

India

FOR THE

No. 156. NEW SERIES.
No. 260. OLD SERIES.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, DECEMBER 28, 1900.

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

Notes and News	313	The Investors' Review Fund	320
Retrospect of a Century	316	Letter to the Editor: The late	320
Retrospect of a Year	317	Bakshi Jitell Ram	320
Our London Letter	318	The New Under-Secretary for India	321
Notes on Embassy	319	"Bhatt" Max Müller	322
The Famine in India	320	"A Famine Empire"	323
The Mansion House Fund	320	Advertisements	324

NOTES AND NEWS.

WHILE great and widespread distress still exists in India it has been decided to close the Mansion House Fund at the end of the year. Though larger than some thought possible, it has yet fallen far below India's needs, and more is wanted yet. And unless there is a change of system it is possible that the Indian people will soon be plunged again in the same distress as that from which they have now barely emerged; it is certain they will have to undergo the same sufferings sooner or later. Even in regard to the famine that is now passing away, help is needed to enable the peasants to restock their farms and sow the land, without being forced into the power of the money lender. Here is where a National Grant would have come in so effectively.

The promised Famine Commission, we learn from Reuter, has been appointed—"appointed to enquire into certain points connected with the recent famine." The President is Sir Antony MacDonnell, and there could not have been chosen a better man. With him are joined Mr. Bourdillon from Bengal (unhappily reminiscent of the Chupra case), Mr. Nicholson from Madras, and presumably to represent the Native States, the Dewan of Jaipur. The Commission will tour through the affected districts, and is expected to be engaged for a couple of months. But what are the "certain points" of enquiry? Are they really so unimportant as not to matter? Well, every little helps, and no doubt the Famine Code will receive a few little touches, perfect as it is. But no substantial good will be done till the Government consents to tackle the fundamental causes of famine.

The *Mahratta* again draws attention to a successful experiment in the relief during famine of a particular class. The Ahmednagar Municipality have provided relief for weavers at their own trade during five of the worst months of famine, without any loss to themselves or the Government. The success of the experiment was due to the untiring efforts of one or two public-spirited citizens of Ahmednagar, but the *Mahratta* insists that the experiment would never have been tried if it had not been for the Famine Commissioner, Mr. Montearth, who would not allow the strong protests of the Collector and the Commissioner to prevent the experiment being made.

The special correspondent of the *Times of India* who went to Ankleshwar to attend the Gujerat Enquiry thus describes the state of the country around:—

Unless the Government intend to act quickly in alleviating the burden imposed upon the people by the collection of revenue in a year like the present, the result must prove disastrous. That is the impression conveyed outside the Court of Enquiry in the fields and the villages. The crops are suffering seriously from the lack of rain in September and October.

The soil has been sown with two year old seed, and
No. 26. Vol. XIV.

sparseness is the result. Even the sowcars are ruined and can lend no more. Such is the situation in Gujerat.

On November 28, in the Gujerat Revenue Enquiry, the Mamlatdar was examined at Ankleshwar, and underwent cross-examination on that and the following day. He made one curious admission:—

He knew of the letters signed "Gujerati," which appeared in the *Times of India*. They were sent to him—those in reference to the taccavi being recovered as revenue. He had them sent for report, and he reported that the statements made in them were false, though he did not examine the village accounts to satisfy himself on the subject.

He, however, denied that Government assessments were recovered from monies paid as taccavi. He insisted that the tenants (1) had other means of paying their dues, and yet (2) had received taccavi before paying their dues. Nor would he admit that there was anything inconsistent in these statements.

On December 4 the enquiry was continued at Hansot. The chief witness was a Koli woman, Bai Nani, whose husband a year before the famine had left the village in search of work. She remained with her son, a boy now twelve years old. When she could not pay the assessment on her husband's holding, the *talati* and those with him seized a plough, a plough-yoke, a hand-spinning wheel, a bedstead, a rope used for drawing water, a cart wheel, copper pots, and other household utensils. Then she and her son were turned out of their hut, in spite of their entreaties, and the door locked behind them. They were taken to the village *Utara*, where the boy was beaten—it is now said because he was "insolent and threatening." She had to remove part of her clothing in order that it might be searched. The police, however, insist that she had not to take any of her clothes off—they were only shaken. A neighbour who gave her shelter was ordered by the police to turn her out, and did so. A few days afterwards she was allowed to return to her hut. She admitted that she sent in no complaint for a month, explaining that she was ill for some days, and afterwards found some difficulty in getting a petition writer. She deposed that an attempt was made to induce her to withdraw her petition.

The Memorial on Land Assessments in India, which we printed last week (p. 308), exhibits a consensus of opinion that should weigh with the Secretary of State. Eleven ex-officials of high experience in revenue and judicial work urge that some definite and readily intelligible limit be placed on the Government land revenue demand; and it cannot be doubted that they are representative of the most intelligent and independent experts on the subject. Their fundamental point is this:—

The only hope of the cultivators throughout the greater part of India is that they should be put in such a position as to enable them to tide over an occasional bad season.

To this end they "consider it essential that the share taken as the Government demand on the land should be strictly limited in every Province," and they agree with the views of Lord Salisbury as expressed in his Minute of April 16, 1875, when he was Secretary of State for India:—

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.

And it is interesting to note that the five leading principles they recommend are substantially five of the seven rules suggested by Mr. Romesh Dutt in his recent book on "Famines in India" (pp. 76-77). Mr. Dutt's other two rules, it should be added, are not directly pertinent to the strict purpose of the memorial.

The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* (November 22) gives a bundle of reasons why the Police in India are unsatisfactory. Thus:—

The Police are bad because the Magistrates put them on their back; because some District Superintendents are not what they should be; because there are some District Superintendents who have no brains and very little education; because the lower Native Staff is not under proper and intelligent supervision; and because the Police have innumerable opportunities of oppressing the people.

"The Police," our contemporary thinks, "would improve if it were put in charge of Indians," but it recognises that "that the Government will never do." Nor will the Government "remove any one of the causes." It is not, indeed, the Police that ought to be blamed; they are "as they have been made": "it is the system that has made them so intolerable." The Government will potter at artificial remedies; it will not change the system.

The following is from the Bombay correspondent of the *Pioneer*:—

The daily mortality returns of the last few days have been lower than they have been for over a year, and at present there is very little plague in the city. The new regulations regarding plague measures have entirely won the confidence and approval of the public. As far as I can ascertain the only thing required from the people now is that they should allow the clothes of the person attacked by the disease to be thoroughly washed and disinfected. A patient can now be treated by his own doctor, or by the Government doctor; he can stay in his own house or go to hospital. The result of these measures has had a wonderful effect on the people, especially on the uneducated and lower classes, who now come forward of their own accord and show where doubtful cases may be found, and who now willingly go to hospital, whereas under the old regulations their one idea was that Government sent them to hospitals to be killed.

And it is not to be wondered at that all those who opposed the old harsh plague regulations feel that they have good reason for triumph.

We trust that the Bombay correspondent's remarks will come under the notice of the authorities at Bangalore, where plague is now rampant. There have been petitions and interviews between the people and the Resident, and at last an understanding, temporary at least, was arrived at (Nov. 19):—

After a discussion lasting over an hour, the Resident finally promised to abolish compulsory segregation of the sick if the heads of communities undertook, in such cases where home segregation is impossible owing to the congested locality or ill-constructed houses, to insist upon patients being taken to camp or left in the house while the remainder cleared out. This was agreed to as a tentative measure, four gentlemen of each community being chosen to assist the authorities.

Nothing is more strange than the slowness of the authorities to learn the workable methods. We observe that the Resident remarked—on what authority does not appear—that "the rich had not bestowed a pice in charity on the poor here, while in Bombay the Parsis, Mahometans, and Bunias, all had their own segregation camps."

In commenting upon the Report for the year 1899-1900 on Public Instruction in the North-Western Provinces, the *Englishman* points out the danger that lies in the competition among schools for clever scholars. In one State-aided school forty-four scholarships were given in the year, because, as the Principal said, in no other way could good students be secured. As the State grants are paid according to results, the colleges may hope to recover their expenditure on scholarships. But the effects cannot fail to be bad. The promising lads go where the scholarships are, and the other schools are left to the dull boys, who are deprived of the stimulus of clever class-mates. Nor can it fail to injure the masters to have none but dull boys to teach. The *Englishman*, however, must not suppose that these evils are peculiar to India.

The *Englishman* is also much exercised over the education of domiciled Europeans. "Many of the schools in which the boys are educated are in debt, and the managers are able to give just that minimum of education necessary to enable the students to pass the code examinations." The best European boys go to Rurki College to be trained as engineers, and the Principal reports that "it is impossible to lecture to them in the same way as to boys of the same age in Europe, owing to the want of development of the critical faculty. They are unable to take notes of lectures because they do not distinguish between what is important and what is not." It is not surprising, therefore, that the

Principal thinks that the European boys will not be able to hold their own against the Indians unless their education can be materially improved.

The Director of Public Instruction believes that no such improvement is possible. He says: "Under our present system this seems out of the question." At this the *Englishman* is very wroth. It asks:—

Why? Surely the descendants of those who have built up and consolidated the British Empire in India have a right to expect that in the struggle for existence, in the race for life, they shall not be handicapped, and they shall be placed at least on equal terms with their Native competitors.

Considering the advantages they have in entering Rurki, the best Indian engineers' college, open to domiciled Europeans from all parts of India, but closed to the Indians of Bengal, Bombay, and Madras, this is an extraordinary statement of the case. Perhaps if the domiciled Europeans are such dull boys a greater infusion of Indians would be a benefit both at school and college.

In a recent debate in the Cape Assembly on the Estimates, there was a most ominous unanimity among the spokesmen of all parties against Indian immigration. Sir Gordon Sprigg, the present Imperialist Prime Minister, Mr. Schreiner, his predecessor in office, and Mr. Sauer, one of the most stalwart leaders of the Afriander party, were all of one mind. Mr. Schreiner said that he, when Prime Minister, had drafted a measure which put a heavy tax on the Asiatic immigrant, and a heavy penalty was to be inflicted upon those who brought Asiatics here in contravention of the law. He thought that measure deserved consideration, and might form the basis of general South African legislation, because Natal might go a little further than it had done.

Sir Gordon Sprigg in his reply struck the same familiar note:—

As to the legislation in Natal, it did not go far enough, and they did not want the class of persons spoken about here at all, whether British subjects or not.

Such are the views of a great Imperialist. Sir Gordon Sprigg further declared that no one was more inclined than himself to bring forward a measure of exclusion.

