

India

FOR THE

NO. 154. NEW SERIES.
NO. 245. OLD SERIES.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1900.

[REGISTERED AS A (PRICE—2d.)
NEWSPAPER. { By Post, 2½d.]

Notes and News	280	The Nagpur Re-Settlement: The	
To Bridge the Gulf	292	Government and Mr. Ramesh	
Mr. Vaughan Nash on the Famine	293	Dutt	295
Our London Letter	294	Anglo-Indians and Indians: "The	
Notes from Bombay	295	Widening of the Gulf"	298
The Famine in India:		Indian Affairs in Parliament:	
The Mansion House Fund	295	Special Report	299
The Investors' Review Fund	295	Advertisements	300

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 300.

NOTES AND NEWS.

THERE is no Viceroyal telegram this week to tell us of the famine conditions in the stricken districts. The discontinuance of the weekly message is no doubt intended to convey that the famine is practically over. The suggestion would have been more reassuring but for the continuous insufficiency of rainfall reported during several weeks past. The needs of the people are in any case still clamant. The Mansion House Fund, however, advances but slowly; it has now reached £389,700. Meantime an "Onlooker" writes to the *Morning Post* (December 4):—

If it is true, as stated by some authorities, that about £2 10s. per head per year will maintain the average Indian rayat, it is surely clear that the heavy home charges for which India gets no equivalent would, if borne here, as they should be, leave ample funds in India to deal with the recurring famines, said to be unavoidable. A famine every five years may be a necessity in India, but if we take several million pounds per year from that country which we should not take may it not be argued that we cause the famine? A famine fund increased yearly by the amount unfairly drawn from India would be far more than enough to cope with these periodical outbreaks. India may be grateful for a Mansion House Fund of a few hundred thousand pounds. How much more grateful would she be for simple justice and fairplay in the matter of her financial relations with this country!

The material ills that accompany and follow famine—the ruined health, the retrogression of agriculture, and the permanent impoverishment of the sufferers—are not the only evils for which that calamity is responsible. The Resolution of the Indian Government on the Administration of Jails bears decisive testimony to the increase of crime and the degradation of morality. It is true that, if we consider not the figures but the suffering and the temptation, the increase in the number of prisoners is perhaps less than might have been expected. It is, indeed, satisfactory to learn that the prison population was slightly smaller in 1899 than it was in 1896, the corresponding year of the last great famine, which yet was not so serious as the one just passing away. The number of admissions for the whole of India, however, was smaller in 1896. The *Friend of India* points out that in the Central Provinces, while the admissions were 13,961 in 1899, they were 21,783 in 1896, a difference which our contemporary, no doubt correctly, attributes to the better organisation of famine relief during the present visitation. The death-rate and the average of sick continues to fall.

The *Indian Spectator* reviews the results of the recent General Election in their bearing on the interests of India in Parliament. Our contemporary has a good word for all the candidates that spoke out for India, and gives marked prominence to Dr. Mursion's contest in the Bridgeton Division of Glasgow. Of those that were happily successful, it says, "the re-election of our old friend, Mr. W. S. Caine, needs special mention."

Indeed, not only has Mr. Caine been re-elected, but he has been able to secure a new seat for his party, thus rendering them service. Perhaps, excepting Sir W. Wedderburn, no loss would have been

No. 24. VOL. XIV.

more deeply regretted in this country than Mr. Caine's. He knows India as only a few Parliamentarians know her, and his sympathy for her millions is wide and sincere. He has served her well, and India has never been slow in appreciating the services of this veteran champion of her cause. May these two remain friends for long!

So note it be indeed! "To those of our friends who fought hard but fought in vain," adds the writer, "we offer our sincere sympathy and hope that they may always keep in close touch with affairs in India and continue to work in her interests." We do not hesitate to engage ourselves for their constancy.

At a recent meeting of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress the following resolution was adopted:—

That this committee has heard with great regret of the death of Bakshi Jaishiram, the secretary of the Lahore Standing Congress Committee, and one of the leaders of the Congress movement in the Punjab, and desires to express its sympathy with the late Bakshi's relatives.

Mr. Jaishiram was one of the secretaries of the Committee entrusted with the arrangements for the forthcoming session of the Indian National Congress at Lahore, and his untimely death will cast a shadow over the proceedings of that body this Christmas.

Turning to the old controversy on the supposed cowardice of the Bengali, the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* recalls the desperate struggle of armies composed of Bengali soldiers and led by Bengali captains against the Moslems. In another place it says:—

The little Goorkha is now considered a worthy brother of Tommy Atkins. But if Nepal is taken and subjected to a Police rule fifty years they would become a cowardly race as the other races India have become.

Those who have read Sir George Robertson's account of the siege of Chitral will remember the figure of the Bengali steward, who, with the dislike of battle natural to a race long devoted to peaceful industry, yet never allowed any danger to interfere with the performance of his duties. Surely this is one of the highest types of character.

The offensive allegation arises from mere ignorance and misunderstanding, so far as it is not based on careless malice. It is a sufficiently vulgar blunder to imagine that because a man loves peace he will not fight bravely when duty calls upon him to fight. Surely we have had ample exemplification of Hindu, as well as of Mahometan, bravery in the South African campaign, and notably on the Natal side. Mr. Protap Chunder Mozoomdar, a man of peace, enters a quiet protest in his paper in the current issue of the *Nineteenth Century* on "Present Day Progress in India." He remarks:—

The Hindu is credited with a large amount of mildness, often perhaps in ridicule. The mild Hindu has fought many a battle by the side of the Englishman, and shown a great deal of endurance and manliness. Not long ago a well-known Governor of Bengal said that Lord Clive fought the great battle of Plassey with the help of a great many sturdy Native spearmen and clubmen. Indeed the proportion of Clive's Native soldiers at Plassey was two to one Englishman.

Mr. Protap goes on to suggest the emasculating influences due to British policy, the results of which ought not to count to the discredit of the Natives. He writes:—

Just now there is a growing fondness of our young men for manly sports of all kinds. They have taken to cricket and football with a zeal which surprises foreigners. Indian teams of cricketers have come to England, and may come again. But our complaint is that our boys are not taught the art of self-defence, or the use of firearms as all European boys, and even those of mixed parentage, are taught in the public schools of Calcutta and Bombay. Their physical backwardness is reproached, but nothing is done to give them that physical education which European and Eurasian school-boys generally receive. If this injustice were removed, even Bengali boys might some day come up to the lofty standard of Mr. Rudyard Kipling.

Mild as Hindus may be, the profession of arms is closed to them at home, and when they come over here they are carefully excluded from volunteer corps, however martial their ardour.

The *Bengalee* relates another case in the Residency Court, at Indore, which is almost more serious than the one to which we recently alluded. The Treasurer of the Indore Residency brought a charge against three Bunias (under Section 500 of the Indian Penal Code) of "conspiring together and attempting to publish defamatory matters about him." The Bunias denied the charge, but, it is stated, without being given a proper opportunity of defence, and without witnesses being examined in their presence, the Magistrate made the following order:—

There is a certain amount of evidence to implicate them, and there is unmistakable testimony to the fact that an attempt of the kind complained of by the treasurer was made. Two of the Bunias named above, namely, Gangaram and Nanakram, have already been bound down in big sums to keep the peace in reference to cases arising out of the hostile feelings between themselves and the treasurer; and under all the circumstances I feel constrained to bind down all the three Bunias implicated in this case, &c., &c.

A judicial conclusion so serious as this might be expected to be based on clearer and stronger premisses.

Here, then, as the defendants complain in their appeal to the Agent of the Governor General in Central India, are several illegalities: (1) An attempt to publish defamatory matter does not come within the section quoted. (2) They could not under the section be bound over to keep the peace. (3) The magistrate did not "proceed to enquire into the truth of the information against them," for no witnesses were examined in their presence, nor had they the opportunity of cross-examining witnesses. Nor can it be reasonable to put forward in defence that the Penal and Criminal Procedure Codes have never been extended to Residency Bazaars, for in this case the code was quoted in the charge and thereby recognised as morally binding. The *Bengalee* and the *Tribune* insist that the Codes should be formally extended to the Residency Bazaars and the authority of the High Courts established over them.

The *Times of India* has at length intervened in the dispute between Mr. Malabari and Mr. Giles, to whom it will be remembered the duty of issuing a review of Native publications was lately transferred. On the whole, we think our contemporary's remarks cannot be pleasant reading for Mr. Giles, although it treats that censor with delicate railery rather than direct condemnation. He is reminded that Mr. K. N. Kabraji, "whose authority as an expert in Gujarati will not be impugned," has given a different translation and one more favourable to Mr. Malabari than that on which he relied. It is suggested that "the drain from India," though a debatable, is not a forbidden subject. Finally, the *Times of India* draws this moral from what has passed:—

But the story of the controversy has impressed upon many minds a conviction of the incongruity of an arrangement which imposes upon the Director of Public Instruction a censorship which may at any time make him—as it has made him in this instance—the centre of angry political controversy.

The new arrangement for reviewing Native literature seems generally condemned. It may be added that the *Times of India* gives translations of two of the impugned poems, so that the public may form their own judgment.

The visit of Lord Curzon to the State of Cochin evokes many memories of the early relations between Europe and the East. Those who love historical contrasts will note that Cochin, one of the first States of India to yield to the influence of the Portuguese, has yet escaped the direct rule of their mightier successors. But the visit of the Viceroy has another interest more nearly connected with the present, for it gave occasion for one of those testimonies to the excellence of Indian rule which have been appearing in various quarters of late so frequently as to have become almost monotonous by repetition. Lord Curzon said:—

Nowhere have I seen a more intelligent or progressive administration than in this State. His Highness during the five years that he has been upon the *gadi* has shown that he has been a hard worker and a conscientious ruler, who is devoted to the interests and the welfare of his people, assisted by a capable band of officials.

So Cochin must be added to the long list of well-ruled Native States.

We quoted recently the generous sympathy which the *Hindu* gave to the Mahometans, even to the length of endorsing their claim to special treatment. Of the soundness of this generosity we are, indeed, very doubtful; and we think the *Hindu* is wise in insisting that any special favour shown should not take the form of a lowering of educational standards. For it appears that this noxious form of favouritism is already practised by the Indian Government, though not in the case of Mahometans. In the new rules for clerical appointments in the Government of India Secretariat, the *Hindu* tells us there are these words:—

Every candidate, if he is a Native, must have passed the B.A. examination, and, if a Eurasian, must have passed some school examination by the higher standard.

Lord Curzon, replying to the Karachi Mahometans, spoke of the impolicy of crying out for artificial pulleys and ropes while they were manfully climbing the ladder. A lowering of the educational standard is undoubtedly the worst kind of artificial aid, and, in the end, the one most fatal to the well-being and progress of the community that receives it.

