

India

FOR THE

No. 100, NEW SERIES.
No. 194, OLD SERIES.]

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1899.

[REGISTERED AS A PRICE..... 2d.
NEWSPAPER. { By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News	261	Lord Lytton's Indian Administration	269
The Coming Congress	264	The Exceeding Poverty of the Indian People	270
Some Lessons of the Chupra Scandal	265	Public Meetings on Indian Questions. The Work of the British Committee	271
Technical Education in India, by the Hon. C. H. Setalvad	266	Advertisements	272
Notes from Bombay	268		
"An Offshoot of the Chupra Case"	269		

NOTES AND NEWS.

IN another column we discuss the lessons of the extraordinary Chupra case. But we desire especially to emphasise the importance of its bearing on the question of the separation of judicial from executive functions. The root of the mischief is seen to lie in the fact that the executive officials had the whole matter in their own hands from first to last, and that they assumed that, once their blow was struck, Narsingh would have neither the pluck nor the means to carry the case to appeal. If Mr. Twidell had been a purely executive officer, is it to be supposed that he would have dared to order, and carry into execution his order, imposing forced labour upon a free community? If Mr. Twidell had possessed no authority over Moulvie Zakir Hossein, is it to be supposed that the Moulvie would have acted with such crawling subservience to him in the conduct of the trial of Narsingh? It was the independence of Mr. Pennell that saved the situation. If the Moulvie had been independent, the situation would in all probability never have arisen. There could be no more illustrative case of the mischievous consequences of the union of executive and judicial functions.

Our cordial congratulations to Miss S. A. Bonnerjee, whose name appears in the class-list of the Final M.B. examination, London University. Miss Bonnerjee is the second daughter of Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, of Calcutta and Croydon, whose eldest daughter is a Licentiate of the Society of Apothecaries and a registered medical practitioner in the United Kingdom.

A fortnight ago, in quoting Lord Curzon's remark on the potency of "moral suasion," we followed the report of the *Times*' Allahabad correspondent. Thus:—

The campaign against plague, I know from experience, if it is to be successful, cannot be a campaign of compulsion, and can only be a campaign of moral suasion.

But the fuller report of the *Bombay Gazette*, now to hand, is still more instructive; for Lord Curzon appears to have added this:—

and that moral suasion can best be exercised by the system of co-operation that I have described.

The exact description is well worth quotation:—

I am sure I only speak the thoughts of Lord Sandhurst when I say how grateful he is to all those members of the Native community who have joined these volunteer committees, who have gone in and out amongst the people, have taught them the true aspect of affairs, have collected subscriptions, and have in fact endeavoured to bring the goodwill and wishes of the Government home to the hearts of the population. And equally I am sure that I am speaking the views of those gentlemen when I say that throughout it has been a source of strength and of help to them to have had over them a Governor as sympathetic—(applause)—and a body of workers as active and self-sacrificing as those who, now for between two and three years have been engaged in the plague operations in this place.

Excellent. But why not "moral suasion"? always—plague or no plague—and "moral suasion" always exercised in the best way, by "the system of co-operation," which Indians have been and are so earnestly pleading for?

There has been a curious unanimity throughout the Indian Press as to the best Governor for Bombay. Anglo-Indian and Indian papers alike have declared for Sir Antony MacDonnell; and the agreement among such strong opponents is at once a splendid testimonial to Sir Antony's

qualities as a ruler, and a signal which no wise Government would be inclined to neglect. But now that Sir Stafford Northcote has been appointed, the general tone of the Indian Press is one of benevolent resignation. Not so of the *Pioneer*, which says:—

... one cannot pretend to believe that the appointment is the one that ought to have been made in the present circumstances of the Province. The grave state of things there called unquestionably for the strongest man that could be found. Not only is famine upon the land and the plague as virulent as ever, but the state of trade is admittedly serious, if not critical. ... Seldom has there been such a combination of public interests calling for a particular appointment; and seldom has there been such a frank demonstration of the powerlessness of public claims when confronted by the claims of family.

These are strong words to come from a paper which usually supports authority, and they show with how little sense of responsibility to India the *Pioneer* credits English statesmen.

By Law 25 of 1891, the police of Natal are empowered to arrest indentured Indians moving without a pass, and by Act 19 of 1898, they are exempt from liability if they have a *bona fide* belief or suspicion that an Indian whom they have arrested is an indentured immigrant. But the police regulations go even beyond this, as an Inspector of the Natal police without legal justification has issued orders to his men to arrest *all* Indians travelling without passes and to refuse bail. Now in the days before Lady-smith became world-famous, and when trains were running, the Interpreter of the Magistrate's Court at Ladysmith arrived at Estcourt. He was promptly arrested by Trooper Jones, in compliance with the Inspector's order. In spite of his protest that as a civil servant he needed no pass, he was taken handcuffed to the gaol, though he made no attempt to escape and offered bail. At the gaol he was recognised and sent to the police camp, where he was released. Trooper Jones, after a summons for assault had been dismissed—for what reason does not appear—had a civil action brought against him both for arresting and handcuffing the Interpreter. But on both points the decision was given in his favour with costs. Although it was shown that the trooper had no *bona fide* belief or suspicion that the plaintiff was indentured, it was held that some words that the Indian had used at the time of his release amounted to a condonation. As to the handcuffs, the plaintiff had laughed at Jones, and so brought that harsh measure on himself. The *Friend of India*, which devotes an article to the matter, says there is "virtually a conspiracy among the white colonists" to make the life of every Indian in Natal a burden to him. We commend this case to the tender heart of Lord Lansdowne who is so touched by the sufferings of the Indians in the Transvaal.

An Indian correspondent recently (in a private note) refers to "this deplorable and unrighteous Transvaal War," which he speaks of, rather roughly, as the work "of besotted Imperialists and speculators." He then goes on to remark, as follows, on the military aid our War Office so readily obtained from India; and as to the effect of the sudden reduction of one-tenth of its British garrison: "Of course the Indian Government gets credit, from Lord Lansdowne, for its swift mobilisation. But this very fact shows that these troops are here for Imperial service; so what a convenient depot India is to draw upon for your foreign wars! And the withdrawal of this effective contingent (soon probably to be followed by another) is already being made the occasion and excuse for feverish demands at our Army headquarters at Simla for still more 'mobilisation and transport' service. In fact this Transvaal business (which is none of ours) will evidently entail more permanent military expenditure in India under various disguises. These urgent demands from your War Office are said (by writers in our Service paper) to have revealed

certain 'defects' in our Army organisation which must be repaired. And you know what such 'repairs' mean. Already some 16,000 baggage animals are to be purchased; and orders have gone forth to establish transport corps, which means continuous future expense and additions to our military budget. Thus the relief we have been counting on from transfer of the surplus 10,000 troops will soon be set off by new charges." Then our correspondent goes on to grieve over "the famine now established in the land."

Though the *Pioneer* has a high opinion of some of the qualities shown by Mr. Stevens in his recent work on India, it nevertheless finds many of his remarks in very bad taste. In regard to his attack on the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, it says:—

What conceivable right has Mr. Stevens to assume that "sheer cowardice" could be "the only possible reason" for His Honour of Bengal's refusal to swallow whole the certainly vexatious and dubiously beneficial measures for combating the plague which were adopted in some provinces which we need not specify.

It goes on:—

It is possible that "strong measures" of observation, segregation, and the rest of it may have had some effect in diminishing the ravages of the plague in the provinces where they were tried; it is certain that they gave rise to the most bitter disaffection.

And it insists that Sir John Woodburn "displayed laudable courage in refusing to allow himself to be made the instrument for needlessly harassing the people of Calcutta." It is unnecessary to say that with all this we thoroughly agree; but it is not so very long ago that such sentiments, if they appeared in the Indian papers, would have been stigmatised as seditious.

Both the *Pioneer* and the *Times of India* blame the way in which Mr. Stevens speaks of the Indians, and especially of the Indian Judges and Magistrates. Nor is the former ready to accept the view that the Indians are effete. As it says, "The great majority of the people are agriculturists—watch them at their work in the fields, and you will see little sign of languor or effeminacy." The *Pioneer* goes on to say:—

To the English administrators of the country he has extended an ungrudging appreciation of their work, and is even a little blind to shortcomings, such as lack of courtesy and sympathy, of which they themselves, the best of them, are conscious enough. . . . But to the less, showy, less virile, non-combatant races his tendency is, it seems to us, to do rather less than justice. It is a good criterion of any book on India that it should be so written as to give no reasonable cause of offence or humiliation to the best class of educated Native—which is quite compatible with plain speaking.

It is scarcely necessary to say that this is a test which the work of Mr. Stevens cannot bear.

It appears from *Power and Guardian* that the charge against a detective of the Howrah police of having extorted Rs. 50 from a woman has been withdrawn. This is to be the more regretted because the prosecutrix as her reason for withdrawing the charge alleged that her witnesses had been tampered with, while the magistrate, Babu Nigendra Nath Pal, in dismissing the case, seemed to think there was some basis for the accusation. *Power and Guardian*, disclaiming any intention of assuming the guilt of the accused, thinks there has been an evident desire on the part of the Howrah police to hush the case up, and suggests that a departmental enquiry should be held.

Captain G. A. Brownrigg, we learn from the *Advocate of India*, has been fined Rs. 10 by the Chief Presidency Magistrate at Bombay for assaulting Seeba Bowjee, the Hindu butler of Mr. C. E. Phillimore. The gallant Captain was dining at a hotel in Bombay where the Hindu was in attendance on his master. The Captain asked Seeba Bowjee who was waiting for his master to remove his plate, but he answered that he was not one of the hotel servants, whereupon Captain Brownrigg abused him, followed him into the next room, gave him three blows on the head and two kicks on the legs, and threw his turban out of the window. The only excuse the defendant gave was that the man stood with his hands behind his back when he asked him to remove his plate, that he could not stand impertinence from anyone, and this was why he struck the complainant.