We have already referred to Mr. Protap Chunder Mozoomdar's interesting paper to the current (December) number of the *Nineteenth Century* on "Present-Day Progress in India." His first concern is with the religious side of Indian and Anglo-Indian and British life, and especially with the position of the Brahmo Samaj. He has a good word for all—even for British missionaries in India: "The only obstruction in their way has been their theology; but even that theology is much more temperate now than it was at one time."

But every English man and English woman in India should be a messenger of the spirit of religion. They should be conscious of the great responsibility that rests upon them. If each one of these ["the subordinate officials, and the non-official trader, planter, soldier"] shaped his conduct according to the laws of life laid down in the New Testament, and felt that the august responsibility of the Empire rested upon each and all, the cause of Indian progress would make greater headway.

Yes; and even upon much less exacting conditions of mere morality.

Mr. Protap regrets to say that, while education, moral character, and religion have improved, "the personal attitudes of the two races remain very much the same as before."

Some of our newspaper writers, some of our political agitators, even some of our religious revivalists, say things which unmistakably have an under-current of discontent, of estrangement, not a little defiance, as if everything English were bad and everything Indian were good. This is often done in spite of the remonstrance and sober examples of the leaders of Hindu society.

On the other hand, when he "contemplates the behaviour of some of our European fellow-subjects," he is "filled with grief and dismay." He asks:—

When will their tendencies to personal violence cease? When will they treat with forbearance and Christian patience the faults and shortcomings of their Indian dependents? One outrage, one taking of life in sudden anger, one case of dishonour to women vibrates through the overstrung feelings of our sensitive millions, and is echoed and re-echoed from one end of the country to the other. I regret to say that such acts are not more infrequent now than before. I know that the Viceroy deplores them, the Judges of the High Court deplore them, the heads of the Government deplore them, and all reputable non-official Europeans are sorry for them. But

nevertheless they go on unchecked; and that they cannot be controlled by a mighty Christian Government keeps open a sore which may some day prove dangerous.

The only remedy for this source of weakness, perhaps, is "the sense that each Christian man who goes out to India is a responsible representative of his Queen and his Christ."

The freedom of public opinion, "spontaneously given by strong and generous rulers," ought not to be withdrawn or curtailed "because we lack in the wisdom of experience and self-control." On the contrary,

should not further training be given, further forbearance on the part of our teachers shown, so that our drawbacks may be removed in time? If you have given us self-government, give us more and more of it, even if we should not be thoroughly deserving, because the sense of responsibility surely teaches and trains in the long run, whereas the withdrawal of responsibility as surely demoralises. If freedom of the Press has been given us, let it not be taken away because some of us have abused it; give us more and more, for with the growth of our moral culture, under the guidance of the indwelling God, we shall surely control our intemperance of speech.

Mr. Protap points out that "the great need of the present day in India is the need of mutual sympathy." "The position of the modern Hindu, with all his new ideas, his arduous conflicting duties, is so difficult that he may rightfully claim the goodwill and sympathy of thoughtful men." "It would be a wiser course to give up all this hypercriticism, and learn some feeling of mutual respect and sympathy." In particular:—

There is such a thing as the famine of the soul—the hunger and thirst for human fellowship and compassion. The modern educated Indian, separated by his advanced ideas from his own people, is a lonely being. The great masses of his countrymen look askance at him; the great community of Europeans look suspiciously at him.

The Indian feels that he too is a child of the Empire, the glory of England reflects lustre upon him, England's heroes are his heroes, England's future is his future. Yet he cannot forget the previous history of his great land and people; he feels, like St. Paul, that he is a citizen of no mean city; he therefore makes his appeal for consideration and help to Englishmen in England, the home of truth and freedom and Christian excellence.

The current (November) number of the *Madras Review* opens with an exceptionally able study of "the National Movement in Modern Europe" by Mr. K. Sundararaman Iyer. Mr. Sundararaman sets himself to investigate "the historical conditions and causes which have originated, fostered, and developed the sentiment of nationality among European communities and have made it a working force in the European politics of this century." There is nothing to show directly that his own country was in the back of his mind while he wrote; and it is difficult to suppose that he would apply the European principles to India without very notable modifications suitable to the differences of situation. But some hasty, or malicious, readers may draw inferences that never occurred to the writer. We hope, therefore, that he will follow up his present article with a special examination of the conditions and causes of the origin and the growth of the sentiment of nationality in modern India and the probable, or the inevitable, or the wisest lines of future development. Such an enquiry seems to be the necessary complement of Mr. Sundararaman's excellent paper.

"Everywhere in modern Europe," writes Mr. Sundararaman, "nations have been roused to assert themselves when foreign communities have, from the desire of self-aggrandisement, sought to interfere in their concerns and prevent them from settling their own political destiny in the manner most suitable to their own racial antecedents and inclinations." Now how does this apply to India? What is the extent of the operation of "the desire of self-aggrandisement"? And how far is India, for the purpose in view, "a nation"? Mr. Sundararaman, indeed, points out that "the birth of the sentiment of nationality is not to be understood as necessarily meaning, or as immediately leading to, the actual birth of a nation." Indeed, India would seem to be far off from the goal if the "fruitful lesson" he derives from European experience be applicable to his country—the lesson "that economic and material prosperity must precede the achievement of political advancement." The fact is, that Mr. Sundararaman's eye is filled with the maxim that "money is the sinews of

war." For "everywhere"—that is, in Europe—the development of the movement "has been helped by the renovation of martial spirit of the people and the effective introduction of military reforms." And "another lesson taught by the history of the national movement in Europe is that foreign help has in every case been found necessary in more or less extent for its successful prosecution." These deductions seem to render it urgently incumbent on Mr. Sundararaman to proceed at once to differentiate the case of India.

It seems very plain that, if Mr. Sundararaman's European principles apply to India at all—and, of course, he is dealing with Europe alone, and does not even mention India—then Indian nationality must be a thing of the far distant future. For it is certainly not to be gained, or advanced, by warlike enterprise. Britain will not allow any external Power whatever to lay a finger on India; and internal armed revolt, with or without "foreign help"—if such a thing were possible in these days—would be the insanest miscalculation of forces, military as well as political. This is very distinctly realised by all that appreciate the facts. But at the same time the British profession—a perfectly serious profession—is that we are governing India, not "from the desire of self-aggrandisement," but for India's own good; and our wisest statesmanship contemplates our gradual withdrawal before the developing capacity of the Indians for self-government. Mr. H. J. S. Cotton, now Chief Commissioner of Assam, with his usual insight and courage, expressed this view some fifteen years ago ("New India," p. 116):—

Sooner or later India must again take her old rank among the nations of the East, and all our action should be devoted to facilitating her progress to freedom. Not in mere vague talk, but strenuously and of set purpose it should be the principal object of our Indian Government to address itself to the peaceful liquidation of its concerns and the reconstruction of Native administrations in its place.

How? By the steady fostering and development of "those national tendencies that we ourselves have brought into existence"—the peaceful, conciliatory, patient, National expansion outlined in the history of the Congress movement. Mr. Sundararaman owes it to himself as well as to his readers to proceed to a full and free discussion of this most important question.

The *Tribune* makes some very serious allegations concerning the treatment of Indians on their way to the China war. A correspondent of that newspaper, a young man of good birth and education who at considerable pecuniary loss joined the expedition in a civil capacity, complains that on board ship clerks and agents of the first and second class were packed on a small and unventilated lower deck with followers and menials. Whatever the regulations may say, no distinctions seem to have been recognised. All, of whatever caste or religion, had to cook in one kitchen and at one stove, and drink water from the same tank. Indeed, the *Tribune's* correspondent alleges that the agents were made to believe before starting that they would travel second-class and be provided with cooked food; but the second-class accommodation was reserved for Europeans, and they found themselves provided with nothing but a part of the lower deck screened off from the rest, while they had to cook their own food, which, moreover, was of very bad quality.

Even this was not all. In addition to bad food and inadequate accommodation, they had to put up with insults and actual ill-treatment from the non-commissioned officers on board. The Senior Agent, who had seen nearly twenty-five years' service, is said to have been beaten and knocked about on deck and even kicked in sight of those on board. Why should the man be openly beaten and knocked about and kicked? Why should he be beaten or knocked about or kicked at all? The reason is given: because, when told to sweep out his compartment, he replied that he was an agent and not a sweeper. On complaint being made to the officer commanding, no steps were taken against the offender, but it was announced that the sergeants (in the plural) would be warned. It is said to have been a common thing to see the followers kicked about. When Parliament meets, we hope that these allegations will be investigated. Such intolerable treatment is beyond comment.

RETROSPECT OF A CENTURY.

VAST as have been the changes that have taken place in Europe during the past hundred years, they can hardly claim to be more surprising than those that have come about in India. The eighteenth century, indeed, may have shown changes even more amazing both there and here. Perhaps the contrast between France at the beginning and at the end of the last century remains unsurpassed—the contrast between Louis XIV and the First Republic, or between the persecutions of the Huguenots and the Festival of the Goddess of Reason. Nor would it be easy to find in the annals of the East a hundred years so full of incident and alternations of fortune as that which separated Aurangzeb from Wellesley. And yet if the political changes of the past century are less striking and dramatic than those of the century before, if events seem to follow as a necessary consequence of the revolutions of the preceding age, the field of change is wider. The political is only one side of a vast evolution embracing, for good and ill, thought and education, economics and finance. The streams of Eastern and Western civilisation, so long flowing separate, have at last been joined together, and none can foretell the result.

But even on the political side a vast change has passed over India during the last hundred years. A century ago Serinagapatam had only lately fallen and Tipu ceased to reign. The Mahratta still hoped to succeed to the position of the Mughal, and still in spite of defeats challenged the power of England. A far larger part of the country was ruled by Indian rulers. From a cursory glance at India in 1800 and again in 1900, it would seem that the Native States of India were doomed. But if we enquire into all that has happened between those years, it will become apparent that the movement has not been continuously in one direction. Sir William Lee Warner, indeed, distinguishes three stages: (1) that of non-intervention, which lasted till 1813, and in which those States that were allowed to retain their independence were left alone; (2) that of isolation with subordination, the least trace of insubordination being followed by annexation; and (3) that of subordinate union. At first sight it may appear that the Native States have lost alike in extent and in status. But this is very far from being the case. Mr. Justice Ranade, too, has recently divided the political evolution of India during the century into three stages—conquest, consolidation, and conciliation combined with reconstruction. And this more nearly expresses the policy now in vogue. The power of the Native Prince may be less, and he may be subjected to interferences from which his grandfather was free. But half a century ago, the extirpation of Native government was looked upon as the goal to which everything was tending. British rule was continually advancing and never receding, and that it should extend throughout India seemed its manifest destiny. But since the rendition of Mysore, all that has been changed. Anglo-Indian statesmen have come to look upon the Native States as co-partners with the British in India. The very interferences in the internal affairs of these States is due to a belief in their permanence; for it is recognised that annexation is not the proper remedy for misgovernment. Thus has the end of the century belied its course, and the Native States become an integral part of the polity of our Indian Empire.