Mr. Oldham is about to leave India, and those who charge the Indians with being an ungrateful people must find it hard to reconcile with their idea the fine tribute paid to him by the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*. The part Mr. Oldham took in support of the unpopular Calcutta Municipal Bill is mentioned only to be put on one side. What is remembered is his defence of Indian character when defamed by the late Mr. Steevens. "Let us show," says the *Patrika*, "that we can forget an injury and remember a good service." The *Bengalee* shows the same spirit of gratitude when it considers who should succeed to Mr. Oldham's seat in the Calcutta Corporation. It says:—

Mr. Oldham could not find a worthier successor than Mr. Cotton. The worthy son of a worthy father, Mr. Cotton's accession to the Municipality would be a gain alike to the administration and the ratepayers.

This is the sympathy of the present Chief Commissioner of Assam still gratefully remembered in Bengal.

Sir Alfred Lyall, in his second lecture at the School of Economics and Political Science (December 7), dealt with the system of the internal administration of India. If Modern India may be fixed to begin with the Queen's Proclamation of 1858, it yet seems more effective than precise to say that "the ancient order of things passed away when the Queen's sovereignty became the outward and visible sign of British rule in that country." The British Government had already, for a generation at least, practically superseded John Company; and the change effected in 1858 was hardly so clear-cut after all—that is not to say, in essentials. However, that is a more formal matter. There is more interest in what Sir Alfred said about the land revenue. We quote the *Times*:—

The land in India was the foundation of society, and the proper adjustment of the land revenue lay at the base of all good Indian Government, for the State was the universal sharer in all the surplus rents. He could not say that we had been altogether successful in this branch of administration, but, perhaps, we had done better, on the whole, in India than in Ireland. Amid all the admixture of antique custom, the British Administration in India had been for many years groping painfully in search of a broad and satisfactory arrangement for distributing the land tax over the immense agricultural population.

This is not a particularly flaming testimonial: "not altogether successful"—"perhaps, better, on the whole, in India than in Ireland." Even Mr. Romesh Dutt, we apprehend, would go as far as this. And yet the matter "lies at the base of all good Indian government."

No doubt, as Sir Alfred is reported to have said, the railways "have been the agents of great moral, as well as of material, advancement." But did Sir Alfred set out on the other side of the account? Since the Mutiny, "we have been engaged in improving the administration, developing the resources, and, generally, furnishing India with refined apparatus and Western civilisation." True; but did Sir Alfred place before his hearers the misgivings of Lord George Hamilton cited in our first leading article to-day? He deprecated the wholesale importation of British institutions into the evolution of "a suitable system of self-government." Such a course is not very likely to be

adopted; but does he mean to discourage the expansion of the powers of Indian members of the Legislative Councils and the natural progress of such municipal institutions as still survive? We are told that

He next dealt with the remarkable spread of political education in India during the past 40 years, and, in conclusion, said that the permanent consolidation of the union between Great Britain and India would depend on the political genius, sympathetic insight, and scientific methods of England, combined with the good will and growing intelligence of the Indian people.

There is no doubt whatever about the last part of the combination; it is the first part that gives ground for anxiety. The political education that has spread so remarkably calls for opportunities of application; and to the provision of suitable opportunities we should like to see "the political genius, sympathetic insight, and scientific methods of England" seriously directed.

A correspondent of ours wants to know "where the science comes in," particularly "in the case of the extremely youthful civil servants who are made judges in districts, though entirely ignorant of the customs, traditions, habits, and dialects of those over whom they have such a control in the matter of judicial sentences." She proceeds:—

These young men act by interpreters, and are practically without equipment for the duty which they are called upon to fulfil. There is no attempt in our Civil Service education to teach even the rudimentary knowledge of anthropology so necessary to a man who would proceed on scientific lines in the administration of a country alien to his own.

And she recalls, in illustration of her criticism, an earlier experience of her own:—

At this very same School of Economics, about a year back, the Students' Union invited a Hindu to open the debate on this very question of governing India. A severer comment on England could not have been made than was made by the English students, who tried to assail the opener. None of these gentlemen were familiar with the language and customs of India. The opener was intimately acquainted with ours. But—and this is the point I would make—he was told that "the Indian" had no knowledge of government and must be taught before he could govern. What knowledge have the young men who go out to India and so quickly proceed to place and power, to show beside the knowledge of this young man, who so ably demonstrated the weak points in our administration in the tongue of those gentlemen who assailed him? And assailed him very inadequately, for he scored all the way through, and not least in the self control, the courtesy, and the moderation with which he put his case.

Our correspondent concludes that "till England's servants become less ignorant of those whom they would govern, the less she speaks of science the wiser she will be."

West Africa is a long way from India, yet in an appeal for a national memorial to the late Miss Mary Kingsley, which has just been circulated, there is quoted from one of the last letters of Miss Kingsley a passage that has its bearing on India as well as on West Africa. Referring to "the root of the troubles in West Africa in these last years of war and bloodshed," Miss Kingsley wrote:—

Now it seems to me a deplorable thing that the present state of feeling between the two races should be so strained; and that unsatisfactory state, I cannot avoid thinking, arises largely from mutual misunderstanding. It does not seem to me to be unavoidable, a natural race hatred, but a thing removable by making the two people understand each other, and by avoiding rousing a hatred in either for the other by forcing them into interference with each other's institutions.

The great difficulty is, of course, how to get the people to understand each other. The white race seems to me to blame in saying that all the reason for its interference in Africa is the improvement of the native African, and then to start on altering African institutions without in the least understanding them, and the African to blame for not placing clearly before the Anglo-Saxon what African institutions really are, and so combating the false and exaggerated view given of them by stray travellers, missionaries, and officials (who for their own aggrandisement exaggerate the difficulties and dangers with which they have to deal). It is mere human nature for them to do this thing, but the effect produced on the minds of our statesmen has terrible consequences.

There is not a little analogy with India here. "The great difficulty is, of course, to get the people to understand each other." Miss Kingsley cried out for organised means of enabling the British statesman to understand "the true African," and "to destroy the fancy African made by exaggeration that he has now in his mind." Is there not in many British minds—even in the minds of British statesmen—a "fancy Indian"?

An Anglo-Indian correspondent writes: "It is always interesting to hear of just attention being given to ancient

Indian affairs, and all the more so when that comes from unexpected quarters. Hence it is well here to record, from the House of Commons Notice Paper of Monday last, that

The Chancellor of the Exchequer will be asked on Thursday in the House of Commons, by Mr. Claude Lowther, to grant a Return showing the cost of each of the different wars undertaken in India on behalf of our Indian Possessions from the year 1800 to the date of the abolition of the East India Company, and showing also the proportion of expenditure borne respectively by the United Kingdom and the East India Company in each case.

This is a very large order, travelling over a vast field of history; but it is not for us to raise any objection on that ground—quite otherwise. As the new member will presently learn, there has been neither 'proportion' nor portion of expenditure borne by the United Kingdom in 'the different wars undertaken in India on behalf of our [? her Majesty's] Indian possessions.' This may seem a somewhat startling statement to Mr. Claude Lowther and to many other public men, but the degree of surprise with which it may be received measures the density of the 'darkness under the lamp' that encompasses popular impressions of fundamental questions concerning our Indian Empire."

"When Mr. Lowther gets under the surface of the big subject he has chanced upon," our correspondent continues, "he will come to see that his question should have been reversed, namely, 'What proportion of expenditure has been contributed by India and its taxpayers to the growth of our general Imperial sway?' One very full contribution to this domain of modern history, never yet fully explored by any of our public men, may be found in a comprehensive paper by the late Mr. Robert Knight in Part 3, Volume II, of the *East India Association Journal*, 1868. And unless the facts and figures embodied in that invaluable essay be taken into account by the compilers of the Return for which the enterprising member has asked, such official document will prove of very little real service. As to the modern portion of the ground which is to be covered by the spacious Return now asked for, there is one very substantial contribution in the White Paper, No. 13 of 1900, entitled 'Wars on or Beyond the Borders of British India,' given in March of that year on the motion of Mr. John Morley. Within its compass it is very full, and it has a good index. But to begin with, it might be well for Mr. Lowther to take a dip into the evidence by the Indian witnesses before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, the greater part of which Lord Welby and his majority so largely ignored in compiling their Report. Anyway let us recognise the courage of Mr. Claude Lowther in taking this plunge into the—unknown."

Mr. William Sowerby, A.M.I.C.E., F.R.G.S., addressed the East India Association the other day (December 4) on "Water Supply and Prevention of Drought in India." He thought considerable supplies of water could undoubtedly be obtained in almost every part of the country by means of artesian tube wells, deep but not necessarily expensive. He admitted, however, that the absence of surveys involved estimates in thick darkness. He also hoped much from the easy construction of reservoirs in the valleys of the great rivers. Though such tanks and artesian wells would greatly mitigate the sufferings of the people during failure of the monsoon rains they "would of course be insufficient for any extent of irrigation of the crops, which must be supplied by rain or by canals from extensive reservoirs." Mr. Sowerby also advocated improved systems of cultivation, so as to enable the ground to absorb and retain the moisture from the heavy dews.

Remittances on India for 40 lakhs were on Wednesday offered for tender by the India Council, and the amount applied for was Rs. 9,83,00,000 at 1s. 4d. and 1s. 4½d. The following amounts in bills were allotted, viz., Rs. 21,91,000 on Calcutta, Rs. 13,02,000 on Bombay, and Rs. 5,07,000 on Madras, all at an average of 1s. 4d. Tenders at 1s. 4d. will receive about 4 per cent. and above in full. Later the Council sold bills for 2 lakhs on Bombay and Rs. 25,000 on Madras at 1s. 4½d. Last week remittances for 40 lakhs were sold for £266,219 making the total sold from April 1 to Tuesday night Rs. 9,41,57,588 producing £6,261,687. Next week 40 lakhs will again be offered.

TO BRIDGE THE GULF.

LAST week we took occasion to remark on the happy capture of the Indian imagination by the Viceroy, and on the deep rift that lies between Viceregal promise and official performance. It is with much reluctance that we now recur to the deeper rift—"the widening gulf"—that yawns so ominously between rulers and ruled in India. There are but too many insistent reminders, and it is an urgent duty to face them frankly and firmly. In another column we print the substance of a very long communication to an American contemporary of great influence by an Indian who professes to be, and no doubt is, in a position favourable to real knowledge of what his countrymen are thinking and saying about the Government of India. The open bitterness of tone may not improbably discount in the minds of many readers some part of his statements and inferences; but it is to be remembered that bitterness is in no way inconsistent with truth. The picture that he exhibits to our American cousins may be derided by Indian officialdom; yet it can scarcely be supposed that the British people will be equally careless of the effects that are likely to be produced by such representations upon the minds of our kin beyond the Atlantic. And even on this side of the Atlantic; for already, we observe, a Dublin journal, the *Irish Independent*, in a leading article wildly headed "Will India Revolt?" (November 24), has accepted the facts submitted by the New York paper's Indian correspondent and endorsed his conclusions. "The English Press, as a rule," says our Irish contemporary, "does its best to minimise or suppress" the evidences of "widespread discontent in India," but, as it goes on to state, "they exist for all that." The British Press, indeed, is slowly awakening to the pressure of Indian problems, and it may be anticipated, will by and by awaken the British public. And if it refuse the suggestions of Native Indian officials and Irish journalists as possibly tainted with racial prejudice, and even hatred, there is abundance of like evidence from unimpeachable sources, which may well claim its sober consideration.

