India

FOR THE

No. 155. New Series. / No. 249. Old Series.] WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1900. [Registered Newspaper. { Price..... 2d. / By Post. 2½d.

NOTES AND NEWS.

THE brief Session of Parliament has been hurried over, with the closest possible restriction of attention to the one object of finding ways and means to keep the warlike operations going on in South Africa and China. It has, apparently, been impracticable to do anything more for India than to edge in a few questions, most of which have been put by Mr. Caine, acting in close co-operation with the British Committee. We anxiously desired, rather than hoped, that the new Parliament would voice the wishes of the country that a worthy national grant in sympathy should be given to the relief of the famine-stricken Indians. Not a word was said on the subject. Such is the Parliamentary conception of Imperial duty and gratitude.

Before the date of our next issue the sixteenth annual meeting of the Indian National Congress will have opened this year's session at Lahore. It is to be regretted that the learned and Hon. Pandit Biswambhar Nath felt compelled to decline the Presidency on the ground of ill-health. The Hon. Mr. Chandavarkar, however, will no doubt maintain the high traditions of the chair in ability, insight, courage, and moderation. Under his guidance, we confidently anticipate, the Congress will discuss the subjects of immediate interest with the customary fulness and frankness, and in a tone equally firm and conciliatory. It may be that the manifold calamities of the year will tell upon the attendance, but we entertain no misgivings about the quality of the work that will be done. We wish the meeting all success.

On another page we have the pleasure of placing before our readers the fullest available account of the proceedings at the unveiling of Mr. N. N. Writer's life-size portrait of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji at the Framji Cowasji Institute in Bombay on November 24. Mr. Justice Ranade's appreciation of Mr. Dadabhai was evidently in his best style, and we are glad to learn that by and by it will be printed in full. Meantime it is plain that he pointed out clearly Mr. Dadabhai's place in the recent history of India, and vindicated his large foresight and his consistent moderation and accuracy in statement and in argument. No wonder that the assembly was raised to a high pitch of enthusiasm in contemplating the beneficent career and indefatigable patriotism of the greatest man of modern India.

In the London letter of the last *Bombay Gazette* (December 1) there is a flattering, but somewhat imaginative, notice of the recent Congress Manifesto. The only definite shortcoming the London correspondent suggests against the leaders of the Congress party in England is that they have "clamoured for the reduction of the numbers of the Secretary of State's Council from 18 to 12. They were continually advised to keep up the number, but to insist upon at least three, and if possible six, native Indians being appointed to it. But all in vain. There are those who think that but for the Congress party that might have been an accomplished fact by this time." This appears to be all pure imagination. When, and where, was this clamour for reduction of numbers raised? Who gave the disregarded advice about admitting Indians to the Council of the Secretary of State? And to which Congress leaders was this good advice vainly addressed? It would be interesting to know these particulars, for Sir W. Wedderburn and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, at least, could not be among the leaders referred to, seeing that in their Minority Report of the Royal Commission one of their special demands was for Indian representatives on the Indian Council, to be chosen by the elected members of the Legislative Councils in India.

The Earl of Hardwicke, the new Under-Secretary of State has received bold advertisement at a very early period of his official career. He is a young man of thirty-three, and a member of a firm of stockbrokers. In his speech on the Address, Lord Rosebery made special reference to this Stock Exchange business, and expressed the opinion that "the connexion once established between the Government and the Stock Exchange is a precedent full of peril to the interests of the country." The Duke of Devonshire explained that Lord Hardwicke, before accepting office, had arranged to cease to be an "active" partner in the business at the end of the year. Lord Hardwicke himself subsequently took occasion to explain that he had gone on the Stock Exchange simply to make a living, for he had suddenly found himself without a shilling; and he could not afford to cut the connexion absolutely. The explanation was frank and manly, and nobody will suppose Lord Hardwicke capable of using his official position for private advantage; but naturally Lord Rosebery could not accept the explanation in lieu of complete separation. Lord Salisbury patted Lord Hardwicke on the back and unceremoniously repudiated Lord Rosebery's doctrine of official purity. One cannot but marvel what Lord Hardwicke has ever done to be made Under-Secretary at all, or why the official salary is not able to command his services under conditions that would be insisted on in a third-rate municipality.

It is lamentable to learn that the Viceroy has rejected the petition for mercy on behalf of seven of the natives condemned to death for participation in the Cawnpore riots of last April. So nine have been transported for life and seven hanged. The correspondent of the *Times* at Allahabad telegraphed the sapient opinion that "the executions will have a wholesome effect in certain quarters." "Cawnpore," he says, "was terrorised for the time being, as the authorities were surprised." But why were the authorities surprised? Did not the whole mischief arise from the foolish and arbitrary conduct of an official? Surely that is a consideration that ought to have weighed heavily with the authorities. All good citizens agree in the desirability of "effectually preventing a recrudescence of lawlessness"; but there is no more crude or antiquated mode of prevention than a comprehensive hanging. The first element of the desired efficacy of prevention is considerate and reasonable conduct on the part of officials.

Mr. Romesh Dutt, who has written so much on Famines and Land Assessments in India, is also delivering a series of addresses in different parts of England on the same subject. He opened his campaign at Lewisham in October, and he delivered a second address ten days ago, also in South London. In January, he is expected to speak at Exmouth and Exeter in the West of England. Among the causes of Indian famines, Mr. Dutt dwells mainly on the decay of Indian industries, on the over-assessment of agricultural holdings, and lastly and principally on the annual drain from India of half its nett revenues, an economic drain unexampled in any other country on the face of the earth.

An occasional correspondent of ours, whose qualifications are not disclosed, raises the question whether the very pronounced opinions set forth by Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt

regarding enhanced land revenue assessments are really sound. This query seems to have been induced on perusal of that gentleman's "Comment" on the Government of India's Resolution on "the Nagpur Re-settlement," both set out in our last issue. Our correspondent recognises the dialectical cogency of Mr. Dutt's review, but the subject as treated is extremely technical, and our correspondent seems to consider that the true issues in this controversy lie below and beyond the domain traversed by the present disputants. This may be so; and we shall willingly try to find space for such an exposition (within reasonable limits) from his pen as may serve to open up a broader and clearer view of the matter for plain folk not versed in revenue technicalities.

In a paragraph headed "Generous Durban," the *Times of India* comments freely on a proposal which is thus expressed by Reuter: "The Durban press suggests the garrisoning of Komatipoort and of other unhealthy posts with seasoned Indian troops." As our contemporary points out, this is somewhat ambiguous, for the troops intended may be British regiments stationed in India, or men of the Native Army; but in either case, it has an answer ready. If British troops are meant, it is not the result of experience that men who have been stationed in India are the best fitted to withstand the influence of a malarious climate. In the Ashanti Expedition of 1895, soldiers fresh from England suffered less than those who had come from India. On the other hand, the *Times of India* is no less indignant at the proposal if it be to employ the Native Indian Army in this way:—

> It would be grossly unfair to compel the Native Army to undertake the disagreeable duties to be performed now that the war is at an end. They asked for fighting, and Durban offers them fever.

And do not the people of Durban object to Indian immigration?

The Natal idea of Imperialism is further illustrated by the treatment of Mr. Karimbhoy Adamjee Peerbhoy, son of Mr. Adamjee Peerbhoy (who was Sheriff of Bombay in 1898) and a member of the Bombay Municipal Corporation. Mr. Karimbhoy's letter to the Governor of Natal (dated Durban, July 6 last) speaks for itself:—

> I with my friend Mr. Panday, of Bombay, came by the R.I.M.S. "Clive" on the 2nd instant. My firm had telegraphed to Messrs. Wm. Watson of Cape Town to send to Durban our travelling agent Mr. Piper. They were good enough to send his brother, Mr. Piper himself being at the front, to receive us at Durban. As the "Clive" was not to proceed further than Durban, we had to disembark. I therefore instructed Mr. Piper (junior) to engage suitable rooms for my friend and myself in a good hotel. He applied at the "Alexandra" and the "Royal" hotels, Durban, for rooms. But the managers on hearing that they were required for us would not let them, saying that he did not receive Indian guests. The same thing happened at the "Marine" Hotel, where Mr. Piper informs me the manager wantonly added that there was no such thing as Indian gentlemen and the Indians were all coolies. On Mr. Piper informing me of the above, I was naturally surprised, having been used to sojourning at hotels during my travels in India, and I with my friend personally applied at the Central Hotel for rooms. But the manager there too declined to receive us, being Indians.

No "Indian guests" need apply, "all Indians being coolies." But when it is to do the work the Natalians cannot do themselves—the work on which the very prosperity, and even the existence, of Natal admittedly depends—or when stretcher-bearers in the field are required, or when England's power and prestige are to be upheld in China, then the Indians may apply. Could there be a more bitter sarcasm on Imperial pretensions?

We referred recently to Lord Curzon's attack on the wealthy Indians because of the smallness of their contributions to Famine Funds; and we gave an account of the great things done by a rich Mahometan, who nevertheless figured in the list of subscribers to the Viceroy's Fund for only Rs.1,000—a proof of how little of a test of Indian generosity that list was. It is an interesting fact that the *Pioneer* has also come forward to defend the Indians from Lord Curzon's charges, at least so far as the people of Bombay are concerned. Adverting to the meagre response which was given to Lord Northcote's scheme for keeping up the breed of cattle in Gujerat—that meagre response which had already been acknowledged with regret by our Bombay correspondent—the *Pioneer* goes on to say:—

> But the hot and cold fits of public enthusiasm are often unaccountable, and if every other community in India could be charged with want of civic spirit and generosity, the people of Bombay, in the midst of the innumerable monuments of lavish munificence that adorn their city, may feel that they are secure against any such reproach.

This is a remarkable and valuable piece of evidence, coming as it does from a leading Anglo-Indian newspaper.

