ertainly a very difficult one, and it is impossible or them to be altogether uninfluenced by their nvironment and natural feelings towards their llow-countrymen ; but this renders it all the ore necessary for them to be on their guard gainst any display, or apparent display, of rtiality. I am glad to acknowledge that in any conspicuous instances they discharge their vidious duties with exemplary firmness and urage; but there is an undoubted tendency to flict severe sentences when natives of India e concerned, and to impose light and sometimes inadequate punishment upon offenders of ieir own race. It is impossible to read the cord of these trials and not to feel that justice not always well and duly administered between an and man. In the meantime a feeling of sentiment and indignation is excited among ie members of the Indian community, and the epresentative press on both sides runs riot in violent and uncontrolled torrent of mutual ecrimination. We are confronted by a problem extreme administrative difficulty, in which the ements of race antagonism are vigorously flected, and the most dangerous passions are used. It is not easy to suggest a remedy, nd for my part I do not know that any better r simpler scheme can be devised than the

institution of special courts for the trial of cas in which Europeans are charged with the coı mission of serious offences This remedy m not be wholly adequate, but it seems to affo the easiest solution. I can unreservedly appla Lord Curzon's policy in this matter. He h spoken out plainly on the great questi between man and man, and, although he l quailed more than once before the storm English race feeling, it is the merest just to say that nothing has more distinguish his administration of our Indian Empire th his overpowering detestation of injustice, a resolve to vindicate uprightness and puni wrong-doers.[1]

[1] The Anglo-Indian press attacks Lord Curzon's sense justice in the most virulent manner. A leading weekly pa writes as follows in October 1903.—"Here in India the wh population are much exercised about the 'Bam' case. Th feel that they have as a ruler a man utterly devoid of sympath and without any of those British instincts which go to make real statesman. They feel that racial animosity is being stirr up, instead of oil being poured upon the troubled waters. V would recommend to the consideration of Lord Curzon the words: 'He who stands by his own order need never fear t crowd'"; and concludes its article by saying:—"If a wh man offends against the laws of this country he should undou edly be punished, but in our opinion the punishment shou not take the form of lowering him in the eyes of the nati community, and if it is necessary to send him to prison, he shou be imprisoned in Port Blair, or outside India. The spectacle a white man being treated as an ordinary Indian convict do

Bitterness of Race Feeling

It is a grave symptom that the official body
ı India has now succumbed as completely as
ıe non-official to anti-native prejudices. I write
ı general terms, always remembering that there
·e many among my old colleagues and suc-
:ssors who rise above all prejudice and most
nourably fulfil their obligations towards our
dian fellow-subjects; but speaking generally,
y statement calls for no further qualification.
he time has passed away when non-official
nglishmen formed one party in India and the
ıdians another, while the Government officials
ere charged with the function of protecting
ıtive interests; and instead thereof we now see
state of things in which the Indian community
ists alone on the one side, while both classes
Englishmen, official as well as non-official,
e united on the other. It is indeed a grave
osition to which we have drifted, for the
ıange is complete and the tension acute.
he non-official community is naturally, in-
nctively, as it were, placed in a position of
tagonism to the people of the soil. This

re to destroy the prestige of the British in India than any-
ng we can conceive."
These extracts illustrate the length to which racial prejudice
ll go, and the necessity of maintaining a strong and firm
licy to curb it.

fact is well brought out by John Stuart Mi[l] who wrote more than forty years ago language which might have been utter yesterday:—

If there be a fact to which all experience testif it is that when a country holds another in subjecti the individuals of the ruling people who resort to foreign country to make their fortunes are, of others, those who most need to be held under pow ful restraint. They are always one of the cl difficulties of the Government. Armed with *prestige* and filled with the scornful overbearingr of the conquering nation, they have the feeli inspired by absolute power without its sense responsibility. Among a people like that of Inc the utmost efforts of the public authorities are i enough for the effectual protection of the weak agai the strong; and of all the strong European setti are the strongest. Wherever the demoralising ef of the situation is not in a most remarkable deg corrected by the personal character of the individi they think the people of the country mere dirt un their feet; it seems to them monstrous that a rights of the natives should stand in the way of tl smallest pretensions; the simplest act of protec to the inhabitants against any act of power on tl part, which they may consider useful to tl

[1] Chapter xvm. of *Considerations on Representative Gov ment*, which treats "of the government of dependencies a free state."

mercial objects, they denounce and sincerely ard as an injury. So natural is their state of ling in a situation like theirs, that even under the couragement which it has hitherto met with from : ruling authorities it is impossible that more or s of the spirit should not perpetually break out. e Government itself, free from this spirit, is never e sufficiently to keep it down in the young and even of its own civil and military officers, over om it has so much more control than over the lependent residents.

In former times the civilian element in India s the self-constituted champion of native hts, and the people of the country always felt at the members of the Civil Service might relied on to protect them from oppression at e hands of the English settlers. During the itation which accompanied the passing of acaulay's so-called Black Act—of which an structive account will be found in Sir George evelyan's Life—when the whole non-official orld was banded together to prevent what it nceived to be the injustice of allowing native lges to exercise civil jurisdiction over British-rn subjects, the Civil Service as a body re-ained firm and supported the Government. uring the indigo disturbances of forty years o the civilians were the staunch friends and otectors of the natives against the indigo-

planters, and incurred thereby an extraordinary amount of odium and obloquy. In those days it was the practice to blackball an official at the Bengal Club, whither men connected with indigo do most resort, merely because he was an official. There was little prospect then of the amalgamation of the two classes of European or of any identity of interests which would induce them to combine in a spirit of self-assertion against the natives.

