INDIA: A NATION

INDIA: A NATION

A PLEA FOR INDIAN SELF-GOVERNMENT

BY

ANNIE BESANT, D.L.

Fellow of the Benares Hindu University

WITH A FOREWORD BY

C. P. RAMASWAMI AIYAR, B.A., B.L.

Fellow of the University of Madras

THEOSOPHICAL PUBLISHING HOUSE

ADYAR, MADRAS, INDIA

1930

First Edition: 1915

Second Edition: 1917

Third Edition: 1925

Fourth Edition: 1930

FOREWORD

THE purpose of a Foreword is twofold. It may introduce to the public either the author or the subject. Mrs. Annie Besant is known to the English world as an untiring public worker, as the associate of Charles Bradlaugh, and as the head of various important movements and a protagonist in the struggle for the extension of women's rights. To the public of India she is even more familiar. Apart from her religious activities, she has laboured long and hard in the educational field, and her name will be imperishably linked with the Central Hiṇḍū College, Benares, the Hiṇḍū University to be. In the region of social amelioration, and the uplifting of the backward classes she has worked no less earnestly, and it would be impertinent for anyone to introduce her to the public. It is the conviction all over India that in her political activities tending towards the betterment of Indian conditions she will be no less successful in her organisation of forces than she has been in other departments. These few lines have been written by one who can claim to be only an exponent of the average opinion of the younger generation of educated Indians, who though they may not profess any religious allegiance to the author yet feel that

in her India has one of her truest friends and warmest advocates.

This book is intended primarily as an appeal to the British Democracy. Notwithstanding the efforts made by a gallant band of men in Parliament and out of it, the ignorance of the average Englishman concerning Indian conditions and feelings is appalling, and it may easily be gauged from a study of any current periodical or magazine dealing with Indian topics. The war has, undoubtedly, brought in a new point of view. Amidst its ghastly train of evils, there has been created a sense of solidarity and fellow-feeling amongst all the component parts of the British Empire which is of most happy augury.

This volume will open the eyes of the British to actual Indian conditions as perceived from the Indian point of view, and the author, it is needless to say, has attempted to elucidate the true interests of India and sought to reconcile them with the larger interests of the Empire as a whole; and she has brought to the consideration of her subject the advantages afforded by a long study of political problems and an intimate and personal knowledge of Indian conditions and feelings. Perhaps no other person born outside the Indian pale has entered so thoroughly as Mrs. Besant has done into our minds and emotions.

A recent volume by Mr. Radhakumud Mukerji, on the *Fundamental Unity of India*, has sought to teach the lesson that amidst various seeming and superficial differences India is essentially one in her

traditions, in the outlook of her peoples, and in their general capabilities. In this little book also the author has striven to deduce from the history of the past the lesson that India has been able to achieve unity in political aspirations and conduct, and that she has been able to govern herself in the past, and will be able to govern herself in the future within the Empire, provided she is trusted. The lesson that is attempted to be conveyed is that India need not be in leading strings during the whole of her political future. However much even an unsympathetic reader may differ from the author in details and in specific lessons to be drawn from events, he can scarcely gainsay the fact that a perusal of these pages will lead to the belief that in the past India has had an organic political development along indigenous lines, and that a healthy civic and corporate life was attained by means of the organisation and development of the village community and the pañchāyaṭ systems. The author has also succeeded in showing that progress is best attainable by adhering to the genius of the race and developing along its own lines of least resistance. To achieve this, the aim of the rulers ought to be not to brush aside or ignore the history of the past, but to instil a love and reverence for National religion and traditions, and so to educate the peoples as to foster a true spirit of patriotism which alone will lead to self-realisation. Manhood is attained not by repression but through healthy, albeit unruly, growth. So long as we are afraid of small differences or difficulties, and so

long as our rulers will recognise them as obstacles, so long shall we continue in our present amorphous condition. If a child is discouraged by fears of falling it will never learn to walk. By hammering out our differences and by our failures alone shall we achieve success.

After discussing the political and economic history of ancient India, the author has summarised the results of British rule, and she has been very strong in her statement of the case that Britain has up to now failed in educating the people of India to govern themselves. Every Indian feels that it is to Britain that he owes his ideals of liberty and of political enfranchisement; but it is patent that the aim of the rulers in the past has been to organise an elaborate system to keep the peace rather than to organise Self-Government. The blessings that have followed in the wake of British rule are manifold and striking, but, whilst young India recognises and is grateful for them, it also feels that perfection of bureaucratic government can be bought too dearly when the price of it is a mechanical existence. To quote an oft cited saying, " good government is no substitute for Self-Government ".

After outlining the system of Indian polity and pointing out that there are serious deficiencies in the administration of the country, which have yet to be remedied, and great and long-standing grievances to be redressed, such as the Land Revenue Administration and the helotage imposed by the Arms Regulations, the author has as her main thesis, endeavoured to emphasise the economic troubles of India

and the faults of her educational system, and striven to awaken British Democracy to the urgent necessity for the overhauling of governmental theories and practice on these subjects. So far as our economic condition is concerned, the whole of thinking India feels that a system has been forced upon the country which, in the language of the present Secretary of State for India, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, is "hateful to Indian opinion". "No tariff reformer," he says in his introduction to Sir Roper Lethbridge's *Indian Offer of Preference*, "need dispute that, left to themselves, Indian representatives would establish a system of pure protection, directed as much against Great Britain as against the rest of the world." It is certain that excise on cotton goods manufactured locally is detrimental to Indian interests. The nascent and growing industries of this country have been victimised by the competition of far-seeing and strong rivals, and it is felt throughout the land that the fiscal and economic policies that have been pursued by England in relation to India need thorough revision. It would not be the language of exaggeration to say that nothing has more shaken the faith of India in the principles of justice on which undeniably the British rule is based than the partiality with reference to Lancashire; and Sir Valentine Chirol, who is certainly not partial to advanced Indian aspirations, has characterised the treatment in this respect by England of India as a permanent discredit to British rule. If there is one matter in which India needs encouragement more than in another, it is in the

direction of industrial growth, so as to relieve the tension on agricultural industry and to develop the tremendous resources of the country. For far too long a period we have been dominated by antiquated Cobdenism. The subsidised goods of foreign and protected countries have been thrust upon us. The hobby has been ridden to death that all taxation must be for revenue only. Taxing as a means of supporting young industries has not been even dreamt of. Most of our rivals are consistently Protectionist, and our trade is passing into their hands. We have not, in spite of appeals from the Press and platform, even the right to help ourselves against competitors outside the Empire. The cotton excise duties are an unheard-of form of discouragement, and India is forbidden to levy for her own purposes export duties on commodities which are her natural monopolies, such as jute. The result is that the Government are at their wits' end to devise fresh sources of revenue, and cannot properly grapple with new and expanding items of expenditure. Indian tariffs as maintained at present are the best possible means for bringing about the strangulation of industries, the needless enhancement of the cost of various commodities, and the increase of indefensible taxation. An export duty on jute and an import duty on sugar and foreign cotton goods were both advocated by Mr. Gokhale, but his was a voice in the wilderness. Not otherwise than by complete fiscal autonomy do we feel that we shall have a fair chance in the struggle for National existence.

Japan, with the true statesmanship which has characterised her recent history, has demonstrated that her political alliance with England will not stand in the way of a preferential tariff against her ally. It is often forgotten, too, that such autonomy would largely benefit Indian finance, and that the financial position of India will stand on a much securer footing if a juster treatment is accorded to Indian commerce, because India is, in the main, a great debtor country, and she has to pay large sums by way of interest on loans for her railway and public debt; a policy which will keep the profits within the Empire is surely the best even from the most selfish point of view. The case for Indian preference as linked up with an Imperial system has often been presented, notably by Sir Gangadhar Chitnavis and by Mr. Gokhale; but the urgency of the problem needs a restatement of it.

No one can also deny that the plea for just treatment of India from an educational as well as from an economic and fiscal point of view is opportune and necessary. In Japan, a few years ago, education was exclusively literary, and as barren of results as at any time in this country; but by actively associating the people with the State, and embarking on large schemes with a single eye to National advancement, research has been stimulated, universities, which are true homes of culture, have been founded and developed, and technical education has been elevated to its proper place in the equipment of the nation.

This book would be of permanent value if only for its timely insistence on an adequate comprehension of the National past and the instilling of a true spirit of patriotism in the youth of the country as an essential element of National education. In these and other matters, India and Anglo-India differ inevitably in their views, and especially in the matter of apportioning blame or praise; but in the main arguments of the book, I may venture to assert that the author has the whole of educated India behind her; namely, that the fiscal policy needs readjustment, that the education imparted in the country is defective in its scope and its aim, and, lastly, that an adequate solution of Indian problems is achievable only by the grant of Self-Government—such government being based on National traditions and on the old national institutions of pañchāyaṭs and village communities. It may be asserted that the present is an unseasonable time to emphasise and insist on these things, and that nothing matters now but the war; but it must not be forgotten that India's loyalty can least be questioned at the present moment.

In finding fault with the systems of administration, Indian public men have never failed to realise that under the rule of no other country would such a frank and free discussion be possible, and the cant about educated India being a microscopic and negligible minority can no longer be solemnly trotted forth. It has been realised throughout the Empire that the inter-relation between the various parts of it must and will be profoundly modified

after this war, not as a reward for the services of the various Dominions and Provinces, but by reason of the readjustment of the mental focus. The presence of a Canadian Minister "at a Cabinet meeting is not a boon" but a recognition of union. It is often said that India expects boons for her memorable participation in the struggle. Nothing can be falser. She craves for no boon. What she expects, on the other hand, is that the realisation of India's loyalty and manhood will lead the British Democrat to bestow adequate attention on Indian problems, to redress inequalities, to restore Indian self-respect, and to consent to India taking her proper place in the federation of the Empire. Shall we hope that no distinctions will be drawn between the "Empire of Settlement" and the "Empire of Rule"?

C. P. RAMASWAMI AIYAR

PREFATORY NOTE

THE Indian National Movement in its political aspect began, as an organised body, in 1884, and worked as a single body until 1907. In that year was formed what was called the "New Party"; it consisted of those who in Mahārāshtra were represented by Mr. Bāl Gangādhar Tilak, and in Bengal by Mr. Arabindo Ghosh and Mr. Bepin Chandra Pāl. This party had been gradually separating off from the mass of the Congressmen, driven by the Curzonian policy into despair of gaining from Great Britain any effective changes in the government of India; within it there was again the difference that while Mr. Tilak was willing to maintain the British connection, if Self-Government were granted, the Bengal leaders aimed at complete separation, and refused all co-operation with Britons. The Congressmen while aiming at Self-Government, had taken the path of the introduction of gradual reforms, co-operating with the Government where the Government was going along the right lines, but acting normally as "His Majesty's Opposition". The split at the Surat Congress divided these; the latter carried on the Congress, while Mr. Tilak's party stood aloof from it, and the Bengal party rejected it wholly.

In the rapid growth of India, the Congressmen, united in essentials, are gradually shaping

themselves into two great natural groups of elders and youngers. The elders, those who have led the Congress from the beginning, cling to the old methods, and still ask for the ungranted reforms which they asked for in 1885. They have won many reforms already, and they will be satisfied if the pace of reforms is much quickened, and if Self-Government be definitely aimed at. The youngers, thanks to the progress made by the elders, and instinct with the life of New India, passionately patriotic and resolute to win freedom, intensely resenting the inferiority imposed upon them, put Self-Government in the fore-front of their programme; while willing to help in gaining reforms, they feel that all those will follow as a matter of course if they first win Self-Government, and that the demand for this should be made in unfaltering accents. Mr. Gokhale stood as a link between elders and youngers, wholly in sympathy with the youngers, but affectionately clinging to the elders beside whom he had fought in the earlier days, and acknowledging their leadership. The youngers are gradually organising themselves, and among their coming leaders the writer of the above Foreword occupies a prominent place. The youngers are weak in Bombay (City) but strong over all the rest of India, especially in Bengal, the United Provinces, and Madras.

The Historical Introduction, so compressed as to lose the weight it ought to have, and the details of which should be studied in the books named in the Bibliography, must be the background of all

true thought about India, and is absolutely necessary for understanding her. The succeeding chapters give: I. The Religious Revival, proceeding and creating the new National party. II. The Economic Conditions which form the material basis of the necessity for Self-Government. III. The Educational Position. IV. The Modern National Movement. V. An Outline of the Machinery of Self-Government, and the existing materials therefor.

Nationality is a sentiment, but it is a sentiment which creates and destroys. How strong it is, how mighty the Patriotism which is its child, may be seen in the European war now raging. There is a hope in Indian hearts that the feeling forced upon Great Britain of the intolerableness of the idea of her reduction under a foreign yoke, as voiced by Mr. Asquith, may awaken in her heart a sympathy with the identical feeling existing in India to-day.

For nearly two-and-twenty years I have lived among Indians, not as a foreigner but as one of themselves. Hindū in all save the outer ceremonies for which my white skin disqualifies me, living in Indian fashion, feeling with Indian feelings, one with Indian feelings, one with Indians in heart, in hopes, in aspirations, in labours for the country, knowing their weakness as well as their strength, I dare to claim an intimacy of knowledge and an identity of sentiment which qualify me for stating, as far as may be in such brief compass, the case for India—a Nation.