Yet although (as we have shown) there have been instances of munificence such as can scarcely have been excelled in the past, the consensus of testimony that the stream has run less copiously on this occasion is undoubtedly remarkable. Now, supposing this is so, what is the reason? The *Pioneer* scouts the idea that, so far as Bombay is concerned, it can spring from a lack of generosity. It puts it down to the "unaccountable" variations of public enthusiasm. But when social phenomena are described as "unaccountable," this generally means that there is an indisposition to take the trouble to enquire or to accept the results of enquiry. It seems to us that there is a sufficient reason for the very partial failure to lend adequate support to the Famine Funds. Reasonable and independent men will not for ever repeat the labours of Sisyphus. The rich Indian is growing tired of subscribing to Famine Funds in the ever-recurrent famines. He is beginning to see that something more is required, and that unless a remedy for famine be found, to subscribe is only to pour his money into a sieve. Until the present system is changed, until taxation is relieved, and the drain on India's resources diminished, he may be expected to give less and less to funds which, however necessary, afford no permanent relief to the country.

The *Madras Mail* makes a curious effort to minimise the importance of the famine. It speaks of the "six millions of people affected" as forming only "an inconsiderable fraction" of the three hundred millions who inhabit India. Six millions! Why, there were more than six millions not merely "affected" but actually *on relief!* Is it possible that the *Madras Mail* can imagine that none suffered save those who were maintained at the public expense? What about those who starved in their homes or perished on the way to the relief works? Or those larger numbers who were supported by private charity? Or those who struggled on without either public or private aid, but who will long bear the marks of that iron time in poverty, in weakened bodies, and in moral degradation? To form a just estimate of the suffering entailed by famine, it is necessary to ask, not what numbers were "on relief," but what was the total population of the famine-stricken area. And that total in the grip of famine is something surely appalling.

Having decided to its own satisfaction that only six millions suffered from famine, or just two per cent. of the total population of India, the *Madras Mail* concludes that, since two per cent. is the normal amount of loss or error according to statisticians, there is nothing "extraordinary" in the numbers affected by famine. "This is an extraordinary view," it says, "but it is a true view." The moral, however, that it draws from this "extraordinary view" is more extraordinary still. It objects to the appeal made by the Indian Government—which is also a great landlord—to English charity. Such an appeal is, indeed, humiliating, but not especially because the Indian Government is a great landlord; for it is not only a landlord in a country where agriculture is the chief industry, it not only in many parts is the sole landlord, but it fixes the rents, and enforces them in a manner and with a vigour that no private landlord would ever think of doing. Where the landlord fixes the rent, as is done by the Indian Government, he will be certain to take into account not only the produce of the land, but also his own necessities, and in so far as he does so, the amount levied will partake, not of the character of economic rent, but of taxation. Though the Indian Government owns land, it is a Government, and not a private landlord.

When, however, the *Madras Mail* comes to what it calls the concealed effects of famine, its remarks give still more considerable food for reflection, all the more so since they must be taken as admissions in view of what has gone before. Thus it says:—

> The poorer of the cultivating classes get poorer still, physically weaker, and, by death, less numerous.

And it quotes the words of Commissioner Robertson of the Central Provinces:—"It is impossible to view the con-

dition of the agricultural classes with anything short of despair." Then it goes on :—

Another silent and unnoticed effect is that the cities and towns are reinforced by numbers of those who never go back to their fields, and thus help to swell the urban populations. And the outcome of all this is to disintegrate social order and caste. Not one of these silent unobserved effects but is evil. People get weaker and poorer; illnesses and plagues increase; more people drift into towns and cities to congest them; and social order, morality, and religion suffer, crime increasing in the meanwhile.

How absurd then to talk of only six millions being affected by the famine!

Meanwhile the *Champion* adds a new touch to the picture of misery caused by the famine. One of its most terrible results has been "to denude the homes of the poor cultivators of their metal cooking utensils."

It seems that many tons of copper and brass utensils have come to Bombay from up country and have been shipped abroad as scrap metal, no doubt to be returned to India in the form of ingots some day.

So that all the labour expended in fashioning these vessels has been thrown away. The *Champion* goes on :—

But what a picture of horror this export of copper pots discloses. The very cooking utensils of the people have been sold, because of the hopeless depths into which the famine has dragged them. And yet there are those who declare that India is not so poor as some would have us believe.

Let the British public take home to themselves this awful picture of Indian distress, and ask themselves whether it is not time to cast about for a thorough-going remedy.

The positions of Judge and defendant are generally thought to be incompatible, but, according to the *Tribune*, there is at least one representative of British justice in India who is of a contrary opinion. On August 21 last, Lieutenant Thornhill, Judge of the Small Cause Court, Mian Mir, was sued in the Court of the District Judge at Lahore for house-rent amounting to Rs.134. The District Judge sent the case to the Extra-Assistant Commissioner, and October 11 was fixed for the hearing, but at the request of the defendant this date was changed to November 12. When the case came on, the defendant's pleader claimed that it fell within the jurisdiction of the Mian Mir Court of Small Causes, and, in spite of the Plaintiff's objection, the case was sent to the very court over which the defendant presides. It is even said that the defendant has given a verbal intimation that he will himself decide the case, though no date appears to have yet been fixed for the hearing. It is, however, incredible that the Judge will actually carry out his threat. If he does, his superiors, we take it, will have something pertinent to say.

Lord Curzon, according to a Reuter's message, replied in highly enthusiastic terms to an address presented to him at the Kolar Goldfields. Among the rest this :—

When one reflects that only 16 years ago this venture, after a series of disappointments, was on the verge of being abandoned, but that at that historic moment a reef was struck from which over ten millions sterling in gold has been extracted; when one reads that the output of gold from the mines has already reached a sum not far short of two millions in the year, and that in the present year it will probably exceed that amount; when one sees the wonderful sight of a barren tract of country converted into a busy centre of industry and population, with forests of chimneys, workshops, and engine-rooms, one cannot but feel proud of British enterprise and capital, which have created so great a concern.

"British enterprise and capital." Yes. But, after all proper self-congratulation, why is there no "Indian" enterprise or capital in the concern? That question, we take it, is well worth the consideration of both the Viceroy and his subjects, and of the British public as well.

Mr. Nilkanth B. Wagle read a most interesting paper on his "Experiences in an English Glass Factory" before the National Indian Association on December 17. Mr. Wagle has for some time been devoting himself to acquiring a thorough practical knowledge of the manufacture of glass, with the view of promoting the industry in India. Lord Reay, who presided, spoke highly of Mr. Wagle's enterprise, remarking specially on the fact that he was a University graduate, for his example "would destroy the extraordinary notion which prevailed in India that every graduate must be in the Government service." He also referred to the fact that "at some of the workshops where Mr. Wagle sought to obtain a position as apprentice he was objected to on the ground that he was a 'foreigner.'" Really we had thought that the monopoly of this anti-Imperial exclusiveness was divided between the "loyalists" of Natal and the commanding officers of volunteer corps in the Inns of Court and at Cambridge. We are glad that Lord Reay said "we must insist very strongly that Indians are subjects of the Queen like ourselves." We hope to return to the subject of Mr. Nilkanth's paper.

The criticisms of the Viceroy's speeches, which have occurred in the *Pioneer*, have produced very varied feelings in the Indian papers. There is, of course, a general disposition to back up Lord Curzon, who is thus attacked for leaning too much, in the opinion of the Anglo-Indians, to the side of the people of the country. Also, there is the thought that, when the rulers of the country fall out, Indians may come by their own, or at least, as allies of one of the parties, may receive a new consideration. But the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* takes another and a less hopeful view of the controversy. When wild buffaloes fight it is the reeds among which they live that suffer. So our contemporary thinks that in the quarrels of Anglo-Indians, Indians are always the losers—a view that does not altogether commend itself to our Bombay correspondent. Our Calcutta contemporary, however, attributes the anger of the *Pioneer* not so much to the Viceroy's recent speeches—these are only the occasion for its expression—as to his action against the Press Messages Bill. On which the *Madras Standard* pertinently asks :—

Is it egotism to bow to public opinion and to be convinced by arguments that cannot be met? Is it egotism to consult the wishes of the people or to inspire confidence in them? Is it egotism to tell the various communities in India that justice, and justice alone, will guide the policy and acts of the Government?

The *Athenæum* states that arrangements have been made by Messrs. Longmans and Co. for the continuation of the late Sir William Hunter's "History of British India" down to the eve of the Mutiny (1856) in five more volumes. The work has been entrusted to Mr. P. E. Roberts, of Worcester College, Oxford, who for some time acted as private secretary to Sir William Hunter, and after his death edited and finished the second volume. The next volume is expected to cover the period from the Earl of Godolphin's Award (1708) to Lord Clive's acceptance of the Diwani of Bengal in 1765 on behalf of the East India Company.

The little brochure of "Tales of Tennâlirâma," sampled by Pandit S. M. Natesa Sastri, B.A., and published by Messrs. G. A. Natesan and Co., Madras (London: Luzac and Co.), will be found curious and interesting. Tennâlirâma, "the famous court jester of Southern India," was the plague and the delight of the great Vijayanagara King, Krishnadeva Râya (A.D. 1464-1530). He appears to have been a fertile practical jokist. Here and there one seems to feel a wooden touch, but in the main he is clever and sprightly.

Lord Roberts, on leaving South Africa, presented an interesting and gratifying memento to an Indian, his personal orderly, in the form of a watch. A photograph of Lord Roberts is inside the watch, and the following inscription is engraved on the outer case :—"Presented by Field-Marshal Lord Roberts to Duffadar Yusuf Ali Khan, 3rd Bombay Cavalry, his faithful and unwearying personal orderly throughout the South African campaign, 1900."

Remittances on India for 40 lakhs were on Wednesday offered for tender by the India Council, and applications amounting to Rs.7,82,10,000 were received at prices ranging from 1s. $4\frac{3}{32}$d. to 1s. $4\frac{1}{2}$d. The following amounts were allotted—viz., in bills, Rs.12,07,000 on Calcutta, Rs.24,30,000 on Bombay, and Rs.1,21,000 on Madras, all at an average of 1s. 4·062d.; and in telegraphic transfers, Rs.2,42,000 on Calcutta at an average of 1s. 4·125d. Tenders for bills at 1s. $4\frac{1}{32}$d. and for transfers at 1s. $4\frac{1}{2}$d. will receive about 60 per cent. Later the Council sold bills for Rs.60,000 on Calcutta at 1s. $4\frac{3}{32}$d. Last week remittances for Rs.50,00,000 were sold for £333,585, making the amount sold from April to Tuesday night Rs.9,91,57,588, producing £6,595,272. Next week the amount to be offered will be increased to 50 lakhs.

