31,000 on Madras at an average of 1s. 3-97d. Tenders at 1s. 3½d. will receive about 14 per cent. Later the Council sold bills for Rs. 30,000 on Calcutta and Rs. 33,000 on Madras at 1s. 4d. Last week remittances for Rs. 30,40,000 were sold for £202,283, making the total disposed of from April 1 to Tuesday night Rs. 8,69,67,908, producing £5,783,209. Next week the amount to be offered will be increased to 35 lakhs.

## THE NATIONAL GRANT.

UNDER a strong sense of our duty to India and still more to England, we return to the question of a National Grant, a question fraught with the most serious consequences to the future of the two countries. The forthcoming meeting of Parliament is a sufficient excuse, if excuse be needed, for again advocating a measure supported outside the House by public opinion and by the Press of all parties, and only defeated inside the House by the power of the Government, acting for this once against the wishes of some of its most devoted supporters. There never was a measure which encountered so little independent opposition, as there never was one which was so strongly urged by every motive alike of policy and humanity. And now within a few days a new Session will open, and there will be an opportunity for the Government to descend from the position of churlish obstruction to which they have so long clung and to give full rein to the generous instincts of the nation. It is true that Parliament is now called together for a particular and pressing object—the finding of money for the South African war; but the wants of India also cry aloud. India is far more important to the Empire than South Africa, and her prosperity concerns a vastly greater population. Her case is serious and demands immediate attention. It is true that the needs of the war constitute a heavy drain on our resources; yet the heaviest taxation due to the war is likely to be slight in proportion to our resources when compared with the taxation borne by India in years of profound peace, and the drain on our wealth in the present crisis is as nothing to what India has to endure even in normal times. And is it to be said that the future prosperity of India and the attachment of her people to the Empire are matters of no importance beside the African campaign? Is it to be said that destruction alone is worthy of the attention of Parliament, and that the preservation of India's prosperity may be lightly put on one side? This is, indeed, a gruesome and a degrading view of the functions of an Imperial Parliament.

In his speech during the debate on the last Indian Budget Lord George Hamilton, referring to the recent famine, declared that "no nation and no Government had ever before attempted to deal with that periodical visitation so thoroughly as had the present Government." A critic might remark that few Governments had had the opportunity of dealing with two great famines in four years. But let that pass. Let us admit and admire the good work that has been already done in the saving of life and the provision of food and work for those who could obtain neither. Does this exhaust the tale of India's woes or England's duties? And has not nearly all that has been done hitherto been done at the expense of India? Has not poverty had to succour starvation? Has not the cost of famine relief been borne by the impoverished Indians of the present or left as dead-weight to drag down to an equal or greater poverty the Indians of the future? How has the British nation and the British Government, as a nation and a Government, dealt with famine? By leaving the cost to be borne by its Indian subjects alone. Individual Englishmen have contributed to famine funds, but as a nation we have done nothing.

And yet there was never a time when India had done more for England and the Empire. But a few days ago the papers had long lists of the gifts and offers of the Native Princes of India. That very war, the burdens of which are made the excuse for refusing to share those of India, has shown us what India can do for England. In the darkest hour of disaster troops supported for years and kept in efficiency at the expense of the impoverished taxpayers of India were our sole resource at hand to stem the tide of invasion and save the Colony of Natal from the enemy. These troops were British troops that formed part of the garrison of India, and it was not thought wise to employ Indian troops as combatants in South Africa, but that decision was powerless to prevent the Africans from showing their devotion at the risk of their lives. As stretcher-bearers they were constantly within the line of fire, and many an English soldier owes his life to the courage and steadfastness of his Indian fellow-subjects. Nor have the people of Natal, who had this heroism before their eyes, been able to refrain from bearing their testimony to the quality of these Indians, in spite of the prejudices they have long cherished against the Indian

race—prejudices which have left shameful traces even in the Statute Book of the Colony. Soldiers, Colonists, friends and foes, unite in praising the services of the Indian stretcher-bearers on the battle-fields of Natal.

And when to the war already raging in South Africa another was added in China, when we heard the news that our countrymen were crying for succour, and when it seemed doubtful if we could do aught to help in their release, then more than ever we had occasion to bless the name of India. With the flower of our Army engaged in Africa, and the garrison at home reduced to a mere name, it seemed as if the work of rescue would have to be left to our allies and rivals, and that the country with the largest commercial interests in China would have practically no voice in the negotiations or the settlement. From this position of humiliation England was saved by India. Indian troops were poured into China and formed the greater part of our army. In fact, so completely is the war in the Far East an Indian war that the General in command reports not to the military authorities but to the Secretary of State for India. Nor have these Indian troops shown themselves unworthy to represent the Empire. Their splendid bearing has evoked the admiration of Count Walderssee, the Commander-in-Chief, and they have proved themselves fit to fight beside the soldiers of Germany, France, and Russia.

Such have been the services of India to the Empire in the year that is past. Such is the help that India has given to England in her hour of difficulty. But if we ask what England or the Empire has done for India in her distress, the answer is not so plain. During the last four years India has had two famines, the first known as the great famine, because of its intensity, and the second still more intense. As always after famine there has come disease. And side by side with this, with the diseases that follow in the track of want and starvation, there has been a terrible visitation of plague, waxing and waning from time to time, but never disappearing entirely. What has England as a nation done for India? Funds have been raised by the charity of individuals, but the purse of the nation has remained closed. Amidst the vaunting boasts of the glories of Empire and the blessings of British rule, India has been left to succour her own famine-stricken with such help as she could get from a few tender-hearted persons—a mere handful in the teeming English world. We are to govern the peoples for their own good and also at their own expense, and the duties of Empire do not include assistance even in the time of greatest misery. Is this to be still the niggard attitude of England?

How stands the case? India has passed through a famine of unexampled intensity. Millions have had to seek the relief works. The expense has been enormous. The revenue over a part of India cannot be collected, or can only be collected by an amount of harshness revolting to a civilised nation. The people of the parts which have escaped the famine are already taxed almost beyond endurance. To support their share of the expenses of our Government—which whatever its other virtues is certainly not cheap—tries their capacity to the utmost. Now they will be required to do more than their share because others can do less. And even then the Government will have to borrow, and so deepen the poverty of the future in order to defray the expenses already incurred in keeping the people alive, and to make up for the losses of revenue. What then will be left for that additional expenditure necessary, not to keep the people alive, but to prevent them sinking into deeper poverty? The immediate and most obvious effects of famine may have been overcome. The shrunken bodies may have been filled, the weakened muscles rendered once more fit for labour, the flickering spark of life preserved, even though the full vigour may never be regained. But man has not been the only sufferer by the calamity. If the poverty of the past is not to be intensified in the future, something more than this must be done. The ground is ready, but even if the seed be there to the hand of the sower, where are the oxen that once drew the plough? This famine has been distinguished from the other famines of the present generation, perhaps of the present century, by the terrible mortality of cattle. If the whole agriculture of the districts that have suffered is not to be permanently degraded, if the poverty is not to be intensified, and if the power of resisting famine in the future is not to be diminished, then aid on a generous scale is

needed to replace the cattle that have been lost. And how many other things need to be replaced? Now it is admitted that the charitable funds by themselves are insufficient. Is it likely that the Indian Government, amid its eternal struggle to find the means of maintaining its vast civil and military establishment, and hampered by the great famine expenditure already incurred, and the loss of revenue suffered—is it likely that the Indian Government can or will do all that is required to bring the agriculture of the afflicted districts to the same state as it was in before the famine? Yet if this is not done it means a permanent increase of poverty for those who were poor before. And if it is to be done, since charity is insufficient and the Government of India unable, what remains but a grant from the Treasury of the United Kingdom? This then is the last resource of suffering India; and that it may be effective it must be done at once. The December Session is a happy opportunity. Let it be seized in the name of justice and humanity, of gratitude, and above all of the good feeling it will arouse in India towards England. The people of these islands offer no opposition. Will the Government any longer stand in the way?