The Assam planters are rapidly rising in the list of European classes that distinguish themselves by assaulting

Natives. Mr. Graham, the magistrate at Hailakandi, was invited by Mr. Teed, the manager of the Akin tea-garden, to come and enjoy the Dassarah festival in the garden. The magistrate thereupon directed the head constable of Kachlichhara to get him ten labourers, and accordingly the writer constable took a constable and nine men to the garden. As they stood looking on at the performances Mr. Teed arrived with two or three other European garden managers and improvised performances of his own at the expense of the constable in charge of Mr. Graham's detachment. He applied his stick to the constable's head-dress and threw it off. The constable having quietly picked it up and held it round his neck, Mr. Teed repeated his genial process of demolition. Then the writer constable remonstrated. Mr. Teed then demanded why the men were there, and ordered them off; and when the writer constable told him the facts and said he could not leave without making the men over to Mr. Graham, who was then in the bungalow, Mr. Teed is said to have struck him in the face. The writer constable, however, returned as good as he had got, "and taught the aggressor a severe lesson which he is not likely to forget and forgive." Unlike the Chupra officials, Mr. Graham counselled Mr. Teed to leave the matter as it stood. We, too, leave it as it stands, without comment.

Lord Curzon observed at Delhi that addresses to him were sometimes made a vehicle of petition or appeal, and covered complaint under a delicate disguise of compliment. He noted, however, with satisfaction that the Delhi Municipality did not ask anything of him, did not complain of anything, but on the contrary adopted a comfortable tone which "reflects the existing contentment and is a good omen for the future." The point is, of course, a somewhat delicate one. Lord Curzon, to his credit be it said, expressly disclaimed the idea that he considered it improper to indicate complaint or dissatisfaction. But we should hope he will not too readily assume that the absence of a tone of complaint is any proof of the absence of good cause of complaint. The address of welcome may be composed by an official who does not feel any necessity for complaint, or is too much of a courtier to give expression to any uncomfortable facts even if he is perfectly cognisant of their existence. Or it may be composed by a Native whose invincible deference will not permit him to say anything that he fancies will be unwelcome to Viceroyal ears. True, the Viceroy ought to be anxious to know the facts exactly as they stand, and indeed to take measures to assure himself that he is not misled by mere feelings of courtesy. Yet it is very difficult for a man in his position to maintain sleepless vigilance against the prophesying of smooth things. It is far better, therefore, that in spite of the ceremonial character of reception addresses, there should be presented a firm and temperate expression of any grievances that the Viceroy ought to be made acquainted with, so as to ensure him an opportunity to enquire on the spot, and to save him from the deflections of official routine.

The recent tour of the Mahārājā of Gwalior through a part of his territories lasted over four months, and fifteen hundred miles were travelled over, while 7,000 petitions were presented and disposed of. Lord Curzon, to judge by his speech at Delhi, dislikes petitions wrapped up in an address of welcome. Perhaps he would like them no better in this more direct form, if they came in such numbers. The *Times of India* does ample justice to the good government of Gwalior:—

Thanks to the economies of the late Mahārājā, and to the careful husbanding of its resources by its successor, the State is rich, and it has made good use of its wealth.

And this has been done, not only by a judicious expenditure on public works within its own borders, but by assisting its less prosperous neighbours to make railways and by aiding them during the last famine. Turning to the Mahārājā's recent tour, our contemporary says:—

Candour in regard to the shortcomings of his officers, indeed, is the dominant note in this interesting record. Nowhere is there the least endeavour to make out that things are better than they really are.

To the praises of the administration of Hyderabad, Mysore and Travancore, which we have lately recorded may now be added those of the Government of Gwalior.

According to the *Hindu* the new rules embodied in the

'grant-in-aid code forbid not only teachers but even the managers of schools from taking an active part in politics, or even being present at any political meeting; and this is said to extend to all those incidentally connected with educational institutions, whether paid or unpaid. This seems almost incredible. The obvious intention is to deprive popular movements in India of the help they have always received from the schoolmasters. But if the scope of the new rules be as wide as is said they can hardly fail to strike a great blow at education. Who will take any unpaid office connected with a school if it involves the loss of his full rights of citizenship?

The diminishing percentage of convictions to prosecutions in the Punjab is the occasion for strong complaint in the *Pioneer* which does not scruple to lay this evil at the door of the Chief Court, certain Judges of which, it is said, seemed to aim at upsetting convictions, to such an extent that magistrates were cowed or disheartened. Mr. Johnstone, the Sessions Judge at Lahore, goes so far as to say that he "would gladly risk the occasional conviction of an innocent man in order to secure a largely increased number of convictions of the guilty." This barbarous sentiment, emanating from one in Mr. Johnstone's position, would go far to justify—if any justification were necessary—the Chief Court in exacting very strong evidence of guilt. Nothing could be more detrimental to the confidence in the justice of our courts, than for such views to become widely spread among magistrates and judges.

On the official reports the lot of the Assam rayat would appear to be a very enviable one in comparison with his brethren further westwards. In the vicinity of Golaghat, for example, there are said to be none "that can be called poor—that is, no man, with perhaps a few exceptions, need ever want either house or food or clothing." Indeed, "so contented with their lot are these Natives that, at their *bishu* festival, which lasts for nine or ten days, it is almost impossible to get them to work at all." We are not satisfied that the test is conclusive, but the official views decidedly affirm the prosperity of the Assamese, and raise a violent contrast with the frightful poverty disclosed within the range of the famine now raging. It further suggests the question whether British rule in Assam will one day be confronted with results that display a widespread poverty, such as is seen to-day in the Bombay Presidency. *Power and Guardian* starts a theory that will seem strange to Western minds—that the cause, or at any rate one of the causes, of this poverty is the undue expansion of the railway system. The rayat sends off his surplus produce by railway, instead of storing it as formerly; and though he gets an equivalent in rupees yet the rupees more readily slip away. There is more in this theory, at least according to *Power and Guardian*, than in the official theory of drought; and "there can be no denying the fact that the railway policy in India has been carried further than the conditions of the country would seem to warrant." In any case:—

That the poverty problem of India has assumed a serious aspect goes without question, and the whole explanation would seem to be furnished by the lack of staying power of the peasant, caused by the tempting offer by foreign exporters at his door, with the periodical reassessment of his land.

We should earnestly hope that the theory will be demolished by the future experience of Assam. Meantime it is worth consideration.

The famine relief works at Lahore have been stopped. It is a little difficult to discover the reason, or which of two contradictory stories is correct. The authorities aver that those seeking relief were lazy, and that the wages given were higher than at Ferozepur, where numbers flocked to the works. The relief workers, on the other hand, affirm that the majority among them were so debilitated by starvation as to be unable to earn sufficient to live by at the given rate. The wages distributed on the first day among 229 men, 169 women, and 95 children amounted to Rs. 42.5, or about 1½d. per head. A correspondent of the *Tribune* who visited the place, where these people were lodged found them in all stages of desecritude. Even on the first day, out of the 633 in the serai 140 could not do any work. Owing to the stoppage of the works all are now dependent on the charity of the people of Lahore.

The full accounts of the inauguration of the comprehensive scheme for the sanitary reformation of Bombay give promise of a radical stroke at some at least of the sources or fostering grounds of plague. The whole district of Nagpada—an area of some seventeen acres with a population (1891) of 11,133 persons—"at present one of the worst slums in the city"—is to be completely reconstructed. The driving of new streets—new shafts of fresh air—through this evil-smelling district is calculated to displace some 2,600 persons. The part of the scheme just inaugurated by Lord Sandhurst, in the presence of the Viceroy, consists of model buildings to be erected at Agripada for the reception of some 1,700 of the displaced. The original proposals formulated by Government assumed the necessity of rehousing 50,000 of the poorer and working classes, and they are in process of being carried out by the Bombay Improvement Trust, which has to a certain extent even expanded them. Lord Sandhurst appears to have worked cordially with the Trustees, and to have used his influence with the Government of India to obtain Imperial backing for the necessary loan of 50 lakhs, which has been taken up in London. "It is interesting," said Lord Sandhurst, "to observe that this is the first time that a local body has succeeded in attracting rupee capital from England to India." The reason, however, is obvious—the Government of India is at the back of it. The enterprise is both grand and beneficent, and, with a continuance of the harmony of all parties, it will no doubt be completed with excellent results.

Is it really worth the money to keep on galvanising ridiculous stories about the Amir, which are as dead as Queen Anne? The *Daily Telegraph* should be interested to learn from the *Bombay Gazette* that the Government of India possesses no information to show that there is "the slenderest ground" for the report that the Amir is "growing insane," or that he recently proposed to leave Kabul for Maizar-i-Sharif for closer communication with the Russians. The plain fact is that he can communicate with the Russians as easily as possible at Kabul—if he wants to do so. The *Bombay Gazette* says, authoritatively:

His Highness has never contemplated leaving for Maizar-i-Sharif, so that the story of his fury at the discovery and frustration of the "plot" is pure fiction. And as to the "growing insanity," the Amir is doing business with the Government of India just as usual, and has his wits about him as much as ever. Nor are executions any more common at Kabul than they used to be—though, to be sure, this is not to say that they are by any means uncommon.

But, of course, the preposterous nonsense about the Amir will continue to be rehearsed by honest ignorance so long as we are in a position to be fluttered by allegations of Russian intrigue in Central Asia.

The Hyderabad Imperial Service Troops are stated to have been visited with a thoroughly unfavourable report by Captain Fasken, the inspecting officer. The Secunderabad correspondent of the *Bombay Gazette* summarises it thus:—

He states that the squadron officers have not yet acquired sufficient professional knowledge to train their men; the officers' salutes require improvement; the drill at the gallop is very poor, the galloping is too slow, while the trotting is too fast; the wheeling is very indifferent; there is a want of straightness and there is a good deal of talking in the ranks; the horses look thin, and the lances want more secure fastening; there are twenty-five officers and men short of the proper strength, and two officers, two duffadars, and thirty-eight sowkars are unfit, and are yet retained in the ranks.

No wonder Captain Fasken was disappointed. But is not this force to all intents and purposes part of the Imperial defence? Is it not trained by British officers lent to the Nizam for the express purpose, as Sir W. Lee-Warner says, of "ensuring the uniformity and harmony of organisation and equipment required by the general system of Imperial defence"? If so, Captain Fasken's report suggests the necessity of explanation and reform, and that vehemently. But the shortcomings, whatever they may in fact amount to, would seem to be purely British, and to be in no sense attributable to the Nizam or his Government. For, so far back as nearly half a century ago, the "oppressive and iniquitous" Treaty of 1853 provided that the Hyderabad contingent "shall be commanded by British officers, fully equipped and disciplined, and controlled by the British Government through its representative the Resident at Hyderabad"; and the British grip has not been relaxed since.

THE COMING CONGRESS.