"BHATT" MAX MÜLLER.

THE news of the death of Professor Max Müller has profoundly moved the feelings of all educated India. In our present issue we report the holding of memorial meetings in several great centres, as well as other expressions of the respect, the veneration, the affection with which Indians regarded him. To another issue we must leave the illustration of the appreciative acknowledgment of his labours and of his love for India by representative Indian journals. From such manifestations it will be seen how powerfully he has impressed the Indian imagination, not only by his revelation of the excellencies of Indian literature to the peoples of the West as well as to the peoples of the East, not only by his uniform personal kindness to all Indians he came in contact with in England, but mainly by his consistent and sympathetic recognition of all that he found best in every department of Indian thought and Indian life. We willingly appropriate the summary opinion of the *Indian Spectator* (November 11):—

> In our experience we have not met with such unanimity of affection, esteem, and gratitude for a European scholar in Indian journals of all shades of opinion for a very long time. The language employed by every one of our contemporaries is of the utmost cordiality. There is not a single dissentient note anywhere. This is all the more remarkable, because, as a matter of fact, Max Müller was not an indiscriminate admirer of Hinduism, and his candour in respect of its shortcomings was as great as the warmth of his appreciation of its merits. There is a note of pathos running through many of the notices, as at the loss of one whose very existence was a pillar of strength to the Empire.

Apart, altogether, from the cordial personal relations of Mr. Malabari and the late Professor, this statement is in no respect overstrained, but is fully borne out by the facts. It is a remarkable and significant demonstration. It points emphatically to the true elements of "a pillar of strength to the Empire." It signalises the inestimable Imperial value of liberal and candid appreciation, firm justice, and ready sympathy.

There is but one opinion as to Max Müller's eminence in Sanskrit scholarship, and as to the value of his services as an exponent of the Vedanta philosophy. Even those that fondly imagine that, if he had "studied the life and teachings of Sri Gauranga with his usual diligence and devotion," he "would have been, perhaps, rewarded with a more beautiful philosophy and a more satisfying religion than even the Vedanta," make no reservations on those points. It does not follow, however—and Max Müller himself would have been the last to claim that it does follow—that he never fell into misinterpretations of the ancient books or of the modern conditions of Indian life. Fairly enough, the *Gujarati* remarks:—

> It may be that he was not a scholar in the sense our Indian pandits and shastris are. Western savants, especially if they have had no opportunities of correcting their knowledge of Sanskrit literature under the guidance of competent Indian exponents of literary and philosophical thought, are apt to go wrong in certain directions in a startling fashion.

At once, however, our contemporary, with like fairness, indicates that there is something to be said on the other side:—

> But all the same some of them, like Professor Max Müller, are higher scholars than any of our pandits and shastris because of their wider culture and knowledge, as well as of their larger intellectual horizon. Correct interpretation of the past from the historical or evolutionary standpoint, and reconstruction of ancient beliefs and institutions on the basis of available materials—these are achievements for which we must go to the West for some time longer, though we admit that Indian scholars trained under the Western system are gradually following with success the example of their brothers in the West, in spite of great disadvantages.

In like manner, the "Interpreter and the New Dispensation" (Calcutta) acknowledges:—

> He was our best representative among the nations of the West, not because he interpreted our views always correctly, but because he loved in his own way the Truth that we love, because he worshipped in his own way the God whom we worship.

All this is very elementary, indeed; but such discrepancies are apt to be exaggerated by unthinking people. It is scarcely worth while to notice the rather humiliating contrast of the *Times of India's* comments. Our Bombay contemporary says Max Müller "failed to see how little of classics and the higher thought of India entered into the structure of the country as we know it—of the country that statesmen and administrators have to deal with." Something like this, indeed, might be said of other countries we wot of; but, as the *Mahratta* judiciously remarks, "we all know what this means." Max Müller was quite aware that he would have gained much from a visit to India, but it may very safely be conjectured that he would never have seen it "as we know it," because he would have looked with the eye of sympathy, and therefore with the eye of understanding.

The liberal appreciation of Max Müller's work by the learned pandits of India sweeps away every jot and tittle of uninstructed and prejudiced cavil. The paper read at the meeting of the pandits of the Vidvan Mandala in Bombay, which we print to-day in another column, is a quaint and striking testimony to the profound impression created upon that learned assembly by the labours of Max Müller in their own fields of study. The gravity of their admiration and respect is not only befitting, it is all but oppressive. Moreover, the contemplation of the achievements of this great "Western Sanskrit professor," who "passed the whole of his life in the study of the Vedas and Vedanta" and "took pride in the appellation of 'Bhatt,'" appears to have stirred in them a salutary and overwhelming sense of the shortcomings of Native students. They flagellate their compatriots and themselves in a vein of repentant self-examination:—

> Very few of our Hindu pandits devote the whole of their lives to the study of the Vedas. And there are still fewer that try to grasp the literal sense of Vedic literature. . . . . We should feel abashed when we see that we learn the greatness of our own literature from foreign pandits.

We trust the pandits, then, will take the current of this emotion when it serves, and bend their strongest efforts to furtherance of the work that Max Müller had so closely at heart. Already, it must be acknowledged, they have done much, and those that have done most know best how very much there yet remains to do. By such action they would raise to Max Müller the grandest of all possible memorials, and confer an inestimable advantage upon their native country.

Nor is this authoritative and intimate Indian appreciation of Max Müller any new thing; it is but a fitting formal confirmation of a settled recognition. He himself had already told us in "Auld Lang Syne," where he speaks of the pressure put upon him to visit India. In a very remarkable passage (p. 145) he says:—

> I would have given anything to go to India when I was young. There was a time when I was on the point of becoming a missionary in order to be able to spend some years in India. But what a strange missionary I should have made! What I cared to know in India were not the Rájás and Mahárájás, the streets of Bombay, the towers of silence, or the temples of Ellora. What I cared to see were the few remaining Shrotiyas who still knew their Vedas by heart, who would have talked to me and shaken hands with me, even though I was a Mlechcha. Had they not asked me even at a distance to act as one of the sixteen priests at their Shrâddhs, their funeral service? Had they not asked me to recite Vedic prayers for the souls of their deceased fathers? Had they not actually sent me the same presents which on those occasions they are bound to give to their priests, because, as they wrote, I knew the Veda better than their own priests? Had they not actually sent me the sacred Brâhmanic thread, which I am as proud to wear as any more brilliant decoration?

What more could be said than this to exhibit the profound sympathy and confidence of his Indian friends? Need there be the least surprise when we read, in more than one Indian journal, the almost serious speculation that "Professor Max Müller was, in the last (if not in this) life, a Hindu among the Hindus"—that "he had in him a Hindu soul, though from the land itself of the Hindus he was, in the present life, perpetually exiled by fate?" "And we know," says the *Mahratta*, "that those among us who have any idea of his love for and deep studies in Sanskrit literature always liked to indulge in thinking of him as an old revered Rishi"—"a man who, perhaps only reminiscent of his former birth in India and never coming face to face with the country of his love, lighted up his heart by the lamp of the Hindu religion and literature and proved a warm and benevolent and disinterested friend of the Hindus to the last."

In these notices the name of Max Müller is affectionately and naturally linked, on the religious side, with such names as Rammohun Roy, Debendrenath Tagore, Keshub Chunder Sen, and Nilakantha Goreh; on the social side, with the reforming efforts of Mr. Malabari; and, on the political side, with his special intervention on behalf of Mr. Tilak. Well may his Indian admirers be prompt to raise to him a worthy memorial. It is a delicate matter to intervene with unsolicited suggestions in a case where simple impulses of gratitude and affection work so strongly. Yet it would be a pity if the funds were frittered away in

a large number of small, local, and merely temporary channels. The great cities may be trusted to commemorate the eminent savant in a permanent form worthy of him and of themselves. But beyond that duty to India and themselves, there seems to us to open up for the Indians a grand opportunity of bringing Indian and British feeling to a closer approximation—an approximation so dear to Max Müller's own heart. Like the Gaekwar of Baroda and the Crown Prince of Siam, like Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Sir M. M. Bhownaggree, let them boldly claim to take a grateful share in the memorial promoted by the Oxford colleagues and friends of the late Professor (INDIA, December 7, vol. xiv., p. 284). Such a marked association with his British friends in his Oxford home could not fail to warm the British heart to a more active and kindly interest in the Indian people.

THE SUPPORT OF THE INDIAN ARMY.

REFERENCE has often been made in these pages to the injustice of throwing on the Indian Exchequer the whole cost of maintaining the army in India. The still more flagrant and barefaced injustice of requiring India to pay for troops engaged in other parts of the Empire or outside its limits will, it is to be hoped, never again be perpetrated. But there is a disposition, even among those who are anxious to treat India with perfect fairness, to acquiesce contentedly in the whole burden of the army in India falling on the impoverished people of that country. Now in the course of the recent debate on the vote of £16,000,000 for additional expenditure due to the wars in South Africa and China, a question was asked by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer which again brings the whole subject to the front. Here are Sir W. Harcourt's remarks and Mr. Brodrick's answer:—

> 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 larger 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.

And upon this some remarks naturally arise.

In the first place, Sir William Harcourt and Mr. Brodrick are at one in recognising the importance of the subject. Sir William spoke of it as a "most serious question"; and Mr. Brodrick recognised its "gravity." Secondly, the Secretary-at-War rested his defence of the present arrangement on the "abnormal" situation, agreeing, apparently, that the present arrangements were indefensible if the troops in India were really an Imperial reserve. And, thirdly, while declaring that the regiments taken from India would return in the briefest possible time, and admitting that both in number and time previous records had been surpassed, he yet found it impossible to determine for how much longer their services would be required. But surely this is a defence which is no defence. It is charged that the army in India is used as an Imperial reserve. It is answered that it is only called upon for services in other parts of the Empire in times of emergency. But is not this the very meaning of a reserve? It is not the first time India has been called upon, and after the experiences of the last twelve months it is very unlikely that it will be the last. More than a year ago, 6,000 European troops were sent to South Africa accompanied by many stretcher-bearers and other non-combatants. More recently, a considerable force, partly European but chiefly Indian, has been sent to China. It is not pretended that the war in China is finished; and although the war in South Africa has been more than once officially declared at an end, the fierce battles and the varying fortunes of the combatants have made such statements appear ludicrous. As Mr. Brodrick admits, no man can say when the troops from India can return.