### THE AMIR OF AFGHANISTAN.<sup>1</sup>

THE autobiography of the Amir of Afghanistan is not only a work of very special interest to the British people, but also an important historical record. The first eleven chapters, which bring the narrative down to the Amir's accession to the throne, have been written by himself, and translated from the Persian original by Sultan Mahomed Khan, his former Secretary of State. "The remaining chapters, consisting of an account of the work which he has achieved in consolidating and developing the powers and resources of his country, of his domestic and foreign policy, of his personal life and occupations, and of his advice to, and aspirations for, his successors, were taken down," Mr. Murray informs us, "at different times by Sultan Mahomed Khan from the Amir's own words." After every allowance for free rendering on the part of the Mir Munshi, there can be no doubt that the latter chapters as well as the former represent in all substantial elements the ideas and hopes of the Amir himself. Those of us who have not outgrown the infantile notion that the Amir is an outer barbarian will be somewhat surprised when they peruse these pages. They will, of course, find themselves face to face with an extremely able man and a strong and resolute ruler. With him, no less than with themselves, freedom is the first controlling passion. He is amply informed of what is going on in other countries, and laudably anxious to secure, at the proper pace, the advantages of foreign ideas. Even the most startling contradictions in his conduct and policy are seen to have inner principles of reconciliation. A devoted Moslem, he can yet speak—and deal—severely with priests. A slave of superstitions, he is alive to the importance of Western science—especially mechanical science. On one page he heaps up two great towers of the heads of his enemies *pour encourager les autres*; on another he speculates philosophically on the duties of a king. While he has definitely asserted and maintained his sway at home, he looks abroad with the keen observation, criticism, foresight, and judgment of a great statesman. These volumes cannot be too widely read and considered.

Though the Amir acknowledges that in his boyhood he was "very dull" in his books, he praises God that he had a natural turn for "engineering" and all sorts of handicraft—a turn that led to interesting developments at a later period. His literary studies, however, were to receive a natural impulse from grief and shame at not being able to read a letter from his lady-love. "I felt my heart beating," he confesses, "and I blamed myself very much that while I boasted of being such a fine man I was really most unmanly, being so ignorant." At an early age he was appointed Governor of a northern province, where he tempered what cannot but seem to us a very severe exercise of justice with striking acts of humane consideration. On the death of Dost Mahomed and the accession of Shīr Ali, Abdur Rahman had to flee from his country.

He spent eleven years in Samarkand. They were trying years. "We were very hard up for money most of our time," he says, "as our expenses were heavy and my monthly subsidy from the Government very small, but as I had no claim on the Russians I was more than thankful for the small sum they allowed me." One consoling element of his lot, however, was the chivalrous fidelity of his countrymen, markedly proved on many occasions. At this time his heart was steeled against the British: "they were the enemies of my friends, whose enemies were my enemies." On the death of the Amir Shīr Ali and the capture of Yakub, he was made Amir by the British Government in 1880. The arrangements were not all to his mind, but he determined to make the best of them.

The Amir's first business was to establish his authority and reduce his kingdom to order. He was desperately in need of money and war material, but eventually was relieved by British assistance. The priests were especially keen thorns in his side.

The first thing I had to do was to put an end to these numberless robbers, thieves, false prophets, and trumphy kings. I must confess that it was not a very easy task, and it took fifteen years of fighting before they finally submitted to my rule, or left the country either by being exiled or by departing into the next world.

If "prejudiced and ignorant people" judge him "harsh," he points out that severe measures are sometimes found necessary even in the "most civilised" States of "the present day." From his description of the behaviour of his courtiers it is plain that he had not a little difficulty in teaching them manners. Nor is it surprising that he did not rely for long on their counsel in affairs of State. Thus he writes sarcastically:—

I will now give an example of the great wisdom exhibited by the counsellors and ministers of the sovereign. One day bread and flour were very dear in the market, there was fear of famine; and my ministers, whom I consulted at that time, strongly advised me to nail the ears of the corn and flour sellers to the doors of their shops, in order to force them to make the corn and flour cheaper. I could not help laughing at this valuable advice, and since that day till the present time I have never asked advice from my counsellors!

The whole work of internal regeneration he therefore took on his own shoulders. He tells how, after reduction of Kafiristan, he laboured to civilise the people by establishing schools among them and putting an end to slavery and wife-selling. He expatiates at great length and with great interest upon his efforts to supersede militarism by promotion of the arts of industry. The Amir himself, in his youthful enthusiasm for practical activities, had become an expert blacksmith; and he narrates how "one of my own cousins" learnt the art of shoe-making, and what came of it:—

I persuaded him, after some reasoning and argument, that it is no disgrace for a member of the Royal Family to work with his own hands, as believed by the ignorant Afghans; on the contrary, it is a disgrace for a person who cannot work at all. I told him to join another man, a Hazara prisoner of war, who had learnt the boot-making trade somewhere else, and together they started this trade at Kabul. Many other shoe-makers have learnt from them, and by the aid of the leather-sewing and boot-making machines bought by me, thousands of boots are being made every day in the Kabul workshops, as well as in other towns, and they are now being sold in Bazaar as well as to the soldiers in my army. The money which was being sent annually abroad for the purchase of boots, leather belting, harness, and other articles, now remains in the country, which is a distinct advantage.

Naturally, industrial progress is very slow in such circumstances, but the Amir draws consolatory patience from contemplation of the fact that even the creation of the world took six days. He sets forth a proud and really remarkable account of the progress of the Afghans in various industrial arts—the manufacture of arms and ammunition, blacksmith's work, tannery, boot-making, soap-making, candle-making, tailoring, and so forth, down to printing and electrical engineering. And this is why he has sought the guidance of British instructors in these things:—

My object was twofold—first, to have my people taught engineering and other works by Englishmen experienced in such things; secondly, to bring my people and the English in contact with each other, so that the old hatred that existed between these two nations should be removed from their minds, as our Governments were friendly with each other, and the interests of both Governments were identical. I was also desirous that the English people should hear of the progress made under my Government from their own countrymen. The friendly treatment shown by the Afghan nation to all the English men and women who visited Kabul proves that we only killed them when we looked upon them as our enemies. When they were employed in my service for the benefit of the nation of Afghanistan they received every hospitality and courtesy, and were treated as our friends.

<sup>1</sup> "The Life of Abdur Rahman, Ameer of Afghanistan, G.O.B., G.C.S.I." Edited by Mir Munshi, Sultan Mahomed Khan. With Portrait, Maps, and Illustrations. Two Volumes. (London: John Murray.)

There can be no question that the Amir has done great things for his people, not only in government and industry, but also in social conditions. No one will grudge him his somewhat mistaken claim of superiority over his British neighbours in the pride of his natural self-congratulation on the results of his labours. He writes:—

I am proud to say that in the short time under my rule the people have made such good progress towards civilization that persons possessing great riches and wealth can travel safely throughout my dominions, by night as well as by day; whilst, on the other hand, on the borders of Afghanistan, in parts under British rule, nobody can move a step without being protected by a strong bodyguard.

Probably the reference is to the frontier tribes within our "sphere of influence"; but it does not in the least matter.