1915 ANNIE BESANT

FOREWORD TO "HOW INDIA WROUGHT FOR FREEDOM" [1]

LITTLE is needed to explain the purpose of this book. It is a plain story of India's constitutional struggle for Freedom, a story so pathetic in its patience, so strong in its endurance, so far-seeing in its wisdom, that it is India's justification—if any justification can be needed for asserting the right to Freedom—for her demand for Home Rule.

The younger generation are impatient under the repetition of disregarded demands, and they are right. The time has come for the definite agitation for Home Rule, to continue till it is granted. But they are wrong if they fail to recognise that these thirty years of work alone make it possible that the full demand for Freedom can now be effectively made. And they are doubly wrong if they are not grateful to these builders of the Indian Nation, who, when all was dark around them, believed in the dawning of the day. They have laid the foundation on which their youngers can build. Homage then

[1] This is the name of the book published in 1915, for which the Historical Introduction was written, that was condensed for *India: a Nation*, which, being out of print, is reprinted in the present volume. The fuller Introduction will make the reprint more useful.

to the veterans, living still with us here, and living in the world beyond. That the younger generation may know how splendidly they wrought, this book is written.

I fearlessly place this volume before the public, as a proof of India's fitness for Home Rule. The grasp of the questions dealt with, the sagacity of the remedies proposed for poverty and misrule, the sobriety of the claims urged, the knowledge of, and the sympathy with, the sorrows of the people, prove how much better off India would be under Self-Rule than under Other-Rule. Let any unprejudiced student turn over the Resolutions passed by the Congress during thirty years, and see how it laid bare the popular suffering, and how it pointed with unerring finger to the causes of that suffering—the drain of Indian wealth to England, the exorbitant cost of the alien rule, the ever-increasing military expenditure, the sacrifice of Indian industries, the land-tax ever rising and condemning the peasantry to perpetual indebtedness, and to a hopeless poverty and semi-starvation that have no parallel in any other civilised Nation. It is these facts, covered up by officials, but laid bare by the Congress, which make Home Rule necessary, if a catastrophe is to be avoided.

The daily insult of the Arms Act, the constant oppression of the Press and Seditious Meetings Acts, the exclusion of Indians from the higher grades of the Army, the Police, the Educational Service, and a score of other wrongs, while bitterly felt by a high-spirited people, have not in them the immediate

menace that lies in the grinding poverty of the masses of the population. People become more or less accustomed to the "atmosphere of inferiority," and oppression, long submitted to, at last dulls pride and weakens self-respect. But people never become accustomed to Hunger, and they become desperate when they see no hope of relief for themselves, nor for their children after them. The danger to British Rule lies far more in the misery of the masses than in the discontent of the educated. To call attention to that danger before it is too late, this book is issued.

The Historical introduction is the background of the story. It is the testimony of 5,000 years to India's success in ruling herself. Let Indian history be set side by side with European history—with what there is of the latter—century by century, and let us see whether India need blush at the comparison. Take but the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth centuries, to go back no further. Compare Akbar's tolerance with the persecution of Protestants by Mary, of Roman Catholics by Elizabeth, and of Puritans by James and Charles. Read the Penal Laws against Roman Catholics in Ireland, and ask if the English, who enacted and enforced them, were fit for Self-Government. See the misery and starvation of France in the eighteenth century ending in the Revolution, review the Peasants' War in Germany, the constant wars in Italy, the turbulence of Hungary and Poland, the royal murders and revolutions in England, and say if all these countries were more fit for

Self-Government than India. Yet they, unworthy, took it, and have purified themselves by it, becoming more fit in the using of it. India, more worthy than they to take it, is deemed unfit. The only argument against India's fitness is her submission.

May this book help Britain to understand the shame of her autocratic rule in India, her broken pledges, her selfishness, her preference of her own to India's interests. May it help India to realise her duty to Herself.

ANNIE BESANT

CONTENTS

INDIA: A NATION

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

AND SOME DEDUCTIONS AND ANTICIPATIONS

THE DAWNING

THE great Nations of the far Past spring suddenly on to the stage of history, as Bunsen said of Egypt, full-grown. Truer perhaps would be the simile, if we said that a curtain rises, and we see the Nation on the stage, full-panoplied, complete, as no Nation could be without centuries, perhaps millennia, of civilization behind it; this is true of India, as of Assyria, Persia, Egypt, but in one thing India differs from those whose contemporary She was. They are dead. She still lives; and in these modern days She is showing a vigour and a strength which bid fair to place Her again in the forefront of the world's history. They are known by unburied cities, by ruins, by fragments, by papyri, by tiles, by coins, found by burrowing in their sepulchres. India is continuous, with a history running backwards to

the most archaic times—how ancient, who may say? —and she has a literature which also runs backwards, claiming an antiquity not yet acknowledged in the West. Vedas, Institutes, Purānas, Epic Poems, which, as regards the historical books—the Purānas and the Epics—can be checked in their later records as regards dynasties by Greek history, and yet more by the fragments of the Past dug up from time to time. Says Vincent A. Smith:

> Modern writers have been inclined to disparage unduly the authority of the pauranic lists, but closer study finds in them much genuine and valuable historical tradition. For instance, the *Vishnu Purāna* gives the outline of the history of the Maurya dynasty with a near approach to accuracy, and the Redcliffe manuscript of the *Matsya* is equally trustworthy for Andhra history. Proof of the surprising extent to which coins and inscriptions confirm the *Matsya* list of the Andhra Kings has recently been published.[1]

Entrancing as are the records of the far-off times, the stories of Sages and Warriors, of Rāmachandra, the Hero-King of the *Rāmāyana*, of the doings in peace and war of the Kauravas and Pāndavas and Shrī Krishna, that make the story of the *Mahābhārata*, of these who live by scores and hundreds enshrined in legend, tradition, drama, song, and—the greatest of them—live still more vitally in Indian hearts and prayers and ceremonies to-day, showing the historical continuity; from all these we must

[1] *Early History of India*, p. 10, Ed. 1908. In so brief a sketch, it is better not to overburden the pages with continuous references, but a bibliography of the books consulted on the history here condensed, which will guide the serious student in his research, will be found at the end of this Introduction.

turn aside for want of space with only this one fact writ large: *It is on this literature and on the Past embodied in it that the foundation of Indian Nationality is indestructibly laid.* The National Self-Consciousness strikes its roots deeply into this rich soil, and whatever may contribute to its later growth—and the contributions are enormous—the Nation's Life and Unity are rooted here. He who knows nothing of the infinite wealth of this "unhistorical" Past will never understand the Indian heart and mind, and Sir Valentine Chirol, in his malicious and unscrupulous book on *Indian Unrest*, saw accurately the truth that from the "Hindu Revival" was born the National Movement of Modern India, as from a similar Revival was born the Marātha Confederacy. Moreover, very many of the institutions and customs of "historical" times are continuous with those of the "legendary" Past, and are incomprehensible and without significance save for that past. The horse-sacrifices of Pushyamitra in the second century B.C., of Adityasena in the seventh century A.D., link with the tradition of that of Yudhishthira in 3000 B.C. odd, and with that of Sagara, uncounted millennia backward—in each equally the sign of the acknowledged Lord Paramount of *India as a whole.* So again with the Panchayat, "the Five," whether the Council of Village Elders of time immemorial, or Chandragupta's Boards in the fourth century B.C. India is a continuum, and her Aryan civilization an unbroken whole. There are invasions and conquests, periods of strength and weakness, of unity and division,

in her æonian story. But she is always India; always Aryan, the MOTHER Imperishable, who has borne uncounted millions from Her womb, but at whose own birth no historian can guess, whose death no prophet can foretell. And this it is well to remember, in our judgments of to-day. With an admitted history of nearly 5,000 years, from the commerce between India and Babylon, according to Dr. Sayce, in 3000 B.C.,[1] and the proofs of high civilization and wealth then existing; with an admitted literature of at least 7,000 years; the period of English rule in India, barely a century and a half, is microscopically small, a tiny ripple on her ocean. Invasions flow and ebb; conquerors come and go; India assimilates what is left of them, is the richer for them, and remains Herself. She did without England for millennia, and flourished amazingly; she could do without England for millennia to come; but the two need each other, and will be the better for each other in the near future, and India desires to be linked with England in that future, but on a footing of perfect equality, and *on none other*.

INDIA'S MIDDLE HISTORY

The Coming of the Aryans

They were no wild tribes that crossed the Himālayan passes and flooded India in successive waves of invasion from 18,000 B.C. onwards. They came

[1] *Hibbert Lecture*, 1887, quoted in *Indian Shipping*, p. 85, Ed. 1912.

from an archaic Middle Asian civilization, the cradle of the Aryans, whence came successively the immigrants who made the Mediterranean civilization, colonized Persia and Mesopotamia, and sent the forefathers of the Latin, Slav and Teuton Nations to people Europe. Later, they came down into India, penetrated first to the south—the Aryan Dravidians—and later settled in the north. But this is still the region of dreams, and no sober western historian will yet accept it.[1] And yet perhaps this is hardly so, for Sir William Hunter, though he gives no dates, speaks of the Aryan home as in Central Asia, of settlements round the shores of the Mediterranean, of a western offshoot founding Persia, of another becoming the Greek Nation, Italy and Rome, Spain and Britain, and of others descending through the passes of the Himālayas into India.

It is not without significance, as Professor Radhakumud Mukerji points out in his *Fundamental Unity of India*, that India is one country in her religious literature. She is Jambudvipa—Ashoka is called "King of Jambudvipa," and Bhāratavarsha, Aryavarta; "India" is a name given by foreigners. In Hindu prayers, the names of the great rivers are recited, the northern only in the earlier, later the southern as well, as the Aryans spread southward. The sacred places range from Hardvar to Kanchi, and later, Badarikedarnāth to Rameshvara, from Dvāraka to Jagannāth. And the people, ever reciting these, knew them all as in their

[1] This first paragraph is not "historic".

Motherland. Pilgrimages took the devout to all of these as Hindu. The student will find in that useful little book many more proofs that India was a Unity, had, even then, a National Self-consciousness in her religion. Patriotism was inspired and hallowed by these loving recitations.

Despite the fact that "India's history only begins with Alexander," as western writers say, we submit in passing that, as above noted, Babylon was trading with her in 3000 B.C.; that Semiramis of Nineveh invaded India in 2034 B.C. and penetrated as far as Jammu, as stated on a column erected by her, and was finally put to flight by an Indian Prince, named Strabrobates by Diodorus Siculus; that mummies in Egyptian tombs, dating from 2000 B.C. have been found wrapped in Indian muslin of the finest quality, and that their indigo dye is said to have come from India; that Diodorus Siculus tells of an invasion of India 981 B.C., by Rameses II; that Hiram of Tyre, 980 B.C. traded with India from harbours in the Arabian Gulf, and Tamil names for Indian products are found in the Hebrew Bible.[1] There is plenty of evidence by such contacts, apart from Indian literature, of a civilization rivalling at least those of Egypt and Assyria.

In A.D. 883, the first Englishman whose visit to India is recorded, was Sighelmas, Bishop of Sherborne, sent by King Alfred (A.D. 849-901) to visit the Christian Church, named after S. Thomas. He travelled comfortably, and brought back to

[1] *Indian Shipping*, p. 89.

England "many splendid exotic gems and spices, such as that country plentifully yielded".[1]

"HISTORY" BEGINS

For our purpose we can arbitrarily begin at the period recognized as "historical" by the wider western historians, the middle of the seventh century B.C., when we find, as said above, highly civilized communities—having existed there "for untold centuries," admits Vincent Smith—commerce with foreign countries going on, making India "historical," the knowledge of writing widely spread, and the country between the Himālayas and the Nerbudda river divided into sixteen States—some monarchical, some aristocratic-republican—with great stretches of forests, jungles, and unsettled lands interspersed among them. The beginning of the seventh century, 600 B.C., sees the first "historical" dynasty ruling over Magadha (Bihar). In the time of the Lord Buddha—a time of obviously high civilization and much philosophical discussion (621 B.C. to 543 B.C. according to Sinhalese traditions, died 487 B.C. according to Vincent Smith)—Kosala (Oudh) and Magadha stand out prominently, Kosala being the premier State and having swallowed up Kāshi (Benares). Very soon afterwards Magadha took the lead, including the territory from the Himālayas to the Gangā, with Pataliputra

[1] These facts and many others of undoubted historicity, may be found summarised in the *Manual of Administration of the Madras Presidency*—a book containing a vast amount of information, with some astounding lapses of knowledge.

(where Patna and Bankipur are now) as capital—the first capital of India in "historical" times, as we shall see later.

Ajatashatru, its founder and the King of Magadha, was contemporary with Darius of Persia (521-485 B.C.) who annexed Sindh and part of the Panjāb, and formed them into a Persian satrapy, interesting to us merely from the proof of the enormous wealth at that time of that part of India—implying thereby high civilization—for it paid an annual tribute in gold-dust equal to one million pounds sterling.