The evidence of a grievously unsatisfactory state of things lies open on the pages of this journal. Our readers will have fresh in their minds the burden of Mr. Edward Carpenter's paper on "Empire in India" (INDIA, October 26, vol. xiv. p. 215), Mr. Alfred Haggard's "somewhat extreme article" (as we characterised it) on "Bleeding India" (INDIA, November 2, vol. xiv. p. 226), our extracts from Mr. Vaughan Nash's articles, and our reports of recent speeches of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, to say nothing of the general discussion of current questions. Nearly three years ago the main part of the matter was set forth by Sir William Wedderburn in an article entitled "Touch lost with India: the Cause and the Consequences" (INDIA, January 7, 1898, vol. ix. p. 5), the gist of which may be usefully repeated now. Sir William, considering the action of Government in the face of the facts, wrote:—

Contemplating this marvellous statesmanship, I am reminded of the caustic humour of Illudus Prichard in his "Chronicles of Budgepore." In a series of character sketches he takes one department of our Indian administration after another, depicting the industry and ineptitude of the officials, their good intentions and the tragic results of their labours. I remember his sketch of the Collector of Budgepore, the head of the local executive, in whose hands, so far as Budgepore is concerned, centre the power and majesty of the distant but irresistible "Sirkar." The Collector has, unfortunately, but a poor opinion of the people of the country, and tells his friend that none of them are to be trusted; not one. But he corrects himself. Yes, he does know one trustworthy native: only one, but he is a man of exceptional honesty and devotion. It turns out, of course, that this one honest man is his own Serishtadar, or official factotum; who is the biggest scoundrel in the place, who has taken the measure of his master's foot, who plays upon his simple vanity, and who for his own ends poisons "the Hoooscar's" mind against all that is independent and respectable in the local community. This little story is a parable; for the worthy Collector of Budgepore is the type and emblem of our whole administration, which has a perfect genius for the selection of the unfittest, distrusting its best friends, and placing its confidence in the one really dangerous class which exists in the Indian community.

It is worth while to compare this picture of Prichard's with the New York journal's Indian correspondent's bitter denunciation of "the Jee Hazoor creatures, on whom the Government relies," and to consider whether, after all, there has been any substantial improvement during the last generation.

The absence of any such improvement may readily be inferred from the acknowledged fact that not only has the necessary basis of a remedy—a closer touch with the

people—not been established, but that there has been in recent years a positive "widening of the gulf." Lord George Hamilton himself has told us so. In his Indian Budget statement on July 26 last (INDIA, August 3, vol. xiv. p. 67), he said:—

We have made enormous changes in India during the last ten years. . . . Yet sometimes I have my doubts whether our popularity has increased. . . . Sir, we have gone on improving our administration, we have passed through various stages of administrative improvements, until administration at the present moment has reached the highest point of development. . . . But, looking at all these great improvements, can it be said that they are as palatable to the people to whom they are applied as the older and cruder system? . . . We have passed from the old patriarchal methods. The gentlemen who go out to India now are in a different position. . . . They have everything that develops, telegraphs and railways, and the result is that they are so overburdened with correspondence, reports, and returns, that they are really imprisoned in their offices for the greater part of the day, and it is only when such a great calamity as that with which India is now afflicted occurs and sweeps away all their stereotyped procedure that these men are able to come out of their offices and join with the other forces at work in dealing with the trouble.

Such being the position of the British officials—"really imprisoned in their offices for the greater part of the day"—acting in accordance with "their stereotyped procedure"—is it to be wondered at that they lie exposed, at every turn of official action, to the misleading influence of "the Jee Hazoor humbug"? The Viceroy has recently ordered the abridgment of this perverse desk work. He has also declared that he "must hear both sides"—that officials have no monopoly of knowledge, and that educated Native opinion is entitled to respect. But to reduce this sensible declaration to practice, he has yet to reform the ingrained Anglo-Indian contempt for Native capacity and Native opinion. In any case the danger stands proclaimed by the highest official authority as fully as by the anonymous correspondent of our New York contemporary and by well-known British and Indian gentlemen of unimpeachable loyalty whose warnings and pleadings for years and years have been officially neglected or contemned.

There is no need here to insist on the fundamental importance of the financial question. The "drain" of India, as Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has contended for a generation past in season and out of season, goes to the root of the prosperity of the country and the contentment of the people. It is necessary, of course, to treat the Indians on terms suitable to the developments resulting from British government, education, example, and the intellectual awakening to Western ideas. It is necessary to modify official airs of racial superiority and to deal with Indians on a footing of equal humanity, opening up to them the legislative and administrative posts to which their fairly-judged capacity may entitle them under a frank interpretation of the solemn promises of statute, proclamation, and official declaration. But no less necessary is it that the financial problem should be faced with equal honesty of intention. We are well aware of the reluctance of officialdom to acknowledge mistakes, and especially mistakes of such vast issues as are involved in the financial history of the country, mainly through perversities of political action. We can perfectly well understand the motives that lie behind this reluctance—we mean the reasonable, and in no sense unworthy, motives—and we may claim that we do not fail to appreciate them. But we have never concealed our opinion that they are mere dust in the balance when weighed against the advantages of an open and resolute fulfilment of the indefeasible British duty of trusteeship for India. And the marvellous response of India to the sympathetic declarations of Lord Curzon might well impress the authorities with the certain anticipation that, in a new order of things, the faults of the old order would be forgotten, swept into oblivion by an irresistible tide of gratitude and confidence.

On the whole we should have been greatly inclined to leave this subject in abeyance and content ourselves with watching silently the operation of the professions of the Viceroy, especially as the British Committee of the Indian National Congress has so recently held out the olive branch of conciliation to the Indian authorities. For, with all our strenuous vigilance and criticism, we hold firmly with the solid opinion and fervent desire of Educated India that the British rule must be maintained, and that the one policy is a "union of hearts." But at the same time, we cannot depart from the principle of recognising facts; and unhappily the inadequate fulfilment of the great promises, the official loss of touch with the people,

and the perilous "drain" of the country are facts beyond dispute. From such facts it is but natural to draw inferences of a very alarming character—inferences that seem to be inevitable. Yet, however, there is time; and the professions of the Viceroy, we should earnestly hope, will prove the turning-point. Already we have intimated that any notion of a second Mutiny is wholly preposterous and mischievous in the last degree. It is unnecessary now to forecast—though we have also indicated this—in what forms persistent neglect or misunderstanding of the conditions of Indian life and Indian opinion may drive popular discontent to break the bonds of long-suffering patience. Much rather would we trust that the gratitude of the people for the official efforts to combat the recent calamities and their cordial appreciation of the Viceroy's sentiments of even-handed and humane consideration will teach the authorities the great lesson that the future of the British Indian Empire rests, not on force, not on alien administration, not on the most unselfish management of the affairs of the Indians for their benefit, but on firm justice, honest sympathy, and the generous fulfilment of the promises of the Proclamation. Never had Viceroy such an opportunity to glorify the Empire by "that which exalteth a nation."

MR. VAUGHAN NASH ON THE FAMINE.¹

MR. VAUGHAN NASH'S account of the Famine is by far the best that has come to our notice. To his skill as a writer Mr. Nash adds an open and sympathetic mind, great powers of observation, and an intelligent appreciation of the value of evidence, while his knowledge of economics renders the opinions he has formed of the greatest value. In fact the book, which gives final form to his observations and reflections, represents one of the very rare cases where a man trained in the study of social phenomena has been able to observe closely and at first hand a critical and interesting, though a diseased and passing, phase of the body politic. Nor would it be fair, while thus declaring our high appreciation of the work of Mr. Nash, to omit all mention of the great newspaper through whose enterprise he found his opportunity. The substance of the book appeared first in the form of letters to the *Manchester Guardian*; and if it be a good work to make known to each other the various portions of the Empire—and, indeed, no political work is more urgent—then may our Lancashire contemporary claim to have done a great Imperial service. To all such people at home as seek an interesting, a lucid, and a thoughtful account of famine-stricken India, the causes of its sufferings, and well-considered suggestions of remedy, we confidently recommend this book.

The matters treated naturally divide themselves into three groups, though without any hard and fast line of separation. There is, first, the facts of the famine area, mortality, etc., and the description of its effects as seen by the observant eye of one unused to such sights of misery. There is, secondly, the organisation of relief, and the efforts to save life and to stave off the ruin of the agricultural population. And, thirdly, there is the great question of the causes of famine—the reasons, why famine, which no longer follows a bad season in Western Europe, is still, and apparently now more than ever, a constantly recurring feature of Indian life. It is not our intention to deal with the first of these divisions, or to spoil by paraphrase or condensation the incisive passages in which Mr. Vaughan Nash has sketched the sufferings of the people. The book is there for all to read. But, considering the bearing of the author's observations and deductions on some of the controversies of the day, we will rather at present direct our attention to his remarks on the organisation of relief and on the causes of famine.

And, first, it is well to note that Mr. Nash is not at all disposed to make light of the skill required in the proper organisation of relief, nor does he withhold his respectful praise where it seems to him well deserved. He is as far as possible from one bent on finding fault with the authorities, or belittling the work of British officials in India. Thus he points out the excellent results of the system of gang-work instituted in the Central Provinces, and he quotes with complete agreement the words of Mr.

Ibbetson, who said: "It cannot be too clearly understood that the exaction of a task depends, in great measure, on the orderly and methodical arrangement of the relief workers." Yet he is far from concealing the failures of the campaign. Thus he says under the date of May 26:—

The people have died, and are still dying, like sheep, and a regiment of doctors and nurses would be too small to render much assistance. It is sickening and horrible to the last degree, but there is the fact. Indian fellow subjects of ours, members of some of the grandest races in the world, are doomed to die as the beasts that perish, and the British Empire, for all its might and glory, is unequal to the task of sending them succour in their extremity.

This was due to a sin of omission, a want of preparation for the inevitable coming of the cholera. But still less is Mr. Nash inclined to spare the authorities for that great blot on their system of relief, the "penal minimum," which he did so much to bring to the notice of the people of Great Britain, and indeed to lead the Government to its modification and practical abolition.