The Amir allows himself to speak out very frankly on the unwisdom of the Forward Policy. If it may be said that he does not speak without bias, yet his words are none the less worth heedful consideration:—

Though some short-sighted English officials and some other people absorbed in the mania of a Forward Policy have caused misunderstandings between Great Britain and Afghanistan on several occasions, and have annexed, or tried to annex, certain Afghan tribes, calling them neutral or independent of Afghan rule, these people had not the sense to understand that taking and keeping under British possession all these barren lands on the borders of Afghanistan was a very unwise step, by which they burdened the Exchequer of India with the heavy expense of keeping an army on the spot to maintain peace in these territories, and also a civil service for administration. By taking upon themselves unnecessary responsibilities and heavier expenses than the income of the State will meet they incurred greater anxieties than they were able to bear; but those short-sighted officials, who are full of boasting and exaggeration of their almighty power and wisdom, believe that, though God knows much, still they know more; and therefore if anybody who knows better tries to give them advice they simply ridicule him, thinking that it is impossible that any person should know half as much as themselves, the all-knowing and all-wise missionaries of the "Forward Policy" and lovers of disputes and war. But luckily the British nation, its statesmen as well as its people, are better informed than these few above-mentioned all-knowing men, whose designs and desires are consequently meeting with the disapproval of British statesmen and of the public at large, who are really anxious to see Afghanistan a strong, independent Government—a true ally and barrier to protect the Indian Empire of their noble Queen.

We could heartily wish that "the British nation, its statesmen as well as its people," had as clear and reasoned an opinion on the subject as the Amir seems to attribute to them. However, one must, in the meantime, be thankful that cogent grounds of self-restraint have commended themselves to the rulers of India. The Amir, in dealing with his relations to his two great neighbours, points out that Russia and Kabul have never been at enmity from causes relating to themselves alone. It is the other big neighbour that causes such friction as arises. He says:—

Russia has, consequently, no reason for attacking Afghanistan, or for interfering in Afghan affairs, beyond the fact that Afghanistan is friendly with Great Britain, that she has no connexion now with Russia, and that she lies as an obstacle between Russian territory and India, thus barring the way for Russian aggression upon India. Considering, therefore, that the only reason that could be given by Russia for attacking Afghanistan is the friendship existing between that country and England, justice demands that, treaty or no treaty, England should be responsible for the safety and protection of Afghanistan, and that both these nations should stand or fall together; and keep her word without discussing the interpretation of the words "if" and "but" in the pledges given by them!

As for the British policy towards Afghanistan, the Amir complains that it has been inconstant and vacillating. He himself, as has already been indicated, strongly approves of the latest policy of "keeping Afghanistan as an independent kingdom and a strong barrier for the safety of the Indian Empire;" but he frankly expresses his disappointment "that it is not carried out to the extent it ought to be." Why not show him more confidence and concede to him a larger measure of moral and material support? Why not permit him to annex the independent Pathan tribes? Why not let him form a triple alliance with Persia and Turkey? Nay, why not acknowledge—by and by, at least—that "Afghanistan ought to secure a footing upon the ocean and have a port for its own steamers to load and unload at?" However, "Afghanistan is not strong enough to stand alone, and is bound for her own safety to lean upon one of her two strong neighbours against the aggression of the other." And she is "quite free and independent to choose whichever she prefers." On this crucial point the Amir says:—

There is no doubt that at present it is to her advantage and interest to choose England, and to lean upon the friendship and support of England.

First, because England has no intention of invading Persia or

Turkestan, to compass which they might require a road through Afghanistan; while Russia does intend to invade India, hence she does require to pass through my country, and not only to pass through and to be anxious about her rear, but also to take Afghanistan if she can.

Secondly, England is a great naval Power, and does not wish to fight Russia on land unless obliged; it is, therefore, to England's own interest and advantage that Afghanistan should be a strong buffer State and barrier in the way of Russia, thereby keeping the two countries of Russia and England apart by land. It is consequently only natural that England desires to see Afghanistan strong and safe, to ensure her own safety and strength in India. Russia, on the contrary, being anxious to fight England on land, desires that Afghanistan should be united with her and support her in the invasion of India, or be wiped out of existence altogether as a Sovereign State.

Thirdly, England has money and arms, but requires fighting men. Afghanistan has fighting men, but requires money and arms. It is accordingly to the mutual interest of Afghanistan and Great Britain that they should be combined, in which case England would have the services of the Afghans, and the Afghans would have money and arms from England. Russia can give no money to Afghanistan because she has none for her own needs, and she does not require any men from Afghanistan because she has already more than she can keep in order.

Fourthly, the friendship of Afghanistan is of no service to Russia whatever, beyond allowing her to pass through the country to India, which means placing Afghanistan under the feet of Russia. . . .

If, unfortunately, the English were to change their policy and become aggressive, with the intention of annexing Afghanistan or interfering with her independence, in that case the Afghan nation would be compelled to fight against England; and, in the event of their being entirely defeated, they would join Russia, because she is much closer to the borders of Afghanistan than England is at present, and therefore in a position to support Afghanistan, which was not the case in the time of Sher Ali, she being then too far away to render him any assistance.

In fine, the policy of Afghanistan towards her two strong neighbours should be friendly towards the one which is least aggressive and hostile to the Power wishing to pass through her country or interfere with her independence. Afghanistan must not, however, by her actions provoke either of her neighbours, neither must she allow either of them to enter her country under any pretence whatever, no matter what treaties or promises they make.

The Amir contrasts the "fits and changes" of British policy with the "constant, firm, and permanent" policy of Russia. He has "more causes of complaint against England than against Russia," he admits. But for all that "there is no doubt that Mahometans all over the world would prefer the friendship of the British Empire to that of Russia." The whole treatment of this subject in these volumes impresses the importance of most careful handling. It is, therefore, significant to note that the Amir strongly resented the brusque and patronising manner of Lord Lansdowne. On the other hand he greatly enjoyed the companionship of the more appreciative Mr. (now Lord) Curzon. This work will happily help, we trust, to increase by knowledge the British appreciation of the Amir; and in any case it will be a striking memorial of his personality and his kingship in the generations and centuries to come.

## OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

OUR political Mrs. Gummidge are looking forward to the opening of Parliament with gloomy satisfaction. The short Session, it is said, promises material for a new Book of Lamentations. Everybody who is anybody is in a state of profound dejection. Lord Salisbury's pessimism, being a matter of temperament, scarcely counts; but some one may have to pay for the irritation into which Mr Chamberlain has been thrown by the treatment meted out to Birmingham in the reconstruction of the Government, while Mr. Balfour, summoned from his books and his golf, will be as petulant as a schoolboy deprived of his Christmas holidays. The disappointment, too, of Mr. Bartley and Mr. Gibson Bowles may be expected to find more effective expression in the House of Commons than it has obtained in the columns of the *Times*. New members, eager for reform, will experience the shock of a first disillusion. Something of the shadow of defeat will naturally linger on the Opposition side, more especially as the threatened absence of the Nationalists cannot but have the effect of seeming to exaggerate the preponderance of the Ministerial strength. And as if to deepen the gloom by a multiplication of evil omens the first business of the new Parliament will be to supply the sinews of war to the Chancellor of the Exchequer for a war begun in the nineteenth century and likely to be continued into the twentieth.

Whether the question of the Liberal leadership will be settled in the course of the Session remains to be seen. One of Lord Rosebery's advocates hints that the ex-Premier may resume his old place on the front Opposition bench in the House of Lords as soon as Parliament meets, and that when the Address has been moved and seconded he may open the debate on behalf of the Opposition. Lord Rosebery could only do this with the consent of Lord Kimberley, whose place it is, as the official leader of the Liberal peers, to initiate the discussion. We are told that Mr. Gladstone signified his return to the Liberal leadership in 1876 by taking part that year in the debate on the Address. But Mr. Gladstone did not usurp Lord Hartington's position. He waited till the official leader had spoken and then intervened. If Lord Rosebery limits himself to the same course in the House of Lords his action will offer no departure from custom, nor will it possess any particular significance. On the other hand, if he were merely to change his seat from below the gangway to a place above that deep though narrow gulf the movement would have distinctive significance. But, after all, the noise about Lord Rosebery has been rather factitious and has become not a little tiresome.

