

## Improvements of the relations between Landholders and their Tenants and Labourers in Madras.

---

“In Farm management whatever is beneficial to the landlord is beneficial to the tenant.”—Taylor.

Madras, excluding Zamins, is preeminently a land of small farmers and about 9/10 of the cultivable land is owned by small farmers owning from  $\frac{3}{4}$  to 10 acres. A good deal of these farmers cultivate the lands themselves, with the aid of the members of their family, and occasionally aided by their neighbours. This very large group of farmers, we may leave out of consideration, for they have not any tenants. A portion, however, of these small farmers do use outside labour in the cultivation of their lands. A ten acre dry land farmer can do all the work himself, while a ten acre garden or wetland farmer, with his present crude implements cannot do all the work himself unless he has a big family. There are others again in every village with a much smaller extent of land, who, not accustomed to manual labour, or not finding the produce from the land sufficient to maintain their family are being engaged in some more remunerative business, let the lands be cultivated by their tenants. The rest of the bigger type of land-holders farm their lands with the aid of outside labour in various forms. It is the relations of these farmers, with their tenants that I propose to deal with in detail.

The tenant labourers may be classed as follows:—

The *varam* tenant, who cultivates the land of the farmer, and shares the produce, the share varying in different localities.

The lessee, who rents the land, generally as much as he can cultivate, and makes a living out of it.

The permanent labourer or *pannial* or *padial* as he is called, who is paid monthly and engaged so long as he serves faithfully and well, or for a year. In the cases of wetland single crop paddy cultivation, he is engaged for a working season.

The casual labourer who is paid daily and engaged in busy seasons when the permanent establishment of the farm cannot adequately cope with the work.

There are also certain other classes of people who aid the landholders in their farming about whom mention has to be made, namely:—

Ryots or capitalists, who take up more land than they can cultivate and sublet it for higher rent and make much profit.

Managers of estates who as the term indicates manage the estates for the landholders. The two latter classes of people are important functionaries in the holdings of absentee landholders.

The small landholder that lets his land is generally absentee and sometimes resident and is feign to eat the fish but loath to wet his feet. The land is generally leased to a labourer in whom he has a certain amount of trust. The lease deed runs for a year, but will ordinarily continue from year to year whether the tenant has paid the dues in full or not. In the former case, because he has paid, and in the latter, because he must be given an opportunity to pay during the next year. There are of course many exceptions. Now-a-days owing to the rise in price of farm produce leases are drawn for longer periods up to five years, but never more, as the landholder does not look without suspicions over such a long period, for, he shrewdly suspects, who knows what may happen.

In certain favoured tracts such as the deltas on the East Coast, are found a class of landholders, who on the assumption of their being higher castes never do any agricultural operations themselves, however small their holdings. The constant division of the landed property splits up a big estate in a few generations into a number of small holdings. These small holders of land inert through thought of their ancestral greatness, do not work, and let the lands to tenants, who in a short time make enough money to purchase the land. This is found to be the case in all the districts. Writing about Tinnevely as long ago as 1879, Mr. A. G. Stuart said "It is not possible to foresee the result of the struggle among the castes for a rearrangement of their social position, but it will be evident that the higher castes, inheriting

the qualities developed by the system of monopoly of the land, by which they so long kept the upper hand are heavily weighted in the race, by their own habits and modes of thought and action, when their monopoly is broken up, and are less fitted for a severe competition with the hardier races below them; for having been artificially protected so long whether they will be able to adopt their national or caste character to the change is not yet clear, but upon this depends the continuance of their position." Things have not in any way changed since. The big estates of the higher castes are quickly breaking up and are gradually changing hands to the lower castes in small pieces. The position of such people in the words of Mr. (now Sir) Harold Stuart "is deplorable and shows a lamentable retrogression in the material condition of the most important class of the population." The only remedy that suggests itself is for such farmers to work the land themselves. The comparison drawn by the present Director of Agriculture of Bombay should convince every one that dignity of labour is the cause of the prosperity of the Agriculturists in other parts of the world. "A small American farmer with an irrigated holding of (say) twenty acres may be worth a lakh of rupees, but he not only works his land himself, but frequently does the whole work, his hours of work being from sunrise to sunset. And the American farmer of a somewhat smaller means will not disdain to work for hire as a navvy in any spare time that he can filch from his farm, and will thus provide with additional capital for developing his land. . . . and such instances must be very rare (in India).