The authorities, struck by the drain on the resources of the country and believing that many who were not really in need of relief sought their help, introduced a system of fines, which in many cases reduced the money paid to those on the works to less than sufficient to keep them in health. It is true that the Government maintained that there was no deterioration in the physical condition of the people. But Mr. Nash asserts that the system resulted in a great increase of mortality, and that as the culprits often failed to comprehend the bearing of the fines little was gained in the way of extra work. There were other and better ways:—

I found, for instance, in the Punjab and the Central Provinces, and in some of the Native States, that the people were working cheerfully and steadily, and doing a fair day's work for a wage which, if fair under the circumstances, was nothing to boast of; that flogging was hardly ever resorted to, and flogging down to the penal minimum unknown. And on enquiries I invariably found that this result was due to two causes—rigorous supervision over subordinate officials, and patient explanation and demonstration to the workers of the task required of them.

The penal minimum, in the opinion of Mr. Nash, was responsible for a heavy death-rate, was too often adopted as a means of doing without care, organisation, and entirely failed in its object of getting good work done.

If we turn to Mr. Nash's views on the causes of famine, we find that he very quickly disposes of two that are in much favour with Anglo-Indians. He was struck by the fact that India not only fed herself throughout the time of famine, but even continued to export wheat and rice, though of course not to the customary extent, and he well says:—

This circumstance helps one to realise the extent of the food surplus in a normal year, and at the same time to appreciate the crudity of the doctrine that over-population is at the bottom of India's misery.

And if he is not prepared to accept the over-population theory, he is no more ready to join in the cry that the ignorance of the cultivator is the great source of poverty:—

The famine, let me say, is in no way due to defects of the *rayat* qua agriculturist. He is short of capital and hampered by debt. But every competent judge admits his wonderful knowledge of the land and the crops, his laborious industry during the seasons of hard field work, and his eagerness to improve his holding. Agricultural enthusiasts from the West, who come to scoff at his primitive customs, remain to admire and learn as they watch him at his work.

High praise, indeed, but none too high for the Indian peasant's great deserts.

When he comes to the true causes of Indian famine, Mr. Vaughan Nash is inclined to dwell chiefly, and perhaps too exclusively, on the effects of the Government assessment, which, however, was by the very nature of his enquiries the one that most struck his attention. At the same time he does take notice of the ruin of Native manufactures and is inclined to think that more might be done, if not to revive the old industries, at least to encourage new ones. And he has some very severe things to say about the introduction of the gold standard:—

The new finance has robbed the people of a quarter of their savings by depreciating the value of the silver ornaments, which fill the place of the Post Office Savings Bank at home. What would the depositor in Manchester say if one fine morning he found that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been forced by considerations of high finance to write his balance down by 25 per cent.?

But the main cause of famine Mr. Nash finds in the assessment of the land. His objections to the present system may be ranged under three heads. First, the land-tax is too high; second, even were it equitable in amount, it is levied with such rigidity that the *rayat* is

¹ "The Great Famine and its Causes." By Vaughan Nash. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans Green and Co. 6s.)

forced into the clutches of the money-lender; and third, the assessment, already too high, is increased at almost every revision. In support of the second and third counts in this indictment Mr. Nash gives some most interesting tables; nor is his evidence in support of the first less cogent. Two pieces of false reasoning are especial objects of his attack. The one is the theory, so much favoured by some Anglo-Indian economists, that the land-tax is identical with rent; and in opposing this he has the countenance of no less a person than the present Prime Minister. Lord Salisbury himself has pointed out that though it may seem to us of no consequence whether the land-tax be considered as rent or as revenue, it may make a great difference to the conduct of an Indian statesman. If it be considered as rent, the Government will be held entitled to all that remains after wages and profits have been paid; if as revenue, it will have to be compared with the taxes paid by other sections of the community. But still worse, in Mr. Nash's view, is the fixing of the land-tax in accordance with the estimated average yield. A former secretary of the Revenue Department asked "What would the English farmer think of running a farm which sometimes produced twenty bushels an acre and sometimes nothing?" Mr. Nash continues thus:—

The fact is, that no ingenuity in computing the revenue demand can adjust a fixed burden to a wildly fluctuating income, or enable the peasant to pay his revenue in bad years. The remissions and suspensions, such as they are, are themselves an admission that the estimate is too much of a fair-weather forecast, and, let me add, they mislead the public into an idea that a well-considered machinery of relief is working in the peasants' favour.

Most readers of this book will be inclined to the view that much more drastic changes than remissions and suspensions of the land-tax are needed to relieve the poverty of India.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

NEW members coming up to Westminster last week must have wondered if, by chance, they had strayed into the purlieus of Billingsgate. The hidalgos of Spain, as Mr. John Burns reminded the House of Commons the other night, suffered a Moorish invasion rather than desist from their genealogical disputations. So, too, in Parliament since the opening of the brief session, members have been chiefly engaged not in putting the national defences to rights or in clearing up the situation in South Africa, but in detecting blots on one another's escutcheons to the accompaniment of such refined epithets as liar, cad, thief, and scoundrel. Perhaps it is needless to add that most of those choice flowers of speech are culled from the orchid houses of Highbury. If Billingsgate were to come to Westminster, as Birnam went to Dunsinane, it would find its match on the Treasury bench.

Of the first night's debate history may record that it was the occasion on which a Cabinet Minister was told by a fellow-member that he had never before spoken the truth, whereupon the Cabinet Minister, bringing himself to the level of his assailant, stigmatised him as a cad. For the rest, the evening was chiefly remarkable for the dignified and forcible speech in which Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman reviewed and condemned the tactics by which the general election was won. The leader of the Opposition was especially severe in his references to the episode of the purloined letters. Mr. Chamberlain, he pointed out, had not scrupled to publish private documents with a view to his own party advantage—an act which if committed in private life would exclude the offender from the society of honourable men. The Colonial Secretary's defence was of the kind with which we are familiar. "I am sorry to be excluded from your society," he sneered, "but I may say that I never much enjoyed it." During the latter part of Mr. Chamberlain's speech on this occasion, an unusual and suggestive thing happened. Man after man on the Ministerial side got up and walked out of the House.

Two days had barely passed before the Government offered the world an exhibition of vacillation and inconsistency in matters of high policy which even Lord Salisbury has seldom surpassed. On the opening night of the debate, both the Prime Minister and Mr. Balfour assumed an attitude of the most rigid inflexibility in relation to the war. They had been urged by Lord Kimberley in one House and by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman in the other, to announce some mitigation in

the rigours of the British campaign of conquest and also to offer the Boers some inducement to cease fighting. Mr. Balfour declined to hold out any hope of such action. The Boers, he said, were brave men, but they should recognise that there must come a period when resistance ceased to be patriotic and became criminal. Until they made that recognition we could do nothing. The policy of the Government was simply to go on with the war till resistance had been finally subdued. Lord Salisbury was even more Bismarckian. You would almost have thought that the painted lath was actual iron. "It may go on for years, or it may go on for generations," he said, "but pacification must precede self-government." As Sir William Harcourt, speaking on Tuesday night, observed, this was the Prime Minister's *Vae Victis*, Mr. Balfour's deliverance being described as a gentler *non possumus*.

Strange to say, the rôle of white-robed angel was reserved for Mr. Chamberlain. Within twenty-four hours of the promulgation of the gospel of blood and iron, the Colonial Secretary came down to the House and announced as a matter of course—for the gyrations and somersaults of the Government are always represented to be in the ordinary way of locomotion—that there was to be a cessation of farm-burning in the conquered territories, that the Boers were to be treated with the consideration due to a brave and patriotic enemy, that Bloemfontein and Pretoria were to enjoy the privileges of municipal government, and that Sir Alfred Milner was to preside as benevolent godfather over this new Utopia, as Governor of the Transvaal and High Commissioner of South Africa. "Then South Africa will be lost," commented Mr. Pirie. But the House of Commons was in no mood to tolerate the vaticinations of a Cassandra—even a Cassandra fresh from service in South Africa. So universal was the joy created by Mr. Chamberlain's peace-offering that the Opposition promptly withdrew its amendment and turned a beaming face in the direction of the millenium!

Some indication of the wrath excited in Conservative circles by Lord Salisbury's nepotism was offered in the earlier hours of last Monday's debate. Mr. Bartley, one of the staunchest Tories in Parliament and a man who has himself refused a minor appointment and the honor of knighthood, actually moved a vote of censure on his leader "for appointing so many of his own family to offices in the Government." The member for Islington dealt his friends some faithful wounds. "What if Mr. Gladstone had done this?" was one of his questions, and, needless to say, the shot went straight to the mark. Poor Mr. Balfour writhed on hearing from his outspoken follower that the reconstructed Government is known, even in the Conservative clubs, as the Hotel Cecil, Unlimited. Subsequently, in a lame defence, the leader of the House convulsed all parties by pleading in Gilbertian strain that the "unhappy accident of birth" ought never to be a bar to public service. Nor did Mr. Bowles mend matters by commending Lord Salisbury's moderation on the ironical ground that, after all, he had refrained from entirely filling his Government with "Souls, sycophants, Cecils, and Socialists." One or two Ministerials voted against the Government on this question, and others expressed their displeasure by not voting at all.

Little need be said of Mr. Chamberlain's attempted vindication of his "direct and indirect" interest in firms having commercial dealings with the Government. The defence, in brief, amounted to this—that the Colonial Secretary was a shareholder in only two such firms; and that in one case his interest dated from twenty-three years ago, while in the other the extent of his holding amounted to a few pounds. Both Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Balfour repudiated the doctrine of the Opposition that members of a Ministry should be altogether free from personal interest, whether large or small, in companies doing business with a State Department; and the House of Commons, giving early proof of its complaisance, endorsed the repudiation by a majority of 140. As an illustration of the Colonial Secretary's controversial methods, it may be noted that he represented the action of his critics as an attempt to gibbet him as a thief and a scoundrel. His speech was liberally besprinkled with such question-begging phrases as "conspiracy of slander and insinuation," "scandalous attacks," "abominable imputations," "petty malignity," "phenomenal malice," and so forth.

Lord Hardwicke, the new Under-Secretary for India, having been twitted by Lord Rosebery on his connexion with the Stock Exchange, will, it is understood, explain his position when the House of Lords resumes its sittings to-morrow after-

noon. Last Thursday the noble lord entrusted the duty of explanation to the Duke of Devonshire, who performed the task in a somewhat remarkable manner. To begin with, the Duke stated that Lord Hardwicke had arranged to withdraw from the firm of which he is a member at the end of the year. The peers, being delighted to hear it, expressed their satisfaction with unusual warmth. A few minutes later, however, the Duke again rose and explained his original explanation. He wished, he said, to make it quite clear that Lord Hardwicke's withdrawal was only to be from active partnership in his City firm. This time their lordships refrained from applause. It is hoped that to-morrow Lord Hardwicke may revert to the explanation of the Duke of Devonshire in its original form.