The change is due partly to the enormously increased influence which the non-official European community now exercises. The numbers have augmented, their interests in industries like jute and tea, coal and cotton have extended, and the Chambers of Commerce at the Presidency towns are now a power which is able to withstand the Government, and too often leads and dictates its policy. The position of officers scattered throughout a province where the unofficial Europeans are the principal social force with which they are in contact becomes one of increasing difficulty, and it is small wonder if they no longer display the independence and courage which were the attribute of their predecessors. The Government has grown too weak or is too demoralised to accord them its support. Few things are

ore remarkable in contemporary history in dia than the sinister growth of this com- ercial influence over the executive administra- on. Individual independence is now swept vay by the pressure brought to bear upon it, id a John Peter Grant or an Ashley Eden who these later days may venture to attempt to dress the wrongs of the weak and oppressed, oes so at his peril. The identification of nterests of all classes of Europeans in India has een Lord Curzon's consistent endeavour. To ne tea-planters of Assam he said:[1] "I look pon all Englishmen in this country as engaged n different branches of the same great under- aking. Here we are all fellow-countrymen, omrades, and friends The fact that some of us earn our livelihood or discharge our duty by he work of administration, and others by culti- vating the resources of the soil, does not differentiate us one from the other. These are nerely the subdivisions of labour; they are not distinctions of object or purpose or aim." And again on another occasion in addressing the nine-owners he declared:[2] "My work lies in administration, yours in exploitation; but both are aspects of the same question and of the

[1] Speech at Cachar, November 1901

[2] Speech at Bu akur, January 1903.

same duty." There is no word of the obligation on English officials to devote themselves to the duty of championing the cause of their suffering fellow-subjects, or of protecting them from oppression; no word of the duty of the strong to protect the weak. The warnings of John Stuart Mill are forgotten. The English in India must be either administrators or exploiters. The ideal of the far-off future is the perfection of the country by the twofold agency of British administration and British exploiting: all are alike engaged in the country's advancement. There is no sign of any appreciation of the capacities and claims of the Indian people, or any thought of the place they are to occupy after generations of foreign administration and exploitation. And yet the thought is one that must be always with us. The prosperity of a country has no meaning apart from that of the human beings who are born and dwell in it. To Englishmen the country may mean the soil of India, with all that is above and below it. To Indians it can only mean the people. This theory of identic British interests denotes, no doubt, the advancement of Englishmen, but it does not connote the welfare and happiness of the children of the soil. On the one side it has directly led to the formation of a solid phalanx

: opinion in acute antagonism to Indian aspira-
ons. On the other it has stirred the nascent
)irit of Indian opposition, and the bitterness of
ıce feeling has been accentuated by the
)nstant iteration of a policy in which the
ıdians have no part or share. They have
arnt by experience that exploitation spells
onomic serfdom, and that British interests are
)stile to their own.

There are other causes also at work set
:eper in the very foundations of the structure
)on which is based the fabric of India's
'olution This great change—the gradual
ıalgamation of opinion and interests among
l classes of Englishmen, in contradistinction to
e wishes and welfare of the Indian people
- is due not only to the fulfilment of an
:onomic policy, powerfully as that cause has
perated, but even more largely to the universal
ndencies upon which I have already so fully
welt. The change was inevitable with the
ıread of English education. The Indian people
ıve now found their voice, and their principal
:mand is, as might have been expected, for a
rger share in the loaves and fishes of the
dministration. A struggle is thereby generated
ith the official classes, and the sense of rivalry
ıus occasioned has created a more effective

barrier between Indians and officials than that which has always been felt to exist between Indians and the non-official community. Both classes of Europeans are equally reluctant to admit the natives to equality, and the official class is especially aggrieved because the natives are invading preserves which have hitherto been free from any intruder.

The result of education has tended to equalise the races, and the nearer the equality the stronger the dislike. The more Anglicised an Indian is the more he is disliked by Englishmen. The sense of jealousy becomes greater Whatever may be professed, Englishmen are ready to encourage the natives who speak broken English more than those who speak good English, those who are subject to Hindoo prejudices more than those who have renounced them, and generally those who are far removed from English habits of thought and life more than those who have made a very close approach to them They are more pleased with the backward Hindoo than with his advanced compatriot, because the former has made no attempt to attain equality with themselves.

This abhorrence of equality rankles in the mind of all Anglo-Indians, and especially of officials. It is the peculiarity of residence in

ıe East to develop sentiments of intolerance nd race superiority. It is painful to observe ıe habitual and almost universal exhibition of ıce insolence displayed by our fellow countryıen as soon as they come in contact with a ›wer scale of civilisation. It may not need .he tenderness of a saint,' but it is not the ttribute of white men to display consideration ıd courtesy to the members of a coloured ce. That intense Anglo-Saxon spirit of self-›probation which is unpleasantly perceptible ı England itself, and is so often offensive ıong vulgar Englishmen on the Continent, ry soon becomes rampant in India. Officials . India are far from being exempt from that eakness of human nature which is tickled by attery and nourished by servile obsequiousness.)ur Oriental subjects have pandered to this veakness, and, in accordance with the custom)f Eastern countries, practise the profoundest dulation and abasement towards those set in uthority over them. English officials, although ıey pretend to dislike this attitude, are secretly leased at it, and do not hesitate to give open ·xpression to their annoyance at its non-)bservance. There are innumerable instances n which pedestrians have been abused and struck because they have not lowered their

umbrellas at the sight of a sahib on the high way. There are few Indian gentlemen even o the highest rank who have not had experienc of gross insults when travelling by railway because Englishmen object to sit in the sam carriage with a native. This form of insolenc generally takes the shape of forcible ejectio with all goods and chattels. In a recent *Time* review of the *Leaves from the Diaries of Soldier and Sportsman*, by Sir Montagu Gerarc I read as follows:—"We have never read a book which shows more pertinently how the ruling caste, from sheer carelessness or fro inbred contempt for the coloured races, la themselves out to court unpopularity. Take two of his instances. A subaltern gets into a railway carriage, where, to his disgust, he finds a couple of Hindoo gentlemen. He quietly waits till the train is in motion, and then, as he expresses it, 'fires them out of the door.' A petty Rajah, going on a state visit to Agra, takes his seat in a first-class compartment, with a magnificent send-off by his loyal subjects. On his return he sneaks out of the third-class and explains to the expectant crowds that on the former occasion he had been boxed up with a couple of sahibs, muddy from snipe-shooting, who had made

ım shampoo them all the way." This story f the Indian Rajah, who was called upon to nlace the boots and shampoo the weary legs f a British officer, is corroborated by Sir David Barr, the Resident at Hyderabad, and would ɔe incredible if it were not vouched for by such .igh authority. One does not know whether ɔ marvel most at the insolence of the young ubaltern or at the miserable spirit of the Rajah, which induced him to submit to such basement. But the incident illustrates the ɛngth to which British arrogance will go.