We can pass on to the first "historical" Emperor of India, Chandra Mori, or Chandragupta; he came, according to the pauranic lists, from a branch of the Pramaras, one of the thirty-six royal races of the "line of the Sun," descended from the King Rāmachandra or one of his brothers; the Pramaras were one of the four Agnikulas, "Fire Families," descended from his brother Bharata. Chandragupta was the founder of the Maurya dynasty, and seized the throne of Magadha in 321 B.C. Six years before that date Alexander the Great had invaded what is now Afghanistan; crossing the Hindu Khush, fighting his way to the Indus, and, crossing it about March, 326 B.C., he entered on Indian soil, "which no European traveller or invader," says Vincent Smith, "had ever before trodden"—a rash and mistaken statement. Alexander did not remain long; he advanced to and crossed the Jhelum, defeated Poros, penetrated beyond Sialkot into Jammu, and then, much against his will, forced by a mutiny in his army, began his retreat in September

of the same year, and quitted India finally about September, 325, and marched to Persia, reaching Susa in April-May, 324. His death in 323 put an end to his hopes, and young Chandragupta—belonging to the Magadha royal family, but unfriendly to its head and in exile—gathered an army, attacked the Greeks left in the Panjāb and Sindh, drove them out and subdued the country. He then attacked the King of Magadha, and seated himself on his throne, added to his troops till he gathered an army of 690,000 men—infantry, cavalry, chariots and elephants—swept everything before him with amazing celerity, and finally established himself as Emperor of India, ruling from the Hindu Khush to the Nerbudda, from the Arabian Sea to the Bay of Bengal.

THE EMPERORS OF INDIA

The organization of his Empire by this extraordinary man was as marvellous as his military capacity. Megasthenes, the Greek, lived for some time in Pataliputra, Chandragupta's capital, observed closely his administration in all its details, and left his observations on record; so we are on ground that cannot be challenged. Hunter sums up the views of Megasthenes as follows :

> The Greek ambassador observed with admiration the absence of slavery in India, the chastity of the women, and the courage of the men. In valour they excelled all other Asiatics; they required no locks to their doors; above all, no Indian was ever known to tell a lie. Sober and industrious, good farmers and skilful artisans, they scarcely ever had recourse to a lawsuit, and lived peaceably under their native Chiefs. The kingly

government is portrayed almost as described in the Code of Manu. Megasthenes mentions that India was divided into 118 kingdoms; some of which, as the Prasii under Chandragupta, exercised suzerain powers. The village system is well described, each little rural unit seeming to the Greek an independent republic. Megasthenes remarked the exemption of the husbandmen (Vaishyas) from war and public services; and enumerates the dyes, fibres, fabrics, and products (animal, vegetable, and mineral) of India.[1]

Megasthenes tells how Chandragupta had established a War Office of 30 members, divided into six Boards each of five members—Panchayats: I. Admiralty, controlling the Navy; II. Transports, Commissariat, Army Service; III. Infantry; IV. Cavalry: V. War-chariots; VI. Elephants. The civil administration was similar, and Megasthenes describes specially the Municipality of Pataliputra, consisting again of 30 members, divided into six Panchayats: I. is specially interesting as showing the care—noticeable in the books describing "prehistoric" times—exercised by the State over Arts and Crafts, it supervised all industrial matters, materials, wages, etc. II. looked after foreigners, acting as Consuls, Vincent Smith remarks, and giving proof that the Empire "was in constant intercourse with foreign States". III. was in charge of the registration of births and deaths, rigidly kept as a basis for taxation. IV. looked after trade, and kept the official weights and measures to which all must conform. V. supervised manufactures,

[1] Hunter's *Brief History of the Indian People*, pp. 77, 78 (printed for the Madras Schools), 1881. Perhaps because intended to teach Indian boys, it is often unfair and prejudiced, *e.g.*, in its account of the great Shivāji.

and VI. collected the tax of a tithe of the value of all goods sold. The Municipality as a whole was responsible for markets, harbours, temples, etc. The Empire was divided into Provinces ruled by Viceroys, and officers travelled over the land, inspecting. It is noticed, as so often in later times, that the Indians bore the highest reputation for truth and honesty. Irrigation had its own Department, which regulated " the sluices by which water is distributed into the branch canals, so that every one may enjoy his fair share of the benefit," says Megasthenes. A mass of details has been accumulated, and may be found in the *Arthashāstra* (*Science of Polity*), ascribed to Chanakya, (Kautilya) Chandragupta's Brāhmana minister, that has been translated. The Emperor died 297 B.C.; and was succeeded by Bindusara, his son, and either the father or son extended the Empire almost as far south as what is now Madras. He was followed by Ashoka, who added to the Empire the Kingdom of Kalinga on the Bay of Bengal, and he ruled for forty years—273 or 2 B.C. to 232 or 1—from the Hindu Khush to Madras. The Andhra State (Andhradesha), between the Godaveri and the Kistna, had its own Rāja, acknowledging Ashoka's over-lordship, but the Pāndya, Chola, Keralaputra and Satyaputra States, occupying the extreme south, were independent. Four Viceroys administered the north-western, eastern, western and southern Provinces, Ashoka himself administering the central. His wisdom, his power, his piety, his splendour, are they not written in his edicts,

engraved on Rock and Pillar, and by these his Empire was ruled. Rock Edict II and Pillar Edict VII declare:

> On the roads I have had banyan trees planted to give shade to man and beast; I have had groves of mango-trees planted; and at every half kos I have had wells dug; rest-houses have been erected; and numerous watering-places have been prepared here and there for the enjoyment of man and beast.

Care of the sick, distribution of drugs and herbs, hospitals for animals, were among his institutions.

After his death, many Provinces broke away, until the sixth of his descendants, Brehidrita, or Brihadratha, was expelled from Magadha, 184 B.C., and seized Dhar and Chittor in Mewar, Rājputāna, where his descendants ruled till A.D 730. But Vincent Smith says he was assassinated by Pushyamitra, the commander of his army. The Mauri Chiefs certainly reigned in Mewar, and the transfer as stated is probable. In any case, the Maurya dynasty in Magadha ended, and Pushyamitra founded a new dynasty, the Sunga. Moreover he finally celebrated the horse-sacrifice a few years before his death, in 148 B.C., being acknowledged as Lord Paramount. His dynasty came to an end in 74 B.C., and was succeeded by the Kanva dynasty of four short-lived Kings, the last of whom perished in 27 B.C., at the hands of the ruler of the great Andhra Kingdom.

THE KINGDOMS OF INDIA

The unity of India for the time had gone, as embodied in an Empire, and great Kingdoms arose

and flourished. In the south the Andhra Nation (later the Telegu-speaking population), occupying the Deccan, which had acknowledged the overlordship of Ashoka, after his death became independent, in 220 B.C., extended its sway as far as Nasik, thus stretching across India, and coming into touch with, and striving to hold, Gujerat and Kathiawar. From A.D. 85-138, the Andhras were constantly struggling on their western borders with invading foreigners, and ultimately Kathiawar, Sindh and Kutch passed from Andhra hands into those of the invaders. The Andhra kingdom lasted another hundred years, ending in A.D. 236.

South of the Kistna was the Tamil country, divided into four kingdoms: Pāndya, in the south, with Madura as capital; Chola, with the river Pennar to the north and Pāndya to the south; while Keralaputra lay between it and the western sea, the later Malabar, and Satyaputra was a small State round the present Mangalore. The Tamil land was wealthy and civilized and inhabited by a great trading people. They exported pepper, pearls and beryls chiefly, and did an immense trade, especially with Egypt and Rome. We read of an embassy to congratulate Augustus Cæsar in 20 B.C., mentioned by Strabo. The routes chiefly followed were those by the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea, the monsoon weather, May to August, being avoided by the merchants. In the fourteenth century, Marino Sanuta, a Venetian noble, said that goods of small bulk and high value—spices, pearls, gems—went to a Persian Gulf port, then up the Tigris to Bassorah, thence to Baghdad.

More bulky goods went by the Red Sea, crossed the desert, and down the Nile to Alexandria. Dacca fabrics were favourite wear in Rome in the imperial Court. This Roman trade led to the establishment of Roman Colonies among the Tamils during the first and second centuries A.D. Roman coins circulated, and some bronze vessels from the West have been dug up in the Nilgiris. Tamil literature grew abundantly during the first three centuries, and music, painting and sculpture flourished.

The Manual of the Administration of the Madras Presidency, putting the events of the *Rāmāyana* at 2000 B.C. (an absurdly late date from the Hindu standpoint), notes that Rāma met Agastya, the great Sage of South India; and that Agastya had much influence over an early Pāndyan King, Kulashekara. For our purposes we may take the kingdom as it existed in 543 B.C., when Vijaya, from the Gangetic region, invaded Ceylon, and married a daughter of the reigning Pāndyan King. Madura, the capital, was famous for its learning, and had a famous Sangha, or Collegium, an assembly of learned men, and among them Tiruvalluvar, the author of the famous poem, Kural.[1] The story of the Pāndyan Kingdom's struggles with Chola, and its invasions of Ceylon, show a powerful State; and it continued,

[1] The date of the Kural is a matter of dispute. Mr. V. Kanakasabhai, in *The Tamils 1,800 years ago*, puts it between A.D. 100 and 130. Dr. K. Graul, who translated it into German, says between A.D. 200 and 800. The Rev. Mr. Pope, who translated it into English, says A.D. 800 to 1000. *The Encyclopædia Britannica* offers from the ninth or tenth century to the 13th.

passing through many vicissitudes, down to 1731, when its last Hindu Monarch died, leaving a widow, Minākshi Ammal, who adopted a son, but was attacked and betrayed, and poisoned herself in Trichinopoly Fort—a Kingdom of more than 2,000 years within "historical" limits, ending in a tragedy in the frightful eighteenth century A.D.

The Chola Kingdom was, as we have seen, an independent State in the time of Ashoka, and like Pāndya was actively commercial, sending its ships across the Bay of Bengal and the Indian Ocean eastwards, and internal commerce being also carried on, goods from the east going to Kerala and Kerala sending Egyptian merchandise to Chola. Both the Chola and the Pāndya kingdoms suffered much from the depredations of the Pallavas, thought by some to be an immigrating offshoot from the Parthian Pahlavas, who invaded north-west India. When Hiuen Tsang in A.D. 640 visited Kanchi, where the Pallavas had established themselves, he mentions the Chola people, just then in a depressed condition. The Pallavas had no fixed borders, but are said to have lived as a predatory tribe; this seems scarcely likely, as they were powerful from the fourth to the eighth century A.D., but they were crushed, to the satisfaction of all, by a Chola Rāja Aditya, between about 880 and 907. Then the Chola Kingdom grew and flourished exceedingly, until the beginning of the fourteenth century; its capitals at different periods were Warriore, a suburb of Trichinopoly, Kumbhakonam and Tanjore. It was crippled by the Muhammadan invasion of South India in 1310, and

though the invaders were driven out again in 1347, Chola soon after disappears.

Kerala occupied the western coast, comprising the present Travancore, Cochin and Malabar, trading chiefly with Egypt and Arabia. Its history has been largely recovered of late years, and teems with interest, most of it living unbrokenly from its ancient Past right down to the present day, under its own Princes. Owing to the constant communication with the West, Christianity was early introduced into Kerala, some say in the first century A.D. by S. Thomas; others, including Vincent Smith, in the sixth century from the Syrian Church. The matter is not important for us, as Christianity made no way outside Kerala, and is not a factor in India during her long and prosperous life. It came again to her with European trading companies, and her loss of power and prosperity.

In Northern India, owing to the powerful Kingdoms beyond the north-west frontier and also to raids and immigrations from China and Central Asia, the break-up of the Mauryan Empire brought about disturbed conditions for many centuries; Bactria and Parthia, ruled by Princes of Greek descent, became independent States, breaking the yoke of the Seleukidae in the middle of the third century B.C.; they invaded the north-western districts from time to time, and much of the Panjāb and the Indus valley were definitely under Greco-Parthian rule (Indo-Parthian or Indo-Greek), from about 190 B.C. to A D. 50, and these were finally crushed by the Kustans about A.D. 90. These invasions produced

but little effect and wrought little destruction. It was otherwise with hordes of nomad tribes, which swept down from the Central Asian steppes and China, destroying as they passed, from 170 B.C. onwards, some even reaching Kathiawar, where they settled, founding a Saka dynasty, destroyed A.D. 390. Among these the Yueh-chi from China definitely established themselves, crushing out the Indo-Parthian kingdom, and establishing their own —the Kushan dynasty—under Kadphises I and II, the latter sending an embassy to Rome to Trajan, about A.D. 99, to announce his conquests. He ruled the whole north-west of India, from Benares as easternmost point, as well as Afghanistan to the Hindu Khush, and his successor added Kashmir. This successor, Kanishka (about A.D. 120-150), is interesting for his famous Buddhist tower—13 stories high—his splendid monastery for Buddhist education, still existing in the ninth century, the Buddhist Council called by him, at which Ashvaghosha was Vice-President, held in Kashmir. The dynasty perished in the third century, about the same time as the Andhra Kingdom in the Deccan, so far as India was concerned, but Kushan Kings were reigning in Kabul in the fifth century, when they were conquered by the Huns.