Turning to British India and its Government, there too one finds extraordinary progress in many directions, even though the century be strewn with broken promises and hopes deferred. A hundred years ago the Company still continued even to trade; fifty years ago it was still in nominal authority. If the clearer remembrance of the days of their supremacy ensured the Indians of the earlier period greater respect, the tendency seemed to be to give them less and less share in the higher functions of public life. When the charter was re-granted in 1833, it contained memorable words which revived the hopes of the Indians. But the times were scarcely ripe for the entry of Indians into the public service on terms of equality with the English. And when, after the Mutiny, the Company passed away, the Queen's Proclamation promised that henceforward distinctions of race should be at an end and that in the service of their sovereign all should be equal, differing only by their own merit. But these words, though re-promised, have been very inadequately fulfilled. The circumstances of our time have had the effect of making

residence in India much shorter among Anglo-Indians, and so estranging them from the people. Though Indians have been admitted to the Civil Service, it has been under many disadvantages. Entry has been difficult. The highest posts of the Executive have been reserved for Europeans. Municipal freedom, when granted, has soon come to be viewed by the rulers with distrust and aversion. Equality before the law has been more perfect in theory than in practice; and the Indian Press, fostered by wise rulers in the past, has been threatened in the present generation, even in the last half decade. Yet notwithstanding these successes of reaction, there is ample ground for hope when we compare the present with the past, the end with the beginning of the century. Indians who have served with marked distinction on the judicial bench and in the Legislative councils have demonstrated that the men of the country are capable of filling the highest positions with honour to themselves and advantage to the public. Moreover, the pressure of officialism and the guidance of the Congress have combined to originate and to foster a national spirit which contains incalculable potentialities for the future of the country.

Even more striking is the advance in education. At the beginning of the century there were practically no Indians who had received a good European education. Now they are Senior Wranglers at Cambridge. They come out at the top of the Indian Civil Service competition list. They extort the admiration of our highest scientific men. Not only do they run our youth hard in our own seats of learning, but they teach our experts even in those games which in the opinion of not a few of the alumni of our universities constitute the chief claim of those venerable institutions to the admiration of mankind. Yet even here the progress has not been quite continuous, though the general tendency has always been forward. The path, deflected somewhat in the first glow of enthusiasm for Western learning, once more runs along the medium course. The desire to excel in European studies, to take the best of European life, at one time threatened to kill all interest in the ancient learning of India, and to substitute for her immortal civilisation a mere imitation of that which prevailed in Europe. That danger has passed. At no previous time have the Indians gained such successes in our schools, but never were the people more resolute to maintain their own civilisation, strengthened, enlightened, and enriched by contact with other nations, but still in all essentials that which was handed down to them by their fathers, that which has been cherished in the hearts of countless generations. The Indians have accepted the education which their conquerors offered them. They have shown themselves the equals of their conquerors in most parts of their own field. And, harder task still, they have been able to keep a cool head in the midst of their successes. Filled with the learning of Europe, they remain true to India.

But if, on the whole, the political and intellectual movements have been for the good of India, if the record of the century may on the whole be considered a distinct triumph of progress, it is to be feared that the case is otherwise with the economic evolution of the country. The century has brought wealth and prosperity to other lands, but not to India. Famines still afflict her; nay, as the years roll on, they seem to become more numerous and more intense. The mass of the people remain among the poorest in the civilised world. And yet the British have left their mark on the country, if not in the great triumphs of art that glorify the memories of those that went before them, at least in works of greater and more enduring utility. Great as were the works of irrigation which were made by the old rulers of the land, we have everywhere surpassed them. Railways have sprung up over the country. The water has been brought to the land so as to diminish the area of famine; and when famine does occur, the means exist for bringing food to the famine-stricken. And yet famine is as great a scourge as ever, possibly a greater scourge; and in the midst of these great works India fails to keep pace in wealth with other nations, if she does not even grow absolutely poorer. This is indeed a paradox. Are there any facts in the economic situation of India which will afford an explanation?

Now, if we survey the economic history of India during the last hundred years, we find that while the manufactures of the country have decreased and the people have been driven more and more to depend on the land, four things

have steadily increased—the expenditure of Government, the load of taxation, the public debt, and the tribute—four closely connected evils of the body politic. The expenditure keeps on growing. The public works of which we boast have been for the most part paid for with borrowed money. This, immensely increased by the cost of military enterprises, has resulted in a great debt. And the service of the debt and the support of an extravagant Government necessitate a heavy taxation, a raising of the land-tax at every reassessment, and a gradual impoverishment of the mass of the peasantry. But even more striking is the increase in the tribute—the large sums remitted annually to this country in payment of the interest on debt, on the charges, pensions, &c., &c.—payments which, being made without economic return, not only fall heavily on India, but oblige her to sell cheaper and buy dearer throughout her whole foreign trade. In 1811 the excess of exports over imports, which gives a rough measure of the tribute, amounted to three millions sterling. In the last years of this century it has reached some twenty millions. In one year (1894-5) it amounted to 34,000,000 rupees. Such a drain continued year after year would impoverish the richest nation on the face of the earth. And since during the century this drain has increased sevenfold—it takes some courage for Englishmen to face the total of the century—it cannot be maintained that the economic situation of India has improved during this period. The tale of the economic evolution of India during the nineteenth century has been one of decline, impoverishment, and degradation.

Yet the partnership must struggle on, and one cannot but welcome signs of a tendency to check the most ruinous sources of expenditure and to institute some reparative treatment. The cooling down of the war fever, the diminished ardour for “reproductive” works, the pronouncement of Viceroy and Secretary of State in favour of revised arrangements for enabling the officials to come into closer contact with the people—these and other manifestations suggest hopes of a happier future. If the authorities could only persuade themselves to concede to Indians an open career on frankly equal terms, in accordance with the spirit of the Act of William and the Proclamation of Victoria, the coming century might witness a far grander advance than can be discerned in the century that is closing. The thing is to utilise in every department the energies and capacities that are so lamentably repressed or diverted into less profitable channels. That, beyond all other considerations, is the lesson of the failures of the century in India.

RETROSPECT OF A YEAR.

TO-DAY the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Indian National Congress is in session at Lahore. This year, by some strange omission, which is all the more gratifying that it is unexpected, the British public have not been impressively assured that the Congress is dying of inanition. The prophecies of last year were too promptly and ludicrously belied for comfortable repetition. The Mahometans, after all, did not manifest hostility; they did not even stand aloof; on the contrary, they put in an appearance in largely disproportionate numbers—over 400 Mahometan delegates in an assembly of rather less than 1,000—and they joined with the Hindu delegates in a spirit of the warmest cordiality. “The meaning of all this,” we wrote (Jan. 5, INDIA, vol. xiii., p. 4), “clearly is, that the Congress is not, as the discredited anticipatory meeting of Mahometans professed, a divisive force, but, on the contrary, is welding together the best elements of both communities into a common Indian national power, far greater than either, and far more powerful for the advancement of the best interests of both.” Nor did the power and efficiency of the discussions of the Congress furnish the smallest support to the gratuitous malice of those that derided its vitality. We do not entertain the least doubt that the proceedings of the present Session will be equally harmonious and no less virile, well-balanced, well-informed, and fruitful. This year, too, there is a much more hopeful retrospect than there has been for many a year past. Political memories, it is true, are proverbially short; but, however others may forget or ignore, the leaders of the Congress are not likely either to forget or to ignore the various main steps of distinct progress in the movement since last December. Nor are they likely

to fail to discern the true lines of cause and effect in the continuous advancement of the principles which the Congress has consistently advocated.

Naturally enough there is here and there a sign of impatience. It is not every adherent of a political cause that readily appreciates the slowness of fulfilment—that understands the difficulties to be overcome, and recognises the essential advantages of even prolonged delays. When the question is the political re-birth of a nation under the complex and multifarious conditions of India, the marvel is, not that so little progress has been made, but that there is so much progress to record. To be sure, there is an ebb as well as a flow in the political tide, and impatient friends as well as foes are apt to be more attracted by the ebb. The judicious observer, it ought not to be necessary to say, gives careful attention to both before drawing his conclusions. A twelvemonth, indeed, is an absurdly small space of time wherein to look for advance; still some seed sown in the past may be found to have come to the harvest. Often, indeed, the harvest is nearer than the husbandman expects. There are Indians that will remember how a certain “dreamer of the West” ventured to “look forward to the time when they would have a Secretary of State and a Governor-General of India who would recognise clearly that it was impossible to govern the Indian Empire without the cordial co-operation of the Indian people, and who would send for the President of the National Congress” and take counsel with him; and that, at the next Session of Congress, at Madras, Mr. A. M. Bose, in his Presidential Address, said:—

“After this, we must speak no longer of the dreamy East. It appears that there is a dreamy West, too, and Professor Muriison is one of its dreamers. I am afraid it will be a very long time before that dream of the friendly conference he speaks of will come true.

Yet no sooner had Mr. Romesh Dutt, the President of the very next Congress, reached Calcutta from Lucknow than he was invited to friendly conference with Lord Curzon. There was at least the first step—so little anticipated only a twelvemonth before. It is not always in the darkest hour that hope is farthest away. What greater discouragement to impatience than the whole career of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji? What greater persuasive to active, resolute, tenacious effort, in full assurance of the final triumph of truth and justice?

We might almost content ourselves now with reprinting our article on “Signs of Advance,” which appeared in these columns less than five months ago (Aug. 10, INDIA, vol. xiv., p. 76). There we pointed out the triumph—the long deferred and persistently fought-for triumph—of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji in bringing about the enquiry by Royal Commission into the financial expenditure of the Indian revenues in England and in India. For many a long year had Mr. Dadabhai advocated such an enquiry before the necessity, or rather the desirability, of it was officially admitted, even in a modified form, and even by a Liberal Minister; and even then some half a dozen years had to elapse before the Commission reported. “We are well aware,” we wrote (Aug. 10), “that a few esteemed friends of India, including educated Indians of strenuous purpose, abandoned hope long before the labours of the Commission took final shape.” We have never quarrelled with them on that score, but we do insist that Mr. Dadabhai chose the better part and pegged away, bating nor hope nor heart. We also acknowledged that those of weak faith “even now hold the results of the Commission as of little value or importance”; but we maintain now, as we stated then, that such a view is a great misapprehension of the actual position, and indeed “mere blindness to the main issues patent on the very face of the Report.” “There could,” in fact, “be no more striking proof that there is abundant hope in every genuine and energetic effort.” And by that judgment we stand.