IN the closing days of the present month and year, the fifteenth meeting of the Indian National Congress will assemble at Lucknow, the capital of Oudh, a city for ever memorable in the annals of British India. This is the first time the Congress has visited Lucknow, but it is well to break fresh ground, and Lucknow is both an important town and the centre of an important province. It is not our purpose now to enter into the recent historical associations of the place; but, when the historian goes to the roots of the unhappy Mutiny, and penetrates the inner spirit of the Congress, he will find a curiously powerful sympathy between British and Congress feeling. There are practical reasons why it is extremely undesirable to rake up, at the present moment, the causes of the madness of 1857. The better aim of statesmanship is to foster union, not to perpetuate and exacerbate division. In spite of all the shafts of virulent dislike and the prejudice of ignorance, the Congress stands forth united in national patriotism and in Imperial loyalty. "The principle on which the Indian National Congress is based," Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee has well said, "is that British rule should be permanent and abiding in India, and that, given this axiom it is the duty of educated Indians to endeavour to the best of their power to help their rulers so to govern the country as to improve her material prosperity and make the people of all classes and communities happy and contented as subjects of the British Empire." The leaders of the Congress, on the testimony of so calm and so well-informed an observer as Sir William Hunter, "are the men to whom, in all other respects, intellectual and moral, we are accustomed to point as the highest product of British rule in India"—"the men who, of all our Indian fellow-subjects, realise most clearly that their interests, present and future, are identified with the permanence of British rule." On the historic ground of Lucknow they will look back over forty years with much more sincere regret for the folly of their countrymen than the most pronounced Imperialist that dares the no less egregious folly of despising and insulting them.

There will be no lack of matter for discussion. Many subjects of urgent importance remain to be taken up again after repeated handling in previous meetings. It is curious, yet it is quite intelligible, that the very first of the resolutions of the First Congress at Bombay in 1885 have not yet been carried out in practice. These were:—

1. That this Congress earnestly recommends that the promised enquiry into the working of the Indian Administration, here and in England, should be entrusted to a Royal Commission, the people of India being adequately represented thereon, and evidence taken both in India and in England.
2. That this Congress considers the abolition of the Council of the Secretary of State for India, as at present constituted, the necessary preliminary to all other reforms.

If a "promised enquiry" of fundamental importance has lain over unexecuted in the only effective mode for half a generation, the blame does not lie at the door of the Congress. But the evasion does not seem creditable to the authorities, who expect the Indian people to take them at their word. These first Resolutions naturally went to the very roots of all reasonable reform, and for that simple reason it is not surprising that the trusted officials of such a practical nation as we claim to be have steadily blocked their execution. Besides there have arisen since last meeting fresh matters of national concern, both on new points and on old questions. What the particular subjects of the resolutions to be submitted to the Lucknow Congress may be we are not yet in a position to say. But one thing is quite certain. The discussions will exhibit very distinctly to the authorities the thoughts and feelings of the people of India on the outstanding questions of government and administration. Lord Curzon invites Indian opinion on his more important Bills. Here he will have an opportunity of learning authoritatively Indian opinion on things that go to the marrow of all his twelve subjects of meditation. The most serious difficulties of the British officials concerned with India spring from the distressing loss of touch with the Indian mind. Here will be an opportunity of seeing deep into the minds of the men that gather up in their own persons the sum and substance of what our officials are looking for and cannot discover—an opportunity of gazing on the whole mystery frankly unveiled. Will they but look? Will they lay the lesson to heart? Will they take home to themselves the principle of "moral suasion"?

The President-elect, Mr. Romesh C. Dutt, C.I.E., is an ex-official, an Indian and a Bengali who has risen to the highest position ever attained in the Indian Civil Service by any Indian under direct British sway, and a man as loyal to his salt as ever man was or could be. It is impossible that Mr. Dutt should not have a word to say that it would be worth official while to listen to with attention. Looking at Mr. Dutt's official experience, one might fairly anticipate that he will deal with far-reaching questions of administration. The war fever being temporarily spent, the question of extravagant expenditure may be assumed to be momentarily of less urgency than the complementary question of the strengthening of the rayat's powers to meet a more reasonable public charge. There is, indeed, no getting away from the load of debt laid on the Indian back by trans-frontier enterprises, except by paying it; but were such wildgoose policy but stayed the country would soon rise superior to the resulting financial embarrassments, under wise internal administration. It is tolerably certain that Mr. Dutt will not approve of the currency cure, or of the ostentatious expansiveness of railway policy, and he may speak in vain for the separation of judicial from executive functions. But his views on the immediate treatment of the rayat, who is the backbone of the country, will no doubt be more fully expressed, and will command the respect due to prolonged and familiar experience. He will be able to contrast authoritatively the position of the rayat in Bengal with the position of the rayat elsewhere, and to deal in a statesmanlike manner with the causes of the astounding difference. As a result of the Acts of 1859, 1868, and 1885 "the Bengal cultivator is (except in a few congested districts) a prosperous, provident and intelligent tiller of the soil, who has adequate protection against enhancement of rents, who knows his rights and can hold his own, and who in a year of bad harvests has some resources to fall back upon, and can often avert a famine." If so, then why is it that the rayats elsewhere are in so much worse a condition? Famine always menaces them; now they are in the dire grip of the grim visitant over an immense stretch of territory; and though the approach of the enemy was well foreseen and active provision was made yet the probable results are fearful to contemplate. And even though the pressure do not amount to famine, or even to scarcity, it is beyond any doubt now that the condition of many millions of the population is always a condition of insufficient nourishment. We do not suppose that Mr. Dutt will advocate a system that goes the full length of the Permanent Settlement of Bengal; he may well be content with the modified principles so well expounded by Mr. John Adam. Nor will he run full tilt against even the money-lenders. But we should anticipate that he will comment drastically upon the extravagant demands of the Government, and will show cause against legislative remedies that restrict the rayat's ability in whatever manner to meet a reasonable Government demand. In any case, his experience will furnish valuable suggestions, negative as well as positive.

During the past year the new system of official repression has been making steady progress. It is impossible that Indian opinion on this ominous perversity should not make itself heard at Lucknow. The Natus still remain in detention at Belgaum, though they have never yet been brought to trial, nor have even been informed definitely on what grounds they have been deprived of their freedom. The liberty of the Press has been persistently invaded, and the Telegraphic Press Messages Bill is pending in the Legislative Council of the Viceroy. The Calcutta Municipality has been shorn of its privileges of local self-government, and has been converted by a mischievous Act into a mere annex of the Government of Bengal; while the like vicious principle is impending over the Municipalities of the Bombay Mofussil. The valued admission of Indian representatives to the local Legislative Councils, which Mr. Gladstone impressively insisted should be made a reality, has degenerated into a farce; even the *Times of India* acknowledges a "flagrant disproportion between the fulness of their enquiries and the sententious barrenness of the replies that they elicit." Anglo-Indian contemptuous superiority over the Indians has reached a climax in the abominable outrage at Rangoon, and the Chupra case would seem to indicate that the insidious malady—more dangerous than plague or famine—has even attacked the executive and judicial departments, so

unhappily united, of Government. Here, in all conscience, is scope for discussion. We should be surprised, indeed, if the Congress did not point out that the reversal of all this odious system is an absolute necessity of the first urgency. Instead of repression what is most needed is a return to the declarations of the Queen's Proclamation, and a free acceptance of the co-operation of Indians in the administration of their country. "Recent events," Mr. Dutt most truly said last year, "have proved that good administration in India is impossible except with the cordial co-operation of the people, and it is through the lack of such co-operation that the Government, in spite of its good intentions, has failed in nearly every department." From this text, Mr. Dutt would be able to preach a most instructive sermon. But will the Government listen to "moral suasion?" Not openly, nor perhaps immediately; but still "moral suasion" will work its silent effects. If the Government will not listen to the Congress, let them listen to Sir William Hunter. "We have got a great force to deal with," said Sir William in 1889, "a force which must be powerful either for the disintegration of our Indian Empire or for the consolidation of our Indian Empire; and therefore, as an old official, I say it is our duty to use it as a consolidating and not as a disintegrating force." It is the modern choice of Hercules.

SOME LESSONS OF THE CHUPRA SCANDAL.

ENGLAND has always been proud of the ability, integrity and devotion to duty shown by the civilians of India. The vast majority have well deserved the high esteem in which they have been held. Where they have erred, it has been more often from want of knowledge or want of sympathy than from any lack of honesty or zeal for justice. When they have been most overbearing, it has usually been from a too keen desire to repress evil regardless of consequences. If they have been too harsh to the voices of others, it has been from a love of high ideals, and a confidence in the good name of their country. It is true that these errors might often cause much pain to the governed. But they at least left the honour of the rulers unstained. Yet from the very virtues of the Indian Civil Service there has sprung an evil. Their countrymen at home have become inclined to hold them up as above criticism, to resent every suggestion that their rule was not perfect, and to answer all pleas for reform by recounting the catalogue of their virtues. How could preventable evils exist when these gods in human shape were spending their lives for the benefit of the people? Those on the spot, it is true, saw that ignorance and want of sympathy were increasing. But they saw no reason to doubt that the standard of honour was as high as it had ever been; and we repeat again that for the vast majority this is entirely true. Yet it is easy to see that there are two sets of forces at work which must inevitably lower that standard among the weaker members of the service. For, (1) as want of sympathy with the people of the country increases, so must the bond between Anglo-Indians grow stronger, till at length the happiness of the ruled becomes of trivial importance compared with the comfort and convenience of the rulers, and the safety of the latter is readily purchased at the price of injustice to the former. And (2) the good reputation already won, as it discredits all unfavourable judgments, promises immunity to many actions which would never be even thought of if they were likely to be exposed to the observation of a well-informed public. From the necessity of the case Indian officials are peculiarly free from such observation, and it is unfortunate that many statesmen and publicists, by flouting even the most temperate criticism on Indian civilians, have deprived the service of a safeguard of which even the best public servants must feel the loss.