ANOTHER EMPIRE

Another vast Empire rises out of the darkness of seventy years, which covers northern India from historical eyes, from the disappearance of the Kushan

Kingdom, about A.D. 240, until A.D. 308, when Chandragupta, a Prince reigning in Pataliputra, weds a Lichchavi Princess, Kumāri Devi, and the royal pair, between them, come to rule a Kingdom comprising Bihar, Oudh, Trihut, and some adjacent lands. Chandragupta I became "Mahārāja of Mahārājas," and started an era, the Gupta era, from February 26, A.D. 320. To him was born a son, Samudragupta, who ruled from 326 to about 375, and built a new Empire.

He subdued all the Chiefs of the Gangetic plain and then those of the centre; then invaded the south, going by the east coast and returning by the west, but invading and gathering huge spoils, not holding, the southern States; he incorporated in his Empire half Bengal—from the Hooghly westwards—and all the country right across India including Gujerat, with the Nerbudda for southern boundary, the Central and United Provinces, much of Panjāb, with almost all the rest of it and north Rājputāna as a Protectorate, and many outlying States, and the South acknowledged him as Over-lord; he finally performed the horse-sacrifice as Lord Paramount of India, probably about A.D. 340. He died about 375. His son and successor was Chandragupta II, sometimes called Chandragupta-Vikramaditya He must not be confused with the ruler of the same name, whose era, called also Samvat, began 56 B.C. the Vikramaditya at whose Court was the famous poet-minister, Bhattumurti.

He added to the Empire Malwa and Surāshtra, abolished the Saka dynasty in the latter, and died in

A.D. 413. Fa-Hien, the Chinese traveller who visited India at the beginning of the fifth century, spent six years in the Empire, during three of which he studied Samskrit in one of the large Buddhist monasteries at Pataliputra. He speaks with intense admiration of the wealth, prosperity, virtue, and happiness of the people, and the great liberty they enjoyed. "Those who want to go away may go; those who want to stop may stop." Most offences were punished by fines, and there was no capital punishment, and no judicial torture. Repeated rebellion, however, was punished by cutting off the right hand, "but such a penalty was exceptional". The roads were safe, for in all his travels Fa-Hien was not once attacked by robbers. "They do not keep pigs or fowls, there are no dealings in cattle, no butchers' shops, or distilleries." "No one kills any living thing, or drinks wine, or eats onions or garlic." Charitable institutions were numerous, rest-houses were kept on the roads. In the capital was a free hospital, supported by the voluntary contributions of the rich. Fa-Hien says;

> Hither come all poor or helpless patients suffering from all kinds of infirmities. They are well taken care of, and a doctor attends them, food and medicine being supplied according to their wants. Thus they are made quite comfortable, and when they are well they may go away.

(The first hospital in Europe was the Maison Dieu in Paris, in the seventh century.) It is worthy of notice that the King was a Hindu, and Fa-Hien a Buddhist, so he was the less likely to praise overmuch.

Some think that the last recension of the great Purānas and of the legal Institutes was made at this time. Sure it is that Samskrit was sedulously honoured, while art prospered, and architecture became ornate and splendid.

Chandragupta's son, Kumāragupta I, succeeded in A.D. 413 and Vincent Smith thinks he must have added to the Empire, as he celebrated the horse-sacrifice; he died in 455, leaving his son and successor Skandagupta to bear the burden of Empire, and to face the oncoming Huns. He defeated them at the beginning of his reign, if not as Yuvarāja (Crown Prince), but they returned about 470 and pressed him hardly, and when he died ten years later, the Empire died with him, though his half-brother succeeded to the throne and reigned in Magadha, its centre, the family continuing there till A.D. 720; while other members of the Gupta family ruled other portions, and a descendant of it was the grandmother of Harsha of Thanesar, in the Panjāb, who became famous.

The fall of the Empire was due to the appearance of the Huns, who invaded India and Europe in two mighty streams, crushing Persia, and over-running the civilized world. Their power was broken by the Turks, in the middle of the sixth century, after they had devastated both Europe and Northern India.

Harsha, who came to the throne in A.D. 606 restored and somewhat enlarged on the east the Gupta Empire, but it was less in Rājputāna. His rule was much approved by Hiuen Tsang, who visited India 630 and 644, but it did not reach the level of the

Gupta administration. After many years of war, Harsha was more or less attracted to Buddhism by Hiuen Tsang, and was fond of religious debates, a fondness shared by his widowed sister, who attended them with him and was a most learned lady He died in A.D. 648. After his death, Adityasena of the Gupta dynasty performed the horse-sacrifice, for no very definite reason known to history; there is no record of any later performance thereof. Sixty-four years after Harsha's death, in A.D. 710-11, the Arabs from Bassorah—who had conquered Mukuram (Baluchistan) and were settled there by A.D. 644—under Muhammad Ben Kasim, crossed the Indus, overran Sindh, which was held by Musalmāns thereafter, and advanced into Rājputāna. Young Bappa, a lad of 15, a Mauri of Chittor, led an army against them and defeated them, but the Crescent of Islām had risen over India's horizon, a new Era had begun.

Before passing on into the Muhammadan invasions, it is well to pause at this point for a moment, for western historians have failed to note the general prosperity and happiness of the Indian populations, save where such incursions as the nomads and Huns temporarily ravaged a part of the country. They have glanced lightly over the wealth, the trade, the happiness of the masses of the people, during an acknowledged period, from Semiramis to Muhammad Ghori, of 3,000 years—to say nothing of the "untold centuries" beyond—and have fixed their gaze on the local wars, ignoring the vast accumulation of wealth, which proved that the industrial life and prosperity of the people went steadily on,

unaffected by temporary and local disturbances, in a huge stream of content and progress. If this be compared with the state of Germany before the Peasants' War, with the state of France before the great Revolution, Western Nations may begin to realize that Eastern Nations may have something to say for themselves, and that the "blessings" of foreign occupation are not fully recognized in India.

A very striking illustration of this was the seventy-five days' festival of Harsha, in A.D., 644, held at the confluence of the Gangā and Yamunā at Prayag (Allahabad), at which Hiuen Tsang was present. Harsha had held such a festival every five years for thirty years, "in accordance with the custom of his ancestors," to distribute among ascetics, religious orders and the poor, the *accumulations of wealth of the preceding five years.* About half a million of people assembled, gifts were distributed on the first three days in the name of the Buddha the Sun, and Shiva: on the fourth day, to 10,000 Buddhist monks, who each received 100 gold coins, a pearl and a cotton garment; then, for twenty days, gifts to Brāhmanas, for ten days to "heretics"; for a month to the poor, destitute and orphans. Harsha gave everything, except horses, elephants and army equipments, down to his personal jewels. And this was done every five years. The great festival is still held every twelfth year, but there is no King Harsha, and no distribution of gifts. Nor, if there were such a Monarch, could the country support such quinquennial accumulations. Only a huge and well-to-do manual labour class could have rendered

possible the great trading, manufacturing and commercial classes, who existed at the coming of the East India Company; history confirms these facts. The Emperors, Kings and Chiefs were enormously wealthy because they ruled a wealthy people, and nurtured their prosperity. Yet Sir William Hunter wrote, during English rule, that "40,000,000 of the people never had a full meal," and a larger number are in that condition to-day.

So long as the wars were internecine, between Hindu Kingdoms, the caste system confined the fighting to the Kshattriya (military) order: the universal Panchayats of the village organisation carried on smoothly the all-important village life, and Hiuen Tsang notes that villagers quietly went on with their agricultural work while a battle was proceeding close by; it was the policy of the contending Chiefs to safeguard the peasantry, on whose labour depended the prosperity of the land they hoped to rule. Only raiders like the Huns devastated, and their devastations were local.

How much the ordinary life runs on with little change may be judged by comparing life in Malabar to-day with Marco Polo's description of what he observed in the same district, then Kerala, in A.D. 1292. He said that the people wear but one cloth. Women burn themselves with their dead husbands. Many worship the cow. They rub their houses with cow-dung and sit on the ground. They chew "tembal" (Persian for "betel"). Cail (Canyal in Tinnevelly) is a great and noble city where touch all ships from the West. Coilum (Quilon) produces

ginger, pepper and fine indigo. No corn is grown, only rice. Gozurat (Gujarat) produces pepper, ginger, indigo and cotton, and manufactures beautiful mats. Tannah (near Bombay) exports leather, buckram and cotton, and imports gold, silver, copper and other articles. Fine buckrams seem to have been very largely exported. Other travellers in the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries give similar testimony. India's trade for thousands of years was enormous, and Pliny the Elder in his Natural History (about A.D, 77) [1] complains that the annual drain of gold from the Roman Empire to India, Arabia, and China, was never less than 100,000,000 sestercia, "giving back her own wares in exchange, which are sold at fully one hundred times their prime cost". "That is what our luxuries and women cost us," says he sardonically.[2]

ISLAM IN INDIA

A new element now enters into Indian history, an element which is still only in process of assimilation, which caused inevitably disturbance and much evil feeling on both sides, but brought to the building of the Indian Nation most precious materials,

[1] Edition Mayhoff, Leipzig, 1906, Bk. VI, p. 101. The readings vary, some giving $500 \times 100{,}000, = 50{,}000{,}000$, others 55,000,000, as adopted in the *Imperial Gazetteer*.

[2] The *Imperial Gazetteer of the Indian Empire* allots 55,000,000 of this 100,000,000 to India, from another reading, and reckons this at £458,000. This calculation again is vitiated by the fact that the value of the sestercium varied from 2·1 to 2·4 pence.

enriching the Nationality, and adding new aspects to its many-faced splendour. As "Saxon and Norman and Dane," to say nothing of other elements, are the English, and as English and Scotch and Irish are forming one Kingdom, the Irish, after eight hundred years, yet unassimilated, so in India, Indians, Persians (Parsis) and Musalmāns are not yet wholly one Nation, though becoming one with great rapidity. We must now, as roughly as before, trace the outline of this Muhammadan entrance into and fixation in India, up to this time a Hindu Nation.

We have seen that the Arabs invaded and conquered Sindh early in the eighth century, and were thrown back from Rājputāna by Bappa. Rājputāna was a congeries of States, each with its own Chief, war-loving, chivalrous, and quarrelling constantly with each other—a poor barrier, therefore, against warriors of a faith resting on one Prophet, one Book and a sword consecrated to both. The whole story is one of heroic, incredible valour, rendered futile by ceaseless dissensions, which led to angry alliances with the common foe against the estranged brother.

A Kingdom comprising the greater part of the Panjāb and the upper Indus was the first, after the Rājput repulse, to face the Muslims, when Sabuktinin, Sultan of Ghazni, Afghanistan, invaded India in A.D. 986, and, after some battles, established himself in Peshawar. His son, Muhammad, raided Indian territory seventeen times between A.D. 1001 and 1024, starting in October on a three months' march into the interior, and returning when he had

satisfied himself with plunder, but holding Lahore strongly from 1021. He died A.D. 1030. Five centuries followed of incessant struggle. In the Empire, broken into pieces, each fragment had its Chief, fighting his neighbour. The rule of the Huns seemed to have bred divisions. As the robber Barons fought in Europe, after the breaking up of the Constantinople Empire, so the Clans and their Chiefs fought in India. The invaders naturally took advantage of it, siding with either party, the weaker for preference, to destroy that weaker when the stronger was crushed. Rājput Chiefs, both in Rājputāna and Panjāb, battled unceasingly against each other, and alas, with Muslims against Rājputs, with varied fortunes. Prithvirāj succeeded to the gādi of Delhi in A.D 1164, rolled back the Musalmāns, broken, on Lahore, but fought his last battle in 1193, the flower of Rājput chivalry around him but some Rājputs against him, fought until the dead lay in swathes on the field, 13,000 of them "asleep, on the banks of the Ghuggur"; and he, the darling of the bards, seeking death, alas, in vain, was caught under his fallen horse, was taken prisoner, answered a taunt from his capturers with a bitter jest, and was stabbed; the Hindu throne of Delhi was empty. The Pathān seated himself thereon, ruled, and set up other kingdoms in India, and fought, conquered and was conquered; and so fierce battles raged up and down the northern lands, with inroads from Afghanistan, and rival Muhammadan Chiefs and changes, Pathāns, Tartars, Mughals, until Babar and his Turks and Mughals came in 1519, and 1520,

and 1524, and finally fought the battle of Panipat against Sultan Ibrahim Lodi, the Pathan, in 1526, and was proclaimed Emperor of India at Delhi, the first of the "great Mughals".

But we must turn aside for a moment, and run backwards to take a bird's eye-view of the South, where later, Musalmān and Hindu fought for rule, until the Marātha Power rose to dominance. The Andhra Kingdom had disappeared, we know, about A.D. 230, and the great table-land of the Deccan, south of the Nerbudda, becomes again the scene of pregnant history, when the Chief of the Chalukyas, or Solankis, a Rājput Agnikula clan, conquered the Deccan and built a Kingdom about A.D. 550, and reigned in Vatapi, in the Bijapur District, gloriously and well. In a century the dynasty had grown strong and famous, and exchanged embassies with Khusru II of Persia—as shown in a fresco in an Ajanta cave. Many fights with Pallavas and others need not detain us; enough that the Chalukya kingdom in the Deccan and Maharāshtra continued to A.D. 1190, just before the Pathān, Muhammad Ghori, seated himself on the Delhi throne. A hundred years later, in 1294, the Sultan Ala-ud-din, after the sack of Chittor, invaded the Deccan, and crushed the Gavadas who had succeeded the Chalukyas, and took as ransom six maunds of pearls, two maunds of diamonds and other gems. (A maund=82 lb. avoirdupois.) In 1309 came the invasion of his lieutenant Malik Kafur, who overran the South, right down to Rāmeshvara, where he built a Mosque, and then returned whence he came; and in 1336, south of the

Kristna and west of the Tungabhadra river, dividing it from the Chola Kingdom, rose the great Hindu Kingdom of Vijayanagar, that held its own for two centuries of pride, despite the growing power of the Muslims.