But this makes Sir William Harcourt's plea unanswerable. The Government, indeed, is on the horns of a dilemma. Either we have denuded India of troops needed for her safety—and never more needed than in a time of crisis, when, if ever, the enemies of the Empire would strike—or else we have forced India for years to keep up a larger army than she needs and to pay for it out of her poverty. And if we have forced India thus to keep up a superfluous army, for what reason could we have done so, save to have ready to our hands a reserve that could be used for the general defence of our Empire? Take it which way you will, India has been treated with gross injustice—whether you consider that she is deprived in the hour of danger of the forces maintained and kept efficient at so great a cost, or whether you believe that amid her poverty and misery, through the years of plague, pestilence, and famine she has had to keep up many thousand more troops than she needs, in order that the Empire may be able to call upon them whenever they are wanted.

If the treatment meted out to India be compared with that experienced by the self-governing colonies, the injustice appears all the greater. Canada and Australia suffer from no famines, their population does not lie continually on the brink of starvation, no failure of the rainfall would plunge the whole population into misery. In both there exists a diffused prosperity such as would seem impossible to the Indian imagination. Yet how different have been the contributions of India and these colonies to the two wars. To China they have sent scarcely any troops, while the greater part of the army that represents the might of Britain in those climes has been furnished by India. To South Africa the colonies have sent raw volunteers, useful and courageous men no doubt, well-fitted by their previous habits for a campaign on the veldt, but still men who have not been kept in efficiency for years at the Colonial expense. How different has been the case of India! Year after year, in times of famine and in times of prosperity—that comparative prosperity which would be poverty and misery to the Australians—India has had to keep up an army, partly of her own people, partly of British troops, larger by ten thousand or more than the defence of the country or the maintenance of internal order required; larger obviously by that number, at least, since that number could be spared in the days of the Empire's weakness, when foreign and domestic foes would have their opportunity. For years those splendid troops that have been fighting the Empire's battles in Natal and China have been paid and fed, trained and furnished, out of the taxes wrung from poverty-stricken India. If this is a fair arrangement, why should not prosperous Australia and Canada also hold thousands of men under arms ready for an Imperial emergency? Why should not the barracks of Quebec be filled with troops ready to be sent to the ends of the earth at England's call? Why should not recruiting offices be always open in the cities of Australia, and soldiers be kept under training till war break out? The colonies would never stand it, we may be told. Then, is it fear, and not justice, which is the guiding principle of the Empire?

It will be remembered that in his Reservation to the Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, Mr. T. R. Buchanan gave the figures for the amount expended in raising and training recruits for India. In the Estimates for the year 1899-1900 this was a sum of £548,000, paid to England by India. But among the recruits provided and trained for this sum many have been used to serve not the purposes of India, but the purposes of the Empire as a whole. Why then should the whole cost of raising and training them before they were sent out from the United Kingdom be borne by India? Further, if it be right that India should pay England for the raising and training of soldiers, a portion of whose military life is afterwards to be at her disposal, why is not the Empire to pay India for raising, training, and maintaining troops which are to be at the disposal of the Empire whenever they are wanted? If the Treasury of the United Kingdom is to be reimbursed for what it has expended in training

soldiers for India, should not the Treasury of India be reimbursed for what it has expended in raising and training the Indian soldiers now serving in China? Should it not be reimbursed for training still further and keeping in efficiency those British troops for whose first training it had already paid, and whose chief use had been to fight the battles of the Empire in Natal? Why should India, the poorest part of the Empire, while having to bear her own burdens, have also to bear more than her share of the burdens of Empire?

Nor is this a matter of little moment to India. Famine is only possible where poverty is intense; and the poverty of India is at least intensified, if it is not in great measure produced, by the drain of wealth from the country and the heavy taxation of the peasant. And here is a great expenditure both at home and abroad, both in the maintenance of troops in India for Imperial uses and in the payment of charges in England not paid to India under similar circumstances, which is unjust, even if we consider the case of India alone, and monstrously unjust if we take into account the treatment of rich self-governing colonies like Canada and Australia. Everywhere it is admitted that India is heavily taxed. It is heavily taxed because the expenditure is heavy; and Indian expenditure is heavy in part because India is unjustly burdened with charges which should really be defrayed by the Empire. But if a poor country is made to pay an unfair share of joint expenses, how can those who enforce these unjust payments escape the guilt of fostering and increasing the poverty of India? And can it be denied that those who are responsible in any degree for the poverty of India are responsible in at least the same degree for all the horrors of Indian famine?

OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

WHY were Ministers so impatient for the prorogation? They have done nothing but make speeches from the moment of the rising of Parliament. Lord George Hamilton, who scarcely opened his lips during the Session, was on his legs as soon as the Session closed. A day later came the Prime Minister with a speech in which he spoke of the war in South Africa as if it were some strange inexplicable eruption in the planet Mars. Had this deliverance been made in the House of Lords it would naturally have provoked discussion, which Lord Salisbury rather resents. He is the Hamlet of politics and prefers soliloquy. From his latest monologue the astonished country has been privileged to learn that the head of the Government is puzzled to know what is going on under his own administration.

One of the most interesting incidents of the short Session proved to be the defence by Lord Hardwicke of his dual position as member of the Stock Exchange and Under-Secretary for India. Lord Rosebery had suggested that these were incompatible positions, and the Duke of Devonshire had so far admitted the force of the argument as to announce amid applause that Lord Hardwicke had abandoned his commercial interests. The Duke, as he had afterwards to explain, was in error. Lord Hardwicke had only resolved not to enter the doors of the Stock Exchange during his official career and not to take any active part in the conduct of his city business. This and this alone was the extent of the self-denying ordinance that he himself laid before the House of Lords last Friday. "The fact of the matter is," said the Under-Secretary to the silent Peers, "I cannot afford to cut my connexion with the city for the sake of a few years of office." The retort was obvious, but their lordships were too polite to make it. Nor did it seem to occur to Lord Hardwicke that the country could possibly dispense with his services for a few years longer. Lord Salisbury indeed had done his best to encourage him in a contrary belief, for he had told the Under-Secretary before, as he was now to tell him again, that Lord Rosebery's professed scruples were mere party clap-trap and must not be allowed to stand in the way of a man's duty to his Queen, his country, and his pocket.

In all his allusions to Lord Rosebery, the Under-Secretary for India spoke with a bitterness which was certainly not justified by anything that the ex-Premier had said. But Lord Rosebery was magnanimous. He merely retorted that Lord Hardwicke's explanation had proved personal in a double sense, and then went on to reiterate his original protest against the precedent established by Lord Salisbury in cementing an alliance between his Government and the Stock Exchange. Among the Privy Councillors who stood in front of the Throne during the ex-Premier's onslaught were Mr. Arthur Balfour, Lord George Hamilton, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Gerald Balfour and Mr. Jesse Collings.

Lord Salisbury's vindication of his choice was singularly whole-hearted. When he offered Lord Hardwicke the appointment, the Prime Minister was probably quite ignorant of the young peer's city connexions. Nevertheless, he now spoke of them with an enthusiasm which almost suggested that unless Lord Hardwicke had been a stockbroker, India would never have had him as her spokesman in the House of Lords. If you desire immunity from the speculative taint, according to Lord Salisbury, you should choose your Ministers from the Stock Exchange, the reason being that stockbrokers rarely speculate on their own account but only on behalf of clients. Moreover, members of the Stock Exchange know something of business, and it is the fault of Governments to know too little rather than too much of the practical affairs of life. The peers accepted those sprightly paradoxes in pained silence. Lord Rosebery, indeed, had the last word in more senses than one, when he reminded the Prime Minister that there were several men of business in Mr. Gladstone's last Government who on taking office resigned their directorships and yet retained their business instincts unimpaired.

A determined resistance is threatened by the capitalists of South Africa to Sir M. Hicks-Beach's proposals for the taxation of the gold mines. So far the Chancellor of the Exchequer has had little support from his own side. His battles are being fought chiefly by Sir William Harcourt, whose speech on the subject in the House of Commons has been followed by a sharp controversy between the ex-Chancellor and Mr. J. B. Robinson. Sir William believes that it will require all the resolution of the Government—"ay, and all the integrity of Parliament"—to settle this great difficulty on equitable lines. The mine-owners, he declares, rule the roost in South Africa. They are the men we have to reckon with there, and they are the men too with whom the Government will have to deal at home. Mr. Healy is evidently under the impression that those gentlemen are all, or predominantly, of one race. One of his suggestions in the course of the debate was that as we have changed the name of the Orange Free State to the Orange River Colony we should now call the Transvaal the New Jerusalem.

Some undignified squabbling was witnessed on the closing day of the Session. Having rebuked Mr. John Burns on Monday, and reprimanded Mr. Bryce and Sir Robert Reid on Wednesday, Mr. Brodrick thought he might round off the week by reprobating Mr. Bryn Roberts on Saturday. The Welshman, unfortunately, seemed to imagine that he had an equal right to reprobate Mr. Brodrick; and so we had the two reprobating each other in the style of Donnybrook Fair. "You stayed at home while the fighting was going on," shouted the Secretary for War. "And so did you, and on a salary too," retorted Mr. Roberts. "I hold you up to the reprobation of the House," exclaimed Mr. Brodrick. "Observe the decencies of debate," Mr Roberts rejoined. It was by no means an edifying episode. But when Mr. Brodrick has become accustomed to his new honours and to the removal of his long-accustomed muzzle he may be able to assume a little modesty. His absurd pretensions during his first week of Cabinet Office were a bad beginning for a young, untried, and not too popular Minister.

While Lord Roberts is on his way home, the Boers have been raiding Cape Colony, capturing British troops and playing havoc generally with the pretence that the war is over. But even the War Office has now abandoned that theory. Lord Kitchener is demanding reinforcements of men and horses—especially the latter; and it is obvious that a new plan of campaign is about to be developed which may take months to complete. An officer, writing home to a friend, is reported to have said that we might as well set the Lord Mayor's Show to catch a burglar on Hampstead Heath as expect the British troops with their present equipment to capture De Wet. Mr. Hales, the well-known war correspondent, estimates the number of horses required to make the army efficient at no less a number than three hundred thousand.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

THE VICEROY AND THE OFFICIAL HIERARCHY.