The most recent illustration of all this is to be found in the Chupra case, in which several Anglo-Indian officials are concerned. In this case we find (1) illegality; (2) conspiracy among certain officials to shield some among them from the consequences of their acts; and (3) pressure brought to bear on a Native magistrate to convict and sentence an innocent man. It is unnecessary to repeat the painful story which appeared at length in our last issue. It will be sufficient for our purpose to take these three points in order. Mr. Twidell, the officiating District Magistrate, who has been in India some five years, issued

orders to the zemindars and rayats to repair certain embankments, and to the police to set them to work, using "natural persuasion." We have the authority of the Sessions Judge that these orders were illegal, that it would have been illegal for the police to carry them out—even by "natural persuasion"—and that it was not illegal for the people to disobey them. Then as the police were slow in carrying out these illegal orders, Mr. Twidell sent Mr. Corbett, a young assistant superintendent of police, aged twenty-three, to stir up the police. Mr. Corbett, assisted by Mr. Simkins, went to the village of Fulwaria to impress labourers illegally, and there they found a policeman from another district on sick leave, who had the impertinence to respect the law more than his masters. He said: "Why should we help; we are free men?" But Narsingh Singh, the constable, not only refused to work himself; he refused illegally to compel others to work, and even snapped his fingers, according to Mr. Corbett, in Mr. Corbett's august face—though this is said to be a form of derision not in use among Indians. Mr. Corbett then kicked the constable, and, on his showing signs of resisting, the two Englishmen hit him. After being hit three or four times the man fell, and Mr. Corbett sat on him and thrashed him, while Mr. Simkins gave him six or seven cuts with a rattan. After this "natural persuasion" the villagers began to carry out the illegal orders. Here then we find a series of illegal orders given by an officiating District Magistrate and carried into effect by a series of illegal—or rather criminal—actions on the part of two other officials. It remains only to be said that the facts stated above are derived from the evidence of Mr. Corbett himself.

But this was the least part of the evils that befell Narsingh Singh. To assault and battery were to be added a trumped-up criminal prosecution, a "mock trial" and a "monstrous sentence;" for, as the Sessions Judge aptly remarked, the constable's "crime consisted not in what he had done, but in what he had suffered; it was the crime—and it may be a very grievous crime in these parts—of having been assaulted by a European official." But the most serious aspect of the case is the way in which all these officials supported each other. When it became known that the constable had gone to the hospital, Mr. Corbett drove to the hospital, arrested him, and took him to the house of the District Superintendent of Police, Mr. Bradley. Then, as the constable refused to resign, the two officials took him to Mr. Twidell's house, and these three worthies discussed under what sections of the Code he was to be prosecuted. At a later stage, when Narsingh Singh had been convicted and had appealed, Mr. Pennell, the Sessions Judge, asked Mr. Twidell for an explanation, and this explanation he refused to give under the orders or with the approval of Mr. Bourdillon, the Commissioner of Patna, an officer of 29 years' experience, who was nevertheless guilty of "the impropriety of sending a demi-official letter" to Mr. Pennell requesting him to have the case heard *in camera*. Thus, until the matter came before Mr. Pennell, the constable found all the officials leagued together for his ruin and their own protection. And while all this was going on under British rule, the Press in this country was denouncing the way in which the military chiefs in France were standing by each other. Unhappily the iniquity of men is not confined to one clime or one people.

The case came before an Indian magistrate, Moulvie Zakir Hossein, who certainly showed himself wanting in his duty as an upright judge. But the respective parts played by him and his European superiors are strangely different from what we have been taught to expect. The English magistrates have been commonly represented as battling stubbornly though often in vain against the innate tendency to sloth and injustice which characterises their Indian subordinates. But here the case is very much altered. It is obvious that the magistrate was overawed by his European superiors. The Superintendent of Police sat on the bench with him. The District Magistrate discussed the evidence with him in private, and does not deny that he let the Indian know how he wished the case decided. It can only be said for the Deputy-Magistrate that he belonged to an inferior branch of the service, from which he could never rise—the worst arrangement for getting really good work—that his position in great measure depended on the goodwill of his superiors, and that they were evidently ready to stick at nothing in order

to get a conviction. Such excuses can do little to clear the character of Moulvie Zakir Hossein; but if he is inexcusable, what can be said for Mr. Twidell? And what can be said of a system which, from the unnatural union of judicial and executive duties in one and the same officer, brings to birth so monstrous a miscarriage of justice?

The Chupra case has been fertile in surprises. At the beginning it was the constable who was prosecuted and not his assailants. But there remained an equally extraordinary inversion of justice to come. It is not too much to say that Mr. Pennell, by his independence and his firm determination that the right should triumph, saved the honour of his countrymen in India and blotted out the shame that would otherwise have attached to an honourable service. Yet it is Mr. Pennell, it seems, who is singled out for punishment. He has been removed from Chupra to Noakhali, which is described as "the most pestiferous hole in Bengal." It appears that the high authorities are wedded to the system, which has only been in vogue for a few years, of always defending any officer who is attacked, and of hushing-up scandals at whatever cost. It is a policy which must sooner or later degrade the best set of officials in the world—a policy which would in the end drag down into the mire the renowned Civil Service of India. With impunity the evil will grow, until it is too strong to be overcome. The Indian public are well aware of the lengths to which officials will go in order to support each other; but they hardly believed such proceedings could obtain the countenance of authority, or that a judge could be punished for administering justice without fear or favour. The transfer of Mr. Pennell is the greatest scandal of all.

Some part of the blame of the Chupra case must no doubt fall on the youth of several of the chief actors. But Mr. Bourdillon, who took a subordinate part, but one of evil example, is an official of long experience. Nor is it possible to comfort ourselves with the belief that in all such cases the just judge will be found ready to do justice, even in spite of his superiors. Mr. Pennell has certainly shown that he can be trusted to do so, but overburdened as Indian civilians are with work, much may escape their attention. In the present case Mr. Pennell's interest was first aroused by his finding that the pleader who appeared for Narsingh Singh had taken "the unusual course" of swearing an affidavit himself. This it was that led him to release the prisoner on bail, and ultimately brought about that great victory of justice which, whether he be cherished or degraded by the Government, will make his name honoured among the Indian people. Among other lessons which this Chupra scandal points none is more important than the urgency of effecting that separation of judicial from executive duties which the informed opinion of India has so long asked in vain. But for the improper union of these two sets of functions in the District Magistrate, the Chupra scandal, even if it had not been avoided, would at least have been shorn of some of its most sinister features.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION IN INDIA.

By THE HON. C. H. SETALVAD, B.A., LL.B.,
(Late Member Bombay Legislative Council, Advocate Bombay
High Court, etc.)

It is said about King George IV, that he had heard so much of the war, knighted so many people, and worn such a prodigious quantity of marshal's uniforms, cocked-hats, cock's feathers, scarlet and buff in general, that he actually fancied he had been present in some campaign, and, under the name of General Brook, led a tremendous charge of the German legion at Waterloo.

This feeling had grown so strong upon him that it is said he used often at the dinner-table to relate to the Duke of Wellington the various details of the battle of Waterloo as if he had taken a part in it. Comparing small things with great, the Parsi knight in the House of Commons has, I am afraid, worked himself into a similar state of mind on the question of technical and industrial education in India. A perusal of his speech in the House of Commons during the last Indian budget debate leaves one wondering at the inscrutable dispensation of Providence that, for the first time in 1898, revealed to Sir Muncherji the panacea of all India's ills when everyone else was still then groping in the dark, and at the phenomenal results that a touch of the magic hand of the

valiant knight has achieved in the short space of a year, for, forsooth, even those incorrigible and perverse beings, the educated Indians who have hitherto refused to gather round the banner of Sir Muncherji, have now been converted to his views. Says Sir Muncherji:—

I feel I must offer an apology to the House for recurring to a subject similar to the one which I brought to its sympathetic notice last year. But so much has been done since I first mooted it, to advance the purpose I had in view, that it has reached a stage when further considerations and suggestions regarding it might be profitably discussed. When I first advocated the promotion of technical and industrial education in India I was attacked by certain people as seeking to aim a blow at higher education. . . . This malicious misrepresentation of my purpose and views has, however, even in the brief space of a few months been exploded. . . . Many of those even who had so far regarded education as an exclusive means for the attainment of political ends, have been converted to the view that it would have other beneficial uses if it could be made to develop the industrial energy of their countrymen. Some of these very men have within the last few months written treatises on the subject, and others have offered to subscribe munificently to projects which are designed to divert education from its present purely literary or academic ends into channels of practical utility. This is all very gratifying.

And further:—

In the prevailing system of education in India there is an almost entire absence of practical and technical instruction. It is now generally recognised that this is a great drawback. (The italics are all mine.)

A little peep into the history of technical and industrial education in India and specially in this Presidency will make it clear what pure fiction all this is, and that those very people whom Sir Muncherji abuses as people "who had regarded education as an exclusive means for the attainment of political ends," and whom he fondly imagines he has made converts of, have long ago anticipated Sir Muncherji, and done much more than all that he has ever said or done about technical education, and that it is really Sir Muncherji who is palming off before the House of Commons as great truths for the first time discovered by him, as he says, "after many years of personal observation and close study," some of the most simple principles repeatedly laid down and acted upon by these very people for the last fifteen years and more.

In the year 1884, when Sir Muncherji was still a student at the Inns of Court, a public meeting of the citizens of Bombay, convened by the Sheriff, was held in the Town Hall on November 29, under the Presidency of Sir Jamsetji Jijibhoy, to vote an address and raise a suitable memorial to that most popular Viceroy the Marquis of Ripon. At that meeting which was, as Sir Muncherji himself cannot gainsay, promoted by the very educated classes whom he now reviles for their blindness in regard to technical education, the following resolution was adopted:—

That as an humble acknowledgment of his eminent services, his Excellency be requested to allow his name to be connected with a permanent institution in the shape of an Industrial School to be founded in Bombay, and with such other memorial as may hereafter be determined.

When the members of the Ripon Memorial Committee approached the then Governor, Lord Reay, they found that he was very anxious to promote in every way the interests of technical education, and was prepared to receive their proposals very sympathetically. On September 3, 1886, an informal meeting of some of the leading citizens, European and Indian, of Bombay (Messrs. Griffiths, Wimbridge, Carrol, Blaney, Dadabhai Naoroji, Telang, Mehta, Badrudin Tyabji, Wacha being among those present), was held at the Secretariat, at which Lord Reay presided, and the whole question of technical education was very carefully discussed and considered. At that meeting Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji presented a very valuable and elaborate note on the subject, in which, among other things, he pointed out that one direction in which industrial education should be pushed was to make it a part of the instruction given in primary and secondary schools. These deliberations resulted among other things in the establishment of the Victoria Technical Institute, comprising the Ripon Textile School. On September 15, 1886, a very masterly resolution of the Bombay Government was issued under the signature of Sir William Wedderburn, who was then Chief Secretary, reviewing the whole question of technical education, taking stock of what had already been done by means of the Poona College of Science, the Bombay School of Art, and the schools of industry at Ratnagiri, Surat, Sirur, and Poona, laying down the line of action for the future, and inviting the Ripon Memorial Fund Committee to form itself into an Association for the

promotion of technical education, and to co-operate with Government by undertaking to establish the Victoria Technical Institute. The resolution concluded with the following important remarks:—

In concluding this brief review of the position as regards technical education, His Excellency in Council desires to express his satisfaction at the strong and healthy interest which has been taken in the subject by the public as shown in the Press, as well as in the valuable suggestions brought forward by individuals who have made a study of the question. It is universally felt that new channels should be opened not to repress the intelligence of the country, so largely developed by means of the education imparted during the last thirty years, but to dissipate it from over-stocking one field by providing other appropriate ground.