Discussion in both Houses will be chiefly concerned with the conduct of the war. A strong feeling is springing up in the country against the policy of devastation to which the military authorities have committed themselves, and the prevailing uneasiness has been greatly aggravated by reports of the precautions which are about to be taken to screen our further operations from publicity. Officers with old-fashioned notions of warfare are being sent home, and so are all the war correspondents. Some of the latter, it may be remembered, caused an inconvenient scandal two or three years ago by telling the world what they had seen on the plains of Omdurman. Among the most vehement critics of the threatened Kitchener régime is at least one old campaigner, whose lifelong conservatism protects him from the imputation of party prejudice.

Both hemispheres have been following with eyes more or less sympathetic the triumphal yet pathetic progress of ex-President Kruger across Europe. In England the spectacle has excited less feeling than might have been anticipated. Mr. Kruger's first speeches provoked an angry outcry and tended perhaps to harden sentiment in this country against the Boers, for he did not scruple to denounce the British soldiers as barbarians, and stigmatised their methods of warfare as more savage than those of the black tribes. But from the time of his departure from Marseilles he has been not only more moderate in his language about ourselves but scrupulously correct in his attitude towards the various Governments whose sympathies he desires to engage. As his efforts are apparently quite hopeless, the British public can afford to take a magnanimous view of the demonstrations in his favour on the Continent. "Give us the friendship of your rulers and we care not what your peoples say"—that, at present, represents our attitude towards the different nations of Europe.

With Lord Wolsley's withdrawal from the War Office to-day or to-morrow that department is left in the temporary control of Sir Evelyn Wood. The circumstances of the case form a suggestive commentary on the foresight and patriotism of the Government. A month before Lord Wolsley's term of office had expired—but, on the other hand, only one day before the opening of the pollings in the General Election—the appointment of Lord Roberts was announced. As soon as the elections were over came the news that Lord Roberts would not be home in time to take up the duties of the office in November, and accordingly Lord Wolsley was invited to continue in command. Lord Wolsley consented, and was rewarded for his complaisance a few days later by hearing Lord Salisbury administer a rebuke to the "professionals" for their want of consideration to their political colleagues. Naturally enough after this incident Lord Wolsley's patience began to show signs of exhaustion. It is half expected that one of his first actions on regaining his freedom from official responsibility will be to respond in the House of Lords to the Prime Minister's extraordinary challenge.

A singular chapter has been added by Mr. Chamberlain to the history of his direct and indirect interest in Government contracts. All who witnessed the closing scene of the Parliamentary drama last session retain a vivid recollection of a certain encounter between Mr. Lloyd George and the Colonial

Secretary. The latter, with quite unusual emphasis—choosing, too, a form of words invested with the solemnity of a statutory declaration—asserted his freedom from all pecuniary interest, direct or indirect, in contracts with the Government. From that day to this, the *Morning Leader* has continued to accumulate proofs of Mr. Chamberlain's commercial interest in various war contracts. While the election was in progress, Mr. Chamberlain affected to regard those exposures with lofty contempt; and afterwards, when he was entertained to dinner by one of the city companies, he actually hailed the compliment as a vindication of his personal impeccability. Now that Parliament is about to meet and that explanations are likely to be demanded, the Colonial Secretary, for reasons that may readily be guessed, thinks it discreet to admit that his original disclaimer was founded on a misconception. Who that heard it could have imagined that that famous repudiation, so passionate yet so delicate, so comprehensive, and at the same time so minute, was made in absolute ignorance of the facts? It was Mr. Chamberlain who once said of Mr. Disraeli that he came down to the House of Commons and threw at it the first lie that came into his head. So severe a censor ought at least to verify his own impressions before translating them into assertions.

Even at the play nowadays one cannot escape from politics. Mrs. Craigie peppers her brilliant conversational drama, "The Wisdom of the Wise," with hits at our Parliamentary institutions and stucco statesmen. She uses a rapier to achieve a purpose which Mr. Grundy, in the drama that preceded Mrs. Craigie's at the same theatre, sought to accomplish with a bludgeon. Again, in Captain Marshall's Criterion play, "The Noble Lord," we have a positive riot of political burlesque. The satire in the same author's "Second in Command," produced at the Haymarket the other night, is more refined and has a keener edge. Significantly enough, the favourite butt of the stage at present seems to be the hierarchy of the War Office. Pall Mall is always treated as a synonym for imbecility, and the more the point is pushed home the more rapturous is the approval of the playgoing public.

## NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

### THE VICEROY IN KATHIAWAR.

#### THE POLITICAL AGENCY SYSTEM.

#### A FOSSILISED ADMINISTRATION.

#### LORD CURZON AND EDUCATED INDIA.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

BOMBAY, November 10.

The week has been full of Viceregal visits and Viceregal utterances, here, there, and everywhere. The Kathiawar Princes and Chiefs met his lordship in State Durbar and were rejoiced at the cordial reception they received. They seem fully convinced that Lord Curzon is exceedingly well disposed towards all her Majesty's Feudatories, and that his sympathies are for their solid progress, consistently with British policy. Thus his lordship has been able to make a very good impression on the Sovereigns, small and great, of Sarushtra, as Kathiawar was known in days of yore. As to his lordship's grave utterances at the Durbar, I shall refrain from reiterating them in this place; you must have already learned the salient points by cable. I will content myself with repeating the universal expression of praise which the speech has elicited from the leading organs of public opinion. The Viceroy never conceals his thoughts. He speaks frankly and courageously to all, freely giving them a bit of his own mind. There is the *suaviter in modo* with the *fortiter in re* in all his more serious deliverances, be they to the Native Princes or to municipalities or to semi-private and other organisations representing certain shades of opinion, and advocating certain special interests. His lordship impressed on the Kathiawar Chiefs the importance of their standing shoulder to shoulder with the British Indian Empire. Their true and permanent interest lies in realising that central fact of the policy of the paramount Power towards its Feudatories. On the other hand, he offers them on behalf of the British Government the right hand of good fellowship and friendly support. So far, no doubt, all is well. But the Viceroy forgot that, however anxious the Feudatories may be to fall into line with British policy, consistently with their

State traditions, local requirements, and the idiosyncrasies of their subjects, the greatest lions in their path towards the attainment of that object are the servants of the British Crown themselves. The political agents accredited to the different courts are generally the greatest stumbling blocks in their way. It is they who make or mar the Princes. They are in reality more than Mayors of the Palace. Virtually, they are the Rájás, while the poor Rájás themselves are nowadays the slaves of the political agents. So that a Native Prince, be he a Mahárájá or lesser Sovereign authority, has nowadays less liberty of action than his meanest subject. This broad and notorious fact has not been taken notice of by Lord Curzon, who, if he really means to do that good to Native States which he evidently seems to have at heart, should, as the *Times of India* has very properly pointed out, entirely overhaul the system of the absurd political agency now in vogue—a system which more than the sins of omission or commission of the Princes has wrought many a disaster to individual potentates. Have the secret archives of the Native States ever been ransacked? Has the Viceroy found time to call for the voluminous correspondence in the secret bureau of the Foreign Secretary? Would he mind instituting an open Commission, entirely composed of men of stern and impartial justice, and try to ascertain how far the system of political agency is prejudicial and how far beneficial to Native States? I am quite sure the revelations which each State could make would be of a most startling character, such as would not bring credit to the British name. But where may be the real reforming Viceroy who could courageously take up this question? If even a Viceroy of Lord Curzon's undaunted courage shrinks from disturbing the present vicious system, which is the bane of Native Feudatories and the chief obstruction to their natural and wholesome progress, what could be expected from other functionaries of similar authority who more or less are timid or are frightened into timidity by the permanent bureaucracy who really hold in the hollow of their hands the destinies of Native States?