Again, we pointed out the marked change that has come over Lord Curzon's views as to the prosecution of the Forward Policy on the North-West Frontier of India. Instead of burning to confer with Russia on the banks of the Oxus, he is to-day probably the most strenuously pacific man in the country. But for this change of attitude, induced undoubtedly by most cogent grounds of responsibility, it is more than likely that we should by this time have been involved in another expedition against the Mahsud Waziris. Yet, beyond doubt, Lord Curzon is consistently holding by the policy of keeping British Indian troops outside tribal territory and building up British

Indian strength within British Indian territory. Here, surely, is the first indispensable step towards the realisation of the fundamental Congress idea of all future internal reform. And with this most wise policy we may connect the new principle of payment from the British treasury in all cases where Indian troops are employed out of India on expeditions in which India is not very directly interested. But for the Congress movement it does seem exceedingly improbable that the bad old system of injustice would not still be maintained. It would have cost but a very slight exercise of official ingenuity to develop the exiguous suggestions that were advanced in some quarters to show a basis of Indian interest in South Africa whereon to rest an argument for payment of the Indian contingent out of the Indian revenues. Nor would there have been much more difficulty in the case of China, or even in the case of Somaliland. Yet no serious attempt was made by the Home Government in any one of these recent cases to dispute the contention that all the expenses, ordinary as well as extraordinary, incurred in respect of Indian troops engaged on those expeditions should be paid out of the Home Exchequer. This unquestioning acceptance of a just principle, this departure from the arbitrary application of an unjust practice, may be confidently attributed to the political and moral interest awakened in India and in Great Britain by the operations of the Congress and of its British friends.

Further, we have remarked again and again during the year the friendly attitude of the Viceroy towards the Indians. The most recent expression of this just friendliness is the most open and emphatic; and it is only too plain that Lord Curzon's outspokenness at Bombay has shocked and frightened the Anglo-Indian clique, who imagine India to have been providentially made for them and not for the Indians, who regard the Indians as fit only for hewers of wood and drawers of water, and whose statesmanship is summed up in repression. Now and again it may be politic for the Viceroy to yield to this evil *force majeure*, but on the point of just and civil treatment of Indians and fair consideration of their deliberate representations he can yield to no compromise, except at the peril of disaster. If these blind guides cannot see the obvious political dangers ahead, the Viceroy has shown that he at least can. Fortunately the Secretary of State is with him in his desire to reform the idiotic system that binds the officials in "scientific" chains to their desk, "so overburdening them with correspondence, reports, and returns that they are really imprisoned in their offices for the greater part of the day." The idea is to enable the officials "to get more time to give to the essentials of administration"—a primary object that the "advanced and scientific system," so gravely contrasted with the system of previous generations, appears effectually to exclude. Such an official acknowledgment of wrong lines of procedure—exemplified also in the Government Resolution on the Plague policy—should count for much, provided it be followed up by an effective effort to get the new system into actual operation. If Lord Curzon succeed in these associated reforms—in securing that officials shall come into free contact with Native thought and opinion, and shall treat Indians and their views on the same footing as Englishmen and their views—then we should hear no more of the gulf that now lies so menacing between the rulers and the ruled. The educated Indians, as represented at the Congress meetings, and always, have professed themselves most anxious to co-operate, not to contend, with the Government. Such is their attitude to-day. They can assist the Government in ways in which the Government cannot assist itself—in ways, moreover, that are essential to good administration, and in which their co-operation is beyond price. The only question now is whether Lord Curzon is strong enough to stand by his word. We hope and believe that he is. We hope and believe that the Bombay utterances herald a new era of conciliation, consolidation, and national development.

If it must be admitted that the Secretary of State has successfully resisted all pressure in favour of a National Grant in sympathy with the distressed Indians of the famine districts, it is still well worth notice how widely and cordially the proposal has been supported in the British Press. And not only this proposal; during the year there has been an immense expansion of journalistic interest in the important questions of Indian administration. The evidences of this increased interest can be traced

readily in the pages of this journal. And so a corresponding interest manifested by the people at large is markedly demonstrated in our reports of the public meetings held under the auspices of the British Committee. It is not for us to attempt to apportion the credit or to specify the causes of this encouraging improvement during the year; it is enough for us that the improvement has taken place. But it may be accepted for certain that the main part of the progress is connected with the Indian National Congress, through the labours of the British Committee. True, as the recent Manifesto put it, "the work in England is great and difficult, and the workers are few; and these are overtaxed both as to physical endurance and financial resources." We shall, of course, not abate our courage one jot—though it must be recognised that the speed of the engine depends on the supply of fuel. But in view of the clearer evidences of success developed during the past twelvemonth, the workers here entertain a confident hope that they will be reinforced so as to be able to carry forward the work with still greater energy and with still greater results during the years to come.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

OUR Christmas moralists have been hard put to it during the last few days to reconcile the texts of the season with the actualities of warfare. Some have tried to ignore the latter, and others to adopt the former. Of the two, the grammarians have perhaps been more successful than the optimists. They take the angelic message and show that, if literally translated, its tidings of peace on earth would be seen to have been strictly confined to men of goodwill. So much having been established, the rest should be easy—especially to people who believe, with an eminent preacher, that the Boers are beyond the pale of civilisation. A less subtle mode of self-consolation has been to persuade ourselves, in the words of Mr. Auberon Herbert, that Boer and Briton are killing one another in a Christian spirit. Unfortunately, the phrase has earlier associations. Everyone remembers the Irish zealots who condemned one another to the nether regions in the name of religion. The fact is that the continuance of the war over a second Christmas day has been a bitter disappointment to the whole country. A year ago no one could have imagined that the next anniversary of the great Christian festival would still be darkened by the South African war cloud.

As to what is really happening at the front, the country, like Lord Salisbury, is still in the dark. London has been full of sinister rumours, pointing to the imminence of widespread rebellion in Cape Colony. Some risings there must have been; otherwise the Boer invaders would by this time have found the country too hot to hold them. We are told that the invasion is spreading, which, as Mr. Chamberlain would say, is nonsense. If it means anything, it means that the invading force is gathering reinforcements from the Cape Dutch. Lord Kitchener continues to send reassuring despatches, but his deeds are, perhaps, more significant than his words. It is at least a suggestive circumstance that he should have thought it expedient to proceed to De Aar to deal in person with the audacious invaders. The whole situation is felt to be one of increasing perplexity and undiminished danger.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Chamberlain's latest scheme of municipal self-government will probably be allowed to fall into abeyance. There is, indeed, no indication of any attempt on the part of the authorities in South Africa to give effect to the Colonial Secretary's policy of conciliation. The farm burnings may have been stopped. Indeed, not many farms can have been left to burn. But the promised proclamation has not yet been issued—the proclamation that was to be printed in three languages and to offer the Boers assurance of magnanimous and even generous treatment under the British flag. "What has become of the document?" asks Sir William Harcourt. "Has it been stifled in Cape Town?" The query suggests its own reply. Sir Alfred Milner is believed to have addressed a remonstrance to the Government against Mr. Chamberlain's precipitancy, and the course of events indicates that the Government have sustained Sir Alfred Milner. It is quite possible, too, that in delaying, if not resisting, the promised policy of conciliation, Lord Salisbury is acting on the advice of his son, Lord Edward Cecil, whose return from

South Africa has been followed by a sudden and singular display of energy at the War Office.

Lord Roberts is to have a public reception after all. It would be interesting to know the inner history of the fluctuations which have swayed the Government in relation to this matter. First they would, and then they wouldn't. A suspicion prevails that there was at one time a half-formed intention in the minds of Ministers to add Lord Roberts to the long list of their military scapegoats. Sneering allusions to "unfortunate phrases," used by the Commander-in-Chief in his references to the "end of the war," began to appear in unexpected places, while the Government, at the same time, were vigorously praised in the Ministerial journals for their good sense in discouraging untimely demonstrations of popular joy. But the chorus is now in a different key. Public opinion has overborne Ministerial discretion, and when Lord Roberts arrives in London next Thursday he will be received by the Prince of Wales and an imposing escort, and on his way to Buckingham Palace will, doubtless, be welcomed by some hundreds of thousands of people.

Unless the Chancellor of the Exchequer has devised some new means, since last April, of circumventing the vigilant and elusive dealer in dutiable commodities, he will probably introduce his next year's Budget almost at the beginning of the session. Heavy additional taxation is anticipated, and as soon as the date of the Budget becomes known there is certain to be a repetition of the extraordinary rush of last spring to release goods from bond and so evade the increased duties. An unprecedented deficit is one of the probabilities of the financial year. Economic statistics show that, quite apart from the war, the ratio of expenditure in relation to the national trade has lately been going up by leaps and bounds. People who sneer at the Manchester school will, no doubt, be gratified to learn that within the last quarter of a century our population has increased by twenty-five per cent., our army expenditure by seventy-seven per cent., and our naval expenditure by 170 per cent. If the war charges were included in this calculation the increase in respect of armaments would have to be put down at no less than 276 per cent.

One of the most remarkable of recent political events has been the unanimity with which men of all parties have condemned Lord Salisbury's exaltation of the Stock Exchange as an ideal recruiting-ground for Ministerial service. Even the *Spectator* shakes its grandmotherly head over this development of the commercial spirit. Mr. Gibson Bowles bluntly tells Lord Hardwicke that while he may be either Under-Secretary for India or a stockbroker, he certainly ought not to be both. And to crown all, Mr. Lucas, another loyal Conservative, in protesting against the attacks on Mr. Chamberlain's financial relations, actually draws a line between the position of the Colonial Secretary and that of Lord Hardwicke, by no means to the advantage of the latter. These are ominous symptoms, and both Lord Salisbury and his protégé would do well to accept them as a storm signal.

De Wet and the weather have alike conspired against a whole-hearted enjoyment of the Christmas festivities this week; but of the two the weather, perhaps, has caused more exasperation than the movements of our ubiquitous enemy. Fog and rain, varied by storms of wind, have made up the meteorological history of the season. Christmastide is always quiet in London, but this year it seems to have been quieter than usual. A fireside festival, its devotees were, perhaps, never so numerous as on Tuesday last, when London town, throughout the greater part of the day, remained almost as peaceful as a country village. But now the theatres are again in full swing, and the tide of popular amusement is rising to its height. A sign of the times, worthy of note in this connexion, is the virtual banishment of pantomime to the provinces and the suburbs. Drury Lane is the only central theatre in London this year at which pantomime of the glorified music-hall type is to be seen.