It is but too common an outrage to assault respectable residents of the country because when ɔassing on the road they have not dismounted rom their horses in token of their inferiority. I have known a case in which an unfortunate ɔld man died from the effects of blows so received. The great shoe question as it is called, ıas convulsed official society a hundred times. The comparative independence of the lads of :he rising generation has excited in countless nstances the ire of the officials who come in contact with them, and a crusade against the muslin-coated students of Bengal has culminated in more than one unjust and ludicrous prosecution before a magistrate. It is with the extremest jealousy—notwithstanding their pro-

testations in preference of a spirit of indepe dence—that the official community has tolerat the omission by the natives of the country any one of the extravagant signs of respect a humility to which it has hitherto been accu tomed. But with the wide dissemination English education and the growth of Weste ideas it has been compelled to accept a chang "Men who speak better English than mo Englishmen, who read Mill and Comte, Ma Muller and Maine, who occupy with distinctio seats on the judicial bench, who administer th affairs of native states with many millions inhabitants, who manage cotton mills and co duct the boldest operations of commerce, wh edit newspapers in English and correspond o equal terms with the scholars of Europe—thes can no longer be treated as an inferior breed" They assert and exercise independence. They claim a position of equality with the ruling race They demand to participate to an ever-increas ing extent in the administration of their ow affairs. They neglect to salaam to an English man when they meet him in the street, an they do not take off their shoes in his presence

[1] It is a pleasure to me to quote this paragraph from my brother's monograph on *Inaiq*, in the English Citizen Series (Macmillan, 1883)

onsciously or unconsciously, their attitude
ccites displeasure, and is characterised by the
ilers of the country as one of growing arrogance.
: is a common thing to hear an English
vilian now say: "No one can have a more
ındly feeling towards the natives of the country
ıan I have; I like the people; I like the
ıasses; I like the up-country natives; but I
annot endure the Baboos." This puts the
hole case in a nutshell. It is the Baboos who
e the product of English education and
ilisation. The Indian Services as a body
ıve no sympathy with the aspirations of the
lucated portion of the native community.
he opposition to all proposals for the enlarge-
ent of India's liberties is headed by members
f the Civil Service, and the unanimity of
pposition is almost as marked among magis-
ates and judges as it is among planters,
ıerchants, and members of other professions.
he dislike to the educated natives of India
shared by all classes of Englishmen.

I must add that the strength of dislike
etween the two races has always been greater
ı the side of the Englishman than on that of
ıe native. Those who know the Indians best
ill be the first to acknowledge the natural
ffection and gratefulness of their disposition.

New India

An Indian daily newspaper, published in C cutta, contains some observations on tl subject in a remarkable article entitled "Nati attachment and gratitude to good, just, a noble-minded Englishmen," from which I ma the following extract:—

It is a practical commentary on the truth a justice of the charge brought against natives, tl they bitterly hate the dominant race as a rule, tl individual attachment to individual Englishn should be so marked a trait in native charac It is hardly possible to travel over any part of Ir where some individual Englishman has not left i impress of his hand, whether for good or evil, on i locality and its people. And it reflects the high credit and honour on the native races that, while i names of the bad and oppressive men have almi been forgotten, the memory of the good, just, charitable Englishmen has been preserved by traditi in perfect freshness—a perpetual testimony to tl simplicity, forgiving spirit, and gratitude of the Indi character. To hate bitterly is not in native natu. The native heart is naturally kind, but the kindne becomes warmer when the object of it is a memb of the dominant class. It is not always because expect any return from him, but it is a pecul feeling with us to be anxious to stand well with race to whom we owe so many obligations as a fall and subject people. If those obligations had bee unmixed with quite as great wrongs, it is our fe

t Englishmen might have become objects of our
latry, so enthusiastic is our regard and affection
all who really mean to confer or have conferred
us any great benefits.

It seems to me that there is little or no
aggeration in these remarks; and for my own
rt I must say that I have often been astonished
the ebullitions of Indian gratitude which are
frequently evoked when English officials, who
ıw the whole of their salaries from India, have
rally done no more than their bare duty by
people of the country in whose service they
employed. The expression of real sympathy
h natives is always, in my experience, repaid
a hundredfold degree of respect and gratitude.
the *Indian Mirror* again observes in the
ne article :—

t is utterly false to say, as has been said, that
ves hate Englishmen as such. It is quite true that
y do hate Europeans who miss no opportunity to
rn, abuse, and degrade them, or to injure them;
it is equally true that their respect and attachment
such men of Western races as do or mean to do
m any good is almost unbounded.

f there is any increase of dislike between
two races, I must place on record my
ıviction that the people of India are not
ponsible for this aggravation of sentiment.

It is due entirely to the changed circumstan in which the ruling race has found itself place

It would be strange, however, if there w not a reciprocity of dislike. The organs Anglo-India have lately resented with so warmth the tendency of the English-speak portion of the Indian community to speak a think of the British in India as "foreigne The word strikes a jarring note and is natura resented, but the tendency is undoubted. I one symptom of the national awakening the rising spirit of patriotism, of the strug for equality. The revolution which has b wrought by English influences and civilisa will always constitute the most abiding mo ment of British rule. The change is complete as that which was effected by Renaissance in Europe. It is hundred-arm and leaves no side of the national chara untouched. But the Government is irrespons it remains the same, a monopoly of the ru race, and so far from there being any advance in the direction of popular concessi a distinct reactionary impulse animates counsels. There is no diminution of suspic distrust, and dislike of the national movem The aim and end of the new Imperial polic to knit with closer bonds the power of

itish Empire over India, to proclaim and ablish that supremacy through ceremonies of np and pageantry, and by means of British tal to exploit the country in the economic ests of the British nation. The encourage- t of Indian aspirations falls not within its