POLITICAL AGENTS AT NATIVE COURTS.

THE UNVEILING OF MR. NAOROJI'S PORTRAIT.

[From an Indian Correspondent.]

Bombay, December 1.

The Viceroy is still touring and will not be back in Calcutta for another three weeks. Meanwhile, there is a good deal of criticism going on in the columns of the Native Press on the recent article in the *Pioneer* headed "Kaiser and Viceroy." The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* is the most prominent commentator. It seems to think that between the quarrel of the official and officialised Anglo-Indians on the one hand and of the Viceroy on the other the only sufferers will be the Indians. To bring this point home to the general reader it relates an Indian story. There was a storm, and the buffaloes fought among themselves by the side of a river bank where grew diminutive plants. Of course, in the *mêlée*, the plants were bruised or crushed. The diminutive plant in this case is the Indian. This is the moral it conveys. But the analogy is not particularly close. There is the Viceroy who, strong in his strength, and just in his justice, protects the weak against the mischievous clique of the Anglo-Indians whose determined policy is to set the ruling classes against the Indians. No doubt to a certain extent there is danger, as the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* rightly points out. The instigators did their very best to humiliate Lord Ripon, who strove hard "to hold the scales even" between the dominant race and her Majesty's Indian subjects, voiceless almost and absolutely powerless. Lord Dufferin tried to regain the ascendency of which the puissant Anglo-Indian section deprived his predecessor. But it was a vain effort. The two succeeding Viceroys were notoriously weak, and therefore were passive instruments in fortifying that ascendency. Secure in that power, the Anglo-Indian hierarchy now finds that Lord Curzon is endeavouring with all his might and main to regain the lost ascendency. This is gall and wormwood. Hence the genesis of the article in the Allahabad journal.

The struggle has once more come to the front, and it remains to be seen how it ends. The time has come when a strong Viceroy, with a force of character and an impressive individuality, should by firmness and tact hold the balance even, and teach the party of ascendency that it is he, and not they, who rules the land. Otherwise, it is greatly to be feared that with bastard Imperialism having rampant sway in what was till lately considered the freest country in the world, Indians will find themselves in a plight even worse than they have experienced. History may repeat itself. The Anglo-Indians will not inaptly represent the Prætorians of the Roman Empire, at whose behest emperors were chosen and deposed till at last the very tyranny of the tyrants broke down the mighty fabric of Imperialism reared by Roman statesmanship and cemented by Roman blood. Heaven forbid that the governing caste in India should thus lay the seeds of the downfall of the British-Indian Empire! It has been more than once said that if India is lost it will be on the floor of the House of Commons. This is extremely improbable; but there is every probability of its being lost in India itself by the action and conduct of the modern Prætorians from the Silver Isle, whose fixed policy is to keep all Indians hewers of wood and drawers of water. Were the House of Commons true to its former traditions, that would be a distinct gain to India. What is now essential for that great assembly, whose desire to render India that justice which is so long its due is well known, is to take back into its own powerful hand the trust which it has for some time past relegated to Providence. Unless the servants of the Crown in India are rigidly kept under check and control, and unless there is a succession of strong Viceroys with a will of their own, there is nothing to prevent them from having complete ascendency. But, I repeat, that ascendency will lead to disastrous results.

The *Bengalee* has been at some pains to trace the real facts in connexion with the recent deposition of the Mahárája of Bharatpur. It candidly admits that the Government of India has acted rightly in the step it has taken. But it is not quite sure whether the Mahárája had not some substantial cause of provocation which led to the tragedy. Careful enquiry set on foot by that enterprising journal leads to the belief that the conduct of the valet was certainly such as would have provoked any person, much more a personage of the position of Bharatpur. And the paper thinks that an independent enquiry might have been instituted by the Government instead of relying implicitly on the statements of the Political Agent. It is evident again, apart from this incident, that the entire system of political agency at Native Courts demands thorough revision. There is a loud and persistent cry for reform, while the Gagging Act entirely shuts the mouths of publicists and others from publicly stating all that they privately learn from the most unimpeachable sources. Is the reform, root and branch, of this system one of the twelve problems awaiting solution at the hands of Lord Curzon? If it is not, let him take a note of it.

The ceremony of unveiling the portrait of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji on November 24 passed off most successfully. The Framji Cowasji Institute Hall was crowded to excess, late comers being unable to gain even a footing on the staircase. The audience was fully representative of all the wealth and intelligence of the city, and our Second Grand Old Man of India, the distinguished Mr. Justice Ranade, occupied the Chair. Great enthusiasm prevailed, for Mr. Naoroji enjoys a universal reputation for all that is sternly patriotic and purely disinterested, and as such is really worshipped. As Mr. Ranade observed in his well reasoned and judicial speech, he is the favourite of 300 millions, who form one-sixth of the human race, and are besides subjects of the great white Queen of England. I am sorry to say the English dailies have given a very meagre report of Mr. Ranade's able speech. But as the secretaries intend very soon to give a complete account of the interesting proceedings in the form of a brochure, the readers of India in London will have an ample opportunity to study the text. Meanwhile it may be said that Mr. Ranade has given a most complete and crushing rejoinder to the calumniators of Mr. Naoroji. He has carefully read every word of his utterances for the last thirty years, and cannot find anything to which exception can be taken. He has, on the contrary, made two conquests which not even one in a million is lucky enough to make. Firstly, he has by dint of perseverance and by the logic of his indubitable facts, educated, or rather brought round, English opinion as to the real poverty of India. Secondly, he has endeared himself to all classes of the divers communities of India by his self-effacement, his sublime unselfishness, and his sterling patriotism. May Providence spare his life for many a long year to come for the sake of India, and may it be his good fortune to witness the fruit of the tree he has planted. India is proud of him. In honouring him Indians honour themselves.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

THE MANSION HOUSE FUND.

The Mansion House Fund, it is announced, will be closed at the end of the year. It is still short of £400,000.

THE "INVESTORS' REVIEW" FUND.

We take the following from the current issue (December 15) of the *Investors' Review*:—

It is a remarkable fact that the House of Commons in its present brief session has paid no attention whatever to the position of India. To be sure, Parliament was called together for the specific purpose of giving liberty to the Government to borrow and make away with some further millions of the country's wealth or credit; yet a few questions might have been asked with regard to the condition of the famine-stricken regions, the manner in which the land revenue is being administered therein, and the impoverished condition of the Government Treasury. What does the Government of India propose to do to restore the cultivators to their land? How much land-rent will it lose? What means does it possess to enable it to cope with the losses certain to ensue? None of these questions were touched upon. India might be in the moon for all Parliament seemed to care about it, and the need of the people there continues extreme.

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

List of Subscriptions.

Amount acknowledged previously	£917	7	5
W. L. A., Bradford, collected at Miss Alison Garland's lecture, per India	2	6	7
Cecil C. Fuller, Esq., Coalville	1	1	0
Mrs. L. F. Mallet, per India	2	0	0
Total to date	£922	15	0

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

LAND ASSESSMENTS IN INDIA.

MEMORIAL TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

We give the text of a Memorial on Land Assessments in India which has been forwarded (December 20) to the Secretary of State for India:—

To THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
LORD GEORGE FRANCIS HAMILTON, M.P.,
Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India,
India Office, Whitehall, S.W.

My Lord,—In view of the terrible famines with which India has been lately afflicted, we, the undersigned, who have spent many years of our lives among the people, and still take a deep interest in their welfare, beg to offer the following suggestions to your Lordship in Council, in the hope that the Land Revenue administration may be everywhere placed on such a sound and equitable basis as to secure to the cultivators of the soil a sufficient margin of profit to enable them better to withstand the pressure of future famines.

2. We are well aware that the primary cause of famine is the failure of rain, and that the protection of large tracts of country by the extension of irrigation from sources that seldom or never fail has been steadily kept in view and acted on by the Government for many years past; but the bulk of the country is dependent on direct rainfall, and the pinch of famine is most severely felt in the uplands, where the crops fail simply for want of rain. The only hope for the cultivators throughout the greater part of India is therefore that they should be put in such a position as to enable them to tide over an occasional bad season.

3. To place the cultivators in such a position, we consider it essential that the share taken as the Government demand on the land should be strictly limited in every Province. We fully agree with the views of Lord Salisbury, when Secretary of State for India, as set out in his Minute of April 26, 1875:—

> So far as it is possible to change the Indian fiscal system, it is desirable that the cultivator should pay a smaller proportion of the whole national charge. It is not in itself a thrifty policy to draw the mass of revenue from the rural districts, where capital is scarce, sparing the towns, where it is often redundant, and runs to waste and luxury. The injury is exaggerated in the case of India, where so much of the revenue is exported without a direct equivalent.

4. Without going into tedious detail, we consider it very advisable that, in those parts of the country in which the Land Tax is not permanently settled, the following principles should be uniformly adhered to:—

(*a*) Where the Land Revenue is paid directly by the cultivators, as in most parts of Madras and Bombay, the Government demand should be limited to 50 per cent. of the value of the nett produce, after a liberal deduction for cultivation expenses has been made, and should not ordinarily exceed one-fifth of the gross produce, even in those parts of the country where, in theory, one-half of the nett is assumed to approximate to one-third of the gross produce.

(*b*) Where the Land Revenue is paid by landlords, the principle adopted in the Saharanpur Rules of 1855, whereby the Revenue demand is limited to one-half of the actual rent or assets of such landlords, should be universally applied.

(*c*) That no revision of the Land Tax of any Province or part thereof should be made within thirty years of the expiration of any former revision.

(*d*) That when such revision is made in any of those parts of India where the Land Revenue is paid by the cultivators direct to the Government, there should be no increase in the assessment except in cases where the land has increased in value (1) in consequence of improvements in irrigation works carried out at the expense of the Government, or (2) on account of a rise in the value of produce, based on the average prices of the thirty years next preceding such revision.

5. Lastly, we recommend that a limit be fixed in each Province beyond which it may not be permissible to surcharge the Land Tax with local cesses. We are of opinion that the Bengal rate of 6¼ per cent. is a fair one, and that in no case should the rate exceed 10 per cent.