Babar, we resume, of Turki race, descendant of Tamerlane, sat enthroned in Delhi, the founder of the splendid Mughal dynasty. Two years after Panipat, a great battle was fought at Fatehpur Sikri between the new Emperor and the Rājputs, and he conquered, only to die four years later, in 1530. Then Humayun, his son, became Emperor, but was driven out by a Pathān Chief, and fled to Kandahar in 1543, coming back in 1555; for his twelve-year old son, Akbar, conquered the Pathān, and re-opened to his father the gates of Delhi. Akbar succeeded to the throne in 1556, to be India's greatest Muhammadan Emperor; perhaps the only serious stain upon his name—and he was then only fourteen years old—is the sack of Chittor in 1557. So great was he, so tolerant, that he welded together Hindu and Musalmān; Hindu Princesses were the mothers of the Emperors Jehangir (Salim) and Shah Jahan; Rājputs were generals in his army, and ministers in his State; the Rājput Mān Sinha was his greatest general, Rāja Toda Mall his greatest minister. Akbar's dream was a United India, and he renewed the Empire of Chandragupta Maurya, though some Rājput States defied him to the end. He "laid down the principle that men of all faiths were to be treated alike by the law; he opened all posts of authority to men of ability, without restriction of

creed; he abolished the slavery of captives, the capitation tax on non-Musalmāns, and the tax on Hindu pilgrims. He forbade the forcing of a widow to burn herself on her husband's funeral pyre, sanctioned widow re-marriage, forbade child-marriage, and the killing of animals for sacrifice." He also laid down a land-system which caused great content. Three classes of land were made, according to fertility. The value of the produce was decided by an average of nineteen years. The Government took one-third for land revenue and support of militia, amounting to 22 millions sterling a year, the land-tax bringing in from 16½ to 17½ millions; all other taxes were abolished. A settlement was made every ten years.

The Emperor Jehangir, succeeding to the throne in 1605, did naught to strengthen his father's work, but he did one thing pregnant with ruin for his House. In 1613, he gave permission to the English to trade in his dominions, and factories were established in Surat, Cambay, Gogo and Ahmedabad. Two years later Sir Thomas Roe came to him as ambassador from James I. His land-tax amounted to 17½ millions. Shah Jahan, 1627-1658, under whom, by new conquests, the land-tax came to 22 millions, continued his grandfather's policy; and had others followed in the steps of these twain, there had been no Hindu-Musalmān question in modern India. But Aurungzeb, the destroyer, succeeded, and his persecutions and his cruelties drove his subjects into rebellion. "At last revolts broke out on every side, his sons rebelled, debts

accumulated, disorders of every kind arose, and in 1706 he died, alone and miserable, amid the ruins of the Empire he had shattered. With his accession the hope of a United India vanished, and at his death the work of Akbar was destroyed." Materially his wealth was immense; his conquests added again to the land revenue, and raised it to 38 millions sterling. A hundred years later it was still £34,506,640.

In the year of Shah Jahan's accession to the Imperial throne was born a child destined to lead in the shaking of the Mughal Power; it was Shivāji, "crowned in Raigad in 1674, as the Hindu Emperor, and the Marātha Kingdom of the South faced the Mughal Kingdom of the North".[1]

THE STATE OF THE PEOPLE

During these centuries of war, raids and forays, what was the condition of the people of northern India? The answer comes from the travellers who observed it, from the merchants who struggled and intrigued for the right to exploit it. They were bitterly prejudiced and speak of "heathen" and "heathen customs," but they drove good bargains and bought, bought largely, to sell again at huge profits, and die in Europe, wealthy from their trading.

Bernier, in his letter to Colbert, complains, even more vigorously than Pliny, seventeen centuries

[1] The extracts are from *Children of the Motherland*, pp. 143, 145, 165.

before, that "this Hindustan is an abyss into which a great part of the gold and silver of the world finds plenty of ways of going in from all sides, and hardly one way out". After a vivid description of the military strength of the great Mughal, he speaks of his immense treasures, gold and silver and jewellery, "a prodigious quantity of pearls and precious stones of all sorts . . . one throne is all covered with them". Women wear rings and anklets, chains, ear-rings and nose-rings; most of all he marvels over the incredible quantity of manufactured goods, "embroideries, streaked silks, tufts of gold for turbans, silver and gold cloth brocades, network of gold"—he is evidently dazed. He can hardly find words to describe the Emperor, with his golden turban, and his spray of diamonds, and a matchless topaz that shone like a little sun, and his huge collar of rows of pearls down to his waist, and so on and on for pages. Tavernier describes him on similar lines, with his seven thrones, and the marvellous peacock throne, with the natural colours of the peacock's tail worked out in jewels, valued by him at 6½ millions sterling; he gives very full descriptions of the manufactured goods. Kasembazar, "a village in the Kingdom of Bengal," exported yearly 22,000 bales of silk, weighing "2,200,000 pounds, at 16 oz. to the pound". Carpets of silk and gold, satins with streaks of gold and silver, endless lists of exquisite works, of minute carvings, and other choice *objects d'art*. The facts speak for themselves. It was this enormous wealth that drew Europeans to come hither to "shake the pagoda

tree"; the stories carried back by successful shakers, drew others to the golden land. This was the country of which Phillimore wrote in the middle of the eighteenth century, that "the droppings of her soil fed distant Nations". To share in this incredible wealth, the first English factories were established on the western coast.

The proof of India's prosperity under Indian rule, Musalmān as well as Hindu, lies in India's wealth. The wars scratched the country here and there, now and then; the peasants, artisans, traders, wrought industriously everywhere, always. The invading raiders laid all waste, and travellers come across such scenes and describe them, as though they pictured the normal state of the country. They carried away enormous wealth, but the producers remained and piled it up again. But when the Musalmāns settled down as rulers, their own prosperity depended on that of the people and they took with discrimination. Firoze of the Toghlak dynasty (A.D. 1351—1388), like Hindu Rulers before him, constructed great irrigation works, canals, etc. It was this care for irrigation, characteristic of Indian Rulers, which gave such marvellous fertility to the soil through the centuries. Ever the immense foreign trade went on, enriching the land, and they exported luxuries and surplus, never the food wanted to feed the people; that remained from the fat years against the lean. A disadvantage of the swift communication between Britain and India now is that the rulers no longer come to stay; but, under the decencies of modern ways, gather wealth like

the old raiders, and like them carry it abroad for enjoyment.

THE MARATHA CONFEDERACY

The Hon. Mr. Justice Rānade, in his small volume on the *Rise of the Marātha Power*, has done more than any other writer to point out the significance of the Marātha story in the long history of India, and to make the reader feel its inspiration and its teaching.

While Delhi was the seat of Mughal Power, the Musalmāns in the Deccan had made themselves independent of it in A.D. 1347, and had chosen Ala-ud-dīn Hasan as King, who founded the Bahamani kingdom, which broke up from 1484 to 1572 into the five kingdoms of Berar, Ahmednagar, Bijapur Bidare and Golconda, whose quarrels with the Delhi Empire facilitated the breaking up of the Musalmān domination. The rise of the Marātha Power was preceded by a great Hindu Revival, Tukārām, Vāman Pandit, Eknāth and Rāmdās, the Guru of Shivāji, were its inspiration, Shivāji himself was a Mystic, materialised into a man of action. His aim was the building of a Nation; his means patriotism and union. His spirit, his aim, his means, are the spirit, the aim, the means of the National party in India to-day; a Hindu Revival preceded the modern National movement; its one aim, is India, a Nation; its fervent patriotism and its striving after union are its means to success. Where it differs from its forerunner is that instead of fighting against the Musalmāns it welcomes them as a part of the

Nation; instead of using the sword, it uses as weapons, education, the platform and the pen, and now (1923) the Legislatures.

Shivāji's careful organisation of the Government recalls the work of Chandragupta Maurya. First came the Peshvā, or Prime Minister; then the Minister of War (Senāpati—Army Lord); the Minister of Finance (Amātya); the Accountant-General (Pant Sachiv); the Private Secretary (Mantri); the Foreign Secretary (Sumant); the Minister of Religion (Panditrāo); the Chief Justice. But it was Shivāji himself who created the new Mahārāshtra, and made the men, who, after his death, broke the Mughal Power. The building up of his great Kingdom from Surat in the north to Hubli in the South, from the sea on the West to Berar, Golconda and Bijapur on the East, his coronation at Raipur in 1674 as Padshaha, his recognition by the rulers of Golconda and Bijapur as Suzerain by the paying of tribute, his death in 1680—all this may be read at leisure. He died, but he had "created a Nation," and when Aurungzeb came in 1682 to crush the Marāthas and the Musalmān Kingdoms, although he with his huge army carried everything before him, Shivāji's younger son. Rajārām, rallied the Marātha leaders round him, and began the great twenty years' War of Independence; at his death his nephew Shāhu succeeded him and the war went on, till in 1705 a treaty was made, though not kept; Aurungzeb died two years later, broken-hearted, after a war of twenty-five years, which ended in failure. Shāhu was crowned, regaining

his grandfather's realm. Thus Svarāj, "own-rule," was gained, and, after a period of quarrelling and unrest, Balāji Vishvanāth became the Peshvā of the Marātha Kingdom, and is called in Hunter's history and even in Rānade's, the First Peshvā. He it was who bound together the great Marātha Chiefs, built up the Confederacy that lasted for a hundred years, that broke the Mughal Empire, and practically ruled India. Balāji marched to Delhi in 1718, and in the next year compelled the Emperor to recognise the right of Shāhu to a quarter and a tenth of the land revenue of the Deccan (the chauth and sardeshmukhi), and when he was succeeded in 1720 by his son, Bāji Rao, he left the Confederacy so strong that it was able to extend its power gradually under the second and third Peshvās from Gujerāt and Kathiawār to Bengal and Orissa, from Delhi to Mahārāshtra.

The Peshvā at Poona represented the centre of the great Confederacy; the Bhonsle General was at Nagpur; Holkar was at Indore; Scindia at Gwalior; the Gaekwar at Baroda. These five represented the five Marātha Branches, each with its Chief. The great defeat of the Marāthas at Panipat, fighting against the Afghans, threw them back from the extreme North, but they regained their power there, and held the Delhi Emperor as their puppet in 1803. In fact the Marāthas ruled India, save where a new Power was making its way, a Power against which they broke, as the power of the Musalmāns had broken against them. It was that of Great Britain.

THE BRITISH IN INDIA

Long and strange was the struggle for European Empire in India from the days when the Mughal Empire was at the height of its splendour, through the Marātha Empire, until the final triumph of the British. Portuguese, Dutch, French, British—such the succession of the foreign ventures, with a gleam of Denmark in 1620; of the German Empire headed by Austria, the "Ostend Company" in 1722; of Prussia, the Emden Company in 1744—ghosts flitting across the Indian stage. They were all seeking for trade. It was a traders' war when they fought: the soldiers were mostly adventurers; European Governments looked on complacently, and helped with a few soldiers now and then. But the flag followed trade, not trade the flag. And the fighting was traders' fighting rather than that of soldiers, not careful of honour, nor treaty, but only of gain. Bold unscrupulous adventurers, they were for the most part, the "bad boys" of the family, like Clive. *Punch* wrote a fearful epitaph on "John Company" and his crimes, after the Sepoy War, and when the Crown took over the Empire the Company had made, it marked the New Era with the noble proclamation of Queen Victoria, the Magna Carta of India. But the making of that Empire by the adventurers is a wonderful story of courage, craft, unscrupulousness—were they not dealing with "heathens"?—ability rising to genius, as in Clive, and great administrators after great soldiers. At the beginning, conquest was not

thought of; no one made any pretence that he was here for "the good of India". Quite frankly, it was the immense wealth of India that lured them, wealth to be carried "home" for enjoyment; the "white man's burden" was golden. The breaking up of the Mughal Empire and the quarrels of Viceroys who became Kings, of Generals who became Chiefs, these gave the opportunity. Britain succeeded, because she was the Power that held in her the most fertile seed of free institutions, because she was on the eve of establishing democratic Government on her own soil on the surest basis, so that while she might enthrall for a time, ultimate freedom under her rule was inevitable. France had behind her then only the traditions of tyranny; the Bourbons ruled and rioted. India needed for her future a steady pressure, that would weld her into one Nation on a modern basis, that she might become a Free Nation among the Free. The High Powers that guide the destinies of Nations saw Britain as fittest for this intermediate and disciplinary stage.

Early in the sixteenth century the Portuguese formed trading settlements on the western coast in Calicut and Goa. Early in the seventeenth century, the Dutch traded on the eastern coasts, established very many factories, but finally settled down, after many vicissitudes, struggles and battles, in Jāva, etc., "the Dutch Indies". France began to nibble in 1537, and established her first factories in Surat and Golconda in 1668, and in 1672 brought the site of Pondicherry; she made a great bid for an Indian

Empire in the eighteenth century through the genius of Dupleix chiefly, and failed.