But I pass on from this dismal subject to a pleasanter one. I need not say that the exhaustive reply which Lord Curzon made to the address of welcome of the Bombay Municipal Corporation is destined to live in the memory not only of the present generation but of generations to come. No doubt you will have before you the full text both of the address and of the reply. What I have to relate here is the impression which the reply has produced. So far I have no hesitation in saying that it has given immense satisfaction to the Native community of Bombay. And I make bold to say that when the speech is read all over the country every Presidency and Province will be equally gratified. Fearlessly and most independently Lord Curzon made the declaration that it was time the modern spirit of government should be infused into the stereotyped administration of British India. The entire service needs to be galvanised into new life in consonance with modern environments. The lines of policy are too old and too fossilised. They are worked more on traditions of bygone centuries than on the wants and requirements of the day. The official classes affect omniscience in the art of government. They arrogate to themselves a knowledge which they do not possess. Cabined, cribbed, and confined within its own sphere, the official hierarchy in India seems to fancy it is in no need of external light. Is it not heaven-born? What mundane light may it then accept? Surely it can better rely on its own inner vision, which is illumined by heaven's own light. Of course, all this conceit may be right and proper from the point of view of the Anglo-Indian hierarchy, but certainly it is not the point of view of those not encircled within its sacred pale. Lord Curzon has seen through this conceit and is desirous of toning it down; and this, in his opinion, can be done only by the hierarchy making up its mind to receive outside criticism. It should take the public into its confidence, and try to govern more in the spirit of modern times, not in the spirit of the Tudors. It is to be suspected that Lord Curzon's outspoken views on this subject will cause many a searching of the heart. Perhaps more. It may not improbably lead to rebellious manifestations within the sacred hierarchy. These will swear by all their past glories and traditions that such views, even when emanating from so exalted an authority, should not be tolerated. They will wait for their opportunity. We remember how they engineered to capture Lord Ripon, who with equal earnestness and solicitude had endeavoured, in his own mild and unobtrusive way, to govern India in the same spirit as Lord

Curzon is anxious to govern. But Lord Curzon is sufficiently combative, and will no doubt know how to hold his ground against the warriors of the distinguished service.

Meanwhile, his observations on educated Natives and the political expediency of hearing their opinion, if not deferring to it, are especially important as coming from a Viceroy belonging to that political party in England which is associated with the policy of retrogression and repression. And it is to be hoped that those who indulge in chronic abuse of educated India will take note of it. Altogether Lord Curzon, by this single speech, has immensely increased his popularity and justly deserved all the high eulogy which the Bombay Municipal Corporation expressed in its admirable address.

## THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

### 420,000 ON RELIEF.

The Secretary of State for India has received (November 26) the following telegram from the Viceroy on the subject of the famine:—

"Rain is still wanted in Bombay, the Karnatic, the Deccan, and Gujerat. Otherwise the prospects are satisfactory. Number of persons in receipt of relief:—Bombay, 257,000; Central Provinces, 76,000; Berar, 28,000; Rajputana Native States, 5,000; Central India Native States, 3,000; Bombay Native States, 27,000; Baroda, 16,000; Central Provinces Feudatory States, 2,000; Haidarabad, 6,000.—Total, 420,000."

### THE MANSION HOUSE FUND.

The Mansion House Fund for the relief of the sufferers from the Indian Famine amounted on Monday night to £387,700.

### THE "INVESTORS' REVIEW" FUND.

We take the following from the current issue (November 24) of the *Investors' Review*:—

It is necessary to point out once more that the statistics furnished weekly about the condition of the starving millions of India are quite delusive. The numbers on the relief works continue to fall off until last week's total is reported at only 555,000. Millions have died, helping to reduce the strain, but millions more must exist still in a condition bordering upon absolute starvation, although not actually in receipt of public relief. The need of India, in short, grows in several respects greater than it was instead of less—at least in some of the most severely afflicted districts. In proof of this statement take the following extract from the London correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, which on this subject, as on not a few others, speaks with authority:—

Unofficial accounts which reach me from India show that the state of things in Gujerat and Kathiawar is still very serious. Though some parts of the district have had rain and to spare, others have gone short; and, what with lack of cattle and labour of all kinds, not two-thirds of the arable land of Kathiawar has been put under seed. Moreover, the destruction of cattle is causing the gravest difficulty in matters of haulage, and notably in procuring supplies of fuel. Worst of all, there is still a vast amount of unrelieved suffering. Fever is raging; people are reduced to the latest stages of want, and numbers are dying daily from starvation. Around Ahmedabad and in Ahmedabad itself the official figures show a weekly death-roll of nearly a hundred from starvation alone. The belief that the famine is practically over is hardly borne out by this terrible state of things.

Subscriptions to our little fund, from which not a penny is deducted for advertisements in newspapers or any other kind of charges, may be sent to A. J. Wilson, at this office; cheques to be crossed "Union Bank of London, Indian Famine Fund."

#### LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

Amount acknowledged last week .. ..	£832 19 1
"Cymro" .. .. ..	0 10 0
Westborne Park Indian Circle, per J. B. W. ..	2 3 4
Chapman .. .. ..	0 10 0
R. R. May, Esq., Southsea .. .. ..	0 10 0
Total to date .. .. ..	£897 2 5

The following certifies to the latest remittance:—

British Committee of the Indian National Congress,  
84-85, Palace Chambers,

Westminster, S.W.

November 21, 1900.

Dear Sir,—I am directed by Sir W. Wedderburn to inform you of the remittance to Bombay to-day of the sum of £44 19s. 6d. (Rs.664) further on account of the *Investors' Review* Famine Fund.

Statement of account to date is appended.—Yours truly,

A. J. Wilson, Esq. W. DOUGLAS HALL, Asst. Sec.



ACCOUNT.			
Receipts as per my letter of August 30 .. .. .	£835	9	7
September 3, receipts as pass book .. .. .	16	1	0
November 9, .. .. .	21	17	6
November 17, .. .. .	7	1	0
	£880	9	1
Remitted to Bombay to August 30 .. .. .	£835	9	7
November 21, remitted to Bombay to-day, Rs. 664 .. .. .	44	19	6

(Rs. 13,048.13.8) £880 9 1

Remittances should be made to Mr. A. J. Wilson, *Investors' Review* office, Norfolk House, Norfolk Street, Strand, W.C.

## MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI AT KENNINGTON.

### INTERESTING DEBATE ON THE INDIAN FAMINE.

The subject set down for discussion at the weekly meeting, last Saturday, of the St. John's Literary and Debating Society, Kennington, was "The Indian Famine; its Causes and Remedy." The chair was occupied by the Rev. H. G. Mackenzie, and the principal speaker was Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. There was a large attendance of members, and among the visitors were Messrs. G. K. Singh, Mukerji, and T. S. Naidu.

In opening the proceedings the chairman commented on the fearful and appalling ignorance which prevailed in this country on Indian affairs and expressed the pleasure they had in welcoming one who was able to speak with so much authority on the subject which they had to debate that evening. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. NAOROJI, who was received with cheers, said that although he proposed to confine himself that evening to the discussion of the causes of the Indian Famine and the remedy, it must not be supposed for one moment that he desired to ignore, in the slightest degree, the good which India had reaped from her connexion with England—(hear, hear)—indeed the very fact that he was on that occasion addressing an English audience and pointing out the faults associated with British rule was in itself the best compliment he could pay to that rule in India. It was not necessary that he should attempt to describe the horrors of the famine. The descriptions of the misery and tortures suffered by millions of the Indian people, which had already appeared in the English Press, must have sufficiently lacerated their hearts. He would go direct, therefore, to the causes of the famine.

When the British people first obtained territorial power in India, bad seeds were unfortunately sown. The Company went there solely for the sake of profit, greed was at the bottom of everything they did, and the result was that corruption, oppression, and rapacity became rampant. That was the state of things at the very beginning of our political connexion with India, as was fully proved by reports of the Court of Directors of the East India Company. One of those reports set forth that vast fortunes acquired in the Indian trade had been obtained largely by tyranny and oppression. One result was that there was a heavy drain of wealth from India, and the Europeans who went out there were so anxious to acquire riches that they did not wait until they had earned or deserved them, but they seized them in defiance of all economic principles. That was one cause of India's trouble.