The Famine Commission appointed to enquire into certain points connected with the recent famine consists of the following four members:—Sir Antony MacDonnell and Mr. Bourdillon (Bengal); Mr. Nicholson (Madras); and the Dewan of Jaipur. Mr. S. H. Butler will act as secretary to the Commission. The enquiry is expected to last two months, and the members will make a tour in the provinces.—REUTER (Calcutta, Dec. 19).

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

THE CONGRESS AND THE "MANIFESTO."

MR. MONTEATH ON NATIVE OFFICIALS.

MORE CURRENCY TROUBLES.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

BOMBAY, December 8.

The Viceregal tour is now drawing to a close. Ere this letter reaches you the telegraph will have flashed the news of Lord Curzon's return to his capital midst the cordial welcome of the people and the usual pomp and pageantry of State. He has literally proved himself a "prancing pro-consul." But when the Roman official returned to the capital he carried with him his triumphs and trophies. No doubt an Indian Viceroy carries trophies also, but they are confined to illuminated parchments and caskets, which peaceful citizens lay before him as the homage due to the representative of the greatest Mistress of the world. His triumphs are bloodless. Collected, they form no doubt a varied museum of Indian art, while the interminable speeches might well be culled for an anthology by a literary artist. For, in the case of our present Viceroy, some of his speeches are very clever mosaics, imbedded here and there with bright gems of sterling statesmanship. But one looks eagerly now for some practical realisation of his rhetorical professions.

Legislative activity will recommence. And Congress activity will be coeval with it. If the Viceroy garners addresses, the people do something better. Their own chosen men assemble in an unconventional way in one or other of the great cities of the Empire, hold their annual convention, elect their own president, and make earnest speeches on important affairs of State, on which they are anxious to throw more light. It is of course, a "microscopic minority"; but Lord Curzon has wisely declared that the minority cannot be allowed to be neglected. It must be counted with for the better governance of the country. Lord Dufferin snapped his fingers, with a sneer, at this minority, forgetting that statesmen in every age and in every clime have had always to reckon with a minority. Even from the history of his own country, during a hundred years, not to go further back, he should have known that there is special legislation for minorities. Minorities have ever a potent voice in Parliament. And yet he strangely forgot to listen to the voice of this minority, which in reality represents the aristocracy of Indian intellect! But the whirligig of Time brings in its revenges, and the minority, wisely guided, becomes a potent political factor—too potent not to be heard and respected. But what a strange irony of fate that it should be reserved for a Conservative Viceroy to do that which a Liberal Viceroy scouted! Thus fossilised Whiggism shows itself more adverse to India's progress than democratic Conservatism, of which Lord Randolph Churchill—a name gratefully remembered—was the archetype, and which Lord Curzon also represents.

Thus, it seems to us Indians, the British Congress Committee could not have issued its Manifesto at a more opportune hour. It synchronises admirably with the recent declaration of the Viceroy in the Hall of this great city, and is a new Standard round which to rally all the forces of the Congress in its onward march of progress. Indians have derived from it fresh stimulus, of which they are sure to make good use. It is a distinct step in advance to the ultimate goal, and as such it is gratefully welcomed. Therefore our motto is to march onward in spite of all difficulties and obstacles. So long as the Congress cause is righteous and its agitation legitimate, its ultimate triumph is a foregone conclusion. It may be that we may reach the goal slowly and by degrees. But we are under any circumstances bound to reach it, so long as we are true to ourselves, and true to the rulers whom an all-wise Providence has set over us.

Our Anglo-Indian friends here and in Calcutta celebrated, as usual, their St. Andrew's Day. The stock toasts were honoured, and the stock post-prandial speeches were made. But while Calcutta was in excellent form, and with exceeding good taste recognised the stern independence and righteous justice of Lord Curzon, Bombay struck a jarring note. While Sir Allan Arthur and Mr. Sutherland recognised the patience and endurance of Indians in their recent calamity, and eulogised Indian character, our masterful Revenue Member, with fatal

facility of indiscretion, indulged in a vituperation of Indians! Mr. Sutherland, in his eulogy of the Viceroy, naively observed that non-officials know from experience that "some persons and things in India require a good deal of hustling." It is a pity that there was no Mr. Sutherland in the Bombay Town Hall on St. Andrew's Day to give Mr. Monteah a "hustling," which he could be made to remember for his life. Speaking of famine and famine work, he extolled his own officers, and had nothing but slurs for the poor ill-paid native subordinates. He threw doubts on their integrity, and condemned them as unfit for responsible posts in emergency. A more sweeping generalisation of a most unfounded and odious character could not have been made. It is not a matter of surprise therefore that the Indian Press is expressing its annoyance in sharp criticism of this utterance of the narrow-minded colleague of Lord Northcote. Has he gone back over the history of the writers of the East India Company? Has he forgotten the early history of the civilians? Has he forgotten the reasons which prompted Lord Cornwallis to fix a schedule of the salaries of civilians? Are Englishmen of the same position of life, and drawing similar salaries in Mr. Monteah's country, of better ethics than the Indians he so ill-naturedly denounced? Is human nature in the rest of the world different? But it is of no use to make further comment on this distasteful subject. The Indian Press is angry, and I see that both the *Bengalee* and the *Hindu* were prompt to hurl back the insinuation. The latter says: "If this impertinent remark had been made in any other place than Bombay, where" recent examples of British official corruption and demoralisation of Native subordinates are notorious, "and where there was exhibited such lamentable absence of discretion and common sense and incredible capacity to deal with emergencies as were made by the stupendous blundering in the administration of the plague measures, we could have found some excuse for the air of superiority which Mr. Monteah assumed." It is to be hoped that Mr. Monteah's remark has attracted Lord Curzon's attention, so that this fresh attempt at libelling the character of Indian officials may meet with such notice as it deserves. It is a *discreet* interference of this character which embitter the feelings of the ruled, and widens the gulf between them and the rulers which all right-minded persons are so anxious to see contracted. I for one trust that at the coming meeting of the Supreme Legislative Council, the representative of Bombay will quote the remark and interpellate the Government as to its propriety. And it is also to be hoped that a similar interpellation will be put in the Local Legislative Council. The remark ought not to be allowed to pass unchallenged.

Lastly, baffled in its attempt to boycott silver, the Indian Government has been driven to a corner and compelled to admit the irrelevancy of the statement touching the "redundancy" of rupees which was the cause of the closure of the mints. It is becoming inevitable day after day that the Government will have to coin at least from four to five crores of rupees annually to meet the growing requirements of an expanding trade and population. But such a coinage signifies the failure of the currency experiment, which it is so difficult and disagreeable to acknowledge. So the Government is now fumbling about for some device whereby to minimise the use of silver coins in future. With that view it has recently addressed letters to local Chambers of Commerce enquiring whether currency notes could not be popularised to a larger extent than hitherto. It has suggested four different alternatives, which you will have seen in the papers. No doubt the greater the circulation of small notes (of five and ten rupees) the less the expense of silver coinage. But as a matter of fact the inland public, who are the real producers, have no confidence in these notes. With them nothing will go save hard cash in silver and copper. How is our Government going to establish that confidence? And to what extent with that confidence, when established—a remote contingency, indeed—will the mass discontinue the use of silver coins? It may be that fresh facilities of encashment at certain trade or distributing centres may accustom the middlemen to make a larger use of notes and dispense with rupees; but is there the slightest hope that the mass of producers, the agriculturists, will, for many a day, take kindly to the paper money? The fact is the currency measure, or experiment, has proved a huge failure, as the *Statist* said in one of its recent issues, and a failure will it be, and not all the tinkering with note circulation will minimise that failure. What is unsound in principle can never be made sound by legislation or executive orders.

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 22) of the *Investors' Review*:—

Does the Viceroy of India wish us to understand that there is now no famine in that country, and that the people who starved all last summer are now comfortable and well fed? He has stopped his weekly message, and, although economy is necessary in an finance at the present time, his silence can hardly be put down to the need for saving a few rupees a week. Whether he keeps silence or not, private evidence maintains that the distress continues more or less severe over the greater part of the famine region, and promises to emerge again in an acute form next year at many points. What steps are being taken by the Viceroy's Government to prevent a return of famine in the spring? How is it dealing with the land revenue? Has it made any provision for advancing money to the distressed cultivators at moderate rates of interest so as to enable them to acquire some necessary portion of cattle and the seed to put in their land, or are they left to the tender mercies of the village money-lender? We ought to have information about points like these and many more, but none is forthcoming, and by the time the small Commission which has been appointed to report upon the famine has finished its labours, remedial measures may come too late to save many more millions of our fellow-subjects. Meanwhile, and although the Lord Mayor's Fund has been closed, with a happy feeling, doubtless, that England has nobly done its best by giving back about 1 per cent. of what it draws in a single year from India, distress continues and help is in many places as much needed as ever. For this reason we shall continue to keep our little fund before the public.

Subscriptions to our little fund, from which not a penny is devoted 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 ..	£922 15 0
Westbourne Park Indian Circle, per J. B. W.	
Chapman	0 4 8

Total to date £922 19 8

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

LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

THE LATE BAKSHI JAISHI RAM.

TO THE EDITOR OF "INDIA."

SIR,—The following extract from a letter which I have received from a near relative of the late Bakshi Jaishi Ram will interest all who esteemed that true patriot and devoted worker for his country. He died, as he had lived, true to the cause of his countrymen, and his countrymen will not forget him.

Since September 25 he had been touring in the Province, collecting subscriptions for the Congress. On October 22, he returned from Ferozpur; and the following day he had an ordinary attack of colic pain, but that was the beginning of the end.

After three days he got quite healthy and had a drive with me to the Congress Hall on the 28th where he had the last view of "that mightiest outcome of Punjabi generosity, and the healthy and noble fruit of his own brilliant exertions."

On the 29th there was a relapse of the illness, and the next day he grew worse. That day the Honourable Surendra Nath Banerjee was here on a lecturing campaign. . . . "I wish I were present there, hearing the speech and having a last view of my dear Congress friends." These words were followed by a flow of tears from his eyes.

The best medical practitioners in Lahore were in attendance, and in spite of their assurance to the contrary, he was sure, even some ten hours before his death, that his end was come. At about 7:30 when being asked whether he felt any pain, he replied: "All pains are gone now."

He took leave of us and his friends ten minutes before his death, chanted the holy *Gayatri Mantra*, and expired at 8:35 p.m. saying "Om, Shanti, Shanti, Shanti!"