During the last three days the House of Commons has been engaged in a gloomy discussion of the cost, conduct, and probable duration of the war. Mr. Brodrick, who distinguished himself yesterday by propounding the startling doctrine that anyone who distrusts Sir Alfred Milner must be an enemy of the Queen, has been reading up the history of guerrilla warfare, with the result that he now takes a darker view of the outlook in South Africa than is entertained even by Mr. John Morley. For instance, he holds out no hope of the slightest decrease either in war expenditure or in the strength of the occupying army for many months to come. Up to date the war has cost us in money nearly ninety millions sterling, and in human wastage over seventy thousand men. And, as Mr. Healy sardonically observes, there is no immediate prospect of that long looked for rainbow of peace, which, we were told, was to extend from Bloemfontein to Pretoria.

Among the amendments to the Address closed by Mr. Balfour was one of which Mr. Caine had given notice, representing that upwards of thirty thousand of the British and native Indian troops having been employed for many months past on active service outside the limits of India, the entire recruiting, transport, and annual charges of twenty thousand of the Indian army should be transferred to the Imperial Exchequer, the position of the troops in India being that of a reserve force available for service elsewhere. The point was briefly but vigorously touched upon the other night by Sir William Harcourt. "If you mean to perpetuate this system," said the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer, "the whole of the financial relations between this country and India will have to be reorganised. It is intolerable that you should charge the people of India with the cost of an army that is merely a British reserve." The subject will, of course, come up for discussion again.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

BOMBAY, November 24.

The week is barren of public events. The Viceroy is touring in the South of India. A couple of days ago he was at Travancore, where the able administration of the ruling prince greatly charmed him, eliciting high eulogy. Mysore and Travancore are the two Native States in all India which have been well known for years past to carry the palm in the matter of enlightened and humane government. And yet these are States administered by Native statesmen under the guidance of the British. The fact clearly shows that Indians of to-day, nurtured in the best traditions of English public life and history, are most capable of accomplishing the very ideal which Lord Curzon set out the other day before the Princes of Kathiawar assembled in durbar at Rajkote.

The *Pioneer* seems to have fallen foul of the Viceroy for his Bombay speech. As the accredited organ of the official hierarchy, it would not have been true to its position if it had missed the occasion to echo the voice of the Western mandarins. But all this was, of course, expected. Reviewing that memorable speech, the *Advocate of India* had made a shrewd forecast of what was in store for the Viceroy at the hands of the bureaucratic organs. But Lord Curzon is a host in himself. He has all the spirit of justice and righteousness of Lord Ripon. But viceregal dignity, as much as serene statesmanship, demands that he should take no serious notice of carping criticisms. No doubt, in the three years of his Viceroyalty yet to run, his Lordship will find many thorns in his path, but it is expected that he will be able to tread them down easily.

An interesting ceremony which is to take place this evening is destined to be historical in our local annals. The Hon. Mr. Justice Ranade is to unveil the life-size portrait of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, which was painted in London by an Indian artist. The event has created the keenest delight among our rising generation, and it is most likely they will flock to the Framji Cowasji Hall in large numbers. Is it not the case that our young men of to-day will be the citizens of to-morrow? And what could give them a greater example in the way of practising self-sacrifice in the cause of their country than the public career of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji now extending over fifty-five years?—Mr. Dadabhai, whom all India years ago declared to be her foremost citizen, her pride, and her solace. In a way the rather long delay in unveiling the portrait has been of the greatest advantage. For the present generation of Bombay has little knowledge of what the preceding one did for Mr. Dadabhai in 1869, when, after founding the Bombay branch of the East India Association, he was on the eve of his return to London to devote the remaining portion of his life exclusively to India and Indians. Full thirty-one years have rolled by since. And what a vista of events the period unfolds! And how in that long vista Mr. Naoroji looms large in front of all Indians, with his good work done unflinchingly and unweariedly, with a noble devotion and sacrifice which extorts not only our admiration and respect but our reverence also! All honour to such a citizen!

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

THE MANSION HOUSE FUND.

The Mansion House Fund for the relief of the sufferers from the Indian Famine amounts to £389,700.

THE "INVESTORS' REVIEW" FUND.

We take the following from the current issue (December 8) of the *Investors' Review* :—

Last week's Indian famine returns show that the total number in receipt of relief has declined to 346,000, of whom 239,000 are in Bombay Province, which remains the worst of all the afflicted districts. Information as to the condition of the people who have left the relief works to try and cultivate their plots of ground is still absolutely withheld, and we only gather from scraps of news coming through private channels that the misery is something unprecedented among many millions, and the death-rate still extraordinarily high. We instinctively turn to Parliament once more to ask whether it is going to do anything to redeem India from a fate that must be disastrous to us as well as to the Empire. Private benevolence, healing and helpful though it may be, can do but little to cope with the calamity overhanging that dependency as ominously as ever. Shall we go on in our oblivion and contemptuous indifference as a nation, as a Government, until the misery comes home to our own doors by the collapse of the Simla Government's credit and power to meet its tremendous obligations in London?

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, India Fund."

Subscriptions already acknowledged . . . £917 7 5

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

THE NAGPUR RE-SETTLEMENT.

THE GOVERNMENT AND MR. ROMESH DUTT.

1.—THE GOVERNMENT RESOLUTION.

The Governor-General in Council sanctioned the revisional settlement of the Nagpur district in a resolution dated October 5. In para. 4, he refers to Mr. Romesh C. Dutt's criticism that "the settlement which has been effected in the Central Provinces since 1890 has been felt as more harsh and severe, and has caused more actual suffering and distress than any previous settlement in any part of India." Upon this he remarks :—

The Governor-General in Council has endeavoured to ascertain whether the settlement of the Nagpur district, which forms part of the operations thus described, merits the appellations of harshness and severity, or is calculated to inflict suffering and distress. His conclusion is that these grave charges are without any foundation in fact as regards the particular settlement, which is the only one with which he is concerned at present.

Before recording the grounds of this belief, the Governor-

General in Council adverts to "certain misconceptions which appear to lie at the root of this hostile criticism." Thus:—

It is said that the first regular settlement of the province, which was effected between the years 1860 and 1867, embodied two great errors, and that these errors, instead of being corrected, had been intensified in the re-settlement which is now assailed. These two errors are said to be that the Settlement Officers of 1860-67 fixed the rents payable by the cultivators to the landlords too high, and that they further fixed the revenue payable by the landlords to the State too high. The Governor-General in Council believes that it is an entire mistake of fact to suppose that the regular settlement of 1860-67 was accompanied by a general revision of rents by the Settlement Courts. In some districts, on the initiative of the landlords, a certain amount of rental revision took place. But the evidence is, that in no district was the revision in any sense general, and that in not a few districts rents were left entirely untouched. In the Nagpur district, as Mr. Craddock shows, no rental enhancement whatever was made by the Settlement Officer in 1864. Rents remained for years after the settlement practically what they were before it.

Equally groundless, in the case of the Nagpur district, is the second accusation: that the Settlement Officer fixed the revenue payable to the State by the landlords too high. The revenue assessed at the regular settlement of 1864 showed no increase on the revenue previously paid. The Settlement Officer apparently assessed, and contented himself with redistributing, without increasing, the existing demand. If it be said that the existing demand was excessive and should have been reduced, and that in maintaining it the Settlement Officer of 1864 perpetuated too high a standard of assessment, the answer is that the district had paid the same or a higher sum for forty years and had prospered under it, and that there was no expectation of better terms in the minds of the revenue-payers, who, on the contrary, considered the settlement extremely favourable to them.

The Governor-General in Council then passes to the consideration of the present revisional settlement:—

The land revenue fixed in 1864 amounted to Rs.8,77,700, representing an incidence of little more than 10 annas the occupied acre.

In 1894 the occupied area was found to have increased by 12 per cent. Prices of agricultural produce had in the 30 years more than doubled. There is no estimate in Mr. Craddock's report of the value of the annual produce of the district in 1864. But in 1894, according to the careful estimate made by him, the annual produce represented the value of 188 lakhs of rupees; and this estimate deducts from the gross produce before valuation the cost of the seed grain, and also excludes straw, chaff, and other fodder of the value of 42 lakhs. Thus, the revenue demand of the old settlement had by the year 1894 dropped below 1-25th of the value of the average annual production. The revenue had been paid with the greatest ease, the majority of the landlord and tenants were by common repute in prosperous circumstances, and the value of land, judged by sale and mortgage transactions, had risen greatly. For the State to have forgone its right to revise and enhance the land assessment on the expiry of the 30 years' leases would have been an inexcusable sacrifice of the interests of the general ratepayer. The enhancement actually taken by the Settlement Officer is only 18 per cent. on the existing demand. The revised assessment gives an incidence of about 1½ annas per occupied acre, and shows on a cautious valuation of the gross produce little more than 1-20th of such value.

The conclusion is that the revision "is neither severe nor harsh, and cannot on *a priori* considerations be deemed to be productive of suffering and distress," and the fact that the new assessments have successfully stood the strain of unfavourable seasons is "conclusive as to their moderation." "The revised assessment represents 58.8 per cent. of the present rental valuation."

The next step is to dispel the "erroneous ideas which are held in certain quarters as to the 'half-assets' rule in its application to the Central Provinces":—

It is alleged that a land settlement must necessarily be unfair and oppressive, however lightly it sits on the land, if it absorbs more than half the rental valuation; that is to say, if it fails to leave a full half of the rental to the landlords. To this the reply is, that there is no inherent right on the part of the malguzars, or landlords, of the Central Provinces to any fixed share of the cultivator's rents, much less to a full moiety. Nor is there any historical or prescriptive right, since, as Mr. Craddock shows as to the Nagpur district, the malguzar is a recent origin, and in reply to certain questions, he has shown the meaning attached in 1860 to the "assets" or "rental valuation" of an estate was not the actually existing rental, but the prospective or potential figure which might hereafter be reached after rents had risen in process of time and the waste had been brought under cultivation. He further explained that the rules of 1860 as adapted to the special circumstances of the Nagpur province directed, with advertence to the recent origin and the expectations of the proprietary body, the Settlement Officer to ordinarily assess up to 60 per cent. of the assets thus ascertained. The alleged breach of faith is thus a pure fiction, and the present settlement rule, which restricts the Settlement Officer to the rental valuation as it exists to-day, is really more moderate than the rules of 1860.

The assessment of Nagpur in 1860 represented 76 per cent. of the then rental valuation; the present settlement represents

only 58.8 of the present rental valuation, and "is thus much more favourable for the landholders."