Denmark was stirred to rivalry in 1612, and made an East India Company, but never was strong enough for the Empire game. She began by a shipwreck on the Tanjore coast in 1620, the survivors from the shipwreck, except the Captain, Roelant Crape, being murdered. The Rājā at Tanjore gave him permission to settle at Tranquebar. The settlement was never important, but it started the Protestant missionaries in India in 1706, and Schwarz (1750—1798) founded the missions in Trichinopoly, Tanjore and Tinnevelly, still the strongest missionary centre in India. England bought the settlement finally in 1845, with Balasore, and with another missionary settlement in Serampur, Bengal. In 1847, the Tranquebar mission was handed over to the Lutherans. From the eighteenth century onwards all the missionary Nations—German, American, French, Italian, Swiss —have freely established their missions in India, *imperia in imperio*, a dangerous policy, a menace to British rule, and a running annoyance and irritation to Indians.[1]

Britain began humbly. On December 31, 1600, Elizabeth chartered "The Governor and Company of Merchants of London trading in the East Indies" for exclusive trading there—at that time no trading

[1] Before the War, I had several times drawn attention to the work of the German missionaries, who taught the children to look up to the German Kaiser, and ignored the British Emperor.

having been done—and they fitted out some ships, one, under Captain Hawkins, reaching Surat, on the West Coast, in 1606. In 1611, a Captain Hippon, on his own account, set up a little trading establishment on the East Coast at Pettopoli, and another at Masulipatam. In 1613, the Emperor Jehangir gave duly written permission for setting up factories at Surat and Cambay, Gogo and Ahmedabad, and in 1616 the Zamorin of Calicut allowed a factory to be set up in his capital city. Thus was a footing made on the West Coast, and Surat became a Presidency Town in the time of Cromwell (1653), and moved its Government in 1661 to the Island of Bombay, given by Portugal as a kind of wedding gift, when Charles II married Catherine of Braganza.

Meanwhile the East Coast was factorised, and in 1626, a factory was established at Armagaon, 70 miles north of Madras, with a fort to protect it. Factory, fort, town, "necessary" extensions—so it went thenceforth, all natural and inevitable. In 1634, Shah Jahan allowed another trading centre, at Pipli, in Bengal, and in the next year, Charles I issued another charter. But Armagaon was not convenient, and the kind Rājā of Chandragiri, descendant of the royal house of Vijayanagar, in 1639, gives Mr. Day permission to have a factory at Chennaputnam, with land one mile broad and six miles along the shore, and he generously builds them a fort to protect it, Fort S. George. And Day builds a wall round the fort, on the island made by the two branches of the Coum River, 400 yards long and 100 wide, and allows only white people to live

inside his wall, any Nation, if only white—White Town; and outside it an Indian town grows up—Black Town. And these twain are Madraspatam—Madras. In 1564, it had a garrison of 26 men. Its official records begin from 1670. Cromwell lets the two companies of Elizabeth and Charles I amalgamate, and makes Fort S. George a Presidency, in 1653, with authority over the Bengal factories.

In 1690, Job Charnock sets up a factory in Calcutta, though trading privileges were not granted to the English in Bengal until between 1713 and 1719 by the Mughal Emperor Firokshere, and builds a fort; so we have three big forts ere the end of the first quarter of the eighteenth century—Bombay, Madras, Calcutta, a Fort S. David also, a mile from Cuddalore; in 1686, Sir John Child, at Bombay, makes the ominous announcement, that thenceforth if the "natives"—the owners of the country—attack, he will retaliate. Until then, they had been yielding and submissive, as became foreign traders. In 1702, various Companies having arisen in England, who all quarrelled bitterly, it was thought well to amalgamate them, and so present a solid front; and amalgamated they were, as the United East India Company, in 1702. The position was a most peculiar one. Here was a Company, to all intents and purposes independent; it was ruled by a Board of Directors in London; it chose its own agents, it made its own armies; after a time it appointed a Governor, then a Governor-General; it applied for Charters, for Courts of Justice, and got them—with subsequent horrors related by Macaulay. There

was no effective control over its proceedings, although Parliament interfered for the first time in 1773, and a Board of Control was established in 1784, and the Court of Directors placed under it—a clumsy dual arrangement, making no real difference. The one useful thing was the renewal of the Charter, preceded by an enquiry, which at least revealed the state of things—terrible are the records. When things became too outrageous, Parliament interfered, as in the impeachment of Warren Hastings; but, for the most part, Britain was far too busy with her own troubles, her loss of her American Colonies, her Napoleonic Wars, the struggles of her rising Democracy, the miserable condition of her people, her Chartists, her agricultural riots, and the rest, to trouble much about what a trading Company was doing in far-away heathen India; the Company made treaties and broke them, or forged them, if more convenient; it cheated, robbed, murdered, oppressed, and—built an Empire in about a century. Clive was the first Governor under the East India Company in 1758; Earl Canning the last in 1856. The Company ended in the Sepoy War of 1857, and the Crown assumed the sovereignty in 1858.

The policy of the Company was shrewd and effective. The Indian rulers borrowed European officers to drill their soldiers, borrowed European soldiers too. Presently, if French officers and men were with one Chief, English officers and men were with the rival. Dupleix had allied himself with one claimant to the throne of the dead Nizām of the

Deccan; the English therefore were with the Nawāb of the Karnatic, who had an eye to a possible chance. Princes, English and French all tried to use each other—the Princes to play off English against French, the English and French severally to use opposing Princes against each other. It is a sorry story of intrigue, of utter disregard of honour and good faith on all sides. Dupleix, that French genius, master of the military art and of unscrupulous statecraft, was carrying all before him and carving out a French Empire in Southern India, when Robert Clive, a writer in the service of the Company, who was also a captain for the nonce, offered a bold plan of attack, and was bidden carry it out; marched rapidly to Arcot (1751) with 200 English and 300 sepoys, seized it, held it against all comers, struck here, struck there, won everywhere, and laid the first stone of the British Empire in India. The French hopes in the South were finally destroyed by the victory of Colonel Coote at Wandiwash in 1760.

After his visit to England, the Directors made Clive Governor of Fort S. David, and he returned to India in 1755 for five marvellous years of glory and shame. Trouble arose in Bengal, where Suraj-ud-daula was Viceroy for Delhi, and had attacked and captured Fort William; he thrust his 146 captives, for the night into the Fort military gaol, the "Black Hole," a room 18 feet square with two small windows, and, says the *Imperial Gazetteer*, "although the Nawāb does not seem to have been aware of the consequences, it meant death to a huddled mass of English prisoners in the stifling heat of June" (ii, 474).

Only 23 survived that night of agony.[1] Clive started for Calcutta, managed, despite the Black Hole, to persuade the Nawāb that he was a friend—"I will . . . stand by him as long as I have a man left," wrote he—seduced by bribery some of the Nawāb's officers, forged a treaty, and Admiral Watson's signature thereto, to deceive Omichand, himself a traitor, defeated his dear friend the Nawāb at Plassey (June 23, 1757), and sold his throne—over our Bengal, Bihar and Orissa—to Mir Jafar for a sum that amounted to £2,340,000 sterling, of which Clive received £200,000. Omichand, when he found the treaty was forged, swooned, and never recovered the shock; Clive advised him to go on a pilgrimage, but the wretched man sank into idiocy, "languished a few months and then died". Macaulay, though he makes excuses for his hero meeting craft with craft, says of his general policy, that "he descended, without scruple, to falsehood, to hypocritical caresses, to the substitution of documents and to the counterfeiting of hands" (*Essays*, ii, 101, 102. Ed. 1864). By these means, joined to marvellous courage and military genius, he founded the British Empire in India, which historians date from Plassey.

Clive obtained in addition from Mir Jafar a tract of 822 square miles—the 24 Perganas—to go to the Company after his death, he having meanwhile the rental; this rental was paid to him by the Company from 1765—when they took over the land

[1] This story is now discredited, and it is very doubtful if it ever occurred.

—till he died in 1774; the quit-rent was about £30,000 sterling a year. At the age of 34, starting with nothing, he had accumulated, between 1755 and 1760, admittedly, £220,000 remitted to business houses in England; £25,000 in diamonds; "considerable" sums and a "great mass of ready money," as well as the huge estate, which he valued at £27,000 a year. All this was challenged in the House of Commons, in 1773, after his last return to England (1767), and a vote of censure was shelved by the previous question, and the words that "he did, at the same time, render great and meritorious services to his country". He committed suicide in 1774. Macaulay says of the enquiry: "It was clear that Clive had been guilty of some acts which it was impossible to vindicate without attacking the authority of all the most sacred laws which regulate the intercourse of individuals and of States. But it was equally clear that he had displayed great talents, and even great virtues"—talents, undoubtedly. Macaulay thinks that the enmity he roused was due to his efforts to stop corruption; for, in 1765, he had returned to India for a year and a half as Governor, and had devoted himself to the purifying of the administration, perhaps repenting of his own rapacity. That, at least remains to his credit, but he kept hold of his own ill-gotten wealth. His new ardour for purity had been more admirable, had he disgorged his own spoils, and it may well be that the attack on him was largely due to the fact that he had enriched himself by methods which he forbade to others.

Macaulay gives a terrible account of the oppressions of the Company at this time: "Thirty millions of human beings were reduced to the extremity of wretchedness. They had been accustomed to live under tyranny, but never under tyranny like this. . . . That Government, oppressive as the most oppressive form of barbarian despotism, was strong with all the strength of civilization." He quotes a Musalmān historian, who praises the extraordinary courage and military skill of the English: "But the people under their dominion groan everywhere, and are reduced to poverty and distress. O God! come to the assistance of Thy afflicted servants, and deliver them from the oppressions which they suffer." In 1770 there was an awful famine; "the Hooghly every day rolled down thousands of corpses close to the porticoes and gardens of the English conquerors. The very streets of Calcutta were blocked up by the dying and the dead." It was "officially reported to have swept away two-thirds of the inhabitants" (*Imperial Gazetteer*, ii, 480), or 10,000,000 persons.

The terrible years roll on; Macaulay again lays stress on them in his Essay on Warren Hastings; of his ability, again, there is as little doubt as of his crimes. He was Governor from 1772 to 1785, taking in 1774 the title of Governor-General. He laboured at administration, and filled the Company's coffers with gold. The gathering of this seems to have been his chief object, and was the cause of his greatest crimes. The Nawāb of Bengal had had an income of 53 lakhs promised him

by Clive, when deprived of his power; Clive cut the allowance down to 41 lakhs on the accession of a new Nawāb, and the third was reduced to 32 lakhs. Hastings found a child as the fourth, and, the child being helpless, cut him down to 16 lakhs. He sold Allahabad and Kora to Oudh for 50 lakhs (then worth half a million pounds sterling), and stopped the tribute of 26 lakhs guaranteed to the Emperor of Delhi in return for Bengal. To these "conquerors" every treaty was a mere "scrap of paper," to be repudiated at pleasure. These "economics" were highly appreciated by the Company; they left the Company wealthy in gold, but bankrupt in honour. Had they only stained their own honour, it would have been their own business. But they stained the honour of England in India's eyes. These were the first "English" whom she knew; England made some amends by giving English education with its liberty-inspiring ideals. She will make her final amends by co-operating with India, as she has co-operated with Ireland, to shape Home Rule.

But worse crimes followed this auspicious beginning: the sale of the Rohillas to pillage and slaughter; the hanging of Nandakumāra; the coercion of the Princesses of Oudh. The Rohillas were a long-Indianised Afghān people, whose "little territory" says Macaulay (*Essays*, ii, 193), "enjoyed the blessings of repose under the guardianship of valour. Agriculture and commerce flourished among them; nor were they negligent of rhetoric and poetry." Sujah Daula, Nawāb of Oudh, coveted this rich territory, but feared the valour of the

Rohillas, numbering some 80,000 warriors. Hastings sold him the use of the British army for £400,000 sterling, and they, with the Nawāb's troops, were let loose on this noble people. Fire and sword devastated the land and slew the people, and "the rich province which had tempted the cupidity of Sujah Daula became the most miserable part even of his miserable dominions". In two years, by such transactions, Hastings gave the Company about a million sterling and £450,000 increase of annual income. He also had saved Bengal from an annual military expenditure of £250,000.

Nandakumāra was a wealthy Brāhmana who accused Hastings of some of his crimes; before this, there was a long story of antagonism; he was a man of high rank, talent and wealth. His accusation was met by his arrest for an alleged forgery, six years before. The infamous Sir Elijah Impey was the judge, the jury English. The verdict was a foregone conclusion, and Impey pronounced a sentence of death. He died with peaceful dignity, hanged on the public gallows before an enormous crowd, amid shrieks and shouts of horror and despair.

The Princesses of Oudh, the mother and widow of Sujah Daula were enormously wealthy, reputed to possess a treasure of £3,000,000 sterling, and great revenues from land. The safety of their wealth was guaranteed to them by the Government of Bengal. But what of that? They were accused of complicity in some rioting, but as there was no evidence they were not brought to trial; Hastings

and the new Nawāb, grandson and son of the Princesses, agreed to an act of confiscation, stripping them of everything. The son repented, but not so Hastings. He imprisoned the Princesses. He then seized the two eunuchs who were at the head of their household, imprisoned, ironed, starved them, and at last gave them up to torture, the Nawāb's officers being empowered in writing to "have free access to the prisoners and be permitted to do with them as they shall see proper," as the Nawāb had "determined to inflict corporal punishment" on them. Their only crime was their refusal to surrender the charge given to them by their dead lord. The Princesses were kept in prison half-starved, till they had paid £1,200,000.