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

ROMESH DUTT.

December 18, 1900.

THE NEW UNDER-SECRETARY FOR INDIA.

PUBLIC OFFICE AND STOCK-EXCHANGE MEMBERSHIP.

Speaking on the Address (December 6), Lord Rosebery referred to the appointment of the Earl of Hardwicke as Under-Secretary for India in these terms:—

Of all the changes made in the Government, none has given me so much pleasure as that of a young and noble lord who has become an Under-Secretary of this House, and whose career has been most creditable to any young man of the day. But he has of late been connected with the Stock Exchange. I feel confident that he severed that connexion before becoming a member of the Government—not that, if he remained a member of the Stock Exchange, I have the slightest apprehension that he would do anything dishonourable. He is a man of solid and pure and honour, but I say that a connexion once established between the Government and the Stock Exchange—honourable employment as the Stock Exchange is—is a precedent full of peril to the interests of this country. (Hear, hear.) There has been no connexion between the Government and the Stock Exchange since the time when Lord North was in power, and when he stimulated and rewarded the flagging energies of his party by leaving loose to them the leverage of the difference between the low rate and the rate of public loans. I venture to say that, though those instances are in themselves perhaps innocent for the moment, and are free from objection as regard the individuals to whom I have referred, they are full of the greatest danger to the very source of political life.

In reply to Lord Rosebery, the Duke of Devonshire stated that Lord Hardwicke, before accepting office, had made arrangements by which, at the end of the year, he would cease to be "an active partner" in the firm with which he was connected. On December 14, Lord Hardwicke himself made the following personal explanation:—

The facts with regard to myself are these. About a month ago the noble Marquis the Prime Minister offered me this appointment. I pointed out to him, through his private secretary, and personally to the Secretary of State for India, that although I would undertake to relinquish all active share in the business of the firm of which I am a partner, I could not undertake to sever my connexion with that firm, and I will explain why. Eighteen or twenty years ago a private bill was passed through Parliament known as the Hardwicke Estate Act. This bill transferred to two trustees the administration of the estates, and it seems almost like the relentless irony of fate that after ten years these estates should pass into the hands of the mortgagees, who become possessors of all that the Act was passed to secure to myself. I was left without a shilling, and I had to consider what I should do—which way I should turn. I decided to embark on a career in the City, and it is eight years since my connexion with my present firm commenced. I do not say that the course I elected to pursue was the only course open to peers who early in life find themselves involved in financial embarrassment. I am told there are pleasanter and easier methods of rehabilitating one's fortune than to work for one's living in the City. However that may be, I took that course, and I am very glad of the connexion I have with the Stock Exchange. In the City a man can gain experience and knowledge of men and manners which is not easily obtainable elsewhere. The plain fact of the matter is that I cannot afford to cut off my connexion with the City for the sake of a few years of office—no, not even to oblige Lord Rosebery. What I have decided and arranged is this. I remain a partner in my firm and a member of the Stock Exchange, with the right to return in the future, but in the meantime I shall never enter the Stock Exchange, and I shall take no active part in any of the business of my firm. This arrangement cannot be carried out in a day, and therefore I asked to be permitted to defer taking up my duties until the new year, and to this arrangement the Prime Minister assented. The noble Lord the Under-Secretary for the Colonies has kindly undertaken to discharge my duties at the India Office in the meantime. As it seems the Opposition are making much of this personal line of attack I have been scrupulously careful to avoid even the most formal connexion with the India Office at present, and I have nothing but the most harmless and natural act may be made a pretext for unjust insinuations. (Hear, hear.) When I heard Lord Rosebery's speech I took the earliest opportunity of offering my resignation to the Prime Minister, but the noble Marquis would not accept my resignation. . . . The noble Earl had considered past administration at the India Office. I think he would have left alone the question of my appointment. . . . The Finance Office, where I have been for some time, is of the India Council, whose members have it in their power to use any special knowledge they may have for their own personal advantage in the City through the medium of the Stock Exchange. Now who did Mr. Gladstone appoint as financial member of the India Council in 1880? Mr. B. Currie, a leading banker in active business, and a member of the important bank of Glyn, Mills, Currie and Co. Lord Rosebery was a member of that Government. Did he protest against that appointment? (Cheers.) Again, in the same Administration, who did Mr. Gladstone appoint as Under-Secretary for India? He appointed Mr. Kynaston Cross, a partner in a firm of cotton merchants, and it may not be interesting to your Lordships to be reminded that the two principal interests of the India Office during the life of that Government were the fall in silver and the cotton duties. Did Lord Rosebery point out to Mr. Gladstone that the purity of his Ministry was in question? (Lord cheers.) However that may be, I do know that the practical commercial experience and the ability of Mr. Cross were of great value to the Secretary of State, in one of the most serious economic crises which India has passed through. I do not mean to say that I shall be of special value to the Secretary of State, but I fall to see why any practical experience I may have gained in the City is to be considered a disqualification. (Renewed cheers.) Even upon the India Council

now there are two gentlemen of conspicuous ability, and both of unquestionable integrity, but who are both members of business firms in the City of London. From Lord Rosebery's speech we may assume that he has only the smallest estimate of matters connected with the Stock Exchange, or he would know that a man does not require to be a member of the Stock Exchange to make use of special knowledge for speculative purposes. Anyone in the public service, from the Prime Minister to a permanent secretary, can in ten minutes' time send an order for the purchase or sale of any security in the world without anyone being one whit the wiser. If, however, the noble Earl, on high technical and moral grounds, holds that there is danger in a member of the Stock Exchange—who, after all, is only the agent who executes the orders of others—being a member of the Government, what are we to say to the stockbroker's clients? If a stockbroker is to be debared, surely you must debar the client also. Does Lord Rosebery hold that a man who has at any time been engaged in speculative operations is not worthy to be a Minister of the Crown, far less an Under-Secretary? While I was made the peg upon which Lord Rosebery hung his argument, the argument was obviously directed against the Prime Minister, for it was he, not I, who made the choice of the Under-Secretary, a choice which the noble Earl thinks so fraught with peril to the public service. I have endeavoured to the best of my ability to place before your Lordships my position in the City, and I thank your Lordships for the indulgent hearing accorded to me. I regret the necessity which has compelled my first utterance at this table to take the form of a personal explanation. (Lord cheers.)

(The Earl of ROSEBERY, advancing slowly to the table, said:—

I contest the speech of the noble Lord has placed me in a position of considerable difficulty, because no one can have heard it without the liveliest sympathy with the position he has disclosed. I was aware of that position so far as regards the private Act of Parliament of which he spoke when I addressed your Lordships the other night, and it was my knowledge of the circumstances attending that Act and its relation to himself which caused me to speak in terms which, I think, may be described as warm and generous with regard to his private position. Under the circumstances I am, therefore, in a position of great delicacy, because, as the noble Earl pointed out, I spoke of him as I felt—in warm and generous terms; but I also asserted a public principle. Now I am sorry to say there is nothing in what the noble Lord has said which shakes my maintenance of the public principle which I have laid down. . . . When the noble Lord asked me if I maintain the principle that no member of a firm upon the Stock Exchange should be a Minister of the Crown, I was obliged to say that I maintain the principle. I say it with the deepest regret. I do not mean by this to disparage the Stock Exchange. Many of my friends are connected with the Stock Exchange, and I know what a high and honourable pursuit it is or may be. But that is not the position. The point is whether connexion with a firm in the Stock Exchange is compatible with the position of a Minister of the Crown. It has never been so held in the past. I hope it never will be so held in the future, because, though I am perfectly certain the noble Earl is as capable of maintaining his position as a Minister as any of those who have occupied that high and honourable position, it is undesirable in these days that there should be any circumstances connected with the Ministry which should in any degree lend the slightest foundation to any suspicion affecting their honour as Ministers. Lord Hardwicke referred to past precedents. I do not thoroughly carry them in my mind. He said that even now there are two members of the India Council connected with firms. Members of the India Council are not, so to speak, members of the current Administration of the country, but they are in the position of advisers, and I refer them to the Minister responsible for the government of India, and under those circumstances they do not come into the same category as those more responsible Ministers who sit in this House or in the House of Commons. The Minister who makes these appointments on the Council is responsible for them. The noble Lord referred to an appointment by Mr. Gladstone in 1880. In 1880 I was not a member of that Government, but there is the noble Duke of Devonshire, who can give every information. Later on I did become an Under-Secretary, but I do not think it is the practice of Prime Ministers to enquire of Under-Secretaries as to the wisdom of appointments, because Under-Secretaries are naturally apt to be critical of those who are placed over them. Mr. Gladstone, from what I know of him, I am quite sure, must have made himself perfectly clear that there was no actual connexion between the firm doing business with India and Mr. Cross. I only intended to lay down a public principle, and I say it down again to day.

The Marquis of SALISBURY assured Lord Hardwicke that nothing that had passed would diminish in any degree the very high estimate in which he is held by his party. He said:—

I not only rise for the purpose of saying that his position is too well established to be shaken by any action of this kind, but I rise because I think that what the noble earl opposite is pleased to call a principle of mine that, coming from his lips, is a new principle to be taken on the part of this House. The noble earl has not stated any precedent for the doctrine he laid down, because I know that they rest at the present moment upon his authority alone. I trust that nothing which he has said will cause any noble friend Lord Hardwicke to alter his conduct in the slightest degree. I do not believe that the principles laid down are sound, and I think that if they are held as such they will rather be an excuse for gratuitous and wanton attacks upon individuals than give any advantage to the Administration of the Queen. I am not prepared to say that I have precedents. I cannot exactly understand in what form he would require to be written down the new doctrine he wishes to add to do of public politics. I understand a stockbroker to be a person who sells or buys stocks on the orders of somebody else. I have heard nothing to induce me to think that stockbrokers are in any special

manner speculators in public companies or firms. On the contrary, I believe that there is far greater speculation in those who are the clients of the stockbrokers than in the stockbrokers themselves. My public friend is a sleeping partner in a stockbroking firm—that is to say, he has invested money in this firm. Are you going to say that everyone who has invested money in the business of a British merchant, and that British merchant goes occasionally upon the Stock Exchange, is to be deemed incapable of holding any office under the Queen? That is an absolutely new doctrine. I cannot help feeling that in raising this doctrine the noble earl has taken a superficial similarity of words as expressing meanings they do not really convey, and has made a sort of slip-trap for himself against stockbrokers. Because their business is conducted on the Stock Exchange there are no more guilty of any commercial sin than any other members of the mercantile community. Now as to directors. There are directors and directors. There are directors against whose business it would be impossible to raise any objection, and whose business does not lead them into any conflict with the officials of the Crown. One or two of my colleagues, however, have thought it right to retire from the position of director lest any sort of suspicion should arise. But that does not give any general licence to attack all directors, nor have we a right to brand all stockbrokers as dishonest. These statements, where they serve no other than party purposes, are not of advantage to the public service, and are not calculated to preserve its purity. It must be borne in mind that the field of selection is small in this country. We are the only country in which Ministers are chosen either from this or the other House of Parliament, and if you add to the difficulties arising from that circumstance the further condition that no one who has any official connection with any form of commercial business shall be capable of being selected, it would not only inflict a very undesired stigma upon an honourable profession, but would very much diminish the power of finding persons capable of serving the Queen in her administrative offices. (Hear, hear.) The difficulty of our administration is not that people who are available to take part in it know too much about business, but that, as a rule, they know too little. They belong generally to a class of society who are not brought much into connexion with business matters, and it would be unfortunate if we were to do anything which might discourage mercantile men of high standing from taking office. I do not subscribe to the language the noble Earl has held on the subject, and I earnestly hope that neither he nor any other person will take any course which may tend to limit the freedom and opportunity which men of knowledge and experience may have of entering into the political service of the Crown. (Hear, hear.)

