

struck with a terrifying premonition: 'Germany has lost the war.'

When he went back to General Headquarters on September thirteenth, von Moltke gave the impression of a sick man. From that time, it was in reality von Falkenhayn who commanded the army, without having the official title. Some days later, as von Moltke was confined to his bed, William II came to pay him a visit.

'Is it still I,' he asked the Kaiser, 'who am conducting operations?'

'I really think it is,' replied William II.

So for three weeks, the Kaiser did not even know who was the true chief of his troops.

Here is a new illustration of the

opinion that was entertained of William II in his own entourage. One day, when von Moltke was describing to me the sentiments of profound horror which he experienced in going back through Belgium after the fall of Antwerp, I spoke to him for the first time of the plan of attack by way of Belgium. 'How did it happen,' I asked him, 'that a Minister of War could bring himself to say in the Reichstag that plans of attack across Belgium did not exist?' 'The minister did not know my plan,' replied von Moltke. 'Only the Chancellor was familiar with it.'

'And the Kaiser?'

'Never in my life,' said von Moltke with emphasis. 'He is too much given to talking and too indiscreet. He would have told the whole world about it.'

INDIA'S INDUSTRIAL OBJECTIVE

BY Y. A. THOMBARE

From the *Hindustan Review*, October

(HINDU PRO-ENGLISH POLITICAL AND LITERARY MONTHLY)

THE World War has shaken the capitalistic organization of industry to its foundations. As a result of the cataclysm, old ideas are being pulled down and old institutions overhauled. India also has been profoundly stirred by the forces of liberalism unloosed by it. She has further been vivified as never before by the great non-coöperation movement of self-discipline, self-purification, and self-sacrifice launched by Mahatma Gandhi. There is so far no reason to fear that India's contribution toward the reconstruction of the world will not do credit to the pristine purity of her

ideals regarding betterment of the human race.

India's greatest need to-day is the development of her vast resources of raw materials so as to possess an industrial equipment on a par with that of the rest of the 'civilized' world — factories to make her own machinery for the requirements of her mills, her own locomotives for her railways, her own motors, steel plates, and aeroplanes. These, it is argued, constitute the *sine qua non* of a modern nation, and without them India's citizens must remain exposed to danger from the attacks of

outsiders. To a full development of her resources there can be no objection from any quarter. But *cui bono?* — and shall it be on the lines of capitalism? These are the paramount questions which face her.

Capitalism is based on the motive of profit to the capitalist. It cannot flourish without markets, to secure which it does not hesitate to make war — at any rate, in the last resort. It forces weaker peoples to buy its manufactures at the point of the bayonet. In its essence it is thus opposed to the peace of the world, intensifying old feuds, racial jealousies, and national greeds. It is thus the foster-parent of militarism. It is unfair to its own nationals. It has never worked smoothly, even in the continent of its birth. Its inefficiency is being brought home more and more even to its active advocates, leading in several places to a creeping paralysis of social and industrial life. There has, in consequence, arisen an incessant demand for drastic changes and a complete transformation of the economic structure of society.

But even if it were possible to get rid of the evils of the capitalistic system, is not India confronted by an insurmountable difficulty in the way of her success, in that she is a subject nation? Her interests have always been subordinated to those of the dominating country, and its effects are writ indelibly in the huge drain on her wealth, the extinction of her world-famed manufactures, and her consequent impoverishment and misery. She is now said to have the same liberty to 'consider' her interests as Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and South Africa. But will she be allowed to take action, irrespective of who may be hit by it? As long as the Governor-General remains responsible to Parliament and the Government of India is constituted as it is, the Government and the Legislature of India are not bound to be in agreement

over important fiscal measures. Then our new-found liberty is confined to matters purely of Indian interest. But in these days of international trade, matters of any consequence can hardly remain 'purely of Indian interest.' In a conflict about them, India must needs go to the wall. In his recent reply to the Lancashire delegation, Mr. Montagu is reported to have said that he was determined to maintain the right given to the Government of India to consider India's interest first, like Britain and the rest of the Empire. But the right must remain unsatisfactory as long as India is unable herself to maintain it adequately. No doubt British trade is in need of the good-will of India for the sake of its own prosperity. But if India is allowed to have her own fiscal way, she will adopt a policy of protection, and the question cannot but arise ultimately, whether her action can be looked upon as consonant with her solidarity within the British Empire. Unfortunately, the world-situation is only too full of possibilities giving rise to those 'exceptional circumstances' which Mr. Montagu declared as justifying the Secretary of State's intervention in matters purely of Indian interest. How would Indian capitalistic interests fare in that eventuality?

The Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau are not a body of non-coöperators. Nevertheless, when they recently had an exchange of views with the head of the Supreme Government's Commerce and Industry Department, for the purpose of mutual help and coöperation, they could not disguise their suspicion and distrust toward Government, and plainly showed fear lest Indian interests should suffer at the hands of the Government. Even an Anglo-Indian daily, in referring to the incident was led to remark: 'But while we feel that the Chamber has not done itself credit by its fulminations upon

false premises, we can understand the apprehensions prevailing in Indian industrial and commercial sections, on the strength of past history, lest there should be appointed to take charge of the [fiscal] Commission some Englishman who would have an unfair bias in favor of the British export trade.' The view that Indian fears are not unjustifiable gains strength from the fierce competition that is inevitable between England, America, and Japan for world-supremacy and, therefore, for capturing Indian trade. Germany, with her colossal burden of the reparation charges, will also be compelled to try her chances in the competition. Under the stimulus of conditions created by the war, America greatly increased her power of production, and cannot now find buyers for her manufactures. Great Britain finds herself in no happier predicament, and yet her productive capacity is now at least fifty per cent in excess of the pre-war standard.

Then there are further reasons why the growth of Indian industrialism is expected to be hampered by British direction. Twenty-eight millions of the people of Great Britain depend upon foreign trade for their livelihood. They have a standard of living which is much higher than what obtains in this country. There can be no finality to the economic advancement of a country which flourishes on capitalism. Then there is the need for England to engage in as comprehensive a programme of ship-building as that of the United States, so as not to be outstripped by them in naval power, and this at a time when her ability to meet the increased expenditure is questionable. The Dominions are asked to lighten the mother-country's burden in this respect, and they in their turn desire to participate in England's profits from her oversea dependencies.

All this portends, sooner or later, a

concentration of strong alien capitalistic forces on Indian soil, in addition to making it their dumping-ground for 'home' products, to oust the Indian competitor from the ground he may dare to occupy. The might of the British arms would make the issue of such an unequal struggle a foregone conclusion. Indian capitalists may be tolerated so far as they may consent to their absorption by their British rivals, just as Indian ministers are; but beyond that they will receive scant mercy. The fate of the venerable fabric of the Austrian Empire is a standing warning in this respect. The Big Four dropped it like a bowl of porcelain, on the ground. What guaranty is there that the pogrom spirit which could ruin the economic structure of Central Europe would leave that of India uninjured?

India again cannot go on playing the second fiddle *ad infinitum*. She has her own pressing problems to solve, and a moment's delay in dealing with them will be nothing less than criminal. The writer of a very careful and elaborate article in the *Indian Journal of Economics* says that, in 1916-17, the best year from the agricultural point of view, despite restrictions on export of food-grains to foreign countries due to the war, so many as 160,000,000 people were in a position to get only 79 per cent of the coarsest kinds of food-grains, to maintain them in health and strength. Two thirds of the population, he continues, always get only three fourths of the amount of food-grains they should have, and it is just possible, he further goes on, that one third of the above number (two thirds of the population) may be getting a little less than 90 per cent of their requirements, and the rest of the two thirds, or 100,000,000, in spite of hard labor, may be getting for a greater part of the year less than sixty per cent of food-grains that are given to the worst sort of criminals

in the jails of the United or Central Provinces.

It is surely a very alarming state of affairs. An examination of the brief analysis of the census figures issued by the Government of India, and of the facts recorded in the vital statistics of the country during the past few years, reveals, in the words of the *Times of India*, that 'there has been a decline of both birth-rate and survival-rate since 1913, and during 1918 and 1919 births were fewer than deaths, while the stimulus which the war gave to agriculture did not affect the population figures.' After making due allowance for the terrific havoc caused by the influenza epidemic and the famine among the population, it could not suppress 'an uneasy feeling that the modernization and current material improvement of Indian life are not being accompanied by an equally promising betterment in the health of the people, but rather the reverse.'