Lord Reay's Government, in this resolution, as well as in a previous one of September 29, 1885, made valuable suggestions for introducing preliminary scientific and technical training in primary and secondary schools. Following close upon what was done in Bombay a very laudable and successful attempt in a similar direction was made in Baroda by that most enlightened of Indian princes, H.H. the Gaekwar. Professor T. K. Gajjar submitted to the Gaekwar a comprehensive scheme of national education comprising the technical and industrial, a scheme about which Sir Raymond West said that it properly carried out "it would make Baroda the intellectual centre of all India." The Gaekwar was pleased to give effect to a part of it by establishing a Polytechnic Institution styled the Kala-Bhavan with Professor T. K. Gajjar as Principal, an institution about which Mr. Chatfield, the late Director of Public Instruction, said that it "promised to solve the question of industrial education in India." The great impetus given in recent years to the industry of dyeing and calico-printing is believed to be mainly due to the skilled labour turned out by that institution.

Moreover, the Indian National Congress made it an important part of its programme from an early part of its career. At its third session, held in Madras in 1887 under the presidency of Mr. Justice Tyabji, it adopted the following resolution:—

That having regard to the poverty of the people it is desirable that the Government be moved to elaborate a system of technical education suitable to the condition of the country, to encourage indigenous manufactures by a more strict observance of the orders already existing in regard to utilising such manufactures for State purposes and to employ more extensively than at present the skill and talents of the people of the country.

In the year 1891 at its session held at Nagpur, the Congress resolved:—

That this Congress concurring with previous Congresses affirms the importance of increasing (instead of diminishing, as appears to be the present policy of Government) the public expenditure on all branches of education, and the expediency in view to the promotion of the most essential of those branches, the technical, of appointing a mixed Commission to enquire into the present industrial condition of the country.

Similar resolutions relating to the industrial development of the country have been year after year adopted at Congress sessions.

In view of the above facts, I am curious to know the "so much" that "has been done since" Sir Muncherji "first mooted" the question, and who those people are who once "attacked" him as "seeking to aim a blow at higher education," but to their great confusion have now found out their mistake and done him the homage of being "converted" to his view, so much so that

these very men have, within the last few months, written treatises on the subject, and others have offered to subscribe munificently to projects which are designed to divert education from its present purely literary or academic ends into channels of practical utility.

Let me assure Sir Muncherji that those who thought with Mr. Scutlar that in his budget speech of 1898 Sir Muncherji was aiming a blow at higher education are still of the same opinion, and that they have no need of becoming converts as regards the necessity or importance of technical instruction in India, for the very simple reason that they have long ago grasped the real principles of the question, and have been acting on them since the time when Sir Muncherji was still in *statu pupillari*. Treatises have no doubt been written by some men, like Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Prof. Gajjar, and others belonging to the class contemptuously referred to by Sir Muncherji, but that was long before, and I know of none since the revelation of August 11, 1898. But who are those who have been inspired so much by Sir Muncherji's sermon as to have offered munificent subscriptions? There have been munificent donations for technical education like the Ripon Memorial, Sir Dinsha endowment, Sir Mangaldas' bequest,

etc., but they have all been before 1898. The princely offer of our eminent townsman, Mr. Jamsetji Tata, was no doubt announced to the public after the great speech. But it would be a gross insult to the knowledge, liberality, and public spirit of a man like Mr. Tata who, it is well known, was maturing his scheme for many years, to suggest even for a moment that he derived his inspiration from Sir Muncherji.

Passing next to the several suggestions made by Sir Muncherji for furthering technical education there is absolutely nothing new in them. For instance, with regard to the necessity of founding technical instruction on a preliminary training of a practical character in primary and secondary schools. That was, as said above, suggested in 1885 by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and I will only quote a sentence from the Resolution of the Bombay Government of October 29, 1885, already referred to, which dealt with the question.

His Excellency in Council must here insist upon the same element of practical instruction being introduced as far as possible in municipal and rural schools, which was above demanded in the case of training colleges and secondary schools. In schools under teachers trained as directed, and as far as may be in others, everything should be done to encourage elementary training in some handicraft, and in the rudiments of agricultural science. It is only on the understanding that provision is made for such practical instruction that His Excellency in Council consents to add the sum of one lakh and of Rs. 28,000 as above approved to the subsidy for district primary schools and for the extension of aid to private effort in rural areas.

Then Sir Muncherji proceeds:—

I recognise fully that, more than Government themselves, the people for whose benefit I plead for this departure in the educational system of India have a responsibility to recognise and duties to undertake. But the people of India have been accustomed to look to Government for guidance, and I maintain that in this matter especially it is for the Government to initiate the necessary reform. Let them impress on the people the benefits of sound and practical industrial instruction and pursuits. . . . If they do this it will be found in a very few years that the intelligent people of India will not be slow to appreciate its advantages, and that the munificent liberality of the Native chiefs and India's opulent citizens will not be withheld from a movement which is rich in promise for that country's welfare.

Now what are the facts? In this matter of technical education particularly, the educated people of India, instead of waiting for guidance from Government or even Sir Muncherji, have for the last twenty years taken the initiative, and have been earnestly pressing upon Government to do their part in the matter. Nothing can be a greater travesty of facts in the case of "the intelligent people of India," who as long ago as 1884 in Bombay raised by public subscriptions about two lakhs of rupees, and by the aid of other endowments from some rich citizens worked towards the establishment of the Victoria Technical Institute, and whose public spirit, good sense and enthusiasm in the matter were very suitably recognised by the Government of Lord Reay in the passage that I have already quoted, and who have since then by writings and speeches on Congress and Conference platforms loudly urged upon Government further to stimulate technical instruction, than to suggest in 1899, that they stand in need of "guidance" from Government, that it is necessary to "impress" them with the "benefits of sound and practical instruction and pursuit," that they have been up to now "slow to appreciate its advantages," that they have only "now" begun to recognise the want of technical education, and that they will require a "few years" yet to fully appreciate it. Equally ridiculous is it, in face of the munificent donations of Mr. Tata, Sir Mangaldas and Sir Dinsha, and the large sums expended by the Gaekwar for technical education, to suggest that the Native chiefs and India's opulent citizens have till now "withheld" their liberality from this movement, but that the whole tide has begun to turn now that the great oracle has spoken.

But the educated Indians are charged not only with stupidity and want of common sense in being up to now slow to appreciate and recognise the advantages of technical education, but of wicked perversity; for, says Sir Muncherji, Lord Curzon in organising a system of technical and industrial instruction in India will have not only "many obstacles to overcome" but "much opposition to encounter." Imagine the educated Indians, after having repeatedly advocated and pressed upon the attention of Government for the last twenty years and more the urgent need of not only technical education in India but of undertaking on an extensive scale all measures for the industrial regeneration of the country, and having themselves done all that they could towards that end, opposing Government when it is going to give them what they have been asking for! It is difficult here to withhold a smile at

the dexterous manner in which Sir Muncherji tries to utilise the opportunity by condescendingly patting Lord Curzon on the back. If Lord Curzon ever read his speech I should have liked to see the pleasant contortions which must have passed over his proud face.

I should not, in writing this letter, be understood for a moment to say that enough has already been done for technical instruction in India. Infinitely more has to be done both by Government and the people in that direction. All that I have striven to show is that there is absolutely nothing in what Sir Muncherji has said or suggested on the subject that has not long before been either done or advocated in India by the very people whom he is now lecturing from lofty heights. He need not deceive himself into imagining that he has for the first time propounded new truths or made startling discoveries, and that India is contemplating in dumb admiration the wonders that the teaching of Sir Muncherji has worked towards her regeneration within the short space of a few months. I really regret very much to do anything that will in the least disturb the very happy state of mind that Sir Muncherji has evidently worked himself into, but unfortunately I am not endowed with either the phlegmatic temper or the soldierly humour of the Duke of Wellington that made him listen with a pleasant smile to the narration by George IV of his performances on the field of Waterloo.

In concluding in right earnest this exposure of Sir Muncherji's libel on the educated classes, may I tell him a word of the real truth? It is true that the efforts of Sir Muncherji to encourage, as he fondly imagines, technical and industrial education, have been received by the whole Indian Press not only with contempt but with some amount of disgust and resentment. The reason is that they have come to take him as a gentleman who conscientiously reflects in the House of Commons the views and prejudices of the more rabid class of Anglo-Indians. Sir Muncherji's cry on this subject is according to them neither original nor independent. They regard it only as a parrot-like echo of the insincere attitude which had been taken up by those men for the purpose of decrying higher education which they have come to regard with alarm and detestation. They believe that there is no sincerity in this sudden advocacy of industrial and technical education, but that its ulterior end is to come in the way of that education which has, in the opinion of all impartial minds, done so much for the advancement and development of the country.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

BOMBAY, November 11.

The event of the week is the visit which the Viceroy is paying to places afflicted with plague and famine. After having inspected some localities in Gujerat, he proceeded to Rajkot, the capital, so to say, of the British Political Agent in Kathiawar. Wherever he went Lord Curzon was warmly welcomed. There is no doubt a magnetic attraction about our young Viceroy. His eloquent tongue and his handsome appearance and physique commend him at once to the people. His words of sympathy endear him to her Majesty's Indian subjects, and he seems to have a happy knack of winning popularity. All these are encouraging symptoms of a better and more kindly rule.