We have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient Servants,

(Signed)
R. K. PUCKLE, Late Director of the Revenue Settlement, and Member of the Board of Revenue, Madras.
J. H. GARSTIN, Late Member of Council, Madras.
J. B. PENNINGTON, Late Collector of Tanjore, Madras.
H. J. REYNOLDS, Late Revenue Secretary to the Government of Bengal, and late Member of the Legislative Council of the Governor-General of India.
RICHARD GARTH, Late Chief Justice of Bengal.
ROMESH C. DUTT, Late Officiating Commissioner of Orissa Division in Bengal, and Member of the Bengal Legislative Council.
C. J. O'DONNELL, Late Commissioner of the Bhagalpur and Rajshahi Divisions in Bengal.
A. ROGERS, Late Settlement Officer and Member of Council in Bombay.
W. WEDDERBURN, Late Acting Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay.
JOHN JARDINE, Late Judge of the High Court of Bombay.
J. P. GOODRIDGE, Late B.C.S., and formerly Officiating Settlement Commissioner, C.P.

24, Palace Court, W., December 20, 1900.

INDIAN MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS.

Sir Charles Dilke, during the closing Session of last Parliament, obtained, by way of question and answer, an important, though incomplete, return relating to the strength of the Indian armies for the five years ending with January 1, 1896. This appeared in due course under the heading "Imperial Parliament" in the INDIA of May 4 of the present year; but it will serve to elucidate the complete return we print below if our brief report of May last be here reproduced. Thus:—

Sir CHARLES DILKE asked the Secretary of State for India what was the strength in non-commissioned officers and men of the forces on the Indian establishment in India on January 1, 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899, and 1900.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The effective strength of non-commissioned officers and men of the British and Native forces in India on the dates mentioned was as follows:—

	British.	Native.	Total.
January 1, 1896 ..	70,615	143,775	214,390
,, 1897 ..	70,400	144,672	215,072
,, 1898 ..	67,808	143,376	211,184
,, 1899 ..	68,578	146,363	214,941
,, 1900 ..	62,220	140,138	202,358

No doubt the right hon. baronet had at the time some good reason of his own for omitting mention of the commissioned officers; but on financial grounds this is an essential item, and it has some bearing on questions of Indian military organisation which specialists, such as Sir Charles himself, are wont to deal with. We are now able to complete the return by the addition of that line of statistics. This has been obtained by an Anglo-Indian correspondent of ours, who is, we understand, indebted for it to the courtesy of Sir Arthur Godley, the Permanent Secretary of the India Office. Here are the completed statistics for the five years under notice:—

	British.		Native.		
	Commissnd. Officers.	N.C.O's and Men.	Commissnd. Officers.	N.C.O's and Men.	Total.
January 1,					
1896 ..	3,560	70,615	2,485	141,290	217,950
1897 ..	3,476	70,400	2,515	142,157	218,548
1898 ..	3,530	67,808	2,727	140,649	214,714
1899 ..	4,135	68,578	2,629	143,734	219,076
1900 ..	3,968	62,220	2,642	137,496	206,326
May 1,					
1865* ..	5,772	63,415	129,818†		199,005

There is no scope within this brief notice to comment on these important statistics, but two or three notes are needed. Thus the line of 1865 figures is added as suitable starting point for comparison by those who may be familiar with the course of Indian military administration during this long period of thirty-five years. The large disproportionate number of British commissioned officers—which includes those belonging to the three Indian native armies—is mainly due to the large number of officers then on "General Duty," consequent on the disbandment of many mutinied regiments, these chiefly in the Bengal Army. It was not until quite five years later—thanks to the obstinacy of the authorities here, the Duke of Argyll being at the India Office much of that time—that reasonable terms were eventually offered, under which these surplus officers were enabled to retire.

The considerable increase in the total establishment in the decade as compared with 1865 will be noted; and this increase has been in all the more costly branches of expenditure. Reference to the rapidly rising annual totals of Indian army charges shows an increase from about fifteen millions in 1865 to twenty millions or more in this decade.

IN MEMORY OF MAX MÜLLER.

MEETING IN CALCUTTA.

At a special meeting of the Saraswati Institute, Calcutta, held on Sunday last (November 4), at the rooms of the Institute, the following resolution says the *Friend of India* (November 8), was unanimously passed:—

> "That this meeting desires to place on record its sense of deepest sorrow at the death of Professor F. Max Müller, K.M., LL.D., D.C.L., who, by his invaluable services to the literature of religion, philology, and philosophy, of the whole world, and of India in particular, by his successful interpretation and noble vindication of Eastern life and Eastern thought, and by his manifold services to this country, has endeared his name to the peoples of India, and has earned their lasting gratitude."

The Institute remained closed on Saturday last (November 3), in honour of the memory of the deceased.

MEETING OF PANDITS IN BOMBAY.

On the 7th inst., writes a correspondent to the *Bombay Gazette* (November 17), a meeting of the Pandits of the Vidvan Mandala was

* There are no figures available for *January* 1, 1865. The figures for this year are taken from the Statistical Abstract for the year. For the other years the figures are taken from the Quarter-Master-General's Returns.

† In all returns for the year 1865 Native commissioned officers were bracketed with Native non-commissioned officers and men.

held to express grief for the death of Bhatt Max Müller, one of the greatest among Orientalists. The following piece was read :—

Bhatt Max Müller was a great professor of Sanskrit and an Oriental scholar. We have suffered great loss by his death. By his deep study and correct editions of the "Rig-Veda," "Shatpatha-Brahmana," "Katyayana-Shranta Sutra," and other such works, he has laid the Indian Pandits under a debt of gratitude. The impression of Aryan learning was firmly stamped upon the mind of this professor. He, like our ancient sages, passed the whole of his life in the study of the "Vedas" and "Vedanta." Very few of our Hindu pandits devote the whole of their lives to the study of the Vedas. And there are still fewer that try to grasp the literal sense of Vedic literature. When some of the Hindu kings, Brahmins and the Vaishyas, began to turn from the study of the "Vedas" and the works of the great sages, Professor Max Müller studied them and revealed their value to his readers. While Bhatt Max Müller, Bhatt Bühler, Bhatt Kielhorn, and many other Western Sanskrit professors take pride in the appellation of "Bhatt" it is a matter of regret that modern Brahmins who have studied English consider it derogatory. We should feel abashed when we see that we learn the greatness of our own literature from foreign pandits. It is, however, a matter for rejoicing that learned men like Max Müller have revived the ancient learning of the Hindus, when Hindus themselves neglect their ancient and venerable religion and lore.

We unanimously, therefore, wish that the Almighty may confer immortal bliss and eternal peace to the soul of that great professor.

The meeting then dispersed. The Pandits present at the occasion were Shastris Ranchhodji Idhavji, Jivram Lalluram, Nathuram Mahashanker, Bhagvanji Prabhuram, Chaganlal Purushottam, Karunashanker Kalidas, Jyotirvid Kanji Mohanji, Vyas Nathji Mohanji, and several others.

MEETING IN ALLAHABAD.

A large memorial meeting of Indian admirers of the late Professor Max Müller was held in the Vizianagram Hall of the Muir College, Allahabad, on November 22. Mr. Justice Knox, Vice-Chancellor of the University, was in the chair. Mr. Satis Chandra Banerjee spoke of the deep feeling of affection the people of India felt for the late Professor. Dr. G. Thibaut delivered a comprehensive and most interesting speech, in which he lamented the lack of interest of Native scholars (excepting the Pandits) in the study of Indian literature. A resolution expressing the deep sense of the loss sustained by India in the death of Max Müller was moved by Mahamapopadhya Pandit (who compared Max Müller to the Pandits of ancient times), and seconded by Professor Aditya Ram Bhattacharya, and unanimously carried. A vote of condolence with the family of the late Professor was also passed. A number of Native speakers took part in the proceedings.

MEETING AT SATARA.

We may hope (writes the *Mahratta*, November 11) that the memorial undertaken in Bombay will be worthy of Bombay. The Mofussil also seems to be moved to independent and prompt activity in the same direction. For on the very day after the sad news was wired all over the country the Satara public, we learn, held a public meeting, and a resolution expressing grief at the Professor's death was passed, and it was also resolved to offer a prize of from 100 to 200 rupees for his best biographical and critical memoir in Marathi.

SPEECH BY MR. ROMESH DUTT, C.I.E.

At a meeting of the English Goethe Society, held in London on November 23, 1900, Mr. Romesh Dutt spoke as follows :—

Mr. Chairman,—In response to your call, I rise to perform a mournful duty, and to say a word on behalf of the people of India to express the feeling of sorrow which they feel at the death of one who was not only one of the greatest of Oriental scholars, but one of the truest friends of India. I do not exaggerate facts, sir, when I state that, for a period of half a century, my countrymen have looked upon Professor Max Müller not only as the best interpreter of ancient Indian literature and philosophy and religious thought in Europe, but also as the truest friend of the people of modern India. For half a century they have watched his literary labours with admiration; they have hailed his noble vindication of modern India with gratitude; and they have regarded him with feelings of affection and of love heightened by the long distance from which they contemplated his sympathetic work. And the few of my countrymen who had the privilege of approaching him and knowing him personally have found in him a true and devoted friend.

I will not recapitulate all the lifelong labours of the venerable Professor, of which my friend Dr. Oswald has given a full account. The publication of the "Rig-Veda," which commenced in 1849, opened a new epoch in historic and religious studies in India, and helped us to turn to the past for inspiration and for guidance in solving the great religious and social problems which lie before us in the path of our future progress. Professor Max Müller's numerous contributions to the elucidation of the literature, religion, and philosophy of ancient India have helped us in this progress; and his sympathetic works on modern India have inspired us with courage, with confidence, and with hope. And, lastly, the splendid series of the Sacred Books of the East, which he has edited, has opened out for many of us, even in India, not only a rich storehouse of ancient knowledge and wisdom, but a living stream of pure thought and learning, which sustains and nourishes and strengthens us in our conduct in life, and in our struggles for progress and true reform.