It would be strange indeed if the fire of triotic opposition were not kindled. A e of political disabilities is the dominant of discontent among the educated classes, to this has been superadded the conscious- of the economic evil which the exploitation the country by foreign capital and foreign ncies inflicts on it. Their anti-official itiment is due to their practical exclusion m participation in the higher official life heir country, the anti-commercial feeling is to their practical exclusion from participation he higher walks of industrial and commercial

The burning embers are slowly rising into me. There is a growing spirit of antagonism less to the commercial than to the official sentatives of British rule; the great gulf h separates Englishmen from Indians is ning, and the increased bitterness of race ng is now reflected by Indian as well as English prejudice

INDIAN LAND PROBLEMS

THE bulk of the Government revenue in I
is derived from the land, and there is no de
ment of the Government to which more ince
and continuous attention is devoted. In
particular are we more ready to contrast Br
rule with native rule so largely in our
favour, as in our dealings with the land.
point to our equitable assessments as enha
ing the value of landed property, to
agricultural experiments as increasing its
ductiveness, and to the benign protectio
the British Government as enabling the ryot
his family to enjoy the fruits of their to
unmolested quiet. But there is not one of
beliefs which is not delusive. Our dealings
the land have been more destructive o
ancient proprietary rights than were the
methods which preceded our own. Our
and revolutionary methods of exacting the
revenue have reduced the peasantry to

lowest extreme of poverty and wretchedness, and the procedure of our settlement courts has been the means of laying upon them burdens heavier than any they endured in former times. Famine is now more frequent than formerly, and more severe, and it is the irony of fate that our statute-book is swollen with measures of relief in favour of the victims whom our administrative system has impoverished.

The primary cause of this state of things is the excessive departmental centralisation against which Sir James Caird many years ago vainly protested. No more complete type of a bureaucracy exists than the Indian Government, and like all other bureaucracies its members are driven to justify their own existence by extending the sphere of their activity. In old days our predecessors in the administration of the country, with more practical sagacity than we possess, were always cautious in their interference, and instinctively favoured the adoption of conservative principles. At the present time, when enormous advance has been made in the expansion of education, in the growth of political ideas, and in national development, the dead weight of administrative departments, needlessly multiplied, is prejudicial to real progress. Wise statesmanship would rather consist in the preservation of

peace and order, and in the encouragement of spontaneous tendencies. What is needed is the decentralisation of the Government, the pervading presence of a spirit of relativity, of a capacity to refrain from unnecessary action, of an appreciation of the wide differences between the East and West and between the different parts of India itself, and above all of a hearty sympathy with the wishes and interests of the governed. If these virtues are granted to our Indian rulers, we need not despair of seeing sound and healthy progress. But unfortunately these virtues are rare, and in their place a spirit is abroad breathing disturbance. Ambitious officials whose tenure of office is short are consumed with a fatal desire to distinguish themselves by the enforcement of their own ideas, irrespective of the wishes and feelings of the people who are affected by them. I look with unconcealed misgiving on the restless proposals which are now so readily made by those who are responsible for our Indian Government. I greatly fear that in our zeal for progress and reformation we are drifting into a campaign of executive and legislative action, the benefits of which are uncertain, while the increased bitterness of race feeling throws a lurid light on our intentions which have been so much praised.

Indian Land Problems

The experimental introduction of agrarian theories into a country altogether unripe for their application, where the existence of an aristocracy is still the material basis of order and the maintenance of an hereditary land-holding class is the corner-stone of internal political reconstruction, is evidence of a profound unfitness to appreciate adequately the necessities of the existing situation. Far from leading through any healthy channels to the settlement of disputes, experiments of this sort are calculated to produce nothing but disorder, by setting up class against class in vain opposition to one another. The Indian tenancy laws, admirably framed as they are in many respects, are avowedly designed to subvert the old relations between zemindar and ryot, and to substitute a basis of contract for personal considerations. It is a common allegation that a large portion of the agrarian trouble existing in India is due to the old relations between landlord and tenant. It is on this hypothesis that these laws have been enacted, and the Government of India has gone so far as to declare that "it would be failing in its duty to the future population of the country if, in order to secure the full development of its material resources twenty or fifty or even a hundred years sooner

than it would otherwise come about, it deliberately introduced, while having power to exclude, the relation of landlord and tenant." I do not hesitate to affirm that this is a most dangerous doctrine, and that there is little foundation for this hypothesis of agrarian trouble. The social aspects of the land-tenure system of India are not those of Ireland or England or of any country in Western Europe. The system is not a perfect one, but it is the guarantee of social order among the agricultural classes. The normal relations of landlord and tenant rest upon a personal basis, and are entirely independent of any conception of contract. It is true that rights are unadjusted, the balance of rent is undetermined, the current demand is not fixed, the area of cultivation is often unknown; and yet it is not the case that the ordinary relations between zemindar and ryot are unfriendly. The narrow induction drawn by local officials from occasional disturbances which come to their notice misleads them and has misled Government into the delusion that general disaffection exists. The one or two cases of disaffection come prominently to notice; the thousands and thousands of instances in which order and contentment prevail pass by unobserved. The occasional agrarian disturb-

ances to which so much importance has unduly been attached have for the most part been stirred up by the injudicious interference of zealous officials who are incapable of recognising the exigencies of the position in which they are placed. It cannot be too often repeated that a patrician aristocracy is the basis of internal order in India, to which the Government must always look for support and for the maintenance of its own duration and stability. The lower orders stand in urgent need of an aristocracy above them; their ignorance and characteristic docility and want of firmness require the guidance and protection of more powerful superiors, and I am firmly convinced that the adoption of any policy to reduce the power of the dominant classes and to destroy distinctions in the different strata of society is fraught with danger to the State.