The EARL OF ROSBERY, with reference to the statement of the noble Marquis that there was no precedent for the principle he had laid down:

Deceived to point out that there was the very recent precedent laid down by Mr. Gladstone's Government in 1892, when all its members were required to relieve themselves of their directorships, and did so, and were not in any respect less efficient men or business.

The MARQUIS OF SALISBURY: That is not the point. The point is that men will not accept political office if they are compelled to sacrifice for it the means of livelihood they had previously held. (Hear, hear.)

The EARL OF ROSBERY: It is exactly the point, because they accepted office on those terms.

A stockbroker writes to the *Westminster Gazette* (December 21) on the subject of stockbrokers as Ministers of the Crown:

There is hardly any branch of legislation or foreign policy which has not its due effect on some stock. It is the stockbroker's business to assess this effect, which his training enables him to do with some exactness. To see the absurdity of the Hardwicke position you have only to imagine him Minister for Foreign Affairs. A stockbroker associates with stockbrokers; and a Minister stockbroker, although a sleeping partner, might mention to his partners that he thought well of Egyptian United and not commit a crime. Surely in future there must be two sets of Ministerial appointments, one for which stockbrokers are eligible and one for which they are not. When a stockbroker returns to business after his Governmental flight does he forget the knowledge gained, or does it retain its power of inducing likely fluctuations in stocks? The Hardwicke contention that any member of the Government might speculate is beside the point. He would probably blunder if he did, as he never knows the local or Stock Exchange situation, and his mind lacks the Stock Exchange training to enable him to give due importance to this element. Stockholders in Government! The idea to my mind is just rank!

"BHAI" MAX MÜLLER.

SOME TRIBUTES FROM THE INDIAN PRESS.

THE "MADRAS STANDARD."

The news of the death of Professor Max Müller will be received with the most profound sorrow and sympathy wherever his name has been heard, particularly so throughout the length and breadth of India. One of the greatest Sanskritists of his day, the deceased Professor did for the regeneration of Oriental literature more than any other scholar has done, and the numerous works of importance which he has bequeathed to us will assuredly serve as an enduring monument of the vast and disinterested labours of his lifetime. India would do well to institute a fitting memorial to the great scholar whose loss we all mourn so deeply and sincerely.—(Oct. 29).

THE "ADVOCATE OF INDIA."

Both England and India will be much the poorer for the death of Max Müller, for not only was he an ornament of the English literature of our day, and a bulwark of the literature and thought of

ancient India, but he was a rare friend of both countries and their peoples. . . . Of India he was a staunch friend and loving admirer, and from a close study of her ancient language, literature, and religion, came to respect and love the modern Indians as they have rarely been loved by a foreigner. His religious faith, which that great Indian of our day, the late Keshab Chandra, the founder of the Brahmo movement, which is so full of great possibilities for the religious and social, and consequently also political, future of India, well illustrated his large-hearted sympathy for this country. . . . Side by side with this religious movement, Max Müller concerned himself greatly with the Hindu social reform movement with which Mr. Maitland is identified. With this eminent Indian he was intimate, and helped him greatly in his work, both by advice and in a practical way using his influence for him. . . . In political matters Max Müller did not interest himself at all, and wisely. Still the way in which he used his vast influence to bring about the early release of Mr. Tilak from prison showed that he had a heart for India and Indians, and could succour them when in sore need. Certainly they have lost a genuine and true friend of India.—(October 30).

THE "INDIAN HERALD."

To his many friends and admirers in India, the news of Professor Max Müller's death will come in the nature of a personal bereavement. No European did identify himself so closely with Indian culture and civilisation, none was a more diligent student of India's ancient literature and philosophy, none drank so copiously at the spring of India's learning and lore, and held up the same refreshing draught to the dried and parched lips of a thirsty world, as the late Professor Max Müller. . . . And while the whole of India, standing by his grave with uncovered head, pay his memory the tribute of a year, let us pray Heaven that the soul that has just winged its flight Heavenwards may find its way into the abode of peace and divine bliss!—(October 31.)

THE "LABORE TRIBUNE."

The magnitude of the services which he has directly or indirectly rendered to this country it is hardly possible to overstate, and the great and cordial sympathy which he has shown for the people of India in the pages of the last work of his life, "*And Lang Syne*," will live in their grateful memories. It is only said the Honourable Babu Savendranath Banerjee in his memorable address, on Tuesday last, that Professor Max Müller was the most illustrious exponent of ancient India. By his death the great uniting link between the East and the West is severed.—(Nov. 1).

THE "HINDU."

The death of Professor Max Müller, though at an advanced age of seventy-seven, will be viewed by educated Indians as nothing short of a national loss. There is no European name so well-known to the Hindus as that of Professor Max Müller, the great *svami* who translated and edited their Sacred Book. He is held by the Hindus in such veneration that his name has been translated as "*Moksha Muler*"—"a guide to Heaven"—an honour which the Hindus would never have bestowed on him but for his eminent attainments in the sacred language and literature of their country. There have been acute differences of opinion in the interpretation of the same parts of our sacred texts between Professor Max Müller and our Pandits. His *Intimate Christian* tendencies prevented him from seeing and appreciating some of their subtleties. But it must be admitted that no man has contributed more towards a better understanding between the East and the West than the eminent Professor. . . . His intimate knowledge of India and Indian literature made him understand the true nature of the Hindus and gave him the peculiar position of a valuable interpreter of the Hindu nature at times when men working years in India mistook those passing sentiments or made them a plea for curtailment of political rights. Our countrymen would distinctly remember his noble efforts in connection with the memorial presented to the Secretary of State for the shortening of the period of Mr. Tilak's incarceration. This was a unique position which Professor Max Müller held, and it will be long before we can find one fit to replace him—one who trusted and was true to India, and no less loyal to the country of his adoption. Honours flowed thick on the great man whose monumental works have been the theme of the world's admiration. But all these honours are nothing by the side of that esteem with which his memory will be cherished in the heart of Hindus, and the grateful regard in which he will be held, not by the present generation alone, but also by the future generations of this country.—(Nov. 1).

THE "AMRITA BAZAR PATRIKA."

In the death of Professor Max Müller the world has lost one of the most prominent figures of the century. He was specially dear to the Hindus; for, if any man had made them, and their systems of religion respected in the West, it was he. Many Hindus sincerely believed, and the Professor appeared to possess in that belief, that he was in his previous birth a Hindu who had come down to earth to disseminate the teachings of the Vedanta philosophy amongst the Western people. It was, indeed, very comforting to the Hindus to find, as long as the Professor lived, that in inverse proportion to the disesteem which the Europeans, as a rule, felt for them in India, they were winning the esteem and admiration of the world at large through his exertions. . . . The fact that a scholar occupying so prominent a position should openly acknowledge the value and satisfying character of the basis of Hinduism is as remarkable as it must be gratifying to the Hindu community. We wish the Professor had studied the life and teachings of Sri Gauranga with his usual diligence and devotion; for, then, he would have been, perhaps, rewarded with a more beautiful philosophy and a more "satisfying" religion than even the Vedanta.—(Nov. 3).

THE "SUDODHA PATRIKA."

The news of the death of the distinguished translator and commentator of the *Rig Veda* will be received all over the country by

educated Indians with profound sorrow. In him India has lost a true friend, and Europe an Orientalist of unequalled scholarship. Professor Max Müller had never visited India, and his knowledge of the country was derived exclusively from its classics. But his interest in our people was not only that of a scholar but also of an Englishman who believed in a future for our people. He had a very high opinion of the character of the Hindus; and his address on "India, what can it teach us?" is a most complete and generous vindication of the Hindu character against base and unjust attacks of the Anglo-Indians. There is no Englishman or Indian so far as we remember—who has done half as much as he, not only to enlighten English public opinion on matters Indian, but to awaken in the Hindu people a love for their ancient Scriptures which, before he translated them into English, were more or less a sealed book to the majority of our people. . . . We are afraid that it will be long before the void caused by his death amongst the *scholars* of Europe can be adequately filled up.—(November 4.)

THE "MARRIATTA"

The death of Professor Max Müller has deprived England of one of her greatest scholars and India of one of her warmest friends abroad. The death of a cosmopolitan scholar and philanthropist, living up to the age of seventy-seven and having spent most of these years in an active pursuit of religious learning and in sincerely wishing good and nothing but good to the world, has an indescribably melancholy grandeur about it. Nor is it possible to estimate the loss which the nations of the world have to suffer on account of its death, nations which, when he lived, fully recognised his value and greatness by bestowing on him some of the rare honours they had to confer. The case of India stands on a different footing altogether. This general benefactor of the world had claimed India specially as his own and no ordinary reasons would be enough to wholly account for the love he bore for this country. A great Sanskrit poet has said that "some mysterious cause always binds together certain things—their worth; and love and sympathy are never influenced by mere external circumstances." This proposition was never so true as in the case of Professor Max Müller, who, though he had never seen so much as seen India, still regarded this country as his own motherland. India was the one dream of his life and his soul yearned to the last "to see Benares and to bathe in the sacred waters of the Ganges." Can this yearning be accounted for except by supposing that Professor Max Müller was, in the last, but not in this, life a Hindu among the Hindus? To him more than any other Orientalist, India owes that while the regions of her classics were successfully explored to the enlightenment of the Europeans, her good name and her real merits were for ever installed on an intellectual pedestal which was a surprise and wonder to the Christian countries of the West. While enriching the English literature with some of the best ideas from the Sanskrit literature both in religious philosophy as well as the philosophy of religion, Professor Max Müller earned for India esteem, admiration, and regard, which alone are the redeeming features of the present condition of this unfortunate country. It is a mere detail, but pregnant with great significance, that he lent his signature to be the first on a petition which was presented to the Queen on behalf of Mr. Tilak while he was in prison, and which was mainly instrumental in securing his release six months before the end of his term. Here we may be sure that he did not care one way or the other for the politics which brought about Mr. Tilak's incarceration. But the thought of an Oriental scholar, and a gentleman, selling in the prison was a thought unbearable to him; and we have but to see how his interest in the cause of our people poured oil on the troubled waters of both Native and Anglo-Indian feeling. India has lost the warmest friend, the wisest lover, and the most enthusiastic admirer, whose place, alas! will be filled, we know not when.—(November 4.)