As a personal friend, he has known and sympathised with most of the distinguished Indians of two generations. As a young man, he knew the princely Dwarkanath Tagore, who was in Europe in the forties, and who now lies buried in a London cemetery. He corresponded with his son, the venerable Devendranath, the head of the oldest branch of the Brahmo Somaj of India. He was a friend of Keshab Chandra Sen, whose earnest religious reforms and great eloquence were admired in this country thirty years ago. The Professor frequently corresponded with the eminent scholars, Dr. Bhau Daji of Bombay and Dr. Rajendra Lal Mitra of Calcutta; he has known Dr. Bhandarkar and Pandita Ramabai; he has been a friend of every great scholar and religious teacher and social reformer that India has produced within these two generations. Last and humblest among the students of ancient Indian learning whom the Professor favoured with his friendship was my humble self. Fifteen years ago, when I produced my translation of the "Rig-Veda" into my own vernacular language, my humble endeavour received his sympathetic recognition and warm support. Twelve years ago, when I wrote a historical account of "Civilisation in Ancient India," I received from Professor Max Müller encouragement and help. Two years ago, when I prepared my condensed translation of the great Sanscrit epic, "Mahabharata," it was Professor Max Müller who was kind enough to write that learned Introduction which graces the pages of that work. And last year I had the proud privilege of dedicating my condensed translation of the "Ramayana" to him who had all his life laboured for my country and my countrymen.

Words cannot express what my countrymen feel on this mournful occasion. But, nevertheless, I am grateful to you, sir, for having permitted me to express, however inadequately, our sorrow at the death of one of the greatest of Oriental scholars, and one of the truest of our friends.

A PROPOSED MEMORIAL IN BOMBAY.

LETTER OF SYMPATHY TO MRS. MAX MÜLLER.

A public meeting of the Hindu community was held on Sunday last (Nov. 11) at Madhav Baug—says the *Mahratta* (Nov. 18)—for the purpose of giving expression to the sorrow felt at the death of Professor Max Müller and sympathy for the bereaved family. Dr. Ramkrishna G. Bhandarkar, C.I.E., was called to the chair. There was a large attendance of educated Hindu gentlemen.

The Chairman, in a short speech, eulogised the services rendered to the Hindu religion and literature by the late Professor Max Müller.

It was then moved by the Hon. Mr. Justice Ranade, and carried unanimously, that the following letter of sympathy be sent to Mrs. Max Müller :—

To Mrs. Georgina Adelaide Max Müller.

Madam,—We, the humble citizens of all castes and creeds of Bombay in public meeting assembled, do hereby take this early opportunity to express the most heart-felt and profound grief with which the news of the death of your dear and revered husband was received in India. The name of Professor Max Müller has become a household word in this country, and will remain so as long as ancient Hindu literature is studied or the Sanskrit language is understood. Professor Max Müller had become by his works a constant companion and guide of every student of philosophy and religion; and to such his death is a serious personal loss. If sharing grief brings any alleviation, you, Madam, may rest assured that the whole Hindu community not only in this capital of the Western Presidency but throughout India deeply sympathises with you in your bereavement. In Professor Max Müller not only Germany that gave him birth, or England that adopted him, but the whole world has lost a brilliant and sympathetic student and a masterly and clear expositor of human thought and noble spirit. His memory will remain ever fresh, but the vivifying effect of his personal influence will now be surely missed, not only by scholars but also by persons engaged in other walks of life. His death, Madam, has therefore created a void which cultured people will feel and mourn with you for a long time to come. To the Hindus in particular, Professor Max Müller was more than a savant. His monumental edition of "Rig-Veda" has brought their oldest and sacred book within the reach of all. The splendid series of translations of the Sacred Books of the East edited by him has opened the rich mine of Hindu philosophy and religion to all not acquainted with the ancient languages. By his always bringing forward in the works written by him what is best in Hindu literature he has raised the Hindu race in the estimation of the world. He was the champion of the Hindus and boldly stood up for the people whom he had learnt to love by a study of their literature and philosophy. The Hindus, grateful as they are by temperament, will always cherish the memory of a man who rendered them such service. He was always ready to defend the character of the Hindus against ignorant and malicious aspersions and their literature against the charge of worthlessness. It was this spirit which was at the root of the advice he offered to the candidates for the Indian Civil Service in

1882. He always befriended those Hindus with whom he came in contact whether they were Sanskritists or not, sympathised with their aspirations, and appreciated the good work done by them. The words of confidence and sympathy that we now send to you, Madam, are not mere conventionalities. They spring from genuine feelings and express the heart-felt sentiments of the people assembled at this meeting and others whom they represent, and will, we hope, be a source of some consolation to you in your great bereavement.

Sir Bhalchandra Krishna Bhatvadekar said that a gentleman who did not wish to have his name disclosed had offered to give a sum of Rs. 5,000 to commemorate the memory of Prof. Max Müller. It was entrusted to a committee consisting of Sir Bhalchandra Krishna, the Hon. Mr. Justice Ranade, Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar, the Hon. Mr. N. G. Chandavarkar, and Prof. A. V. Kathavate, to suggest the best way to preserve the memory of the late Prof. Max Müller.

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI'S PORTRAIT.

THE UNVEILING CEREMONY.

The unveiling of a life-size portrait of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji at the Framji Cowasji Institute by the Hon. Mr. Justice Ranade took place on Saturday evening (November 24) in the presence of a very large gathering of people representing every community. In opening the proceedings, Mr. D. E. Wacha explained the genesis of the fund subscribed for the portrait. He said it was started so far back as 1869 at a public meeting held in the Framji Cowasji Institute under the chairmanship of the late Mr. Framji N. Patel. Resolutions were then passed acknowledging the services rendered by Mr. Naoroji to the country during a long series of years, and a committee was appointed to give effect to the resolutions. About Rs. 30,000 were raised; and out of this sum a purse of Rs. 28,000 was presented to Mr. Dadabhai, and Rs. 2,000 were set apart for the portrait. The surplus amount remained idle till two years ago when, with interest, it had swelled to Rs. 8,000. This sum was remitted to Mr. Dadabhai, with a request that he would sit for his portrait. Mr. Dadabhai accordingly gave sittings to Mr. N. N. Writer, a Parsee artist. The portrait arrived in Bombay some time ago. At the conclusion of his review, Mr. Wacha requested the chairman to formally unveil the portrait.

The portrait having been unveiled, the Hon. Mr. Justice Ranade addressed the assembly. He said that they had met for the purpose of giving the finishing stroke to what was done by the public meeting of Bombay citizens who assembled in that very hall more than thirty years ago to do honour to their friend Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. Of the men who promoted that movement only seven were living, and these were among them at that meeting. It was a matter for congratulation that seven gentlemen still survived to witness the evening's proceedings. Mr. Dadabhai in his younger days was described by one of those who knew him best as the Promise of India; another expressed the opinion that there could be but one such man in a million; and a third thought there could be but one such man in three hundred millions. (Loud Applause). Now it might fairly be asked whether the promise thus held out had been fulfilled, or the high eulogisms expressed had been justified. As was well known to them Mr. Dadabhai had attained this pre-eminent position not by reason of his riches or high birth. He had prided himself on being a man of the people. (Cheers). In learning and industry—and especially in industry—Mr. Ranade believed that Mr. Dadabhai had scarcely an equal. But it was not learning and industry that had endeared him to millions of his fellow-countrymen. What was it, then, that had endeared his name and made it a household word in this country and among the foreign nations with whom he had been brought into contact? In order to answer that question, they might just cast a glance on the way in which he had developed himself. In the early part of the century the work which the British Government in India had to discharge was the work of conquest and subjugation. Next came the consolidation period, and that period expired just at the time when Mr. Dadabhai began to flourish in the many walks of usefulness which he had carved out for himself in the surroundings of this city. Then followed the third period, which might well be called the reconciliation period, or rather the period of reconstruction. With the first two periods the people had very little to do. But it had been providentially arranged that after the work of subjugation and consolidation, which covered a period of about fifty years, was completed, the time should come, and it did come, when the work of reconciliation should commence and the work of reconstruction be undertaken. On what lines was this work of reconstruction to be carried out? They were laid down in Mr. Dadabhai's own words—that the people of this country should come to regard the existence and the continuance of British dominion in this part of Asia to be an unquestionable fact. That was the very foundation of the whole edifice. But along with the foundation so laid, and the sure basis so well put, there was the other thing—that by reason of the conquest and of the consolidation the people of India should be raised up to a place of equality among the other nations of the earth. (Cheers.) This was the work which had to be undertaken. Without it the conquest would not have been justified and the consolidation would have no meaning for them. The work of reconciliation was between two parties, but that of reconstruction rested on the Indian population solely. They had to reconstruct the edifice which had been shattered by conquest. This was the work which commenced fifty years ago and which was still continued on the lines laid down by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. Reconciliation was the first plank of this platform—reconciliation between opposite races; reconciliation between Parsis, Hindus, Mahometans, and Christians; reconciliation between the British and Indian races as a whole. Mr. Dadabhai was the first man to accomplish most of those things which they were then dreaming of being able to accomplish. Again, they had not only to reconcile the Native communities with each other but also to reconcile the two opposite interests represented by the dominant British power and the protected Indian communities who throve under that power. It was the most serious work to undertake, and it had been undertaken on both sides of the Channel. It might be said that in this work of reconciliation Mr. Dadabhai's extreme position had not been as helpful and as serviceable to the cause of this country as one might expect. But anyone who had studied his writings and his speeches carefully and attentively would say that such a calumny as this would never lessen the affection and esteem in which the people held him. (Cheers.) In his writings as well as in his speeches there was not a single sentence or expression, even the most casual, which could be pointed out in support of the allegation that Mr. Dabadhai had created a gulf which did not previously exist. (Hear, hear.) When he said that the phenomenal poverty of India must cause anxiety both to the dominant and protected classes, he said nothing but the truth. It was to the highest interests of both Britain and India to acknowledge that truth. (Hear, hear.) It was of no use to ignore facts when those facts were proved; and, in Mr. Dadabhai's case, he would assure them that there was not a single sentence or figure put down in any of his books which did not represent mature thought and life-long study. It was not that he had uttered them for the sake of gaining a temporary advantage in a discussion. These facts were being slowly filtered from mind to mind, and those who had followed recent discussions in Parliament and the Press must have found that slowly and surely the officials and non-officials, journalists and men of business in England, were beginning to realise, what it was impossible in the last century to realise, that India was not the rich land which the travellers of old times had described it to be. It was a poor country, and as such it required a specific regimen and treatment. And what were these regimen and treatment? They were exactly those which Mr. Dadabhai had been recommending to those responsible for the government of the country. He was afraid to admit that there might be those among them, and among English-men, who really thought there was no room for such an extreme position as had been taken up by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. But whatever might be their individual opinion, whether they were Englishmen or Indians, there was no doubt that the matter was serious and that the seriousness had been emphasised by recent events, which could not fail to work out their own salvation. Mr. Ranade then dwelt at some length on the work Mr. Dadabhai had undertaken of educating the English public with regard to matters Indian, and on his disinterested and untiring labours in the cause of India. He exhorted his hearers to follow the example set to them by Mr. Dadabhai and continue the work of reconstruction on the lines laid down by him. And, in conclusion, he bore eloquent testimony to the regard and esteem in which all classes of the Indian people held Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji.