In this connection the opinion of the late Sir Henry Lawrence is worthy of attention, and a deep interest attaches to the following expression of his views, which is recorded in Sir Joseph Fayrer's manuscript diary of the siege of Lucknow (quoted by Mr Forrest in his *Selections from Mutiny Despatches*, vol. ii. p. 63):—

During the time that Sir Henry Lawrence was in my house before his death he talked frequently in an impressive but excited way, and amongst other things

that he said, as his thoughts travelled from one subject to another, one which seemed to be most present to him was the causes of the Mutiny, and that which led to the troubles in which we were now involved. He spoke of the injudicious method in which native land-holders had been dealt with by the Government, and among other things he said more than once with emphasis: "It was the John Lawrences, the Thomasons, the Edmonstones (and others), who brought India to this." This I heard distinctly.

It is essential to the prosperity of every country that there should exist within it not only a proletariat, the great body of the people who devote themselves to labour, but also a class of capitalists who provide the funds which enable labour to become reproductive. It is the combination of capital and labour which leads to wealth: capital without labour is sterilised, and it is only under the fertilising influence of capital that labour is productive. It is not to the advantage of any country that it should consist exclusively of petty agriculturists whose rent is increased with increased production, and who will labour therefore neither for the improvement of the land nor for the extension of cultivation. It is not to the advantage of any people that they should be reduced to one dead level of a peasant proletariat

with no substantial middle class, such as forms the backbone of the nation in more favoured countries, and no upper class on whom they can lean for assistance during an emergency. The Government of India, when it rejects the intervention of middlemen, acts as a rent-receiver only; it is unable to sympathise with individual cases of misfortune among its tenants; it is not disposed to invest any portion of its revenues in agricultural improvement; it does not acknowledge and it certainly does not fulfil the duties of a capitalist landlord. It does not allow the profits of the soil to be distributed through the various grades of the community between the cultivator and the State. They pass into the coffers of the Government direct, and the people are only permitted to share among themselves the subsistence margin that is left.

One of the principal merits of the old native rule in India was the elasticity of its revenue system. The demand of rent or revenue was not rigid or fixed, but variable with the seasons and the distress or prosperity of the people. In a favourable year large collections would be made; when the crops had failed the demand would be reduced accordingly. We see the same principle now governing the land-revenue administration of Native States, and it is a

common reflection, echoed by all Indian gentlemen who have had experience in the management of those States, that it tends to the establishment of sympathy and friendliness. The same principle still controls the relation between landlord and tenant in British India. 'It is only in the most prosperous years that a full demand of rent is ever collected from the tenantry, and it may be taken as an ascertained fact that 75 per cent. on the demand is a fair average proportion of realisation in zemindari estates This is a striking contrast to the practice in Government estates, where a full cent. per cent. on the current demand is rigidly exacted. Nor does the Government system tend to develop the wealth of the peasantry by extension of cultivation. It was estimated by Lord Cornwallis that at the time of the permanent settlement of Bengal one-third of the culturable area of the province was waste and jungle. And yet within two generations, under the beneficent operation of that settlement, these waste lands were cultivated in every direction, and teeming agricultural wealth is now produced every year in tracts of country which formerly were wilderness or devastated by famine. These reclaimers of the jungle are all sub-tenure holders who have got land to clear

on favourable terms from the zemindars or landlords of the parent estate, and have acquired an indefeasible title to the land they occupy. With the aid of a fertile soil, rising prices, and a continually increasing demand for produce, this system has proved extraordinarily successful. Very different influences have been at work in provinces where the land is held directly by the State. The soil is not less fertile, and the cultivators have the same stimulus in respect of rising prices and the increasing demand for produce, but they are labouring under the burden of a system in which the land is periodically settled with them by Government. This system has not promoted the cultivation of the country, and the prohibition of sub-letting has proved fatal to the extension of land reclamation. So true is it that a proprietary tenure, if left in the hands of the people, will always be fruitful, but that if retained by Government it starves. Short settlements, an exacting demand, and an unbending severity in collecting rent have driven the simple husbandmen into the clutches of the money-lender, and are responsible for their share in intensifying the effects of famine. In a country like India, where almost the entire community is agricultural, all questions relating to land are

of the most engrossing interest to the people, and the attitude of Government for good or evil is the source of prosperity or the cause of suffering. Nothing is more needful than that we should forbear from casting about for every opportunity of exacting from the cultivators more and more of the fruits of their labour, and that we should desist from fanciful innovations, which always imply harassment and disturbance. Nothing is more urgently necessary than that there should be a reasonable, equitable, and intelligible limit to the State demand, and that greater elasticity, in accordance with the old Indian custom, should be allowed in the operations of the tax-gatherers. Under the viceroyalty of Lord Canning a bold attempt was made to effect improvement. But the pendulum of official opinion soon swung back, and the subsequent efforts of Lord Ripon in this direction were frustrated. More recently Lord Curzon has followed with some concessions for which we may be grateful, but they were bought too late at the cost of much suffering, and the newly-found toleration, which was forced on the Government by outside agitation, cannot be recognised as adequate. No protection has been afforded against excessive assessment or undue enhancement. No attempt

is made to adjust the revenue or rent demand so that it may represent any fixed proportion of the produce of the land or of its letting value, and the amount of the assessment to be imposed on an individual unit is determined chiefly by a consideration of the percentage of increase which can safely be exacted from the area under settlement. The limits placed by law on enhancements claimed by private landlords have not been extended to cases where the State is the landlord, and peasant proprietors paying revenue to the State have not been allowed the civil remedy which tenants of private landlords enjoy. "The true function of Government is to lay down broad and generous principles for the guidance of its officers, with becoming regard to the traditions of the province and the circumstances of the locality, and to prescribe moderation in enhancement and sympathy in collection." These are the admirable sentiments enunciated by Lord Curzon for the amelioration of the Indian system of land revenue policy They should be engraved on tablets of brass over the council-chambers of India as the speech of the Emperor Claudius was engraved at Lugdunum. But alas, that practice should so lag behind the precept! The ryots cry aloud for bread, and we have given them a statute-

book to comfort them. It is vain to appeal to our good intentions. The people can only judge of these intentions by their effect in practice. It is useless to affirm that where there is a civilised government you must trust that government to some extent. It is idle to point out that ours is "one of the fairest governments in the world." We are mistrusted by the people, and our motives are subjected to suspicion. It is a mockery to preach to them of "moderation in enhancement and sympathy in collection" when re-settlements and survey, with their symbols of oppression, the theodolite and compass, the initiation of incessant local inquiries for the assessment of land, however small, and the realisation of Government demands by summary process, are resorted to with no less frequence than formerly, and with no diminution of harshness or persistence