The next class of landholders cultivate their lands by one or other of three main systems of cultivation usual in Madras. In the *Pannai* or home farm system of cultivation, the farmer owns a number of cattle and keeps every equipment usually supposed to be sufficient for running the farm. A few permanent labourers are engaged according to the extent of land and the nature of cultivation. Casual labourers are engaged whenever necessary. The permanent labourers are usually paid grain wages, generally once a month, but invariably it is observed that even before the end of the month the labourer has taken advance wages for the next week or more, or has borrowed money elsewhere. This cannot be said to be due to poor wages, for a permanent servant

in addition to his perquisites, and occasional feeding, gets from 45 to 50 Madras Measures of grain a month; and the family members add a good deal to this. There is a peculiar custom in parts of Salem and Coimbatore Districts of mirasidars advancing to good men from Rs. 50 to Rs. 100. called (முதல் கடன்) *Muthal Kadan*, first loan, free of interest. This debt is rarely ever discharged, but when the man wants to change hands, the other mirasidar who takes him discharges the debt, and when the man dies the son is bound to and invariably does discharge the debt, or continues to work for his father. This smacks of the slavish system of indentured labour, but has none of the evils of the same. It, on the other hand, means that a good servant is esteemed so much that farmers are even prepared to advance him money. Such servants are said to work very well, begin work very early in the morning and stop only late in the nights whenever such pressing work is on hand. They generally do not go home for the mid-day meal which is brought to the workspot by the servant's wife who is given a small remuneration of about four Madras Measures of grain called (சேந்தப்படி) *chothupadi* wages for bringing food. This system seems to work really well. But in most places where the outside demand for labour is also increasing, such as near towns, or other busy places, or where local bodies are providing constant work, the general complaint with the mirasidars is that the labourers demand more wages and do less work. To demand more wages is but quite proper but that the work should be worse is not excusable. It is here that the master who can do work himself is at an advantage over the one who simply supervises. And it is the latter class of people that complain most. So in the cause of efficiency of work, there must be a combination among the landholders of the village and some radical measures should be adopted not impelled by cruel hearts, but with a view to improve the resources of the country and to make the labouring classes a stalwart race of people. Dismissal from service of a capable cooly shirking work is the first step, and he should not be entertained by others in the community until he shows signs of improvement. If concerted action is taken this step will certainly tend to improve matters. This radical move must go hand in hand with better wages, more comforts and ultimately less hours of work. The best examples for this may be seen in the success of the planters.

It is a saying among the labourers "Don't beat me on my stomach but beat me on my back." meaning thereby—do not starve me, for I cannot then do any work, but feed me well and thrash me into work I need be. Here again there is trouble. The landholder is prepared to pay better and tries his best to get better work but only so long as there is work on the farm. How is he to pay the permanent men during the long slack season when work on the farm is at a stand still. What now takes place is that the number of permanent coolies is lessened and their wages raised. As raising of wages has not increased their efficiency, casual labourers are engaged during the busier seasons at very high rate, and these absorb the little margin of profit that the landholder gets. It is thus necessary for the farmer to provide work for the permanent men in the slack season—a work that ought to be remunerative and one that can be taken up and dropped as necessity demands. The labourers are as a rule entirely ignorant of the rudiments of mechanics and even in places where there is a variety of occupations, a cooly that does *mammatti* work in dry land is incapable of doing the same work in wet lands, and so on in every other simple work. The permanent men must therefore be trained in a variety of occupations. A few of the small industries for which there are vast opportunities are the making of flour from Bananas, Plantains or Tapioco, the extraction of fibres from plantains and other fibre crops, the making of baskets, utilitarian and ornamental, out of bamboos and rattans, the making of summer thatties and brushes out of Palmyra fibre, the making of coir rope and foot rugs and things of that sort where coconuts abound. Every youth is taught in the school of the various uses of the coconuts and its parts and his only practical demonstration is the putting of everything into fire. Practical instruction in rural schools must be of better quality. It is of course not an easy thing, but with a little organized effort can be made success.

A number of interested mirasidars should engage the services of an expert and make him train the coolies. In due course of time a good many would prove very useful and in the long run even the ladies of the biggest mirasidars of the village would find it a better

pastime, to do some useful work at home than spend idle hours. Leisure hours and off seasons are not peculiar to India, but found all the world over. It is the proper utilisation of these hours that has made the farmers of Japan, America and Switzerland so successful and so happy as they are. Such work as husking rice, shelling and milling groundnut, ginning cotton and purifying the produce to be marketed would engage the farm coolies for long periods and give more profit in addition. Very hard work during an important season, and light work during the other seasons, is what the labourers have everywhere. But the period of idleness in the black soil and paddy tracts is quite a long one. When paddy ripens as it does simultaneously, and the harvest comes suddenly there is so much hard work to be done, that a good portion of the servants get sick and as a consequence almost everyone of the labourers loses a good number of days' wages, while the landholder for want of labour has to pay yet higher wages. This condition of things can well be got over by providing work during the slack season and to a certain extent by cropping with paddies of different ages.