But though Lord Curzon has engaging manners and a winsome tongue, I cannot say that I have yet found in his many utterances, especially on plague and famine, a single statesmanlike thought. We have had no courageous declaration of a liberal policy. We have had no candid announcement of any departure from the traditional and bureaucratic lines of administration which have wrought untold mischief in the past and which are certain to create further mischief in the future. It is very well to praise the suffering people for their exemplary endurance amid a succession of calamities. That may be some balm to their sorrow-stricken hearts. But what fresh policy did he announce in connexion with the plague? Has he really heard the complaints of the masses in reference to plague rules and plague administration in the Bombay Presidency? Of course he has heard the officials. But what of that? He has, we know, heard three or four representative men. Yet what has been the outcome? Nothing so far. Whether on his return to Calcutta his Lordship will promulgate any new

orders, issue new Resolutions, and instruct the Administration here to treat the people differently is a question. My own forecast is that we shall hear nothing. It would be some solace if, for instance, at next Budget day we were to hear that the Indian Government had laid it down that plague expenditure, which is now sedulously attempted to be foisted on provincial and local Governments of all sorts and degrees, should in future be considered an Imperial charge, to be borne from Imperial revenues, just as famine expenditure is. Famine and plague are both said to be providential visitations. Why should the State in coping with famine adopt one financial policy and another policy in coping with plague?

As to famine I have not read in any of the recent utterances of the Viceroy anything to lead me to believe that a new departure is to be taken by the State in connexion with its land revenue policy, which is the source of the woes and miseries of the peasantry in India. His visit to the famine-afflicted localities must have convinced him that, however well the relief for the time being may allay starvation and its attendant evils, it can never cure the disease of all diseases. That, as I have often said, is the growing impoverishment of the rayat—an impoverishment which leaves him, every time that famine recurs, worse off than before. We see before our eyes how cruelly the prophecy of Sir Louis Mallet is being slowly realised. In that imperishable Minute of his of 1879, he foretold that every delay which occurred in solving the agrarian problem would tend only to deteriorate the condition of the peasantry. What are the facts to-day? Can even the most optimistic apologists deny that, as far as the annual supply of food grains is concerned, we are far behind, or that while population is only increasing at the normal average of one per cent., the supply of food is not keeping pace with it? One has only to refer to the concluding chapter of the last Famine Commission, and study the table of food supply given there, to convince himself of the real economic condition of India. There is enough land which is cultivable to relieve the dire necessities of those who are said to go hungry to bed daily. But where is the money? Even without the additional cultivable land the rayat could grow a larger quantity of corn if only he had the necessary funds for good strong seeds, for manure, and for agricultural cattle. But where is the money? Are we to be told that it is the *Sowcar* (i.e. moneylender) who is eating it up? Why so? The *Sowcar* is, no doubt, a harpy. But he is a creature of the circumstances which are created by the State and not by himself. The usurious *Sowcar* would be non-existent in millions of the villages if the State land laws were different from what they are. After the land laws and reform the Revenue and Survey Department, and within ten years we should witness a beneficial change in the condition of the peasantry, and a change in the yield of the soil. The root of the famine is the land laws which work so harshly that they leave the rayat absolutely without funds to carry on his ordinary agricultural operations. Borrowing is inevitable; and when once borrowing has begun we know what the end is. I ask again, where is the statesman who is going to relieve the Indian rayat from the grip of the greedy *Bania*?

Meanwhile it is a mockery to be told that the Government of Madras is going to make an experiment with an agricultural bank in one village. Shades of Munro and Elphinstone! What would they think of this latest freak in statesmanship if they revisited the scene of their labours? One little bank in one little village—and that, too, with only one-tenth of State subsidy; that is to say, while the indefatigable Mr. Nicholson is to find his own capital to carry out his experiment, he will be so far encouraged to persevere with it that the munificent Government of Madras will give him a grant-in-aid of one-tenth of the capital. Such is the statesmanship which governs India.

But amid the dismal pessimism which surrounds India it is some relief to find a ray of comfort so far as the Rangoon outrage is concerned. The Indian Government, thanks to Lord Curzon's force of character, has administered a severe rebuke to the local authorities who mismanaged the case and led to so sorry a miscarriage of justice. The Commissioner of the Pegu division as well as the District Magistrate and his subordinates have been informed how woefully wanting they have been in discharging their duties. It is to be hoped that the stern lesson now administered may lead to a wholesome reform.

Lord Sandhurst laid the foundation of the block of new dwelling-houses for the poor in the city on the 9th instant.

Bombay was grateful to H.R.H. the Prince of Wales for kindly remembering Bombay where on that historic day, twenty-four years ago, he first put his foot, and where he received his first magnificent and most loyal reception. The Viceroy at the same time pleased Bombay by his personal presence, and comforted us by stating that in our new Governor, whom he knows well, we shall find a statesman worthy of the Presidency, and one who will be liked by the people. Let us hope that this forecast will be realised.

"AN OFFSHOOT OF THE CHUPRA CASE."

[FROM THE "AMRITA BAZAR PATRIKA"]

It will be remembered that when Messrs. Corbett and Simkins instituted proceedings before Deputy Magistrate Moulvie Zakir Hossein, against constable Narsingh Singh, for assault and intentional insult, the latter brought a counter-case against them stating the real facts, namely, that he had been violently assaulted by the above two Europeans, one being the Assistant Police Superintendent, and the other, the District Engineer, of Saran. The Moulvie, however, not only dismissed this case but remarked that Narsingh Singh had been rightly served. The District Judge, Mr. Pennell, in the exercise of his revisional authority, delivered the following judgment, in which, it would be seen, he strongly commented on the conduct of the officiating District Magistrate and others concerned in the matter:—

REVISION CASE No. 6. (a) OF 1899.

In re Narsingh Singh vs. Corbett and Simkins.
Revision against the order of Moulvie Zakir Hossein, Deputy Magistrate of Chupra, dated September 8, 1899.

JUDGMENT.

In this case one Narsingh Singh lodged a petition before M. Zakir Hossein, Deputy Magistrate of Chupra, on August 23. In this petition he complained that Mr. Corbett, the Assistant Superintendent of Police, and Mr. Simkins, the District Engineer, had beaten him and unlawfully compelled him to labour against his will. He asked that they might be dealt with according to law.

The Deputy Magistrate examined the complainant on oath, and thereafter adjourned the case till the disposal of a case brought by Mr. Corbett against the complainant.

On September 8 the Deputy Magistrate delivered judgment in the latter case, sentencing the complainant to two months' rigorous imprisonment under Sections 352, 114, and 504 I. P. C. On the same day he passed the following order in the present case:

"This complaint is utterly without grounds. I have found in the counter-case that this complainant, as accused in that case, was the aggressor and that he was rightly served. I dismiss the complaint under Section 203 Cr. P. Code."

This case has come before me not on the application of the complainant, but in connexion with his appeal in the case in which he was convicted.

In the latter case I am this day delivering judgment acquitting the complainant.

It is only on the evidence recorded in that case that the Deputy Magistrate has purported to act in dismissing the present complaint. After carefully considering that evidence I am entirely unable to agree with the Deputy Magistrate that the present complaint is without grounds, that complainant was the aggressor, or that he was rightly served. On the contrary, it appears to me that the deposition of Messrs. Corbett and Simkins themselves in the case which Mr. Corbett brought against the complainant, furnish good grounds for their prosecution under Sections 323 and 374 of the I. P. C.

I therefore set aside the order of dismissal passed by the Deputy Magistrate and direct that a further enquiry be made into Narsingh Singh's complaint.

If the charge of this district were continuing in its present hands, it would seem to me very doubtful if any fair enquiry can be had, and I might probably deem a reference to the High Court necessary.

In the counter case I have found that the present District Magistrate was at the bottom of the dismissal of this case, that he has prostituted his position to screen Messrs. Corbett and Simkins from justice. Fortunately, however, the permanent District Magistrate, Mr. W. C. Macpherson, will be back here in a few days, and as I think it probable that all parties will feel confidence in his impartiality, a reference to the High Court is not required.

I direct that the further enquiry into Narsingh Singh's complaint be made by Mr. W. C. Macpherson himself.

(Signed) A. PENNELL, Sessions Judge.

7-10-99.

Now we need make no comments on the case as apparently it will come up for enquiry before Mr. Macpherson, the permanent Magistrate of Saran.

LORD LYTTON'S INDIAN ADMINISTRATION.

The following review by Sir Auckland Colvin of Lady Betty Balfour's "History of Lord Lytton's Indian Administration" (noticed in our columns a fortnight ago) appears in the *Review of the Week*:—

It would be ungracious to criticise this book too closely. In presence of great difficulties the late Lord Lytton's widow has done her best to give pious effect to the instructions in her husband's will for the production of a complete record of his

Indian administration. No "statesman or writer, in whose ability and character Lady Lytton had confidence," as the will runs, being available apparently for the task, her daughter, Lady Betty Balfour, has brought together, with the aid of a little group of Lord Lytton's Indian colleagues, a selection from the materials collected or preserved by the late Viceroy in connexion with his work in India. The narrative, Lady Betty writes, is presented to the public as a contribution to history rather than to biography. It is the Viceroy, therefore, not the many-sided Robert Lytton, that we see; while at the same time we breathe the loaded atmosphere of Indian public life, far remote from those pleasant meads and bosky alleys in which the genius of the versatile Earl dearly loved to dally and to disport itself. Even as a contribution to history much of the contents of this volume has been already before the public in blue-books, in other volumes relating to the Afghan war, in parliamentary reports. Yet here and there, every now and then, a personal note is struck. Something sad and pained confronts us, as of a man in much physical weakness and stress of bodily ailment working at a Titanic labour imposed upon him, and handling with infinite pain instruments fit only to be deftly wielded by stouter and more brawny arms. The "profound sense of discouragement" with which Lord Lytton admits that he started for Madras in the crisis of its famine was evidently no unaccustomed mood. Like Falstaff, as he later writes pathetically, he must often have wished that "it were bedtime and all were over." The interest of the volume, might, we venture to think, have been increased if its arrangement had been somewhat modified. The political thread of narrative connected with events on the North-West frontier is twice interrupted, once by the episode of the Delhi assemblage and the proclamation of the Queen as Empress of India, and once by the tale of the Madras famine. Would it not have been better to reserve these subjects till the story of the Afghan imbroglio had been completed, and to place them after the close of the Afghan war and immediately before the chapters which deal with the internal and financial administration of the late Viceroy?