Not less injudicious is the policy of interference with old customs and economic conditions. Those conditions vary from one another as widely as the *petite culture* of France differs from the system of large proprietary holdings and farms in England. And yet we insist on introducing one nomenclature, to which, like the bed of Procrustes, we adapt all tenures, holdings, and systems of settling the Government demand

of revenue and rent. These administrative fictions, which proceed on the assumption that what is true of one part of a province must be applicable to the whole, are a prolific source of trouble. A blind adhesion to theoretic symmetry will always lead to practical confusion. And so it has come to pass that the principal officers of the revenue department have been mobbed by despairing ryots in the streets of Calcutta, and compelled to revise settlements, reduce assessments, and remit revenue demands which ought never to have been made. I may be allowed to refer to a case of which I possess particular knowledge. For more than a century an invariable custom had been followed in the assessment of waste lands brought under cultivation in the Chittagong district and during this long period the Government had concluded more than 50,000 settlements with individual tenure-holders on one consistent principle. But when that principle was completely reversed, and I protested against the change, I was called upon to show that Government was in any way pledged to follow the old procedure in future settlements. I replied then, as I reply now, that I was not concerned to meet the challenge. I claim that there should be some continuity in administration, and that present and future

Governments should show some respect for precedent, customs, and rights invariably recognised by their predecessors I deprecate the shifts and changes to which it is so often proposed to subject our revenue policy, as inevitably exercising a most injurious effect upon the people who are the victims of our experiment. Is it to be supposed that such changes will play innocuously, so to speak, over the heads of the agricultural classes? This is assuredly the only aspect with which true statesmanship would concern itself, but by our revenue authorities it is too often wholly ignored, or buried in a multitude of circular instructions which lead only to the increasing harassment of an already overburdened peasantry.

Even more serious cause for anxiety is the suppressed premise, which runs through all our revenue policy, that the soil of the country does not belong to the inhabitants of the country, but to the Government There is no great harm in saying that the land belongs to "the State" when the State is only another name for the people, but it is very different when the State is represented by a small minority of foreigners, who disburse nearly one-third of the revenues received from the land on the remuneration of their own servants, and who have no abiding-place on the soil and no stake in the fortunes of the country.

It is because we have acted on this principle all over India, with the exception of the permanently settled districts, that we have reduced the agricultural classes to such poverty. By vigorously asserting the false position that a party of foreign occupiers who choose to call themselves "the State" have become the proprietors of the actual soil of India, we have destroyed all other rights of property therein, from the talookdar down to the ryot, we have subverted the entire organisation of the village communities; we have torn up by the roots the economic fabric by which the agricultural classes of the country were held together; and we have substituted in its place a costly and mechanical centralisation. Our Mogul predecessors were content to levy the State demand by simple processes which had grown up imperceptibly with the administration, and were sanctioned by immemorial usage. The harshness and cruelty of the Mogul tax-gatherers, on which we are too prone to dwell, were tempered by the contingency of migration, which effectually acted as a check upon oppressive landlords. The rapacity of Oriental despotism was restrained by the self-interest of those who were employed on the assessment and collection of the taxes. The old records of our English Government are full of evidence that the fixed

deeper, to do more than scratch the soil. But it is forgotten that the cattle with which they plough are incapable of deep ploughing. We tell them to enrich their fields with manure, and that the produce of the land would be augmented by its use. No doubt it would. The ryots do utilise manure as much as they possibly can, in the way of simple forms of manure, such as cow-dung—which is, however, also an extremely useful article to the poor cultivator as a substitute for firewood—but they can no more afford to procure the expensive manures with which we are so familiar than they can afford to plough with elephants. It is not in the power of the Government to effect any improvement by experiments in agriculture, or by agricultural teaching, or by any form of departmental interference. I do not know whether the poverty of the people does not always obtrude as a permanent obstacle to improvement But of this I feel sure, that all attempt to lead should be given up, and that our object should be little more than the arrangement of agricultural facts from which the awakened intelligence of the Indian community may in due course profit to its own advantage. If the agricultural departments succeed in laying a foundation of scientific knowledge and in enlisting the sympathy of Indian gentlemen in the

welfare of the agricultural classes by assisting them to better knowledge, they will not have been constituted in vain. The ambition of those departments should be to secure the active aid of members of the Indian community who are sincerely interested in agriculture [1] It is only through and by the Indian community that agricultural improvements can on any important scale be effected. There are landholders who have experience and facilities for extending improvements which no official can ever obtain, and many of them have capital available for investment in agricultural enterprise They are familiar with the usages of the agricultural classes. They understand the existing systems of Indian agriculture, and are acquainted with the local reasons which justify practices that may seem strange and illogical to an English observer. They can therefore best guide the course of agricultural improvement with the least disturbance of existing circumstances, and develop the true policy of progress in improving and adding to indigenous conditions without that subversion of ideas and methods which inevitably accompanies the introduction of exotic experiments.

[1] These principles were enunciated in one of Lord Ripon's resolutions, dated 8th December 1881 ; but they have not been acted up to.