In order that the permanent servants may do better work, with less supervision, it would be a good inducement to offer them a small share of the total produce say about 1 to 2 per cent. extra.

It is not perhaps quite good to make them work very long hours but the present practice of their starting work late in the day and working till evening with perhaps an hour or so leisure in the middle is a very bad one and must be put an end to. In a tropical country, the sun tires out the coolies very much if they work in the day and they cannot do half the work which they will turn out if they begin work in the cool hours of the morning. Work has to be stopped at about eleven and started again at about 3 p. m. in the evening and continued till 6 or 6-30. When moonlight is available they can start work much earlier, such as the ryots of Salem and South Arcot do for water lifting. Improving the general efficiency of their work is another very important matter. This ought to follow better wages. There is however no sign of its taking place especially among the servants who are working for wages for others.

The holding of matches among the servants of the landholders, both in the Agricultural work and the domestic industry, would be a sure way of improving the quantity and quality of their work. The landholder concerned must subscribe a share of the expenses, and the amount realised by the sale value of the work done in the competition, would add to the sum. The rewards to the winners must be some efficient implement suitable to the locality and must be given away by a gentleman of local standing. If the conduct of the servant is satisfactory, the prize winner must be paid better, otherwise it would damp his spirits and by comparison he would probably do less work in the field than the rest. Better wages increases his desire to get more and so he would do much better work.

There is an enormous amount of permanent improvements such as levelling, draining, silting, fencing etc., which have to be effected in every holding which are never properly attended to and which if taken up would keep the hands fully engaged in such.

The importance of keeping the labouring class in a healthy state and free from want can never be too much exaggerated. "In every nation the welfare and contentment of the lower dominations of people are the objects of great importance and deserving continual attention. For, the bulk of every nation consists of such as must earn their daily bread. It is to the patient industry of these that the higher ranks are everywhere indebted for most of their enjoyments. It is chiefly on these that every nation depends for its population, strength and security. All reasonable persons will therefore acknowledge the equity of ensuring to them at least the necessary means of subsistence. But of all dominations of people in a state they are the most valuable for, "they provide the staff of life for the whole nation, and their wives rear those hardy broods of children, who besides supplying the country with the hands it wants, fill up voids which death is continually making in camps and cities."\* He "must therefore receive at least enough to sustain his body in working condition, and he will naturally want more. He will usually want to support a family and this is essential for the future supply of labour."† The labourer does

---

1. \*The case of labourers in husbandry. 2. †Taylor.

receive fair wages and may even be paid more, but the farmer must see that the wages received by the labourer is not wasted. The improvidence and the drinking habits of the cooly class is a thing which deserves every sort of consideration in the hands of a farmer. A farmer who redeems one of his servants from drunkenness, has done more to the cause of the labourers, than all the improvements he would have effected in them. Steps are being taken in this direction on all sides but the farmer's efforts will by far be the most effectual. The period of harvest is the busiest season for the toddy contractor, for it is then that he realises in many cases, most of his profits. During this season wages rule a 100% over the normal, and 75% of the wages invariably goes to the toddy shop. The excuse is that toddy gives relief to the over-worked body. It is time that some other cheaper remedy should be found out. That the poor labourer should spend more than half his earnings on toddy alone is too grave a condition to be left unconsidered. How can a land-lord check this? The cooly rarely uses the grain stored in the bin in his hut for this purpose, for, when once the grain enters the hut, it becomes the property of the wife who would rather part with her life than part with the grain to be taken to the toddy vendor. The cooly, therefore, parts with his wages even before it reaches home. This may then be avoided, by the master not issuing wages in the field, and thus a good deal of temptation is removed. The coolies' wives may be asked in some cases to take the wages, and then the grain is safe. The master knows very well the quality of the servant and will thus use various means such as, persuasion, threatening with dismissal, and many other ways of preventing the servant from frequenting toddyshops. This cannot be done at a stroke, but can only be gradually effected; all the same it is an urgent work in which the influence of the mirasidar can do more than anything else.