Again, in the formation of the Indian Empire there had occurred many wars which had entailed enormous expenditure. Probably the cost of them had gone into hundreds of millions, and towards this the British people had not contributed a single farthing. Everything expended upon the formation of the British Empire in India had been exacted from the Indian people, and in addition to that the Natives had shed their blood freely—and to a much greater extent than Englishmen—in order to insure the maintenance of the British supremacy. Year by year the burden upon India had steadily increased, and the three millions which was annually exacted at the beginning of the present century had now grown to 25 or 30 millions. The worst of it was that India was afforded no chance of recuperation. She was suffering from a running wound which was slowly but surely sapping her vitality, and he ventured to assert that if Great Britain, now the richest country in the world, were to be subjected to similar treatment, she would as certainly fall into a state of impoverishment such as now afflicted her Eastern dependency.

It might be asked were not the famines due to droughts. His answer was in the negative. India was able to grow any quantity of food. Her resources in that respect were inexhaustible, and when famines had occurred in the past—before she was subjected to the continual drain of her wealth—the population were able to withstand them because they had stores of grain upon which they could fall back. But nowadays they were unable to accumulate such stores. Immediately the grain was grown it had to be sold in order to provide the taxation of the country, and the people were therefore not in a position to cope with famine. Indeed, the English little knew the actual conditions under which the Indian Natives existed. A large proportion of the population was in a normal state of

starvation. The people were always underfed, even in good years, and consequently, when bad years came, they the more readily succumbed. No doubt, thanks to the assistance which had been sent from this country, many thousands of lives had been saved. But for what? The people had been reduced to living skeletons; they had lost all stamina, and they would fall easy victims to disease. Now if England failed to produce a single ear of corn in any one year there would not of necessity arise a famine, for the nations of the world would at once pour into the country stores of food which the people would be able to buy. But the difficulty of India was that the Natives had no money with which to buy food should their crops fail, and hence it was that those disastrous famines arose—India was being made to bleed at every pore, her agricultural population—the vast mass of the people—had become weak for want of blood, and their poverty was accentuated by the fact that much of her produce was sent out of the country without anything being received in return for it.

Now he came to the remedy. It was to be found in two words and the two words alone—"honour" and "justice." There was not the slightest necessity that India should suffer in order that England might gain. If only the right policy were adopted India could be made prosperous, and at the same time England would reap ten times the benefit she now had from the connexion. She would gain the blessings and the gratitude of the people in lieu of their curses and their blood. What ought to be the British policy in India had been laid down in terms which gave the greatest satisfaction to the Natives of India. From 1833 onwards it had been stated in official document after official document—in Act of Parliament and in Royal Proclamation—that the Natives should have perfect equality with British citizens and should not be debared by reason of their origin or place of birth from holding any place or office for which by education they were fitted. (Cheers.) But, unfortunately these solemnly-made promises had never been fulfilled. The people were still kept under a bad system of government. They had no voice in the expenditure of the money exacted from them in the form of taxes. The Queen, in her Proclamation after the Indian Mutiny, promised that the Natives should be freely and impartially admitted to offices, "the duties of which they might be qualified by their education, ability, and integrity to discharge." But that promise had not been fulfilled and therein was to be found Great Britain's dishonour. The promise was renewed when her Majesty assumed the title of Empress of India. It was reiterated on the occasion of her Jubilee. But it had ever been a case of promise to the ear which was broken to the hope. Even Lord Salisbury had described it as a "political hypocrisy," while Lord Lytton had asserted that "every transparent subterfuge had been resorted to" in order to avoid giving effect to it. One of the remedies which he put forward as essential for curing India's troubles was the abolition of this particular piece of British dishonour. Let Great Britain honourably fulfil her pledges in this respect, and he believed that they would witness in India an amount of prosperity beyond conception.

Next he came to the question of justice. Surely when there were two partners in an undertaking it was only just that each should contribute to the cost of carrying it on. It was not fair that one should bear the whole burden and the other reap the sole benefit. Yet that was characteristic of the partnership between England and India. Whatever expenditure was incurred in the government of India, whatever outlay was involved in the maintenance of British rule there, the whole cost had had to be defrayed by India. He would not deny the necessity of maintaining European civil and military services there, but he did contend that, inasmuch as the main purpose of those services was to uphold British rule and to keep out the Russians, the cost of them ought at least to be equally divided instead of being wholly exacted from India. Why, he would like to know, should India have to pay the cost of maintaining the India Office in London, and why should she provide the salary of the Secretary of State for India? The same principle was not applied to the British Colonies; there was a Secretary of State for the Colonies, and there was a Colonial Office, but the Colonies were not called upon to contribute one farthing of the cost involved. Again, why should India pay the whole cost of carrying on the wars on the North-West frontier, the object of which was to keep the Russians at a distance? Certainly Mr. Gladstone gave them an instalment of justice in regard to the war of 1878-80 when he made a grant from the Imperial Exchequer of five million sterling towards defraying the total expenditure of twenty millions. But even that did not go far enough, for why should a wealthy country like England pay only one-fourth and a poor wretched country like India contribute three-fourths of the cost of a war waged for the promotion of purely Imperial interests? If only England were to treat India more fairly in regard to financial matters, and if this continual drain of Indian wealth were to be put a stop to, not only would the natives of India be placed in a better position to withstand famine but they would be able and willing to purchase British manufactures, and an enormous impetus would thereby be given to British trade with

India. The small amount of trade we now did with India as compared with other parts of the world was remarkable, and if only that country were enabled to be prosperous England would find her hands full in supplying Indian trade demands, and the unemployed would soon become an extinct class. If India were treated with honour and justice the result would be the disappearance of famine and destitution and the re-appearance of prosperity, accompanied by still greater prosperity for England.

A very interesting debate followed, several of the speakers urging that the lecturer had not shown a sufficient recognition of the benefits of British rule, and of the generosity of the British people in periods of distress. It was suggested that the Indian people were partly to blame for their condition because they relied too much on agriculture and had no manufacturing industries.

In the course of the discussion Mr. MUKHERJEE insisted that loyalty was ingrained in the Native mind. It was part and parcel of their religion, and they were always grateful for services done on their behalf. When the Prince of Wales visited India he had a magnificent reception, but it was a noteworthy fact that when Lord Ripon left their shores still greater crowds of Natives assembled to do him honour, because they knew he had endeavoured to rule them justly, notwithstanding the discouragement with which he met at the hands of the Europeans there.

Mr. SINOR also joined in the discussion and said it had been asked whether India would have been better off under Russian rule. His reply was that two wrongs did not make a right. (Hear, hear.) A suggestion had been thrown out as to whether there had been an adequate recognition on the part of the people of India of the generous response to the various appeals for funds to cope with various famines. He thought the best reply to that was to be found in the readiness with which the people of India had volunteered their services to fight for Great Britain in South Africa and in China in the day of her need. (Cheers.) He complained, however, that no matter how well fitted a Native might prove to be to hold public office in India, he was unfairly debarred from rising to positions—especially in the army—which were open to Europeans, some of whom were now cheering Mr. Kruger in France.

Mr. NAOROH, replying on the whole debate, said no speaker had attempted to dispute his assertion that Indian resources had been exhausted by British policy—which was thus responsible for the famines. It had been suggested that India should look more to manufacturing industries and be less dependent upon agriculture. But it seemed to be forgotten that the Indian industries had been destroyed by the British policy. India was originally noted for her industries. Venice and other ancient cities acquired great wealth through their trade with India, but Great Britain had deprived them of their life blood, and they could no longer carry on their industries because they had no means wherewith to maintain them. One of the speakers had stated that India was more prosperous now than before she came under British rule. To the eye that was so. But really it was not the case. They must remember that there were now two Indias—British India which was flourishing, and the India of the Indians which was not prosperous. He thought he had been able to show that England's policy had had might and not right as its foundation. There was no ground for charging India with ingratitude and disloyalty if she resented the violation of the solemn pledges to treat her people justly, and he warned them that the three hundred millions of Indian natives were now beginning to understand the position and might be tempted, unless something was done to ameliorate their condition, to use force in order to destroy force. They were not discussing what Russia might do under similar circumstances. He admitted that if Russia took India to-morrow the natives would fall from the frying pan into the fire. They were undoubtedly now in the frying pan, but surely Great Britain was not entitled to justify the breaking of honourable pledges by simply suggesting that Russia might do worse. England had taught India one very important lesson, viz., that the ruler was for the people, but the people were not for the ruler. He reiterated his friend's statement that loyalty was part and parcel of the Indian religion, which enjoined that the king should be father to the people and that the people should be children to the king, and finally he tendered hearty thanks for the sympathetic hearing which had been accorded to him.