During the 30 years of the settlement their rental assets rose from Rs.11,53,000 to Rs.15,36,000, the difference (Rs.3,83,000) measuring the annual gains of the proprietors over the profits left to them by the Settlement Officer in 1864. The additional revenue imposed at revision in 1894 was only Rs.1,60,000, and this sum was practically returned to the landlords by the Settlement Officer when he raised the district rental, by enhancements of tenants' rents, to Rs.17,22,000.

Hence a settlement is not "necessarily unjust and ruinous to the revenue-payers because it takes more than 50 per cent. of the rental valuation."

Next is considered the charge "that the Settlement Officer, in addition to fixing the land revenue, fixes the rents of all classes of tenants, and by enhancing them arbitrarily, and by means of calculations not understood by either landlord or tenant, makes his own rental valuation."

As regards the Nagpur district, Mr. Craddock has fully justified the moderate rental enhancements made by him. He has clearly shown that the great majority of rents were customary and not competition rents, which had remained stationary while agricultural produce had doubled in price, and which were much below the smaller not competition rents recognised as reasonable and paid with ease. The enhancements effected by him were based on a very careful soil classification and exhaustive comparison of rates, and were evidently kept within very moderate limits. Before revision the average rental per acre for all classes of tenants was 14 annas, and after revision Rs.1-0-3. Compared with rents ruling in other parts of India, an all-round tenant rate of one rupee per acre for a district of the fertility and rainfall of Nagpur conveys the idea of a singularly light standard of rent.

Finally, there is "the allegation that in the Central Provinces rents are adjusted by an intricate and unintelligible formula, to which the settlement officer alone possesses the key." This refers to "the method peculiar to the province of referring the different grades of soils to a common standard or unit of value." But

The people were not kept in the dark as to the grounds of rental enhancements, and, if they did not in all cases follow the "soil unit" calculations of the Settlement Officer, they had at least an opportunity of showing on grounds of their own choosing that too severe an enhancement of the rental of their village was contemplated.

"The assessments will have a currency of 20 years, the ordinary period now fixed for the duration of settlements in the Central Provinces." This period is fixed "as a convenient mean between the short term settlements, which are not uncommon in backward parts of India, and the full term of 30 years which is suitable for fully developed districts."

2.—MR. ROMESH DUTT'S COMMENT.

On November 20, Mr. Romesh Dutt addressed to the Secretary to the Government of India in the Department of Revenue and Agriculture a long letter in comment on the Government Resolution on the re-settlement of Nagpur. He points out that the Resolution is strictly confined to the case of Nagpur, whereas his criticisms were directed to the eighteen districts of the Central Provinces generally; and he refuses to accept Nagpur as "a fair example." As to rental revision and excessive assessment, Mr. Dutt writes:—

4. Referring to the old settlement of 1864 you state that "in the Nagpur district, as Mr. Craddock shows, no rental assessment whatever was made by the Settlement Officer in 1864." Here again you are speaking of the Nagpur district, I was speaking of what took place in some other districts in the Central Provinces. That the rental was revised in some districts of the Province is abundantly proved by the records of the settlement of 1864. This is known to the Government, and this is admitted in another part of your letter, where it is stated that "in some districts, on the initiative of the landlords, a certain amount of rental revision took place." How this rental revision was effected has been explained by me more fully in paragraph 11 of this letter.

5. "Equally groundless," you proceed to remark, "in the case of the Nagpur district is the second accusation that the Settlement Officer fixed the revenue payable to the State too high. The revenue assessed at the regular settlement showed no increase on the revenue previously paid." It is scarcely necessary to point out once again that my "accusation" referred to the Central Provinces generally, and not to every particular district in those Provinces. In my letter of February 12 I stated that "the principle that one-half of the malguzars' assets should be demanded as revenue was repeatedly laid down and insisted upon in the Orders of the Government of India." "As a matter of fact, however, the revenue demanded was sometimes 75 per cent. of the malguzars' assets." Neither of these statements has been questioned in your letter to the Chief Commissioner. And I may be permitted therefore to repeat my allegation that the Settlement Officers in some districts fixed the revenue payable to the State too high in the settlements of 1863, and subsequent years.

Mr. Dutt then turns to the present settlement of Nagpur, and, while re-affirming his complete confidence in Mr. Fraser, the Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces, re-insists that an enquiry should not be left to him alone, but should be entrusted "to him and to a few Indian colleagues." He says:—

6. "If you will refer again to my letter of February 12, you will find that I had asked for such an enquiry because the true facts can be ascertained only by such an enquiry in villages, and not by an examination of the settlement papers by the Chief Commissioner.

Complaints have been made that what is described as the area under crop is not the area under crop in any year, but includes "new crops of lands," such as are left uncultivated every year; that what is described as the average crop has not been the actual average crop during the last several years; that in making a classification of soils under complicated rules unintelligible to the Patwaris, they have recorded soils of an inferior quality as being of a higher grade (see paragraph 15 of this letter); that the real produce obtained by cultivators from year to year has for these reasons been largely overestimated; and that the incidence of revenue assessed on the real produce is largely in excess of the income in the settlement papers. I am sure the Government of India are as anxious as I am to ascertain the truth or otherwise of these complaints, and I respectfully repeat my request, therefore, that enquiries in selected villages may be made into these complaints before the settlements in the remaining seventeen districts are sanctioned.

7. To examine the figures as they stand in Mr. Craddock's report for Nagpur, the old assets were supposed to be Rs. 11,46,599, and the assets under the new settlement are supposed to be Rs. 17,72,234, showing an increase of nearly 50 per cent. in thirty years, an increase which suggests an additional doubt that the Patwaris have overestimated the assets. The land revenue now fixed appears to be Rs. 10,54,830, which, according to my calculation, comes to nearly 62 per cent. of the estimated assets, and not to 58.8 per cent. of the assets as Mr. Craddock puts it. But very likely I am wrong in my figures somewhere, for it is not possible that Mr. Craddock has made any mistake in this matter. But whether the percentage of the revenue to the actual assets be 62 per cent. or 58 per cent., the proportion is considerably over what was considered equitable and fair by the Government of Lord Dalhousie in 1855 in the Saharanpur Rules, and must be felt severely by landlords who have to pay so many additional cesses in these days. And it should be remembered that the general average for the district does not apply to the case of every particular estate, or even to every particular group of villages. The percentage of the revenue, including the assessment on Malik Makburza holdings, is 67 in one group, 64 in another group, 63 in seven groups, 62 in one group, 61 in eight groups, 61 in another eight groups, 59 in two groups, 56 in two groups, 55 in one group, and 50 in another group. It is obvious that landlords who are called upon to pay 67 per cent. of their supposed assets, plus about 12½ per cent. as cesses, must feel the assessment to be unduly harsh and severe.

The right interpretation of the half-assets rule Mr. Dutt justly regards as "a most serious question," and accordingly he sets out the main points of its history:—

8. . . . It is stated that, for the purposes of this rule, "the meaning attached in 1860 to the assets or rental valuation of an estate was not the actually existing rental, but the prospective or potential figure which might hereafter be reached after rents had risen in process of time, and the waste had been brought under cultivation." Permit me to state that this was not the original meaning of the half-assets rule when it was framed in 1855; that this was not the meaning of the rule when it was extended to eight districts of the Central Provinces in the same year; that the Supreme Government never sanctioned such an interpretation of the rule for the purposes of the general settlement commenced in 1863; and that Mr. Mackenzie, the Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces, did not approve of such an interpretation of the rule when he addressed the Supreme Government, in view of the Revisional Settlement of 1893. I am convinced therefore that the Government of India will not lend their sanction to an untrue interpretation of a plain and unmistakable rule.

9. Lord Dalhousie's Government first promulgated the half-assets rule in 1855 in the body of rules known as the Saharanpur Rules. Rule xxxvi. runs thus:—

The assets of an estate can seldom be minutely ascertained, but more certain information as to the average net assets can be obtained now than was formerly the case. This may lead to over-assessment, for there is little doubt that two-thirds, or 66 per cent., is a larger proportion of the real average assets than can ordinarily be paid by proprietors or communities in a long course of years. For this reason the Government have determined so far to modify the rule laid down in para. 62 of the Directions to Settlement Officers as to limit the demand of the State to 50 per cent., or one-half of the average net assets. By this it is not meant that the juma of each estate is to be fixed at one-half of the net average assets, but in taking these assets with other data into consideration, the collector will bear in mind that about one-half, and not two-thirds, as heretofore, of the well-ascertained net assets, should be the Government demand. The collectors should observe the cautions given in paragraphs 47 to 51 of the treatise quoted, and not waste time in minute and probably fruitless attempts to ascertain exactly the average net assets of the estates under settlement.

The italics are mine. There is not a word in this of the "prospective or potential figure which might hereafter be reached after rents had risen." The words used are "average net assets," "real average assets," "well-ascertained net assets," and so forth. The real meaning of these words does not admit of a shadow of doubt. The Government of Lord Dalhousie meant the actual current assets of an estate, not the prospective and potential figure which might be reached hereafter.

10. This rule was extended to eight districts of the Central Provinces by an order of N.W.P. Board of Revenue, No. 74, dated February 16, 1855, and there is nothing in this Order justifying the application of the rule to the "prospective and potential" assets of an estate.

11. It appears from Mr. Mackenzie's letter to the Government of India, No. 501-S, dated Nagpur, May 18, 1887, that the Settlement Officers of the Central Provinces violated the rule with their own consent in the settlement of 1893, and in subsequent years. Mr. J. B. Fuller, secretary to Mr. Mackenzie, wrote thus in para. 4 of the letter cited above:—

Under the method of assessment which was then followed, it was

however, practically impossible for an officer in any part of the Province who saw that an enhancement of revenue was justifiable, and sought to secure this, to give full effect to a rule restricting the Government revenue to a definite share of the assets, unless the term "assets" received a very loose and general interpretation. The "assets" or rental value of each Mahal was in fact determined by the comparison of a number of statistical inferences, the principal of which was that obtained by the application of soil rates to the average under different soils in a village, which yielded the "soil rate rental." Whether this rental corresponded in any way with the real rental of the Mahal depended on the extent to which rents rose in the proceedings taken for rent adjustment after the assessment was given out.

It will appear from the above extract that the half-assets rule, extended to some districts of the Central Provinces in 1855, was violated in the settlement of 1893 by Settlement Officers "who saw that an enhancement of revenue was justifiable, and sought to secure this." The violation was effected by giving to the word "assets," not the interpretation intended by Lord Dalhousie's Government, but an untrue interpretation, viz., the potential rental of the estates.