One other way in which the mirasidar can better the life of the servants is to invest in the name of the servant, a small share of his wages about 6 to 10% in a bank. Co-operative banks are springing up, where security is sound, and whose advantages every small labourer ought to reap by his becoming a member. As to their extravagance the writer can give one small instance



and the rest can be imagined. A daily labourer not having more than ten rupees (probably his years savings) spends for invitations to the forth coming marriage, on a bag of areca nuts alone not less than Rs. 16, a very modest estimate. His other expenses for the marriage may well be imagined. He is probably ensuring slavery to the mirasidar for a good many years to come or has to pack off to Singapore at the next opportunity. But on the question of extravagance in marriages it is difficult to say where the reform should begin, with the landlord or with the servant, as both spend much beyond their means. I would have it begin with the mirasidars who will be copied by the servant. The health of the labourers should be better looked after. They must be better educated, must be made to have cleaner habits, their houses should be more sanitary and they must be encouraged to have small gardens by the side of their houses. They must be made to make use of the modern dispensaries instead of trusting to quacks who destroy more lives than any of the epidemics. The absolute ignorance and the entire dependance of the labourers upon the "*Poosaries*," devil drivers and such others to cure their ailments is simply miserable.

The untouchables should be better treated and made to love their master by a slackening in the strict observance of the distance at which they should stand from their master, for they seem to move too far from their masters. Except a few among them who are acquiring property, the whole mass of them are sunk in ignorance, improvidence, poverty and their allied evils. It is high time for the mirasidars to see that their relations with these people are improved. They must be lifted up if they want to benefit themselves.

The relation between the landlord and the tenant, at any rate, the identification of the interest on the land ought to be greater in the share system of cultivation, where the share increases, with the increased expenditure either of labour or money or both. Generally, in this system of cultivation the tenant is a man of little means, and the landholder is generally resident in the village and the prime object of this system then is for the landholder to get more income by making the labourer devote greater attention on the land with

a prospect of his getting a greater share, while the landless labourer instead of having an uncertain life, tries to get a fair return for the exertion he bestows upon another's land in whose produce he will have a fair share. The capital necessary for farming in this way is usually advanced by the landholder, by way of seeds, manure and advance of labour charges. All or some of these are taken with or without interest after harvest from the tenants' share. Sometimes a portion of these expenses is shared by the mirasidar also. The share of the proceeds varies in different localities, from one-fourth of the grain as is the case with paddy in Tanjore, to half the produce either in wet, garden or dry lands as in Coimbatore. In Coimbatore the most expensive and profitable crop of sugarcane is raised on the share system both the parties spending almost equally, and both sharing the produce equally. The tenant has to do all the lifting of water himself which is to some extent compensated by the owner not deducting the rent of the land and allowing grass to be cut and fed to the tenant's cattle. The average cost of raising canes (excluding irrigation) would come to about Rs. 150 per acre, and the average outturn would be about Rs. 450 per acre. Thus the landlord and tenant sharing equally, get each a profit of Rs. 150. The tenant thus gets about Rs. 12 a month to which there are various additions and is thus better off than the cooly labourer who does not get more than Rs. 7 a month. It is not uncommon for such labourers to own in two years a pair of good cattle, and in the course of time to lay by something substantial. Thus the share which the tenant gets is higher than the wages he would get if he worked as a cooly labourer, and it is necessary that he should get it because he works much harder and with greater interest on the land. An instance of the share system not put to quite a successful use is seen in the Tanjore district where there is no identity of interest on the land, on the part of the tenant, on account of the very low share he receives. "The payment of a share does not tend to increase the intensity of culture" so says a famous American economist. A fourth of the paddy and half the straw is the general rule. The landlord is to manure the land but manure as a rule is never applied, the land gives the minimum returns and the tenant is a pauper and the very little advance he

receives from the farmer for expending upon cooly labour and seeds is frequently used up for his own living. Here then is improvement necessary. But if the share is to be greater to the tenant the landlord complains that he is losing more of his dues while possibly the land may not give a greater return. This would naturally happen if the land is not better cultivated. "Share tenancy is more profitable to the landlord only when the farm is under his immediate supervision."\* He must therefore advance money for all the operations and see that that they are carried out effectually. More manure must be purchased, better implements and bullocks must be provided, and better work must be exacted from the tenant, and a better sympathy must be created between them. "For it is only the landlord who is willing to give his tenant a fair chance, and then insists on good farming and honest business, that will get a good income from the land,"† while "a grasping landlord drives the tenant to dishonest means in order to make both ends meet."‡

A very good system of share tendency practised in Salem and Coimbatore is that the landholder sends in one of his servants to work under the tenant. The servant is made to work better because the tenant is a labourer, and the servant must keep the same hours and do as much work as the tenant. This is something like joint cultivation, where the sleeping partner is represented by a labourer. This is worth trying in other places.