Warren Hastings was a man of magnificent abilities, and made a strong administration, but the record of his crimes is long and terrible. He left India in 1785, and was impeached by the House of Commons, which had before censured him, after long debate, for his crimes, while the King favoured him, the Company adored him, Lord Chancellor Thurlow protected him; the result was sure, despite the marvellous eloquence of Burke. In vain his passionate peroration rang out:

> I impeach him in the name of the Commons' House of Parliament, whose trust he has betrayed. I impeach him in the name of the English Nation, whose ancient honour he has sullied. I impeach him in the name of the people of India, whose rights he has trodden under foot, and whose country he has turned into a desert. Lastly, in the name of human nature itself, in the name of both sexes, in the name of every age, in the name of every rank, I impeach the common enemy and oppressor of all!

The trial began in 1788 and the decision was pronounced in 1795. 160 nobles began the trial; 29 voted at the close, a majority in his favour. Meanwhile Hastings, secure in the King's favour, had spent £40,000 in building a house and in laying out its grounds.

Within our limits we cannot trace fully the growth of the Indian Empire; Lord Cornwallis followed Hastings in 1786 and left his mark in the Permanent Settlement of Bengal. Fighting as usual went on in the South, and in the Third Mysore War (1790-92), Lord Cornwallis, Governor-General, allied with the Nizam of the Deccan and the Marātha Confederacy, conquered Tipu Sultān of Mysore, robbed him of half his territories—which they divided between them—and exacted from him three million pounds sterling, thus ensuring another war. Marquess Wellesley and the Nizām, in the fourth Mysore War (1799), finished him, and he died, fighting gallantly to the end, in the breach at the storming of Seringapatam. This added the Karnatic to the Madras Presidency. The quarrels of the Marātha Chiefs enabled Marquess Wellesley to detach the Peshvā from them, and he became a vassal of the Company; the third Marātha War followed (1802-04), and in 1817-18, the last, the Marātha Empire perished, and left its Princes as feudatories of the English.

Ranjit Singh, the "Lion of the Panjab," who created the Sikh kingdom, and seized Lahore as his capital in 1799, when only 19 years of age, was the creator of the last Power the British had to meet.

His army was united by religion not by territory; they were the Sikhs, the disciples of the ten Gurus who had built up the Khalsa (Society), from Nānak the Saint to Govinda Singh, the Warrior (1675-1708). He made his Kingdom in the Panjāb as far south as Multān; in 1809, Metcalfe visited Ranjit Singh as envoy from the British, and concluded a treaty with him, making the Sutlej River the boundary between his Kingdom and the British territory. With him there was peace till his death in 1839, but in 1845 the Sikh army crossed the Sutlej, and after four battles was driven back. In 1848 the second Sikh War broke out; the British were defeated at Chilianwālā (1849), but soon after Multān was stormed, the victory of Gujrāt won, and the Panjāb was annexed two months later.

Lord Dalhousie (1848-56) started the convenient theory that "Native States" were less well governed than British Provinces, and should be annexed wherever possible, *e.g.*, as when a ruler died without a son. Under these conditions he annexed Satārā in 1849, Jhānsi in 1853, Nāgpur in 1853. Oudh he annexed in 1856, on high moral grounds, because its administration was "fraught with suffering to millions"—a dangerous argument from an official of the East India Company. It was looked on with alarm by the "Natives," and contributed to the Sepoy Revolt of 1857, when Lord Canning was Governor-General. This broke out in May 10, 1857, in Meerut, and ended in January, 1859.

From that time we may date the famous "Pax Britannica," for until that time there were

continual wars and annexations, while since then there have been none further within India itself. There have been frontier wars, the iniquitous Afghān wars, the annexation of Burma, but internal order has been maintained.

On November 1, 1858, was held the Darbar of Allahabād, in which was published the Queen's Proclamation, assuming the Government of India, and making the Governor-General a Viceroy. The Company perished in the Sepoy Rebellion, in which poured out the hatreds accumulating since Plassey, in 1757. The Queen's Proclamation contained the memorable words :

> It is our further will that, so far as may be, our subjects, of whatever race and creed, be freely and impartially admitted to office in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability and credit duly to discharge. In their prosperity will be our strength ; in their contentment our security ; and in their gratitude our best reward.

Sixty-five years have rolled away since those noble words were spoken ; they remain unfulfilled, and, as the inevitable consequence, the security of contentment is not yet ours.

The existing conditions in India, bearing on the religious, economic, educational and political problems of the present, may be read in the Congress story.[1] They will be better understood against the historical background, which shows that Indian Nationality is not a plant of mushroom growth, but a giant of the forest, with millennia behind it.

[1] *How India Wrought for Freedom*, by the present writer.

India is now full of unrest, righteous unrest; she is consequently held down by a series of enactments unparalleled in any modern civilized country; Lord Morley has had the audacity to state, according to Sir Valentine Chirol (*Indian Unrest*, 154, Ed. 1910) that the Government of India "must be an autocracy," and India loathes autocracy. She has enjoyed all the benefits which flow from it during her childhood and youth as a Nation, and she has felt its weight in British hands; she is now mature; she demands freedom, and she is resolute to take her destiny into her own hands, as one of the Free Nations in a Crowned Commonwealth, if Britain will work with her, in making the transit. Vincent A. Smith (*Early History of India*, p. 331), in tracing the annals of some "Indian petty States," says that they show "what India always has been when released from the control of a supreme authority, and what she would be again, if the hand of the benevolent despotism, which now holds her in its iron grasp, should be withdrawn". If a central authority is wanted, and all Free Nations need it, to prevent centrifugal forces from causing disintegration, India demands that it shall be her own Parliament. Why should she, alone among civilized modern Nations, require a foreign supreme authority?

But there is one danger to India's future which it is well to recognize—the effect of the concomitants of the famous Pax Britannica of sixty-five years. India has never before been under foreign domination *as a whole*. If one part of her

was invaded, other parts were tranquil; if there was a foreign conquest, the new rulers settled down on the old lines; there were no barriers put up round State offices, differentiating between the new-comers and the earlier inhabitants; in fact the aim of the new was assimilation with the older elements in a common civic life, and when the Musalmāns made their Kingdoms and Empire, everything was done to induce the people to accept the new rulers and live in peace. Aurungzeb, the sixth Mughal Emperor, was the first persecutor, and his brutalities broke the Mughal power. The British policy has been different; the whole administration of British India has been in its own hands, and all the chief positions of responsibility and power have been rigidly confined to the foreigners; it is thought a wonderful concession that the Minto-Morley reforms allowed *one* Indian to enter the Imperial Council! All initiative, all originality have been rigorously repressed, while manly independence has been resented, and even punished. It has seemed as though it were the British aim to turn the whole Indian Nation into a race of clerks. This steady crushing pressure over the whole population has produced a serious result; it has emasculated the Nation. Indians hesitate, where they should act; they ask, where they should take; they submit, where they should resist; they lack self-confidence and the audacity that commands success. Prompt, resolute, effective action is but too rare; they lack fire and decision. Mr. Gokhale, in his answer before the Royal Commission on

Indian Expenditure (Ans. 18,331), voiced the same idea, after pointing to the 2,388 officials drawing annual salaries of Rs. 10,000 and upwards, of whom only 60 were Indians: "The excessive costliness of the foreign agency is not, however, its only evil. There is a moral evil, which, if anything, is even greater. A kind of dwarfing or stunting of the Indian race is going on under the present system. We must live all the days of our life in an atmosphere of inferiority, and the tallest of us must bend in order that the exigencies of the existing system may be satisfied." This is the deepest, gravest, wrong that Great Britain has inflicted on a once mighty and imperial race. Unless Indians can again develop the old vigour, courage and initiative, India can have no future. But the old spirit is awaking on every side, and therein lies our hope.

We doubt if those, who read and *verify* the above, will think that she has got on so badly in the past, left to her own resources.

So much for India as She was. Now as to

INDIA AS SHE IS

British rule over India is dated from the Battle of Plassey, 1757, and lasted for 164 years as an undiluted autocracy—for the Councils of 1892 and 1910 had no power—until 1921, when the present interlude between undiluted autocracy and Self-Government began. We have seen that 5,000 years ago India was a powerful, wealthy and colonizing country, with an immense sea-borne trade,

enjoying orderly and settled government at home, borne witness to by travellers from abroad. She tried all forms of political government, from "Village Republics" and Council-ruled City States, up to huge Empires, through these 5,000 years, at least, and none can say for how many millennia more. The outstanding material fact was her enormous wealth created by her prosperous agriculturists and village craftsmen; the splendour of her religious and philosophic literature, her art, her drama, her seats of learning, her village education, the strength, courage and discipline of her armies, her well-equipped commercial navies, her caravan-trade, her embassies to foreign courts—all these things belonged to India as she was.

The beginning of India as she is, her people a subject Nation at home and her Nationals despised abroad, began with Clive and Hastings, with the East India Company establishing its ruling power, described by Macaulay (quoted on p. 45 *ante*) as "That Government, oppressive as the most oppressive form of barbarian despotism, was strong with the strength of civilization". The havoc it wrought, till practically overthrown by the Sepoy rebellion, made India as she is.

The chief and lasting injury done by the Company was the destruction (in Madras in 1816) of the *Village System*, as it had existed and kept India rich for immemorial millennia. The Company turned village land-holding into small-owner land-holding, village servants elected by the village into village tyrants appointed by and responsible to the

Government, thus creating village jealousies and feuds, favouritism and fleecing by the new officials, bribery to obtain unfair advantages, the corruption of village life. With the village system went free village education, which, in 1813, Sir Thomas Monro said in his evidence to the House of Commons, was carried on in a school in every village, which taught reading, writing, arithmetic to every child, and provided the Company with clerks and accountants. India, as she was, had an educated people. This destruction of the admirably organized village system was the root of India's fall; she could easily have recovered from the wars and annexations and plunderings of the Company, but the destruction of her villages, of her local governments, essentially democratic, of her village education, her village industries, her village servants—ironsmiths, carpenters, shepherds, tax-gatherers, and headmen, etc.—strangled her National life, and plunged her into ignorance, so far as the masses were concerned, and from this she has never recovered. To the credit of that Company-rule are some of their servants, noble and generous-hearted men, who tried to serve the much-wronged Nation, and the introduction of English education, shorn of its religious and moral inspiration. Crown government was an immense improvement on Company rule, though it continued the demoralization of the people by the neglect of mass education, and by the continual unvarying pressure of the treatment of Indians as inferior, as devoid of ability to govern, as needing tutelage, excluding them from high positions,

and from all but the most formal social functions. Everywhere the stamp of inferiority was branded on them, in their education, in the legal, medical and educational professions, in their employments, in their social relations, in their manufacturing and mercantile associations. The marvel is that in such an atmosphere, with an education which taught them nothing of their glorious past, which gave them as a subject for an examination essay, "The blessings of British rule," the inborn spirit of the race—nurtured by agelong traditions of culture and Nationhood kept alive by religion—responded to the trumpet-call of Liberty ringing through English literature, as though a rush of native air had swept through that mephitic stifling atmosphere of enforced inferiority, and grew such men as Rānade, Telang, Gokhale, Tilak, Rāsh Behāri Ghosh, Dadabhāi Naoroji, and the younger generation, S. Srinivāsa Shāstri, Tej Bahādur Sapru, Madan Mohan Mālaviya, C. P. Rāmaswāmi Aiyar, and many another man who, in a free country, would have been hailed with acclamation as its foremost statesmen, but here have to struggle for the right to serve their country, as though patriotism were an outrage, and courage a crime. Even these sometimes shew a lack of self-confidence, a tendency to underestimate their own powers, bred of the repression of the generous enthusiasms of boyhood, the pride in country, the noble ambition greatly to serve their Nation.

"But we gave you peace, the Pax Britannica," urges the Civilian. A peace, a safety, bestowed and

preserved by others is more demoralizing than war, and should it cease to be felt as humiliating, then would the Nation be dead.

Education.—India was very highly educated as regarded the student population in her huge universities. The masses of the people enjoyed free education, reading, writing, arithmetic, mensuration and account-keeping being generally taught. Now India is, as regards the masses of her people, the most ignorant civilized population in the world. She has now, in 1923, 3·4 per cent of the population receiving education. [This has increased to 5 per cent.]