It is not probable that his family will have expected any marked change in the public estimate of Lord Lytton's Indian administration from the publication of this volume. Events of later years have sufficiently shown what were the errors and where lay the strength of Lord Lytton's frontier policy. The two points on which he insisted as cardinal, viz., that British agents should reside at Herat or elsewhere on the Northern frontier of Afghanistan, and that Kandahar should be retained in British hands, have been recognised to be impracticable, and have been abandoned. It was on the former condition (insisted on in spite of the remonstrances of Sir Lewis Pelly, the Viceroy's envoy) that the negotiations with Amir Sher Ali fell through, and that war ultimately ensued. The Amir Abdulrahman is believed to have absolutely declined to accept the throne of Kabul unless Kandahar remained an integral part of that kingdom. The terms granted ultimately by the British Cabinet to Amir Abdulrahman do not appear in any material point to differ from the conditions which Amir Sher Ali was willing to accept, and so far as our relations with the Government of Kabul are concerned, the war of 1878 would seem, therefore, to have been fruitless. It may be urged that the conviction of our material strength, which was inevitably brought home to the Afghan mind by our successes during the war, was not fruitless; but was it commensurate with the enormous cost of life and money at which alone it was enforced? The conviction of our strength produced in 1841 by General Pollock and Nott was similarly unquestionable and bore good fruit in 1857, when Amir Dost Muhammad Ali was hesitating whether to attack us, in our troubles with the revolted Sepoys. But no one, on that account, would wish to reproduce the disasters which preceded the successes of those generals at Kabul. Then, again, though much of the Lawrence policy has been discarded in pursuance of Lord Lytton's views, much remains. Where Lord Lytton aimed at a weak and disunited Kabul, there still stands the friendly and independent buffer kingdom, which was regarded by Lord Lawrence as our best defence. If in defiance of the Lawrence policy we have established and multiplied our posts in the tribal territories adjoining the Kabul kingdom, we have respected the remonstrances of Amir Abdulrahman against the mission of British agents to points within that kingdom itself. Our present policy is, in fact, an amalgam of the Lawrence and Lytton views; a kind of compromise, such as British statesmen much encourage. There are not wanting indications, meanwhile, that possibly the early occupation of Herat by Russia may again before long reopen the Afghan question, and that our necessities in South Africa may prove the opportunity of Russia in Central Asia. The fate of Herat may thus have been sealed by the declaration of war which issued from Pretoria; and President Kruger would have the satisfaction of reflecting that if he has delivered two African Dutch Republics to the tender mercies of Great Britain, he has at least put the so-called key of India into the hands of Great Britain's greatest antagonist in Asia.

The chapters on the internal and financial policy pursued during Lord Lytton's Viceroyalty are not the least interesting in the volume, but they record for the most part the results of

the labours of Lord Lytton's colleagues rather than of the personal administration of the Viceroy, who had neither the time nor the requisite knowledge to bestow on these intricate questions. The finances of India were administered by Sir John Strachey; the policy of famine public works was practically in charge of his brother, Sir Richard. "A nobler, more humane, or wiser programme was never devised by any Government for the benefit of a country than that put forth by the Government of India in 1878 for the protection of India" against famine, wrote these eminent brothers in 1878 in their book upon the "Finances and Public Works of India." But to those acquainted with the course of Indian administration it is evident that this eulogy is more applicable to the authors of the paragraph quoted than to the Viceroy who presided at the general Council table. Of Lord Lytton's Press Laws, and his regulations in regard to the establishment of a Statutory Civil Service, nothing now remains. If it would be premature to say that the present provisions of the laws by which Lord Lytton's legislation was repealed are likely to provide the final remedy desired, it is certain that his measures were found impracticable of execution, and were discarded as insufficiently considered. The many pages devoted in this volume to the mummeries and masquerade of the Delhi assemblage might have been contentedly curtailed. The policy of proclaiming the Queen to be Empress of India, which brought that assemblage together, did not in any way originate with Lord Lytton. The developments which he proposed to give to that policy were neither approved nor accepted. The lip-loyalty of the mediatised Princes, and their sugared phrases addressed on so august an occasion to her Majesty's representative, were surely not worth the reprinting. They can have deceived no one at all conversant with the East, least of all Lord Lytton himself. They formed part and parcel of the unreality of that somewhat comical pageant, and they had better be forgotten with it. On the other hand, the credit of having successfully combated the Madras Famine may be fairly assigned personally to the Viceroy. By a visit to Madras from Simla during a very trying time of year, by tact, temper, and patience, he induced the Madras Government to convert chaos into order, and he laid the foundation of a system of famine relief which has shown itself singularly successful.

There is quoted incidentally in connexion with the proceedings at the Delhi assemblage a somewhat curious expression of Lord Lytton's views on the importance of the great Indian Chiefs: "I am convinced that the fundamental political mistake of able and experienced Indian officials is a belief that we can hold India securely by what they call good government; that is to say, by improving the condition of the rayat, strictly administering justice, spending immense sums on irrigation works, etc. Politically speaking, the Indian peasantry is an inert mass. If it ever moves at all, it will move in obedience, not to its British benefactors, but to its Native chiefs and princes, however tyrannical they may be. . . . The Indian chiefs and princes are not a mere *noblesse*. They are a powerful aristocracy. To secure completely and sufficiently utilise the Indian aristocracy is, I am convinced, the most important problem now before us," and so on. It needs scarcely to be pointed out that the position of the Native princes is not analogous to that of an aristocracy, properly so called. They live and move outside the system of British India, and their names have little significance or influence with the mass of British Indian subjects. In times of trouble, some members of the disaffected classes from our territories might possibly rally to their standard; as, on the other hand, if they proved themselves loyal, disaffection in British India might be discouraged by their attitude. But this is a very different matter from furnishing disproof of the contention that we can hold India best by good government. The view pressed by Lord Lytton is one which might easily have been adopted by a Viceroy under the influence of the ceremonials, the salutes, and gilded glories of the Delhi assemblage. But Lord Lytton should have remembered that it was the "inert mass," too indifferent, too content, or too timid to rise up against us in its millions, which in 1857 set our hands at freedom to deal with the disaffected soldiery; and that, on the other hand, in spite of the lukewarm loyalty of princes such as Scindra, or the active disloyalty of lesser feudatories, we were never confronted with any large body of popular hostile feeling in our own provinces. It was the *dispossessed nobility*—the Nana at Cawnpore, the Rani at Jhansi, the Talukdars in Oudh—who were our irreconcilable enemies, and who showed themselves powerful for evil. The princes or chiefs in undisputed possession of their territories were disposed rather to befriend than to oppose us. Since 1857, the recognition by the British Government of the right of adoption by the Native chiefs, in cases where no immediate heir existed, has done much to reassure and to conciliate them. What danger to our rule may exist in that quarter lies much more in the large armed forces at the disposal of the mediatised Princes than in their moral influence over our own people. Especially has this become the case since, by the creation of the Imperial Service Corps, a portion of the army of each Native State, while remaining under the control of its Chief, has been armed, drilled, disciplined, and rendered effective through the supervision or by the agency of British officers.

THE EXCERDING POVERTY OF THE INDIAN PEOPLE.

[FROM THE "INVESTORS' REVIEW,"]

On September 27 Lord Curzon, the Viceroy of India, made a short speech on the Punjab Land Alienation Bill, which was described at the time as one of the most able and striking he had yet delivered in India. We gladly subscribe to that view, because it was a speech indicating a sympathetic mind on the part of his lordship. He evidently does not intend to be a mere automaton puppet, worked by the ruling bureaucracy, but is seeking to penetrate the mysteries surrounding him, and to get at the facts. Here are two extracts from the speech, which we shall make the text, as it were, of what we now have to say on this subject:—

The issues at stake are, in my judgment, as momentous as any that can attract the attention of the Government of India. There is no country in the world so dependent upon the prosperity of the agricultural classes as India, no government in the world so personally interested in agriculture as the Indian Government. We are, in the strictest sense of the term, the largest landlords in creation. Our land revenues are the staple of our income. Upon the contentment and solvency of the millions who live upon the soil is based the security of our rule. In the present case we have all the greater responsibility from the fact that in the Punjab we originated the present land system which has had the unfortunate consequences that it is proposed to rectify, as well as the legal system which has given the user his opportunity. A double responsibility, therefore, rests upon our shoulders. We cannot afford to see the yeoman farmers of the Punjab, the flower of the population and the backbone of the native army, dwindle and become impoverished. Neither can we acquiesce in the consummation of a social revolution in contradiction both of the traditions of Indian society and of the cardinal precepts of British rule.

Many objections can be raised to this legislation. It will be said that we are taking away a right which we ourselves too generously conferred; that we are depreciating the value of land, or that we are affecting the credit of a section of the population to whom a mistaken system has given the opportunity of borrowing up to the edge of their own ruin. But even were these minor drawbacks to be realised—and I do not think they will be to any appreciable extent—they must be weighed in the balance against the vastly superior advantages to the land-owning and agricultural community that we have in view, and they must be measured by the scale of the disaster which, unless drastic measures be taken, will assuredly before long overwhelm the smaller zemindari classes of our population. I trust that in the public scrutiny to which we now commit this proposal these considerations of statesmanship may be borne in view. Great and salutary ends are not apt to be secured by timid and temporising means.

Every word of the above is true, and we rejoice to find a man in such an exalted position as that occupied by Lord Curzon speaking out upon this momentous subject. But is there not something wanting? He does not attempt to indicate the root of the mischief. Some deep-seated reason must exist for this tendency of the active, laborious, and thrifty Punjab farmer, "the flower of the population, and the backbone of the Native army," as he describes it, to sink down and disappear among the crowd of the utterly poor, bereft of their inheritance. Why do usurers obtain such hold over the agricultural population of India? His lordship hints that our liberality in putting legal facilities into the usurers' hands to enable them to foreclose upon creditors is at the bottom of it. But then, why is the people driven to seek assistance from the usurer? He cannot compel a farmer to borrow from him, and it is against commonsense to suppose that farmers would allow themselves to fall into the hands of these harpies if they had any choice in the matter. The evil must lie far deeper than anything apparently as yet suspected by the Viceroy, and his speech reminds us of the man who sought to remove traces of a spring that made a continual bog of a portion of his garden paths by heaping up the wet ground with gravel, instead of digging down and draining the water away.

The true cause of the devastation that for many years had been gradually spreading among the small land-holders of India, tenants of the Government and of the Native landowner, is the burden of our Imperial dominion. And unless we can make up our minds to face the problem from this side, it is to be feared that no law, however skillfully drawn, will stop the mischief. If a hard-pressed farmer, unable to live while paying his taxes, cannot mortgage his land out and out, giving the mortgagee power to oust him on failure to redeem the debt, we may depend upon it that other and yet more grievous demands will be made upon him by the money-lender, and his next state will be worse than the present one. Many times in past years we have tried to convey to the British public some idea of the utter poverty in which the majority of the Indian population lives. It is a thankless and almost impossible undertaking, but we should like, if anybody will listen to us, to make one more attempt.