The people who cultivate the lands for a cash rent, are mostly poor, owning perhaps a pair of cattle and a few implements. Being poor, they borrow a small amount of money either from the money lender, or from a ryot in the village. Very rarely the landlord advances money to his tenant, for he has to risk his land and capital. The sum bears in most cases 18% interest, and he will have to pay the rent in certain periods, just before the Government kist is due or when the tenant has either just harvested the crop or is about to do it. The result is that on account of pressure, he has to sell the produce at a lower rate, to pay off the landlord. He thus loses much in selling, has to pay interest on the investment and the rent

---

\*Agricultural Economics Taylor.

†Ibid.

‡Ibid.

on the land and no wonder the land hardly gives a margin of profit. The rate of interest that these people have to pay is high and the land is not generally so very fertile or is made so by the farmer that it may give heavy yields. To add to the poverty of the tenant, the period of lease is short so that he hardly utilises all his labour power in the general improvement of the farm. Arthur Young, one of the older economists of England says that "In general it may be held for sound doctrine that an estate can neither be improved, nor even held to its former state of improvement without long leases." The tenant cannot apply large quantities of manure or silt or anyhow improve fertility of the land if he is not guaranteed possession of the land for a sufficiently long period, so that he may reap the benefits of the improvements. The tenants being generally poor, cannot very much improve the land even if the leases are effected for longer periods, unless the mirasidar takes the initiative. He must first of all spend some money to improve the estate and then bring in the best type of tenants and give the land on a long lease of, say, at least 10 years. The tenant must be made to get a fair profit, a portion of which he will be induced to invest on the land in better manuring. Otherwise the tenant who lives on borrowed capital and heavily handicapped in the race, by not being able to secure the best value for the produce in the market, cannot effect improvement on the land. The landlord foreseeing the ultimate good must at first sacrifice a share of the profits by investing more money in the land. Frequent troubles have arisen about the "tenant right" for unexhausted improvements. This is a long story, and various enactments have been made to bring about amicable relations between the landlord and the tenant in England. The Agricultural Holdings Act, enables the tenant to obtain compensation for the improvements effected on the land, for which full return has not been obtained. Disputed questions as to the value of improvements are settled by arbitration. The American Economist, H. C. Taylor, reviewing the whole question says: "that accompanying the gradual perfecting of the Agricultural Holdings Act, there has been the growth of a sense of justice in the minds of both landlords and tenants. This sense of justice is all the more effective because it is accompanied by the belief that in farm

mangement whatever is beneficial to the farmer is likewise advantageous to the landlord. It is this maxim that has to be realised by every landlord in India.

In most cases the mamool decides the cropping, and no definite clauses are added in the lease deed, as to the cropping of the land during the period of lease. In some places varagu is prohibited, just before the lease expires. A crop of paddy is enforced after plantains, sugarcane or betel in order that the tenant will leave the land level. The short leases and the indifferent manuring does not necessitate any such restrictions which may be necessary when longer leases and the greater use of fertilizers come into vogue. One clause, however, must find a place, namely that the tenant shall not raise any crop without manuring, and the landlord finding the means for it if need be. The tenant shall not also sell away his farm yard manure. It is not possible within this short article to detail the various conditions which the farmers and tenants abide by, and any book on Agricultural Economics or Farm Management will give an idea of how complicated things have become in other countries.

In the garden lands of Coimbatore, it is the custom to provide the tenant with a hut near the well, where the tenant frequently lives and keeps the cattle. The petty repairs to the shed are done by the tenant himself and the more substantial ones the farmer does at his cost. Such a system is exceedingly beneficial and should be adopted by all farmers, wherever possible. It is beneficial to the landlord, because the tenant living on the land, however, indifferent he may be, will yet devote more attention to the land than when he lives away. It will attract better tenants and command more rent. It is helpful to the tenant who can economise his time, labour and manure. One drawback to effecting this system is the scattered nature of the small holdings. This has got to be remedied by every right thinking farmer at a very early opportunity, by a system of mutual exchange. The village panchayats that are being created may have given to them some more powers to enable them to effect permanent good to the landholders.