INDIA'S ECONOMIC PROBLEM

THE greatest material boon which could be conferred on India would be the restoration of her industries. The greatest material calamity which can befall India is that which has been going on for so many years before our eyes—the continual contraction of her manufactures. The agricultural trade of India has expanded, but her manufactures have diminished: the imports of cotton piece-goods, which forty years ago were valued at 8½ millions sterling, now exceed 20 millions; the ancient weaving industry has been practically extinguished and the local manufactures of the country have been crushed out by British competition. The tendency of events for more than a century has been to turn the people more and more towards agriculture and less and less to manufactures. While the invention of steam engines and the development of machinery enormously cheapened the cost of production in England, the

operation of transit duties in India, amounting to £450,000 per annum, and of heavy and ruinous import duties in England, amounting to 67 per cent., and more, on the value of cotton and silk goods, combined to repress all the exertions of local industry These duties, which were deliberately imposed in order to enable English manufacturers to undersell the Indian artisan, have long ago been repealed, but they did their work The introduction of Manchester goods has been accompanied by the collapse of indigenous industries.

Mr Henry St George Tucker a Director of the Honourable East India Company, wrote as long ago as 1823 -

> What is the commerce which we have adopted in this country with relation to India? The silk manufactures and its piece goods made of silk and cotton intermixed have long since been excluded altogether from our markets and of late, partly in consequence of the operation of a duty of 67 per cent., but chiefly from the effect of superior machinery, the cotton fabrics, which hitherto continued the staple of India have not only been displaced in this country, but we actually export our cotton manufactures to supply a part of the consumption of our Asian possessions. India is thus reduced from the state of a manufacturing country to that of an agricultural country

Even more emphatic is the verdict of Professor Horace Hayman Wilson, the historian of India:—

It was stated in evidence (1813) that the cotton and silk goods of India up to that period could be sold for a profit in the British market at a price from 50 to 60 per cent. lower than those fabricated in England. It consequently became necessary to protect the latter by duties of 70 and 80 per cent. on their value, or by positive prohibition. Had this not been the case, had not such prohibitory duties and decrees existed, the mills of Paisley and Manchester would have been stopped in their outset, and could scarcely have been again set in motion, even by the power of steam. They were created by the sacrifice of Indian manufactures. Had India been independent, she would have retaliated, would have imposed prohibitive duties upon British goods, and would thus have preserved her own productive industry from annihilation. This act of self defence was not permitted her, she was at the mercy of the stranger. British goods were forced upon her without paying any duty, and the foreign manufacturer employed the arm of political injustice to keep down and ultimately strangle a competitor with whom he could not have contended on equal terms.

And yet the manufactures of India were once in a highly flourishing condition. The Mogul Courts encouraged large towns and urban enterprise. European traders were first attracted to

India's Economic Problem

India not by its raw products but by its manufactured wares. It was the industrial "wealth of Ormuz and Ind" that dazzled the eyes of Western nations and sent them in search of a passage to that land of fabulous prosperity. Large portions of the Indian population were engaged in various industries down to the close of the eighteenth century In the palmy days of the Honourable East India Company a certain part of the revenues of the country was set aside to be employed in the purchase of goods for exportation to England, which was called the investment But the commercial agents of the Company were not engaged in exploiting the resources of the soil, and the "upcountry investment" was entirely devoted to the purchase of manufactures. Nor was India at that time dependent on its maritime commerce. The inland trade was very considerable. The fame of the fine muslins of Bengal, her rich silks and brocades, her harmonious cotton prints, had spread far and wide in Asia as well as Europe "The Bengal silks, cloths, etc.," writes Mr Verelst, who was Governor of Bengal before Hastings, "were dispersed to a vast amount to the west and north, inland as far as Guzerat, Lahore, and even Ispahan.' The Indian cities were populous and magnificent.

When Clive entered Murshidabad, the old capital of Bengal, he wrote of it: "This city is as extensive, populous, and rich as the city of London, with this difference, that there are individuals in the first possessing infinitely greater property than in the last city." All the arts then flourished, and with them urban life. Now, out of a population of three hundred millions, only 7 per cent live in towns of more than 10,000 inhabitants. In Ireland, that unfortunate annexe of the British dominions, the proportion is 20·8, in Scotland it is 50·2, and in England and Wales it is 67·5. An overwhelming majority of the people of India live in rural villages, and the colonies of workmen who were settled in the large towns have been broken up.

I will cite as an example the city of Dacca. It was during the time of the Mogul government that this city reached the zenith of its prosperity. When it passed under British administration the population was estimated at two hundred thousand souls. In 1787 the exports of Dacca muslin to England amounted to £300,000; in 1817 they had ceased altogether. The arts of spinning and weaving, which for ages afforded employment to a numerous and industrious population, have now become extinct. Families

which were formerly in a state of affluence have been reduced to penury: the majority of the people have been driven to desert the town and betake themselves to the villages for a livelihood. The present population of the town of Dacca is slowly increasing, but it is only 90,500

This decadence has occurred in all parts of India, and not a year passes in which the local officers do not bring to the notice of Government that the manufacturing classes are becoming impoverished The most profitable Indian industries have been destroyed and the most valuable Indian arts have greatly deteriorated Dyeing carpet making, fine embroidery jewellery, metal-work, the damascening of arms carving, paper making, even architecture and sculpture have decayed. "There is no class," exclaims Sir James Caird "which our rule has pressed harder upon than the native weaver and artizan" I doubt whether the public at large has any conception of the deplorably small proportion of persons in India who are dependent on art or commerce or mechanical production, or working or dealing in mineral products. The figures cannot be ascertained with precise accuracy, but I work out the proportion at about 15 per cent. in India, against about 80 per cent. in the United Kingdom.

New India

The economic problem of India is the poverty of her people. The development of petty occupations and menial employment, the establishment of large industries capitalised by Englishmen, even the accumulation of silver, which has so depreciated in value, the increased use of brass pots, cheap cotton cloths, and umbrellas among the people, afford but a poor compensation for the variety of social and industrial life once spread through the country. The dimensions of Indian trade are not inconsiderable, and yet no country is more poor. The economic conditions upon which material prosperity depends are lacking. An India supplying England with its raw products and in its turn dependent upon England for all its more important manufactures is not a spectacle which is likely to reconcile an Indian patriot to the loss of the subtle and refined Oriental arts, the very secret of which has passed away, to the disappearance of innumerable weavers who have perished from starvation or have sunk for ever to the lot of agricultural labourers; or to the sacrifice of that constructive genius and mechanical ability which designed the canal system of Upper India and the Taj at Agra.