According to the most recent figures, the agricultural population of India numbers about 173 millions, of which 135½ millions are embraced in the provinces directly under British rule, and another 36 millions odd live in Native States more or less completely controlled by British residents. How many of these people are farmers owning their own land, subject merely

to Government taxation, we cannot say, but the decided majority is unquestionably composed of small cultivators, and we can form some conception of the slender resources possessed by the entire body from the rates of wages paid to the labourers. Now we find that in a number of districts selected by the British Government the wages of the agricultural labourers do not exceed Rs. 5 per month. Among these districts are Patna, Cawnpore, Meerut, Fyzabad, Jubbulpur, Nagpur, Rajpur, and Salem. In not one single district in India amongst those selected for illustration does any agricultural labourer earn as much as Rs. 10 per month, except in Bombay, Backerganj, and in Burma, Rangoon, and Toungu. Now, consider what it means to be earning only from Rs. 1 to Rs. 1½ per week. At the present rate of exchange this means 1s. 4d. to 1s. 8d. per week, but it is useless to compare figures in this way with British money. The only thing we can do is to discover, if possible, what the purchasing power of this piece of money is to the recipient, and, in a rough way, we are able to do so by noting how much of certain kinds of food grains can be bought in different parts of India with this amount of Indian money.

What follows will be very dull and uninteresting to that class of mind which is anxious to be told what securities are going up on the Stock Exchange next week. If, however, such will have the patience to read and then try to think a little about these matters, they may be able to form some dim conception of the precarious foundation upon which our great Imperial dominion in India rests, and incidentally some contribution may be made towards a solution of the question whether the purchasing power of the rupee has declined much within the peninsula. We take a few examples much as they come, beginning with Patna, where the monthly wages of the agricultural labourer have risen from between Rs. 3 and Rs. 4 a month in 1873 to between Rs. 4 and Rs. 5 now. Between the same periods of time, taking averages of five years—that is to say, 1873 to 1877 inclusive as the first period, and 1893 to 1897, also inclusive, as the second, the average quantity of rice procurable in exchange for one rupee has fallen from 36 lb. to 30 lb., there or thereabouts. But in 1897 the purchasing power of the rupee fell so much in this district, owing to the famine in other parts of India, that one rupee bought barely 21 lb. of rice. How much rice is required to sustain in full vigour the body of a working-man the year through, we do not know, data of that kind appearing to be unobtainable; but in England it takes 360 lb. of wheat, roundly speaking, on an average, to feed one human being, able-bodied or otherwise, the year through, in addition to the unascertained quantities of meat and vegetables. On the basis of 1897 a family of five in Patna could only have provided themselves with 220 lb. of rice per head to keep them alive.

Cawnpore is another example where wages have risen to the same standard as in Patna—i.e., Rs. 4 to Rs. 5 per month, or, say a rupee per week, after having been less than Rs. 4 in the earlier period selected; and there we find that the purchasing power of the rupee was equal to securing an average of 40 lb. of wheat in 1873-7, and only about 29 lb. in 1893-7. No benefit, therefore, came to the labourer here from the increase in his wages. One of the poorest districts in India, gauged by this test, appears to be Fyzabad, for there the wages of the same class of workmen range from Rs. 1.87 to Rs. 4, and have varied scarcely any since 1873, the lowest at that date being still Rs. 1.87, and the highest Rs. 3.75. Life must be hard indeed to the rural population in that region, for it cannot possibly buy rice enough to sustain life, the purchasing power of the rupee being only equal to about 25 lb. of that grain. And it is little better with wheat, which is cheaper than rice, for a rupee in the latter period we have given was worth only about 27 lb. of this cereal, as against 40 lb. twenty years before. Probably, however, the population has to depend for keeping body and soul together chiefly upon great millet, jawar, but even of this it cannot now get enough to sustain life comfortably, for the price has so risen that a rupee commands only some 37 lb. of the grain, as against nearly 60 lb. twenty years before.

The same kind of story is told at every other point where we have the figures. Wages in Delhi have risen, and so has the price of grain. At Amritsar, indeed, wages have risen from about Rs. 6 a month twenty years ago to between Rs. 7 and Rs. 8 in the five years ended 1897, and the tendency appears to be still upwards, but the labourer cannot be considered better off, for the cost of living has increased at a greater ratio than the means—not much, but still a little—the increase in wages being, roughly, one-third, or 33½ per cent., and in the price of rice about 3½ per cent. The labourer is able to buy only about 19 lb. of rice now with his rupee, as against 29 lb. twenty years back. He is worse fed, therefore, than the labourer in Patna, and if there is a large section of the population kept in a state of semi-starvation such as this even in years of plenty, can we wonder that the usurper should be rending the life out of the community so that families are now becoming calamities of almost perennial occurrence? In Jubbulpur wages have actually declined, being now only Rs. 3½ per month, as against Rs. 4 to Rs. 5 between 1873-7. Yet

here, likewise, it is becoming harder for the people to live, through the slow advance in the price of cereals. A rupee bought 35 lb. of rice at the first dates given, and buys little more than 25 lb. in the second group of years. Indeed, if we take 1897 alone, its purchasing power is down to less than 20 lb.; but we have taken averages of five years invariably.

Without multiplying examples further, it may be said that, on the whole, the purchasing power of the silver rupee has not uniformly, or perhaps, in a majority of instances, declined to the same extent that the coin has sunk on the exchange market, but that it has declined beyond question, and that its tendency now is to become calamitously less than it was in the seventies is only too apparent from the statistics. Can any inference be drawn from such a statement but the one that the people of India are being steadily and relentlessly pressed by our system of Government and our enormous load of taxation down towards starvation? At least fifty millions of them must always live in a condition of semi-starvation now and have nothing whatever to spare, either for the tax-collector or anyone else. When to the demands of the tax-collector are added those of the atrocious Native money-lender, can it be wondered at that small land-holders disappear, that farmers become serfs in the hands of the unscrupulous usurers, that hunger and discontent are prevalent over large areas of the peninsula? It is no light burden that the people has to bear, especially that portion of it directly under our rule. As we said at the outset, there are more than thirty-six millions of agricultural inhabitants of India in Native States who bear but an insignificant share in the cost of our Government. All these Native States together do not contribute Rs. 9,000,000 to our total revenue of Rs. 960,000,000. From taxes alone of various descriptions the population directly under the sway of the Simla Government has every year now to raise upwards of Rs. 600,000,000. To do this, many of them must go without sufficient food pretty well all their lives, reduce their consumption to the minimum necessary to sustain life, abstain from providing themselves with clothing, and live far more basely than the wild beasts of the jungle. Is not this an aspect of Indian life worth a British investor's serious consideration? Ought not every intelligent citizen at home to direct his mind somewhat to this great question, with a view to bring intelligent pressure upon the administration at home and upon the Viceroy and his Council to set about economising and developing the resources of the country, not by huge loans and gigantic works, but by such simple devices as the "water mining" recommended for Cyprus by Mr. Patrick Geddes, lest worse should befall? Another dreadful famine has now begun to eat its way into the life of perhaps fifty millions of Indian people, and it is spreading its effects far wider than that, for although only thirty millions altogether are said to be directly affected, prices all over India will go against the poor because of the distress into which these thirty millions are plunged. This cannot go on for ever, and what is the use of calculating the income from various Indian investments provided by our enterprise, if the whole foundation upon which this income rests is being eaten away like a pillar of wood by worms? One day the pillar will collapse, unless we bestir ourselves and apply the one radical cure—economy; economy and the diligent endeavour to help the millions of the very poor to rise above continual want.

PUBLIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

THE WORK OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

So far during the present season meetings exclusively devoted to Indian affairs have been addressed by lecturers on behalf of the British Committee as follows:—

Sept. 26.—Melksham.	Nov. 1.—Guisborough.
Oct. 3.—Weston-super-	6.—Aspatia.
	Mare.
6.—Hayward's Heath.	7.—Maryport.
9.—Stokenchurch.	8.—Cockermouth.
13.—Nottingham.	14.—Sheffield.
16.—Bentham.	14.—Attercliffe.
18.—Prestwich.	16.—Exeter.
21.—Failssworth.	17.—Plymouth.
27.—Otley.	20.—Leamington.

Indian questions have also been dealt with in addresses on current politics at the following places:—

Oct. 2.—Exmouth.	Oct. 23.—Horwich.
5.—Brighton.	24.—Burton-on-Trent.
10.—Watlington.	25.—Ripponden.
11.—Benson.	26.—Sowerby Bridge.
15.—Keighley.	31.—Beverly.
19.—Wigan.	Nov. 9.—Accrington.

SINGER'S SEWING MACHINES.

FOR CASH OR HIRE.

Machines Exchanged and Repaired.

DUPLICATE PARTS, NEEDLES, OIL, &c.,
ALWAYS IN STOCK.

100 Offices in India, Burma, and Ceylon.

Instructions Free. Price Lists Free on application.

The SINGER } 5, CHURCH GATE ST.
Manufacturing Co. } BOMBAY.

“INDIA,” JAN.-JUNE, 1899.
VOL. XI.

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). Price

7/6 each, post free.

Remittances should accompany order.

Apply to the Manager, “INDIA,”

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

TUITION BY CORRESPONDENCE.

B. C. GHOSH, B.A. (Cantab), Honours in Mathematics and Natural Sciences, M.A. (Allahabad), Government of India State Scholar, Ouseley Scholar School of Modern Oriental Studies, Imperial Institute, formerly lecturer Bareilly Aided College, prepares students for various examinations, Indian and English, by Correspondence; and supplies gentlemen in India with information as to courses of study at Cambridge and preparation advisable before coming over to England for the I.C.S. Open Competition. Address St. John's College, Cambridge.



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

I beg to enclose a cheque for the “Jvara-Hari.” Both in India and Africa I have found the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER
G. E. WOOD, Capt. and North Staffs. Regt.
“Jvara-Hari” is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is
more than made in it. G. L. KARSINGIA BOW.

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

Cuddalore Municipal Councilors' Office.—“I have much pleasure in stating that your ‘Omum-Carpoor’ was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage.
Prices of “JVARA-HARI” and “OMUM-CARPOOR” 2 ans., Rs. 1/8 Rs. 2/12 Rs., and 11 Es. 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.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in “INDIA,” should be made to

THE MANAGER,

84 & 85, Palace Chambers,

Westminster, S.W.

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

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

LECTURES and ADDRESSES ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

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

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

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

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

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

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

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

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

DR. V. VENOR says: “I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.”—21st March, 1898.

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



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

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

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