The writer knows of an instance in Coimbatore where a tenant had leased the lands of an individual which were scattered in a few places of which three sites were close enough, with only a few yards distance between each other. The tenant had raised sugar cane in all the three pieces, and had fitted up the mill in one field, where the canes from the other fields had to be brought. While he was taking a few bundles from one field to the other, along the bund of a neighbour's field, the latter refused the right of way, and the tenant had thus to take all the cans circuitously along the bed of an irrigation channel paying as much as four times the normal wages for transport. This extra expense in cultivation and other troubles need not be incurred if the plots are consolidated.

The relations between the landholder and the tenants must be more intimate and more direct especially in the case of big estate holders, where the tenants rarely ever have an opportunity of representing their grievances to the landlord. It is here that the managers of estates are doing more harm than good to the landlord and the tenants. Where managers are appointed the landlord never cares to see to the cultivation, the requirements of the tenants and of the land. So long as the rent is duly collected, he thinks that there is nothing to be done by him in his estate. This is exactly what ought not to be. The landlord must visit the land as frequently as possible in the absence of the manager, see to the condition of the land, listen to the requirements of the tenants and find out how the income from the land can be increased without unduly taxing the poor tenants. This the poorly paid manager cannot be expected to do. Nor has he ever done very much in this way "Neither the assiduity and the experience of a hired manager, nor the power and willingness of the master to lay out improvements are so effectual as this one thing, the presence of the master."\* The pay of the manager is

---

\* "Adam Dickson" Husbandry of Ancients from Taylor.

in most cases quite nominal, while his income is quite ample. Why not pay him better and make things get on more straight forward? In smaller farms where the landholder can manage the lands himself it is a suicidal policy to employ a manager.

The system of leasing the lands to a capitalist is equally bad. It is done because the landlord finds it convenient to deal with one individual and have better security than a number of poor tenants and be worried about collection, remission of rent and a hundred other difficulties. Generally he sublets the land to poor tenants at a higher rent, a rent which would cover up his investment with 12% interest, and bad debts and also to get the lion's share of the profit. It is the honest type of the tenants that are thus taxed heavily. Why pay a middleman so heavily for the easiness in collecting rent? It is better to deal directly with the cultivators, individually and where security is uncertain to bind him with another of better security. The profit of the middleman may either go to the landlord, or in the first instance to the tenants who in the course of time will farm better.

The rent is paid either in cash or in kind. Kind payment is advantageous in that it is more convenient for the tenants to measure out a portion of the produce than that they should deal with the traders, who do not deal fairly with poor tenants.

The general economic condition of the agriculturists and the labourers of Madras is and has been far from satisfactory and a thorough study of the Madras Agriculturists that was made by Sir Fredrick Nicholson more than a decade ago in connection with the establishment of land banks in Madras, reveals, that the labourers are sunk in poverty and the landholders are in debt. The Land Improvement and Agricultural Loans Act so graciously passed make them avail of the cheap credit. The village organisation, so ancient and so firmly established, is yet

a living force, though not powerful, and the present activity of the Co-operative Department is giving a fresh lease of life to the villages. 'Back to the village'—the common cry for the labourers in industrial countries is not necessary, but the retired officials must certainly go back to the village if ever they have any spark of patriotism. It is these and other better class of landholders that must begin to improve their relations with their tenants, and the rest will follow their lead. Co-operative societies must be established everywhere, where the landlord and the labourer must sit as equals and conduct the business of the society. To go into the possibilities of co-operation would be to go astray. But I will quote a few sentences from an address of the Hon. Dewan Bahadur L. D. Swamikannu Pillai at the 3rd Agricultural Conference of the Union. A resident landlord "can best help his tenant by establishing a co-operative society, where they as well as he will be members. There is another way in which a landlord can do good to his tenants through co-operative societies, that is by investing his money in the societies, to which his tenants belong." It is by co-operation that most of the foregoing improvements will be thoroughly effected. "For the indirect and immediate effects of co-operation, its diffusion of knowledge, its remarkable educational capacity, its powerful stimulation of thought and which among them teach men to cultivate better, to select the most paying crops for each particular use, to turn their produce to more profitable account, to settle in groups, promoting well-being all round, to make the country prosperous and happier, and its immeasurable value as enabling us at length to make the rural social reform, so long fondly dreamt of, so often attempted, a palpable reality, by producing once more a peasantry comfortably and permanently settled on the soil, ought certainly not to be left out of account." ‡

K. Raghavachari.

---

‡Wolf.