"A FAMISHED EMPIRE."

By way of review of Mr. Vaughan Nash's book "The Great Famine and its Causes," Mr. Sidney Webb writes to the *Manchester Guardian*, (December 14), as follows:—

It is one of the many costs of the South African war that it has cut off from England any effluential knowledge of the fact that at least one-quarter of the inhabitants of the British Empire have during the past year been exposed to the almost certain prospect of starvation. Mr. Vaughan Nash has published these articles in a volume, with photographs, a map, and statistical appendices, it is possible to estimate at its true value the very useful contribution that he has made to our knowledge of India.

Mr. Nash's first business was with the famine, and to the famine he has brought with praise-worthy concentration. He does not fill out his book to the weariness of the reader, with preliminary sketches of Indian history from the invasion of Alexander the Great down to the rule of the Strachays. You look in vain for ambitious word-painting of scenery or cities, though the opening chapter on plague-stricken Bombay fingers in the mercury. But the painstaking conscientiousness of his descriptions of what he saw with his own eyes in one famine district after another has an honest eloquence more impressive than rhetoric. It is above all things a cool, unprejudiced, outside glimpse of India as it is seen neither between official blinkers nor through the imperfectly accurate spectacles of the novelist or the poet. Every reader of the book will wish that there were more of it—it will feel how useful and suggestive would have been Mr. Nash's account of the rest of India and the other branches of its administration, had this been within his task. As it is, he has given us a peep at India which will heighten the interest of every reader of Mr. Rudyard Kipling and Mrs. Steel, and which will double our understanding of Sir John Strachey's admirable volumes.

The net effect of the book is disquieting. We have been accustomed to accept the Indian Government's account of its own

success. We know that the *gross mass* of our Indian subjects are miserably poor, but this, we are told, has always been their lot. Badly as they are, we are reassured that they are at any rate better off than they were under the Mogul Empire. We have spread over India, from Cashmere to Cape Comorin, the British peace and the British reign of law. We have for a whole century abundantly supplied India with administrators and generals, lawyers and merchants. We have placed at their disposal, for public and private use, many hundred millions of our capital. We have covered the land with a network of railways, and set up whole systems of irrigation works. We have provided the best possible codes of law and all sorts of Government Departments unknown in England. We have freely endowed the people with schools, dispensaries, and lady doctors. We have, in return, received first-hand after first-hand evidence of "moral and material progress." And now, at the end of the nineteenth century, we find the social organisation that we have been so laboriously and disinterestedly building up failing to fulfil the first and most elementary end of social organisation, namely that the people should be able to live and not die.

For let there be no mistake about it. Mr. Nash's book incidentally but irresistibly drives home the truth that this so-called famine, more extensive than any of which we have authentic record—this loss of an army and army of seven millions of Indians, and this loss of a money famine. Though perhaps a million of our people have died from slow starvation and the diseases attendant thereon, there has been no actual absence of food. Throughout the whole famine India has gone on exporting wheat and rice to Europe. In some previous famines, it is said, whole districts starved with money in the people's pockets, from sheer lack of food within reach and the impossibility of transporting it to time. This has not been the case on the present occasion. What the six million people lacked who perished of the famine was not money but food, and that means food to buy food. In practically every village there has been at all times food for sale, either actually on the spot or within the grain-dealer's reach. But the people, always within easy distance of absolute destitution, had this time exhausted their little store of wealth, parted with their ornaments, pledged up to the hilt their little holdings of land, seen their plough oxen die for want of fodder, and finally had absolutely nothing left to give in exchange for the food in possession of the grain-dealer. It was therefore (under a system of individual property and competition) as inaccessible to them as if it did not exist. And seeing that millions of our people were on the move, travelling away from the famine districts towards the ports for shipment to Europe, that the Bombay Government went on levying taxes from the starving villages, and that the accumulated personal wealth of the princely, priestly, and commercial potentates of India is enormous and scarcely touched by direct taxation, it is not too much to say that hundreds of thousands of our fellow-citizens have been starved to death in the midst of plenty. This is whether we like to admit it or not, clearly the direct result of the particular social organisation that exists in India. Compulsively to teach it, in full-of-living phrase, to "the set of God" is ignorance and blasphemy to boot.

The actual cause of the famine was of course the absence of sufficient rain, just as the actual cause of many hundreds of premature deaths in England last month was the presence of too much rain. But mankind knows that it has to live on the earth, in the presence alternately of too much rain and too little, and it is the aim and purpose of social organisation to remedy our individual helplessness against such conditions, and to see that we may live and may live well. Judged by this test, the social organisation of India is confessedly unsuccessful. As a piece of social mechanism it is very largely a failure. It may be a question whether the task of improving it is not beyond our capacity. But it is, to say the least of it, not a result of our administration of which we have any reason to be proud, that fatally because it did not rain one year many millions of people should, for no fault of their own, find themselves reduced to a destitution of all belongings almost equal to that of the beasts of the jungle, that over six millions should have been kept alive only by Government rations, and that a million should have died from lack of food—not because there was no food, but because they had nothing to buy it with.

It is indeed high time that we "book stop" of our position in India, and called upon the greatest of all bureaucracies to give an account of itself. That the officers of this bureaucracy are able, zealous, incorruptible, and splendidly disinterested is beyond question. But have they *stagnantly made up* their mind how great is their task, and how they are to do it? The theory of social evolutionists takes it that India is included a whole stock of economic ideas which theories which obviously do not fit the circumstances of our Indian Empire. We are busily patching the terribly ancient garment with brand new cloth from English looms. And the new cloth is not even all of one kind. On the one hand is the theory of Administrative Nihilism—that the business of government should be confined to the enforcement of law and order; that it is not its business to keep people alive, let alone see that they are happy; and that, once courts of justice are set up, the play of individual enterprise and free competition will do the rest. This theory has provided India with State and private landlords trying to extract Ricardian rents, peasants free to alienate their holdings, money-lenders selling up whole villages, and a perpetual stream of individual litigants in the law courts, rapidly dissolving away the fundamental tissues of the ancient social structure. The Indian peasants no doubt gain by the abolition of internal warfare and arbitrary exactions. But this does not profit them much if the new order yields them up defenceless to famine wherever the rains fail. On the other hand, if the Government of India is to come into line with modern political science, it is bound to acknowledge as the first duty of government, the maintenance and progressive elevation of the standard of life of the whole people, then the facts revealed in Mr. Nash's book amount to a grave indictment. We ought not to leave the matter where it is. The time has come for a Royal Commission to find out what we are doing in India, and what, during the coming century, we ought to aim at doing.

Open Letters to Lord Curzon ON FAMINES IN INDIA.

By **ROMESH C. PATT, C.L.E.**

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

"Mr. C. Patt's volume is extremely opportune at the present time, and his position, that of an educated and experienced agricultural journalist, enables him to treat two successive years of drought, calls at least for careful examination. Mr. Patt is on this delicate ground in his opinion of the actual damage to England and for the more extended employment of the Indian in civil employ."—*The Times*.

"Mr. Patt succeeds in showing that, on the whole, years of recurrent famine have been marked with those of excessive mortality."—*The Daily News*.

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

"It is a most agreeable attention to Mr. Patt's own convincing and elegant plan, hidden away in the final pages of the appendix, for the creation of such representative institutions as should make the Government of India to utilize native feeling and keep abreast of native opinion."—*The Manchester Guardian*.

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

"It is very true that it is impossible to make India pay for the maintenance of a large army to be used for the general purposes of the Empire, but the support of many high authorities who are by no means to be deceived, as Little India has."—*The Standard*.

LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAORAJI, Esq., President.

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

Apply—

N. M. PARIKH, Esq., Barrister-at-Law,
1, COLETTES, TEMPLE, LONDON, E.C.; or

DR. MULLICK,

85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

CONGRESS GREEN-BOOKS.

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

I. THE SKELETON AT THE JUBILEE FEAST.

By **SIR WILLIAM WILKINSON, Bart., M.P.** (being a Series of Suggestions for the Prevention of Famine in India). Price 7d., post free; in India, by V.P.P., 7 annas.

II. ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

Evidence in Chief of the Five Indian Witnesses. Price 1s. 10d., post free; in India, by V.P.P., 8 s. 4.

III. THE PROPOSED SEPARATION OF JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE DUTIES IN INDIA.

Memorial to the Secretary of State for India. With Two Appendices. Price 1s. 2d., post free; in India, by V.P.P., 14 annas.

LONDON: Published by the BRITISH COMMITTEE, 84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, S.W.

Is Export: Copies may be obtained from D. B. W. & Co., Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

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

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

DR. V. VENOB says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief."—*31st March, 1898.*

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



is what its name implies **FEVER DESTROYER.**

and Cures Malaria, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Chills, etc.

I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jwara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the most reliable for FEVER.

"I know."

"Jwara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now depend upon you for it, do not value my own parcel. I think there is more than made in it.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Send to the London Dispensary Office:—I have much pleasure in stating that your "Gout-Cure" was found very useful by Gouty II. sent in the early stage. U. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman.

Price of "JWARA-HARI" and "GOUT-CURE" 2 annas. Rs. 1/8 Rs. 2/4 Rs. 5, and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors.

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

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

LECTURES and ADDRESSES ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

The British Committee of the Indian National Congress (84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.), is in a position to offer to Political Associations, Literary Societies, Ethical Societies, etc., etc., the services of Indian gentlemen, well qualified to place before an audience the facts relating to the condition of India and its people.

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

Associations or individuals desiring to arrange meetings on Indian questions are requested to communicate with the Secretary as below:—

**BRITISH COMMITTEE of the
INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,**

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

"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 & 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 **MRS. RILLOT STOCK, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.**; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.