A vote of thanks to the Rev. chairman brought the proceedings to a close.

#### MERCILESS TAX GATHERERS IN INDIA.

The editor of the *Investor's Review* writes as follows in the issue for November 24—Shameful are the deeds often done in the name of British rule—if the statements made by the Honourable Mr. Gokuldas Khandekar Parekh in his evidence regarding the "Improper Practices in the Collection of Land Revenue" be true, and no man in his senses would make such allegations unless he were pretty confident of being able to substantiate them. That such conditions of things should exist is not surprising. It is the natural result of a system of

Government whose ruling principle is militarism. The history of the conquests of all the great military nations of the world has been the same, and there is no law of nature which decrees that history will not repeat itself because the ruling power is Great Britain. All militarism tends towards the brutalisation of those whom it seeks to hold in despotic sway. This fact is strongly in evidence in this melancholy story from India, particularly as regards the conduct of certain native underlings amongst the officials. . . .

Letters signed "Gujerati" appeared in certain issues of the *Times of India*, and gave publicity to statements regarding the improper methods which were being resorted to for the recovery of Government revenue dues. Government ordered no formal investigation, but called for reports from the officials alleged to have done the wrong. Foolishly basing their conclusions on such reports, the higher powers decided that "most of the statements in the letters were devoid of foundation and others grossly misrepresented facts." Mr. Parekh, knowing that in certain quarters it was rumoured that the complaints were not genuine, but merely the outcome of conspiracy, visited the districts, himself examined the witnesses (except two), and took down their statements in Gujarati, which he translated in order to submit them to the Government of Bombay. Mr. Parekh's evidence goes to show that in scores of cases where the poor starving rayats had absolutely no money to pay the tax demanded household goods were seized even to cooking utensils, people were ejected from their homes, and men were actually whipped for their inability to pay. When those who have with unflinching regularity paid their taxes for years on end, that they have not the wherewithal to do so any longer—nay, more, when they relinquish their lands entirely because they see no prospect of being able to meet the liabilities which the possession of such land entails—then, surely, it is clear that the burden laid on them is "too grievous to be borne," and something ought to be done by way of relief. But no, the people may starve, but Government demands must be satisfied. After five years of bad seasons, when much of the land yielded little or nothing, Government allotted certain sums of money to purchase grass or fodder, but in most cases the land dues were first deducted. Thus a Koya, who was allowed Rs. 50 for the purchase of grass received only Rs. 20. The remainder was seized for Government dues. Many sold cattle, ornaments, and household goods to pay the tax and were then forced to make use of the "takavi" to support their families. Still worse has yet to be told. The charge is made that deductions from land revenue were made out of money from charitable funds distributed by Government officials. Fajli Lakhio was granted Rs. 7 from the charitable fund, but the whole of it was retained for Government revenue. The first statement in the "Evidence" is that of a woman, Bai Mani, who, in the absence of her husband, was turned out of her home, along with her son. Much of the house property was appropriated, the son was beaten, and the woman herself treated in a disgraceful way. The case of Bhima Prag is also a shameful one. He and his brother between them possessed sixty-five bighas of land, but in order to pay up debts it has all been sold but seven and a half bighas. Up till this year Government dues were regularly paid, but now it is impossible. This poor man was made to make almost naked, from his own village to Olpad, and was kept the whole day without food. Finally, after being cautioned by the Mamlatdar to "pay the monies slowly," he was allowed to go home. His cattle had died for want of grass and he has only a she-buffalo and one calf remaining. These are but a few instances of the cruelty and oppression complained of, but scores are cited which are as bad, if not worse. The condition of affairs is greatly aggravated by official red-tapism. It seems that there is a Government rule that no petition will be considered which has not the signature of the village head of Karasia, and Pardi, ignorant of this regulation, sent a joint petition to Government stating their grievances. The soil had been ruined by the blowing in of brine from the seashore, and the total yield was barely enough to pay Government dues. At the new Revision survey it was admitted that the land assessments were exorbitant, and a reduction was ordered. Nevertheless, no difference was made, and the tax remained the same. The petition was sent in February last. No reply was received till June, and it was couched in the following terms:—"The reply to the petitioners is that in case of such petitions, each petitioner should make a separate petition for himself; nothing can be done on a joint petition. Again, such a petition should be presented to the Mamlatdar of the Taluka, in order that he may enquire into the merits and pass a proper decision in the matter." Meanwhile the condition of the distressed villagers was growing still more lamentable. Mr. Parekh's efforts have not been in vain. He has roused up the Bombay Government to grant a formal investigation, and it has appointed Mr. E. M. Moulton, I.C.S., to make it.

And direct evidence of the truth of these accusations is to be found in the revenue returns of India for the first six months of this financial year, down, that is, to September 30. From these we learn that the shrinkage in the land revenue of the provinces affected by the most disastrous famine known in the history of India has been pitifully insignificant. Compared with 1898, the decline over the affected provinces has been only £558,000, and compared with last year barely £565,000 or Rs. 64,45,000. If 10,000,000 of the population has already disappeared, killed by starvation, it is just what but that the land rent should show so much more serious decline. Probably it will fall off far more severely in the second half of the fiscal year, but even so there must have been severe pressure used to bring so much money in during the earlier period of the distress.

## PUBLIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

## THE WORK OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

On October 29 Miss Alison Garland gave a lecture at Woodburn, Northumberland, on "Our Indian Empire." The Rev. A. Matthews presided over a large attendance.

On October 30 Miss Garland gave a limelight lecture on her visit to India at the Reading Room, Cambu. Lady Trevelyan presided. There was a good audience, the room being quite full.

On October 31 Miss Garland spoke at Elswick, Newcastle-on-Tyne. Mrs. D. Richardson, President of the Women's Liberal Association, presided. The lecture was illustrated by limelight views.

On November 2 Miss Garland addressed a crowded audience at Hayward's Heath, Sussex. Mrs. Payne, President of the Women's Liberal Association, presided. Miss Garland gave a graphic description of the famine and the means taken to combat it, and she dealt largely with the economic condition of the people of India.

On November 6 Miss Garland addressed a meeting convened by the National Union of Women Workers, at Berner's Street, London, W. Miss Manning presided. Miss Garland gave an account of the Indian Social Conference which she had attended at Lucknow and of the condition of the women of India. An interesting discussion followed, in which Lady Laura Cavendish, Miss Martin Wood, and some Anglo-Indian ladies took part.

On November 7 Miss Garland opened a debate at the Grosvenor Crescent Club on "Famines in India." Miss Leggett presided. Mr. N. B. Wagle also addressed the meeting on the land question in India. In the evening Miss Garland attended a large meeting at the Town Hall, St. Alban's, when she gave a limelight lecture on "My Visit to India." Thomas Miles, Esq., L.C.C., presided, and introduced the lecturer in a racy speech. Miss Garland showed photographs (taken last winter) of some of the starving rays, which caused a sensation in the audience.

Speaking on "Current Politics" at Burnham-on-Crouch on November 8, Miss Garland referred to her visit to India, and earnestly pleaded that more interest should be taken in the Indians by Liberals in this country.