Thus India is menaced by a grave danger, in the form of the food or vitality problem of the vast bulk of her population. Every other question must necessarily pale into insignificance before it. It would be a national disaster of the first magnitude if this problem of problems were neglected, and India's man-power were to be seriously crippled as a result.

The remedy, to be of any use, must be one which will add to the inadequate resources of the masses in fighting the dire enemy of semi-starvation. No amount of success in the growth of

capitalism will be able to effect this. There is not space enough in the cities, which are the citadels of capitalism, to accommodate all the population of the villages, and they must always look to the soil for their sustenance. What is required is to provide them with an occupation which will supplement their income, and thus render them capable of earning and retaining enough food for themselves.

An ideal occupation is that of spinning and weaving. The spinning-wheel is cheap, is easily made and repaired by the village carpenter, and requires only a small capital for raw material. The yarn can be woven in almost every village. Vast potentialities have now been opened out by the introduction of the *Charkha* propaganda and the boycott of foreign cloth. The prices of cloth may leap up for a time as a consequence; but it will not be an unmixed evil for the villagers, who, as producers, will be able to share in the profits. Again British capitalism need not become anxious, as it has endless resources. A self-reliant and self-sufficient India will, further, be a source of greater strength to the Empire than a helpless, weak, and starving India.

What is more, is the promise of the rise of a peasantry in India, healthier, cleaner, freer, and sweeter than the population ground down by capitalism, which will ever furnish an object-lesson stimulating the European societies wrecked by war to revive similar rural societies amongst themselves.

COMRADESHIP IN INDUSTRIALISM

BY LORD LEVERHULME

From the *Sunday Times*, October 16
(NORTHCLIFFE PRESS)

HAPPENING to be in the United States toward the end of 1919, only a few weeks after the visit of the Prince of Wales to Canada and the United States, a prominent New York business man said to me: 'Your Prince of Wales is your greatest asset in the cultivation of friendly relations with our country'; and after last Wednesday's speech, every business man must feel he is also our greatest inspiration in the opening up of 'our vast undeveloped estate' for the cure of unemployment and the expansion of our trade and commerce.

It is the human touch and the sound common sense of the speech that is its great strength, supported by the recognition of comradeship he pleads for in industrialism. It was Ruskin who declared that the man who said that two and two made four, and could not under any conceivable circumstances make more or less than four, and who left human nature out of his calculation, would be wrong every time; and this is equally true — even more so — of the trade and commerce of our great Empire.

Behind all the hard facts and hard knocks of business stands the human element of comradeship and of 'men in a world of men.'

The Americans are said to be the hardest, keenest, and most successful business men the world has ever produced; yet they are giving each year, in their industrial organization, more and more care and thought to the man and

the woman behind the machine — to the human element in their organization.

The following verses by Mr. Tom Dreier, of Boston, indicate better than any words of mine this American view of the man behind the machine, which is being cultivated there, and it behooves us all to study carefully and follow wisely the suggestion and inspiration of comradeship given us by the Prince of Wales.

The verses are as follows: —

Business is business, but men are men,
Working, loving, and dreaming;
Toiling with hammer, brush, or pen,
Roistering, planning, scheming.
Business is business, but he's a fool
Whose business has grown to smother
His faith in men and the Golden Rule,
His love for friend and brother.

Business is business, but life is life,
So we're all in the game to win it.
Let's rest sometimes from the heat and strife
And try to be friends a minute.
Let's seek to be comrades now and then
And slip from our golden tether.
Business is business, but men are men,
And we're all good friends together.

In our world-wide British Empire circumstances have dealt to us a winning hand. All we are asked to do is to play the game and to make the most of our opportunities, to the best of the skill and ability science has placed at our disposal. If we do this in the truest spirit of comradeship, scrapping all snobbish distinctions, all wasteful methods, making the fullest and most complete use of all labor-saving appliances for increasing output, while reducing