It is true that railways, cotton mills and jute mills, gold mining and coal mining, oil wells and

refineries, have lately come into existence. But with the exception of most of the cotton mills and a few of the coal mines, the operations are in alien hands: the capital is British and the profits do not remain in India. It is true also that in some minor trades and industrial professions there has been an increase in recent years. There are more shoemakers now, more carpenters, more tailors, more blacksmiths. The demand for shoes, furniture, clothes, ironware, and the like has increased. New wants have arisen, and facilities have been afforded for their gratification. The immense cheapening of cotton piece-goods and of other articles imported from Europe cannot be without its benefit to the country. But all this is not inconsistent with the growing poverty of the people to which the unanimous testimony of Indian observers bears witness. This has been the theme of every National and Provincial Congress for the past nineteen years. It is supported by the evidence of Indian merchants and traders, who are convinced from their business experience that the struggle for existence is greater than it was before. Official opinion admits this in regard to artisans, but denies it in respect of the great mass of the population, the agricultural classes. The official verdict affirms that the material prosperity of the

people generally has improved. This verdict is directly opposed to educated Indian opinion, and a battle royal rages between the contending camps. In any case there is no question that the people of India are miserably poor. They are absolutely and relatively poor It is enough to repeat Lord Curzon's estimate that the aggregate income per head of the population is about £2 per annum.[1] For my part, I may be allowed to say that I believe in no general improvement. There has undoubtedly been improvement in some places; in Eastern Bengal, for instance, where the people are favoured with a fertile soil and a permanent settlement, where the demand for jute is practically unlimited and the rainfall never fails; in Burmah, where, with so much waste land, there has been a vast extension of rice cultivation, and in tracts, such as those in the Punjab and elsewhere which have been fertilised by irrigation But I can find no signs of general improvement. The increasing number of famines and the terrible mortality

[1] A general survey of the Empire by Sir Robert Giffen, in his address to the British Association in 1903, to consider "how vast must be the economic gulf separating the people of the United Kingdom and the self-governing colonies from India and like parts of the Empire occupied by subject races, when we find that forty-two millions of people in the United Kingdom consume in food and drink alone an amount equal to the whole income of three hundred millions of people in India"

which results from them, in spite of all the exertions of the Government and the heroic effort of individual officers, are—if there were no other evidence—an overwhelming demonstration that the capacity of the people to maintain themselves is on the decline. It is no argument to reply that there was heavy mortality from famine in ancient times. There was: the rains failed then as they fail now, the crops withered, and the people perished because there was no food to support them. There was then no means of conveying food to the afflicted province. But now, with improved communications, there is never any deficiency in the supply of food. The failure of the rains no longer means famine, for grain can be and always is imported into the distressed tracts. Famine ensues because the people are too poor to buy food. We no longer hear the old story of crowds perishing with money in their hands. At the same time, owing to improved communications, the reserves of food-grain have everywhere been depleted. The old custom was for the peasantry to keep among themselves three-quarters of a year's supply. Now the surplus is always exported, and there are no stores to fall back upon in the hour of need. The deficiency is imported at a price the people cannot afford

to pay. The reason why famines are more frequent now than formerly, and more severe, is that the resources of the people are less able to resist them.

The increasing poverty of India is due to many causes, but primarily I trace it to the decay of handicrafts and the substitution of foreign for home manufactures. It is due also to the extension of agriculture Every exertion is made to augment the area under cultivation with staple crops, and the increase in the amount of agricultural produce exported is pointed to as irrefragable proof of increased national prosperity. It is a proof of the reverse. Foreign markets are forced and commodities are sold at a lower rate—take tea, for example—and bought at a higher price than would otherwise be necessary. The export trade has indeed been developed at a great cost, and in the meanwhile the soil of the country has been impoverished by overcropping, and the breed of cattle is deteriorating from want of pasturage. The blessing has been withheld from the parched fields. Nor, unfortunately, does the profit from increased exports find its way, as it should, to the pockets of the cultivators. On the contrary, they receive but little of it themselves, for their crops are ordinarily mortgaged before being harvested, and the profit goes

to middlemen In all times, no doubt, the bulk of the Indian population has been agricultural, but formerly the cultivators were not wholly dependent on agriculture They had home industries which employed their leisure when labour in the fields was useless, there was the carrying trade, in which the bullocks used at other times for ploughing were employed—the railroads have very much ruined this trade, and, above all, there was the weaving industry. The ryots are now reduced to the simple labour of their fields "No one," said Lord Ripon at the opening of the Exhibition of Industrial Arts in Calcutta in 1884 "No one who considers the economic condition of India can doubt that one of its greatest evils is to be found in the fact that the great mass of the people of the country are dependent almost exclusively upon the cultivation of the soil The circumstance tends at one and the same time to depress the position of the cultivators, to aggravate the evils of famine, and also to lower wages generally" I will add that it tends also to maintain them in the depths of ignorance in which they are sunk. It will always be found in all countries that the artisans are more highly educated than the peasantry

A further cause of the impoverishment of India is the drain from the country Before the

Mutiny, the sums annually drawn from India by Great Britain amounted to two or three millions only. The Home Charges alone now exceed seventeen millions, of which nine millions and a quarter are on account of interest on funded and railway debt, and four millions three hundred and fifty thousand pounds are on account of pensions paid in England. But this grand total does not include the remittances on account of private gains from railways, banking, merchandise, the ocean and river carrying trade, tea and coffee planting, cotton and jute mills, indigo, coal mines, and the like, or the private savings of officials and others which are sent to England. Taking these into consideration, it is a moderate computation that the annual drafts from India to Great Britain amount to a total of thirty millions. The equivalent of this at the current rate of exchange is four hundred and fifty million rupees. It can never be to the advantage of the people of India to remit annually this enormous sum to a foreign country. The amount paid in pensions may be inevitable, but it is obviously a dead loss, for it is spent abroad; and no country was ever a prosperous one in which the interest payable on its own capital expenditure, whether for military purposes or on reproductive public works, was