12. When the time approached for the Revisional Settlement of 1893, Mr. Mackenzie, Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces, did not desire to attach to the half-assets rule the untrue interpretation which had been given to it once before, and therefore desired to do away with the rule altogether. In his letter No. 501-S, dated May 18, 1887, already referred to, Mr. J. B. Fuller, secretary to Mr. Mackenzie, wrote thus in paragraphs 10 and 11:—

It must, moreover, be realised that the system of settlement to which the Government has now by law committed itself will render it impossible to evade the operation of the half-assets rule in the manner followed at the last settlement. It will no longer be practicable to adopt for the application of the half-assets rule a rental value which is in excess of the actual adjusted rental. . . . Mr. Mackenzie considers therefore, even in the interests of the people, that it would be safer to abrogate the half-assets rule altogether than to attempt to evade it by the calculation of hypothetical assets.

The italics are mine. It will appear from this extract that Mr. Mackenzie regarded the practice of 1863 an evasion of the Government Rule; that he considered such an evasion impossible in 1893 after the rents had been fixed by law; and that he desired the Rule to be abrogated. The Government of India, accordingly, abrogated in 1888 the Central Provinces rule which had been extended to the Central Provinces in 1855. And the letter of the Government of India, dated May 31, 1888, to the Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces ends thus:—

In respect to your proposal to vary the assessment between 50 and 65 per cent. of the assets, I am instructed to inform you that the Government of India has some hesitation in allowing in any case so high a percentage as 65 to be taken, and would at least prefer that this maximum be restricted to 58½ per cent. in which the former percentage was not at any rate below that fraction, and that in other estates 60 per cent. be taken as the highest admissible percentage. With this restriction your proposals are, I am to say, approved.

13. . . . It is an unwise policy to demand a share of "prospective and potential" rents, because such a policy is a direct incitement to landlords to screw up their rents from their tenants. If they succeed in doing this without there being a corresponding increase in the prices, it is an act of injustice and cruelty to the tenants. And if they fail in doing this, the State demand is an injustice and harshness towards them.

Mr. Dutt next remarks on "the local cesses, which are also imposed on the assets of landlords," and which are not mentioned in the Government Resolution:—

14. . . . I believe I am correct in stating that there was much less of local cesses when the settlement of 1863 was made in the Central Provinces, and that the local cesses now in that Province amount to about 12½ per cent. of the assets. These cesses have to be paid by land-ribs out of their assets, precisely like the land revenue; and they are virtually therefore an addition to the land revenue. When therefore you state that the assessment in Nagpur represents 58½ per cent. of the present rental, it means that the landlord is called upon to pay a total demand of over 70 per cent. of his assets. Seeing that no landlord in India can realise the whole of his rents from the cultivators from year to year, and that he has his collection expenses to undergo, his position to maintain his assets is not so easy to meet. I may be permitted to repeat my allegation that this is a very severe assessment which must permanently lower the position and reduce the condition of the landed classes. The Government of Lord Dalhousie was of the same opinion when in Rule xxxvi. of the Saharanpur Rules they recorded that "two-thirds or 66 per cent. is a larger proportion of the real average assets than can ordinarily be paid by proprietors." The proprietors in the Central Provinces in 1900 are not better off than the proprietors in Northern India were in 1855, and a demand of two-thirds or 66 per cent. of the average net assets, but of the estimated assets, which are never realised in full—must be admitted to be harsh and severe.

With regard to the "intelligible formula," Mr. Dutt comments on the Government remark that "it is evident that by no device can soils be so accurately compared and arranged in proportionate order of merit as invariably to lead to a correct arithmetical result":—

15. . . . This is precisely the main objection to the "soil-unit" system, and if an enquiry had been held in villages and estates, such as I had suggested in my letter of February 12 last, it would have been found that the Patwaris employed in the settlement work had very vague notions of the system which they were supposed to be adopting, and that rents were assessed in many places in a very haphazard manner. I have not the smallest doubt that an officer of Mr. Craddock's great ability, experience, and judgment, can explain

and justify the system on very strong theoretical grounds; but the danger in India always is that when a system so intricate and difficult is placed in the hands of subordinate officials working in villages, the application of the system is bound to be wrong in a great many instances, and the mistakes made are not in favour of tenants and cultivators. A life insurance office is justified in preparing its table on abstruse calculations; *firstly*, because these calculations are made by trained and well-qualified experts who cannot go wrong, and, *secondly*, because life insurance is not compulsory, and only those who have faith in the rectitude of an office and the correctness of its calculations need come to the office to have their lives insured. It cannot be contended that every village official who applies the "soil-unit" system is above making serious blunders; and it cannot be said that it is optional with tenants and cultivators to be assessed. How the village Patwari, who gets a pay of Rs. 5 or Rs. 10 a month, and is entrusted with the classification of soils, does apply these rules will be found from the recorded opinion of a retired Deputy-Commissioner, which is quoted below. The italics are mine, and they show that the actual produce of lands has been over-estimated. We judge of the settlement by figures, and the figures are wrong:

Schoolboys, taken from school and taught a little surveying, are set to classify soils, their Inspectors being for the most part young schoolmasters. It is not surprising, then, that the results obtained by such a staff show such variations in different districts, with a general tendency to exaggerate the capabilities and revenue-paying capacity of particular soils and villages. . . . The reason given for such enhancement is that new land has been brought under cultivation. But the fact has been overlooked that this new land consists principally of very inferior soils, which yield but little at any time, and nothing in year of drought. There has, too, been a general complaint that in the classification of soils by Patwaris and Inspectors, for many reasons soils of an inferior quality have been recorded as being of a higher grade than they really are. This complaint has been borne out by my experience.

16. More than this, it is infinitely better that landlords and tenants should settle rents among themselves under strong and efficacious checks against undue enhancements, as is done in Bengal and in Northern India, than that Settlement Officers should be eternally interfering in every village and nursing the tenants. . . .

Finally, Mr. Dutt reviews the history of the Thirty Years Rule, pointing out that the change to twenty years "is a departure from the generally accepted policy of the last seventy years." He writes:—

17. . . . The Thirty Years' Rule was considered desirable to save landlords and cultivators alike from frequent harassments, incident to settlement operations, by making a settlement only once during the lifetime of a generation. It was considered desirable to afford to landlords and cultivators alike time and opportunities and motives to make improvements and to enjoy the fruits of their improvements. It was sought to foster the accumulation of some wealth in the hands of the landed and agricultural classes, and to promote the growth of an enterprising middle class interested in the soil of the country. And it was sought to foster the general prosperity of the people of India, largely dependent on agricultural industry, by giving them long leases. These and similar motives induced the Government of Lord William Bentinck to accept the principle of thirty years' settlement as far back as 1833, and ever since that time settlements have been made for thirty years in Northern India. In Bombay, too, the same healthy rule has been followed since 1837; and in Madras the general rule, I believe, is to make settlements for thirty years. In Orissa, three-fourths of which are not permanently settled, the same rule of thirty years has been adhered to, and indeed was relaxed on the occasion of a great famine. . . .

"It will not be contended," Mr. Dutt adds, "that the Central Provinces are, after the famines of 1897 and 1900, in a better condition now than Northern India was in 1833, than Bombay was in 1837, than Madras was when the settlement operations began in 1855, or than Orissa was in 1836; and the same reasons which made for the policy of long leases in the earlier days of British rule in India exist in their full force at the present day, and indeed have acquired additional force in these years of frequent famines."

ANGLO-INDIANS AND INDIANS: "THE WIDENING OF THE GULF."

The *New York Sun* has published (November 11) a somewhat piquant letter of considerable length under the signature "Ozah," who dates from Bombay, and professes to "have been connected with independent States, ruled by indigenous Princes, for upwards of twenty years in more or less responsible positions." He claims, therefore, to be able to "speak with authority from a point of view that no civil or military official can, for the simple reason that their relations extend only to official connexion." His outlook is gloomy indeed. But he lays no blame for this upon the Indians—or, as he calls them collectively, the "Hindaryans." Thus:—

As to the loyalty of the Hindaryans, particularly of the educated classes, who are fully cognisant of the blessings of British rule, I unhesitatingly assert it is beyond question. But there is a possibility in human nature when such relations may be strained, but not so long as the educated classes can control the vast indigenous population whose sufferings are gradually but undeniably on the increase.

The blame lies, according to the writer, with the Anglo-Indian community, which, he says, "is unique in the world in that it

stands self-satisfied and lives in the halo of mutual admiration utterly regardless of the rest of mankind." He contrasts the present officials with those "shrewd statesmen, the founders of the great Hindaryan Empire," "who saw with their own eyes the ruffled disposition of the people and that they are human like the rest of mankind, and that incessant belittling and cornering will not be conducive to goodwill and permanency." Hence the proclamation of 1858—the Indian Magna Charta. "How," then, "is the Magna Charta working?"

Is it welding together the units, as desired and expected by the founders of this Empire, into closer bonds? Undoubtedly not! But why? For two simple reasons:—

First, because principles have changed, not for the better, but worse.

And, secondly, because Hindarya has spoilt England by making her one of the richest, if not the richest, country in the present-day world. She is pouring into the coffers of Great Britain directly and indirectly something like £50,000,000 per annum. From this fact the inner circle of the children of the soil are drawing many conclusions of which the authorities are in blissful ignorance. Some will no doubt be very angry at being disturbed in their self-satisfaction, but as momentary issues are at stake I will take the consequences and mention but three.

1. That Hindarya, which had a past when Great Britain was not, has steadily been re-awakening to her present condition. . . .

2. That after steady application of forty odd years she has come to realise the deviation from the principles laid down by mutual benefit in the undertaking of 1858. . . .

3. That the unnatural drain of fifty millions or so a year, helped by her own sons to be packed out of the country, is doing an incalculable injury to their fatherland and fellow countrymen. . . .

Here I will invite you to pause and note the drift of growing thoughts among a class that seldom, if ever, comes in contact with the better class of Europeans, and certainly does not share the identity of interests beyond paying of taxes and existing on half rations; and how far aid and acquiescence may yet be expected from these very sufferers to their future and further injury. . . . And it is impossible, try as we may, to hide the great factor which militates against the maintenance of the *status quo*, namely, the silent widening of the gulf between the rulers and the ruled. This unhappily is encouraged by irresponsible mediocrities inflated at the present position of the Empire they did not build but may possibly destroy. And, finally, many being at a secure distance from the scene of danger, where the rulers numerically represent one to every three thousand or so of the indigenous population, are utterly oblivious of the fearful convulsions into which their actions, based on contempt for others, may throw the foreign resident population, both military and civil. For it is highly improbable that the results this time will in any way be analogous to those of the former occasion. As for those on the spot, with the exception of some noble, sober, master minds, the majority are reckless through affluence, power, and indulgence never dreamed of in their own native land. Consequently it behoves those at the helm not only to check this intoxication, but to see whether the caps of power are placed on right heads.