On the motion of Sir Bhalchandra Krishna, seconded by Mr. Jehangir B. Petit, a hearty vote of thanks was accorded to Mr. Justice Ranade.

The Bombay correspondent of the *Hindu* (November 27) wrote:—Last Saturday, at the Cowasji Hall, our Grand Old Man's portrait was unveiled, and this was done by the greatest Indian of the Presidency. It was a grand sight to see the communion of such two great personalities, one present in the flesh and *the other in the picture*—of two individuals who can be compared with none but themselves. There cannot be two Dadabhais or Ranades. Each is unique in his own way, and it was a happy thought of Mr. Wacha to get Mr. Justice Ranade to unveil the portrait of Mr. Dadabhai. A man more exalted in position might perhaps have been found. . . . . But the charm of the whole thing would have gone. To do justice to the qualities that have given to Dadabhai his present position in the political world a Ranade is required. The only other man that would have filled the place and done equal justice to it is perhaps Mr. Justice Tyabji. But as it was, the right man was chosen, and the necessary corollary followed—the meeting was a grand success. The hall was overcrowded, and myself having gone a little late had to make the best of the place I got on the steps. On the dais the Mahometan element was strong, and that was a gratifying circumstance. Only two persons that were badly missed were Mr. Pherozeshah Mehta and Mr. Justice Tyabji. One was absent in Matheran and the other in Bombay. Even the old infirm Lakshmidas Khimji was there, notwithstanding the difficulty he felt in getting upstairs. I heard only a portion of Mr. Justice Ranade's speech, but that was enough to show to what height he had risen on this occasion. His speech was really eloquent. It will find a place among his best. He took advantage of the occasion to expound once more, for the edification of the misunderstanding public, the first principles on which the edifice of our political agitation is built. It was a grand effort. . . . . The English dailies have not done justice to it. . . . . Their reports are meagre. But I learn that a full report will be published in pamphlet form.

Imperial Parliament.

Thursday, December 13.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE COST OF INDIAN WARS.

Mr. Claude Lowther asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he would 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.

Lord G. Hamilton: An ancient Return No. 261 of 1808 shows that it was impossible even then to give the information now asked for as to the earlier years of the century. And it will be seen from Return 13 of 1900, which shows the wars on or beyond the borders of British India since 1849, that it is not till the last thirty years that the costs of the several military operations have been shown separately in the Accounts of the Government of India. This latter return took more than two years to compile and caused great pressure on the Departments concerned in India. I do not think I should be justified in ordering further investigations to be made in the accounts of the years from 1808 to 1849 for the purposes of the return now asked for.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR SOMALILAND.

Mr. Caine asked the Secretary of State for India if he could state what number of Indian troops were to be employed on the Somali Expedition; and if their expenses would be borne by the British Exchequer.

Lord G. Hamilton: The Foreign Office has asked for the services of half battalion Native infantry, fifty camel sowars, two mountain guns, and four maxims, with the necessary equipment, transport, and supplies. The expenses will be borne by the British Exchequer.

THE CONFERENCE ON AGRICULTURAL BANKS.

Mr. Caine asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could state the time when the Conference on Agricultural Banks, promised by Sir Edward Law, would meet in Calcutta:

Whether independent Indian gentlemen would 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 would be taken into careful consideration.

Lord G. Hamilton: I cannot state the time when the Committee which the Government of India have appointed to consider the question of Agricultural Banks will meet. But I know that the Government are most desirous to bring the question to a practical issue; and I am satisfied that, in the matter of selecting members and advisers of the Committee, and in the matter of furnishing the Committee with all available information, the Government will take all possible means to secure the end in view.

THE DEPUTY-COMMISSIONER OF DHARMSALA.

Mr. Caine asked the Secretary of State for India if his attention had been called to the conduct of the Deputy-Commissioner of Dharmsala, who with his revenue officer interviewed the head men of Spiti and Bara Bangahal 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 was 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 proposed to take any action in the matter.

Lord G. Hamilton: I have received no report concerning the circumstances described in the Honourable Member's question. But I can quite conceive that the Deputy-Commissioner of Kangra may have urged the headmen of those remote Himalayan tracts to support the Government in putting down illicit stills and illicit drinking. If he did this, the Deputy-Commissioner would not, in my judgment, be contravening the principles and policy of the Government of India, as declared in the despatch quoted in the question.

Friday, December 14.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Examinations for the Civil Service).—Copy *presented*—of Regulations for Examinations for the Civil Service of India [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

Government of India Act, 1858—Copy *presented*—of Order in Council of 26th November 1900, approving a Statement of proposed new and revised Appointments, alterations of Salaries, and abolition of appointment in the Establishment of the Secretary of State for India in Council [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

INDIAN TROOPS IN SOUTH AFRICA AND CHINA.

Mr. Faber asked the Secretary of State for War if he would state what was the total number of British troops withdrawn from India for service in South Africa and China; and, whether men of more than eight years' colour service had been retained in India.

Mr. Brodrick: The number of British troops withdrawn from India for service in South Africa amounts to about 8,500, and in China to about 450. Men of over eight years' service are detained in India under the terms of the Royal proclamation.

Mr. Caine asked whether a number of Indian troops were not stationed at Mauritius and other places to relieve British soldiers now serving in South Africa.

Mr. Brodrick said those were British troops who were paid for by the War Office.

Saturday, December 15.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITION.

Officers of the Indian Staff Corps—Petition of F. A. Andrew, F. G. W. Davies, W. A. Hill, George B. Brown, H. W. Davies, D. F. Stuart, and Arundel Begbie, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

THE WORK OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

On December 4 Miss Alison Garland gave a lantern lecture at Channing Hall, Chapel Lane, Bradford, to a large meeting of the Bradford Women's Liberal Association (Mrs. J. A. Godwin in the chair), on "Are Famines in India Inevitable?" Miss Garland dwelt on the vast extent of the recent visitation and made some instructive observations on the culture of the Native population. English, she said, was becoming the language of the people. Interesting slides were shown of Delhi, Lucknow, Cashmere and other places which she had visited, and also of famine scenes which she had witnessed. After condemning the opium traffic, which was encouraged by the Government for purposes of revenue, she urged upon her audience the grave responsibilities of empire. With wiser government and better economy famines in the East would become as unknown as they were in the West.—Miss Gregory moved and Mrs. W. E. B. Priestley seconded a vote of thanks to Miss Garland, which was supported by two gentlemen and carried. All the speakers laid emphasis on the necessity for greater interest on the part of the public at home in the welfare of the Indian Empire.

On December 6 Miss Garland lectured at the Young Men's Society in connexion with St. Nathaniel Church, Liverpool. Canon Hobson was announced to preside but had been called away to the South of France, and Mr. Williams took his place. The lecture was illustrated by lime-light views and was much appreciated by a good audience.

On December 13 Miss Garland delivered an address on India to the Gloucester Women's Liberal Association at their annual social gathering. Some 300 were present. Sir William Wedderburn occupied the chair. Introducing the lecturer, he said:—

It was with no small amount of self-sacrifice and courage that Miss Garland went out to India and visited the terrible famine districts. She had seen with her own eyes many of the sad scenes in connexion with the lamentable famine, and that fact would give her address an added interest. It was absolutely necessary that the people of this country should be put in possession of more information with regard to the sufferings of their fellow-citizens. It was a very painful subject, but it was necessary that the British people should understand those things in order that they might realise their responsibilities in the matter. The people of India were allowed no power—they were not allowed to manage their own affairs; and, that being so, ought not the people of this country to look after them themselves? (Hear, hear.) How could the people of this country look after their fellow-subjects in India unless they understood them? Therefore he thought Miss Garland was performing a most important public duty by coming to enlighten the English people with regard to the condition of India. He believed that those famines were preventible. (Applause.) If the people of India were in fairly good circumstances, the failure of one harvest might cause some inconvenience, but would not bring about wholesale deaths by hunger. If the people had sufficient store in their houses to last them over one season, then at any rate it would not be necessary to call upon the Government to feed them to prevent them from dying by thousands of starvation. His own belief was that much might be done to mitigate the suffering which was being experienced. The great fault of the Government was that they did not sufficiently consult the people themselves.

Miss Garland gave a most interesting and instructive lecture, illustrating it with a large number of views, "the awfully realistic photographs of some of the victims of the famine causing the audience quite a creepy sensation." She spoke in terms of special praise of the Salvation Army for its efforts in allaying the suffering in the famine districts. Mr. Mukerji, in moving a vote of thanks, said the famines not only were preventible, but were indirectly the creation of the people of this country. Mr. Frederick Sessions seconded, and the vote was heartily accorded. After a vote of thanks to the chairman, the company sang "God save the Queen."

On December 14 Miss Garland addressed a public meeting held under the auspices of the West Bristol Women's Liberal Association at Bishopston. Miss Comins presided over a good attendance. Many questions were put to the lecturer, and a hearty vote of thanks was accorded to her. A resolution urging a grant of money from Parliament was proposed by Miss M. Priestman and seconded by Mr. Milner, and passed unanimously.

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 utilise native services and keep abreast of native opinion."—*The Manchester Guardian.*

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

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

NOW READY.

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

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

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

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

Remittances should accompany order.

Apply to the Manager, "INDIA,"
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2 Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.