On November 13 Miss Alison Garland gave a limelight lecture on "The Indian Famine" at the Mechanics' Institute, Burnley. There was an attendance of about 900. The chair was taken by Alderman Armistead. It was decided to send part of the entrance money to the *Investors' Review* Fund to maintain the orphanages started during the famine.

On November 14 Miss Garland gave a lantern lecture at Cliviger, near Burnley. Mr. A. Stansfield presided over a crowded audience. Miss Garland gave an account of her visit to India, which was listened to with much interest.

On November 15 Miss Garland spoke at Stalybridge on the same subject. T. Beeley, Esq., C.C., J.P., presided. There was a large attendance. The chairman urged the Liberals present to continue working for their party, and trusted that when that party returned to power it would carry some of the reforms advocated by their lecturer.

On November 19 Miss Alison Garland addressed a large meeting at the Liberal Club, Colne. Councillor Hewitt, J.P., presided. The lecture was illustrated by limelight views. "Her pictures of the famine," says a local paper, "almost made the audience groan at the sight of men, women, and children in a mummified state of skin and bone." Alderman Catlow in moving a vote of thanks said "it would be a very good thing if the schools would take up the question" of India, and was "glad that the Liberal party were not responsible" for refusing a grant from the Exchequer for the famine-stricken people. He also dwelt on the commercial importance of a prosperous India.

On November 21 Miss Garland spoke at the Liberal Club, Middleton, to an influential and appreciative audience on "The Needs of India." Mr. A. G. Harvey, C.C., spoke vigorously in support of the lecturer's views.

Among future meetings already arranged may be mentioned the following:—

On December 5 Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji will deliver an address on "India" at the Midway Radical Club and Institute, 34, Newington Green, N., at 8.30 p.m.

On January 14 Mr. Naoroji will deliver an address at the Penge and Beckenham Liberal and Radical Club.

On February 10 Mr. Naoroji will deliver an address at Hatching Liberal Club, New Cross Road.

## PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO INDIA.

To be obtained from

THE BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS, 84-85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

**Reports of the Proceedings at the Annual Sessions of the Indian National Congress, from the 3rd to the 14th Session.** 2s. each, post free.

**The Skeleton at the (Jubilee) Feast** (Congress Green Book I.), by SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN, Bart. (being a series of suggestions for the prevention of famine in India). Post free, 7d.

**Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure:** Evidence-in-Chief of the Indian Witnesses. (Congress Green Book II.) Post free, 1s. 10d.

**The Proposed Separation of Judicial and Executive Functions in India.** Memorial to the Secretary of State. With two Appendices. (Congress Green Book III.) Post free, 1s. 2d.

**Two Statements presented to the Indian Currency Committee** (1898), by MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

**Speech by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P.,** in the House of Commons, August 14, 1894, on the Debate on the Indian Budget.

**Ditto do.** in the House of Commons, February 12, 1895, on the Debate on the Address.

**Ditto do.** on British Rule in India (1898).

**Presidential Address by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P.,** delivered to the Indian National Congress at Lahore, 1893.

**Presidential Address by Mr. A. M. Bose, M.A.,** delivered to the Indian National Congress at Madras, 1898.

**Speeches of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P.,** President of the Indian National Congress, 1894-5.

**Valedictory Address of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P.,** delivered at Bombay, January 17, 1895.

**Speeches of Mr. D. E. Wacha** delivered at the 9th, 11th and 14th Sessions of the Indian National Congress.

**Is the Government of India Responsible to Anyone, and if so to Whom?** Speech delivered at Croydon by MR. W. C. BONNERJEE.

**The Famine in India.** Speeches delivered at a Public Reception to Mr. Vaughan Nash on his return from the Famine Districts, July, 1900.

**Mr. A. O. Hume's Farewell to India.** Speech delivered at Bombay, 1894.

**India Reform Pamphlet IX.** The State and Government of India under its Native Rulers. 3d.

**The Indian National Congress: its Aims and Justification.** By ROBERT KNIGHT.

**Indian Politics.** A Series of Papers on Important Indian Questions by Prominent Congressmen. Post free, 4s. 4d.

**A Needed Reform in the Indian Administration,** by ROHESH C. DUTT, C.I.E.

**The Bogey of a Russian Invasion.** A Lesson from the Tirah Campaign, by COL. H. B. HANNA.

**The High Courts and the Collector-Magistrates in India,** by J. DACOSTA.

**The Government of India and its Reform** through Parliamentary Institutions, by J. DACOSTA.

**Indian Polity:** being Extracts from the Writings of Major Evans Bell.

**Note on Sir J. Westland's Budget, 1894-5.**

**Note on the Explanatory Memorandum of the Secretary of State for India, 1894-5.**

**Note on Sir James Westland's Budget, 1895-6.**

**Note on Sir H. Waterfield's Tables, 1884-5 to 1894-5.**

**The Poor Man's Lamb:** Famine Insurance for the Masses versus Exchange Compensation for the Classes.

## REPRINTS FROM "INDIA."

**The Judiciary and the Executive in India.** Interview with Mr. Manomohan Ghose.

**The Bombay Government and Higher Education,** by the Hon. C. H. Setalvad.

**A National Famine Grant,** Letter from the London Indian Society to Lord Salisbury, 1900.

**India and the General Election (1900).** "Melancholy Meanness."

**The "Over-population" Fallacy Again.**

**No National Contribution?**

A Selection of the Publications enumerated above will be forwarded to responsible persons or Associations in the United Kingdom for gratuitous distribution, on written application to the British Committee, Indian National Congress, 84-85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

## Open Letters to Lord Curzon ON FAMINES IN INDIA.

By **RAMESH C. DUTT, C.I.E.**

London: KEANE 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 dr. in 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 excesses in assessment."—*The Daily News*.

"Nothing could be better than he 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 enquiring man exactly what he ought to know."—*The Daily Chronicle*.

"We would draw special attention to Mr. Dutt's own convincing and eloquent plan. Hidden away in the first pages of the appendix, for the creation of such representative institutions as should enable the Government of India to utilise 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 are supported with a wealth of detail of all kinds, which proves his mastery of the subject and makes good his 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—

**J. M. PARIKH, Barrister-at-Law,**  
1, CLOISTERS, TEMPLE, LONDON, E.C.; OR  
**Dr. MULLICK,**  
85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

## THE FORWARD POLICY AND ITS RESULTS;

OR,

Thirty-Five Years' Work Amongst the Tribes on our  
North-Western Frontier of India.

By **RICHARD ISAAC BRUCE, C.I.E.,**

Formerly Political Agent, Beluchistan; late Commissioner and Superintendent,  
Derajat Division, Punjab, India.

Just Published. With 28 Illustrations and a Map. 8vo, 45s. net.

LONDON: LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.

**DR. T. N. GHOSE'S**

## PECTORAL BALSAM.

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

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

DR. S. 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.—31st March, 1889.

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



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 I know.  
North Haglan Barracks, Devonport.  
"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.  
G. L. NARAYANA ROW.

**FOR INDIGESTION, DIARRHOEA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.**

Wholesale Municipal Councils' Office: "I have had much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-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,

**HERRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras**



## "INDIA," 1901.

### NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

In future "INDIA" will be forwarded only to persons in respect of whom subscriptions have been actually received at the London office. To this rule there will be no exception.

In order to obtain every number published during 1901 it is necessary that the name of the Subscriber and his Subscription be received in London before December 31, 1900, as back numbers will not be stocked. New names will be added as received, but no back numbers can be obtained.

Subscribers are requested to cut out the Order Form printed below, and forward it to the London office, together with a Post Office Money Order for the sterling equivalent of Six Rupees (net), made payable to W. Douglas Hall, Manager of "INDIA."

### ORDER FORM.

To the Manager of "INDIA,"

84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

Please send "INDIA" during 1901,

Name

Address

To be written clearly.

for which is enclosed the sum of Six Rupees.