The writer takes for illustration the unfortunate riots at Cawnpore. "Sir Antony MacDonnell," he says, "in his resolution dated May 15, 1900, on the Cawnpore riots, admits that the power to influence the people has passed into the hands of a secret junta at whose identity the local officers could make no guess. It is a sorry admission of the want of touch with the people." Further:—

In this very incident of the Cawnpore fracas it will be observed that the unsympathetic and over-bearing proclivities of a certain class of officials (as witnessed in the intensity of ill-feeling that bubbled up at the action of the civil surgeon) have a great deal to answer for—for what occurred and what may yet be possible under similar circumstances. Sir Antony MacDonnell is quite prepared to punish the ignorance of regulations, where such subjects are concerned. But his Excellency fails to grasp the high-handed attitude and the consequences emanating from such action, forming a store of bitterness for a future day—of this civil executive [officialer], who through wanton abuse of power had not only set aside Government regulations but had been guilty of forcing his own arbitrary will on the people in a manner that was bound to end in disaster. For be it remembered the people above the Nerbudda, though extremely polite, are not servile, and not to be compared with the inhabitants of the extreme east or lower south. And this the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Provinces well expressed when he said: "They (the officials) misjudged the temper of the people and missed their opportunity."

The rules distinctly allow segregation in their homes or its vicinity. But the civil surgeon in the plenitude of his power ignored Government resolutions and insisted on removing one of the cases to a distance of three miles or so. This was the key of the disturbance. Why, then, the Hindaryans are whispering to one another in secret chambers, has not Sir Antony been equally ready to take drastic measures against the civil surgeon whose unwarrantable action brought about the final disorder? Surely, if his Excellency is ready to punish ignorance, even in the case of subjects, he ought to be doubly prepared to uphold British prestige by proportionately punishing those servants of the people who are entrusted with privileges for the proper carrying out of the measures of a benevolent Government, but who deliberately ignore them through self-sufficiency. Shortcomings of this nature are becoming the common talk of the bazaars. But as these topics are distasteful to many who can realise nothing but their present-day prosperity, and petulantly chafe at the insulence of a fellow subject asking for justice or human treatment, I will refrain from further enlightenment!

"Ozah" is especially severe on "the *Jee Hazoor* creatures, on whom the Government relies"—"the *Jee Hazoor* humbug," who lulls officialdom in a false security, and, on an emergency, helps to give a wrong direction to such action as Government may take.

Yet when occasions arise they (Government) are startled and disappointed, and for a remedy rush to legislation at the instigation of inferiors and mediocres and so make bad worse. For this rushing to Acts and Laws never touches the aching wound that caused the patient to move for relief. On the contrary, the effect of these hasty and unsympathetic measures is that the sufferers in their agony and helplessness either become hopeless and decline, to the infinite satisfaction of Mr. Crash-and-break-the-spirit-at-all-costs, or become sullen and determined—transferring, as is customary in the East, the resolution, formed under these bitter circumstances, from father to son—gathering strength in its course, rather than fulfilling the fallacy that a troublesome individual is got rid of. Under these circumstances one is constrained to ask Will the Government then rise superior to the ways of heathen Rome whose principles were in the end its ruin? Or will it ignore the lesson?

The Christian missionaries also come in for severe criticism. "For what do we find these worthy missionaries now advocating? Curtailment of education! Nothing short of stunting the human mind!" "And this, one is constrained to imagine, in full sympathy with the ethnic principle of *Divide et impera!*"

Imperial Parliament.

Thursday, December 6.
HOUSE OF COMMONS.
PAPERS PRESENTED.

The following Papers, presented by command of her Majesty during the recess, were delivered to the Librarian of the House of Commons during the recess, pursuant to the Standing Order of August 14, 1896:—

East India (Imperial Institute, Indian Section)—Annual Report for the year 1899-1900. [Cd. 268.]

East India (Statistical Abstract)—Copy of Statistical Abstract relating to British India from 1899-99 to 1898-9. Thirty-fourth Number. [Cd. 387.]

East India (Trade)—Copy of Review of the Trade in India in 1899-1900, by J. E. O'Connor, C.I.E., Director-General of Statistics to the Government of India. [Cd. 381.]

East India (Sanitary Measures)—Copy of Report on Sanitary Measures in India in 1898-9, Volume XXXII. [Cd. 397.]

East India (Madras Land Revenue)—Recent Correspondence, Return. [236.]

East India (Inoculation against Cholera and Typhoid)—Return. [269.]

East India (Railways)—Administration Report, 1899-1900. [Cd. 232.]

East India (Loans raised in England)—Copy presented—Of Return of all Loans raised in England, chargeable on the Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ending on September 30, 1900, etc. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 379.]

Friday, December 7.
HOUSE OF COMMONS.
PAPERS PRESENTED.

Restrictions upon British Indian Subjects in British Colonies and Dependencies—Return presented—relative thereto [Address May 11, 1899; Sir William Wedderburn]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 383.]

Monday, December 10.
HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS.

The debate on the Address to the Queen's Most Gracious Speech was closed, and the following Amendment, with several others upon the Order Paper, was not reached:—

Mr. CAINE: As an Amendment to the Address, at end, add—
And we humbly represent to Your Majesty that upwards of 30,000 of Your Majesty's British and Native Indian troops have for many months past been employed on active service in South Africa and elsewhere outside the limits of the Indian Empire; and that it is desirable in the interests of the Indian people that the entire recruiting, transport, and annual charges of 20,000 of the British troops in India should be transferred from the Indian to the Imperial Exchequer, while remaining stationed in India as a reserve force available for service outside Indian territories.

Tuesday, December 11.
HOUSE OF COMMONS.
THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

Indian Expenditure (Royal Commission)—Address for "Copies of any Correspondence between the Secretary of State for India in

Council and the Treasury on the subject of the Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure."—(Secretary Lord George Hamilton).

THE INDIAN STAFF CORPS.

The MASTER of ELILANK asked the Secretary of State for War if his attention had been called to the grievances of Indian Staff Corps officers in respect of their supersession by officers of the British service; and, if so, when a decision might be expected to be arrived at in the matter.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The question of the length of service for promotion of Indian Staff Corps officers has been for some time past under consideration in India; but I have not yet received any definite proposals on the subject, and I have reason to believe that some months must elapse before any decision is arrived at.

THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF IN INDIA.

Mr. CAINE asked the Secretary of State for India, how long had the office of Commander-in-Chief in India been vacant, and when was an appointment to be made.

Lord G. HAMILTON: Sir William Lockhart died on March 19 last; since then Sir Power Palmer has been acting as Commander-in-Chief. I hope to make a permanent appointment shortly, but I am at present unable to fix any date for it.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

Mr. CAINE asked the Secretary of State for India if any arrangements had yet been made to carry out the transfer of the sum of £250,000 from the British to the Indian Treasury, as recommended by the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, and foreshadowed by himself on July 28 last in his speech introducing the Indian Budget to the House.

Lord G. HAMILTON: It has been arranged that the Indian revenues shall be relieved of payments amounting to £257,000 a year, with effect from April 1 next. The correspondence on the subject will be laid before Parliament.

INDIAN TROOPS IN SOUTH AFRICA AND CHINA.

The House went into Committee of Supply, and Mr. BRODRICK moved a Vote of £16,000,000 required for the current year to meet additional expenditure due to the war in South Africa, affairs in China, and other Army Services. In the course of the debate,

Sir W. HARCOURT said he forgot to ask the Secretary of State for War how long he meant to keep the Indian troops in South Africa. This, of course, raised a most serious question. We could not maintain an army in India and charge it on the Indian people if it was to be used as a mere reserve for our armies for any purpose, as it had been used in South Africa and in China. If 10,000 men were to be kept away from the Indian Army the whole financial relations between the Exchequer here and the Indian Exchequer must be altered. (Hear, hear.) It was intolerable at a time when the Indian people were suffering so severely from famine that they should be charged with an army which was merely a reserve for our own purposes. (Hear, hear.) It ought to be known in India as well as here how much longer it was intended to keep these troops away from India. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. BRODRICK replied that he quite recognised the gravity of the question raised by the right hon. gentleman, and he thought that the right hon. gentleman himself would recognise that the present circumstances were entirely abnormal. Obviously the Indian regiments would be retained for the briefest possible period of time. The War Office did not and never had looked upon the Indian Army as simply a reserve; but on this occasion, no doubt, when a large number of troops had been employed than ever had been employed before, the services of the regiments from India had been retained for a longer time than was contemplated. It was, however, clearly impossible at this moment to determine the extent of their service.

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS.

Notice has been given of the following questions:—

Mr. CAINE.—To ask the Secretary of State for India, if he can state what number of Indian troops are to be employed on the Somali Expedition; and if their expenses will be borne by the British Exchequer. [Thursday, December 13.]

Mr. CAINE.—To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can state the time when the Conference on Agricultural Banks, promised by Sir Edward Law, will meet in Calcutta.

Whether independent Indian gentlemen will be invited to join the Conference.

And, whether the views in favour of an experimental bank set forth in the Government of India despatch of May 1884 will be taken into careful consideration. [Thursday, December 13.]

Mr. CAINE.—To ask the Secretary of State for India if his attention has been called to the conduct of the Deputy-Commissioner of Dharmasala, who with his revenue officer interviewed the head men of Spiti and Bara Bagaah districts, and urged them to loyally support and increase the revenue in every possible way, but particularly in the excise department.

And, whether, seeing that this action on the part of a revenue officer is in distinct contradiction of the declared policy of the Government of India as formulated in their despatch to the Secretary of State, No. 29, February 4, 1890, the Government of India propose to take any action in the matter. [Thursday, December 13.]

Mr. CLAUDE LOWTHER.—To ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will agree to a return showing the cost of each one of the different wars undertaken in India or on behalf of our Indian possessions from the year 1800 to the date of the abolition of the East India Company, and showing also the proportion of expenditure borne respectively by the United Kingdom and the East India Company in each case. [Thursday, December 13.]

Open Letters to Lord Curzon ON FAMINES IN INDIA.

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

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

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

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

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

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

"His recommendations are that the land tax should be moderated, that irrigation works should be constructed, and that the public debt and the public expenditure of India should be reduced. These proposals he supports with a wealth of detail of all kinds, which prove his mastery of the subject and make 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."—*The Leader*.

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, Esq., 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. 15s. 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.

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

Dr. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief."—*31st March, 1899.*

P. C. GHOSE & CO., New Medical Hall, MEERUT



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-Hart." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER.
North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
C. E. WOOD, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.
"Jvara-Hart" 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. NANNINGA ROY.

FOR INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Sundalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I have much pleasure in stating that your 'Omum-Carpoor' was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage."

Prices of "JVARA-HART" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 anna, 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.

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

Omum-Carpoor
TRADE MARK

"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 should 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 _____

To be written
clearly.

Address _____

for which is enclosed the sum of Six Rupees.