Poverty.—India was very lightly taxed while Self-governed. But she is now extremely heavily taxed, and her expenses are rushing up by leaps and bounds. Her military expenditure in 1913-14, including military works and marine, was over 31 crores of rupees. In 1922-23, it is over 73 crores of rupees and it is said to be impossible to reduce it even to Rs. 50 crores. India uses an inordinate proportion of her income in military expenditure, not for her own defence, but for Imperial needs, and is forced to support a large English army at an exorbitant cost, said to be necessary to keep a white soldier in health. But why have white soldiers? The cost of the British officials, again, is exorbitant; why have them? After a while they retire, and spend all their pensions out of the country. The people are underfed and therefore have little vitality, little hold on life. Infant mortality is very high. The average life period is 23·5. Her manufacturing industries languish under the

competition with Self-governed countries, the English Government considering English interests more than Indian, and the Japanese underselling her on her own soil. In many provinces the death-rate is higher than the birth-rate, the total excess in 1919 being 5·8 per 1,000 in a population of 245 millions. This may be intelligible when we remember that, between 1909-10 and 1919-20, Indian taxation has risen from an average annas 41 to annas 73 per head, on an average annual income of about Rs. 35 per head. Her debt has risen from £290 millions to £465 millions.

The Reformed Legislatures have made great progress in their first 2½ years of work, passing measures for Compulsory Primary Free Education in Bombay, United Provinces and Panjab, while in Bengal, Madras, Bihar and Orissa, and Central Provinces compulsion is left to the local authorities. They cannot touch Military Expenditure, nor the Services, nor "Home" charges, the worst departments of Expenditure, but they have cut down considerably the grants over which they have control. They have given Woman Suffrage in Madras, Bombay and the United Provinces, and it has also been incorporated in the new Burmese Reform Act; they have passed important amendments in the Factories Act and a Workmen's Compensation Act; they have repealed the Press Act 1910 and most of the Emergency Laws; have swept away most of the racial distinctions in the Law Court, with several other beneficent measures. The outlook is bright for the future, if India obtains

Svarāj without further delays, and this she imperatively demands. The National Conference held in February, 1923, issued a broad outline of the irreducible factors in a Svarāj Government, and proposed a NATIONAL CONVENTION in 1924, composed of delegated members of the Legislatures, with power to co-opt, to formulate an Act establishing Svarāj, whether by sweeping away the restrictions in the Reform Act of 1919, or drafting a Constitution, a "Commonwealth of India Act" as in Australia. In either case, India will obtain Dominion Status, and become a Free Self-Governing Nation.

SOME DEDUCTIONS AND ANTICIPATIONS

We submit from a review of this rough sketch:

That India, despite foreign invasions and local disturbances, which all Nations have suffered in their time—what peace had England from the Conquest up to the final defeat of Charles Edward in 1745?—was a prosperous and wealthy Nation before the coming of the East India Company, and that her huge wealth, down to the end of the eighteenth century, is a proof of general industry and security and immense industrial output among the masses, while the wealth of the merchants, and of the banking and trading communities shows a settled condition, where credit was good; that commercial integrity was so great that receipts and bonds were not demanded in financial transactions.

That the English connection, under the Company, reduced India to poverty, and dislocated her

industries, and that, under the Crown, the Government still hampers her industries, makes a cruelly severe drain upon the country, and by its fiscal arrangements prevents the return of prosperity. That between 1770 and 1900—130 years—there have been twenty-two famines, eighteen according to the Report of the Famine Commission of 1880 and four after 1880. In 1770, as we have seen, there was a famine in Bengal with 10,000,000 deaths; in 1783 in Madras; in 1784, in Upper India, which left Oudh in a pitiable condition; in 1792 in Bombay and Madras; in 1803 in Bombay; in 1804 in northern India; in 1807 in Madras; in 1813 in Bombay; in 1823 in Madras; in 1833 in Madras, where in one district, Guntur, 200,000 died out of 500,000 population, and the dead lay unburied about Madras, Masulipatam and Nellore; in 1837 in north India, in which a calculation of 800,000 deaths is thought too low by the Famine Commission; in 1854 in Madras; in 1860 in northern India, about 200,000 deaths; in 1866 in Orissa and Madras: in Orissa a third of the people died, about 1,000,000, in Madras about 450,000; in 1869 in north India, about 1,200,000 deaths; in 1874 in Bengal, over 1,000,000 were relieved and life was saved; in 1877 in Madras, 5,250,000 deaths; in 1878 in north India, 1,250,000 deaths; in 1889 in Madras and Orissa; in 1892 in Madras, Bengal and Rājputāna; in 1896-7 in north India, Bengal, Madras and Bombay—the number of deaths is not given, but 4,000,000 persons received relief; and in 1899-00, in north India, Central Provinces and Bombay, 6,500,000 persons were in

receipt of relief—the worst famine on record. In 1897, Burma also suffered from famine. In 1896, bubonic plague broke out in Bombay, and has slain its millions.

That even if Self-Government should cause—as we do not think it would—any recrudescence of local jealousies and divisions, they would be local and temporary troubles, out of which India would emerge prosperously, as she has done before.

That after an admitted prosperous and wealthy existence for 5,000 years under eastern rulers, she could not fall into barbarism even by the total and sudden withdrawal of a rule that has only been here in any kind of power for a poor 165 years, of which the first fifty were spent entirely in plundering, and which only stopped constant wars and annexations in 1856. Has the history of British rule in India proved to be more peaceful than the worst of its predecessors up to the Sepoy Rebellion? And it must not be forgotten that nearly all the current history is the special pleading of an advocate, who is representing his own side and blackening his antagonists, minimising every wrong committed by his own side, exaggerating every wrong done upon the other.

That in the very limited educational work she has done, Britain has been immensely useful, for the study of her own history has strengthened and given point to the National feeling that was powerfully aroused in the rise of the Marāthas; from 1835 she took up education, and though it has spread very slowly, and is doing badly now in consequence of

the strangling policy initiated by the Universities Act of 1904. India's debt here to Britain is great and is fully recognised.

That Britain has done much in railways—of mixed benefit, being chiefly strategic instead of economic, but on the whole desirable; much less well than the old rulers in irrigation works, in forestry, in village government, and in sanitation.

That India welcomes English co-operation, but is getting very tired of English domination, that she is determined to get rid of coercive legislation, and to enjoy Self-Government. That she earnestly desires to have it with English help, but is resolved to have it.

That she is perfectly well aware that England did not "conquer her by the sword," but by the help of her own swords, by bribery, intrigue, and most acute diplomacy, fomenting of divisions, and playing of one party against another. But she is willing to let bye-gones be bye-gones, if Britain will now treat with her on equal terms, and welcome her as a partner, not a dependent.

INDIA WANTS SELF-GOVERNMENT. BECAUSE:

1. British rule has destroyed her Village and Council Government, and has put in its place a hybrid system of Boards and Councils which are impotent for good, because well-informed Indian opinion is overruled by officials who come, knowing nothing of India, and seek to impose English

methods on an ancient land which has its own traditions. They then complain that their hybrid is sterile. It is the way with hybrids. India wants to rebuild and improve her own system, beginning with Panchāyats, and working upwards, untrammelled by foreign experts.

2. British rule, after eighty years of its education, is educating 3·4 of the population, and bases her denial of liberty on the "microscopical minority" of the educated, due to her own policy. Japan, under eastern rule, has educated her whole population in 40 years. British education is not only microscopic, but it is ill-directed; it was arranged with a view of supplying clerks and some professional men, in order to enable the British Government to be carried on. India wants a system which will develop her resources by supplying scientific experts in every branch wherein applied science is needed, by supplying practical experts in all industries and crafts; a system which will educate her whole population for useful ends, as the United States and Germany have done for their populations and Britain is now doing for hers. India also desires to check the lavish expenditure of her money on the schools and colleges of foreign missions—British, Scotch, American, German (till 1914), Danish, French, Swiss, Italian—while those under her own control are discouraged and crippled in their natural development on lines shaped by Indians.

3. British rule has destroyed India's finest arts and industries in order to favour the importation of cheap foreign goods, and even in machine industry,

such as cotton, taxed the home-produce until lately in order to balance the customs duty on imported goods. It encourages the export of raw materials, which come back as manufactured articles, thus paralysing Indian industrial efforts for the benefit of foreigners. The export industry being in full swing, when England goes to War, India's materials are suddenly thrown on her hands, and as she has neither plant, nor knowledge how to use it, they rot on the ground and their producers starve. India would train her own sons to utilise her vast stores of raw material for her own profit, and would only send abroad her surplusage.

4. British rule has neglected irrigation—only lately taken up because of the awful famines, and even now starved for want of funds—and while recklessly cutting forests down has, also until lately, neglected replanting. Huge tracts of land, especially in the north-west, have consequently become deserts, which were formerly rich and fertile. India would place irrigation and forestry among the first duties of Government.

5. British rule has neglected sanitation, while the tendency to centralise in towns and neglect villages has necessitated changes from the old methods. Alarmed by the plague—a disease of dirt, which decimated Europe dirty and vanished before Europe semi-clean—it took some hasty and injudicious methods, which alienated Indian sympathy, and is now more busy with injecting serums into Indian bodies, thus really perpetuating disease, than with sanitation. The trouble is increased by the

arrogant contempt for indigenous systems, and the ousting of them by Government, while it is impossible to replace them adequately everywhere with the costly modern appliances. India would insist on sanitation as among the first duties of Government, would encourage all that is good in the old systems, and utilise what is good in western methods.

6. British rule is extremely costly; it employs Europeans in the highest posts at the highest salaries, and introduces them everywhere as "experts"—experts ignorant of the conditions in which they are working; it keeps special preserves wholly for Europeans; others into which Indians may enter at the heavy cost of going to England to obtain "English degrees"; it pensions its servants, so that the English ones live on Indian money when they retire to England, making a huge annual drain; it encourages exploitation of the country by English companies and English capital, making another drain; it makes India pay for an Indian army, maintained to keep India in subjection; it makes India pay for a costly English establishment, the central autocracy, irresponsible to our Parliament. India would do away with all this; would open everything to Indians—as indeed the Proclamation of 1858 promised—and require no foreign degrees as credentials; would abolish the India Office; would acknowledge, outside India, the authority only of the Crown and the Imperial Parliament, in which she enjoyed adequate representation. She would have her own Army and Navy, for

protection and Imperial needs, not to hold her people down.

7 British rule has substituted coercion for improvements in Government, like any other autocracy. It has just revived the Press Act (1930). India would sweep all this coercive legislation away; she would not be afraid of her people possessing arms; she would not be afraid of the criticism of free speech and a free Press; she would reform abuses instead of strangling the expression of the discontent which abuses produce; she would emulate British rule in Britain, not British rule in India.

In a phrase:

India is enthralled, and she is determined to be free.

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO INTRODUCTION

TITLE	AUTHOR	PUBLISHERS	DATE
Prosperous British India	William Digby	T. Fisher Unwin, London	1901
Poverty and Un-British Rule in India	Dadabhai Naoroji	Swan Sonnenschein, London	1901
Economic History of British India	Romesh Chandra Dutt	Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., London	1902
Government of India	Sir Courtenay Ilbert	Claredon Press, Oxford	1915
Law of Municipal Corporations in British India	P. Duraiswami Iyengar	Guardian Press, Madras	1913
New India	H. J. S. Cotton	Kegan Paul Trench & Co.	1885
Indian National Congress		G A. Natesan & Co., Madras	
Speeches of G. K. Gokhale		do.	
The Struggle between the Mahrattas and the Mogals	Mukund Wamanrao Burway	Printed at The Tatva-Vivechaka Press, Bombay	1914
A Brief History of the Indian People	W. W. Hunter	Morrison & Gibb, Edinburgh	1881
The Indian Empire, Its People, History, and Products	Sir William Wilson Hunter	W. H. Allen & Co., Ltd, London	1893
Travels and Travellers in India, A.D. 1400—1700	Edward Farlay Oaten	Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., London	1909

TITLE	AUTHOR	PUBLISHERS	DATE
Progress of the Madras Presidency during the last forty years of British Administration	Dewan Bahadur S. Srinivasa Raghavaiyangar	Printed by the Supt., Govt. Press, Madras	1893
India. Forty years of progress and reform: being a sketch of the life and times of Behramji M. Malabari	R. P. Karakaria	Henry Frowde. Oxford University Press, Warehouse, London, E. C.	1896
India and Her People	Swami Abhedanand	The Vedanta Society, New York	1906
Rise of the Marâthâ Power	M. G. Ranade	Punalekar & Co., Bombay	1900
The Ârya Samâj: An account of its aims, doctrine and activities with a biographical Sketch of the Founder	Lajpat Rai	Longmans, Green & Co.	1915
A History of Civilisation of Ancient India in 2 Vols. [Based on Samskrit Literature.] (B.C. 2000 to 320) (320 B.C. to A.D. 1000)	Romesh Chandra Dutt	Kegan Paul, Trench, Turbner & Co., Ltd.	1893
An Essay on the Civilisation of India, China and Japan	G. Lowes Dickinson	J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd.	1914
Voyages de Bernier	François Bernier	Paul Marret, Amsterdam	1699
Tavernier's Travels in India (originally published in French in 1676)	Jean Baptiste Tavernier	Bangabasi Office, Calcutta	1905

TITLE	AUTHOR	PUBLISHERS	DATE
Early History of India (including Alexander's campaigns)	Vincent A. Smith	Clarendon Press, Oxford	1908
History of Indian Shipping and Maritime Activity from the earliest times	Radhakumud Mookerji	Longmans, Green & Co., London	1912
Critical and Historical Essays in 2 Vols.	Lord Macaulay	Longmans, Green, Longmans Roberts & Green, London	1864
Manual of the Administration of the Madras Presidency in 3 Vols.		Printed at the Govt. Press, Madras	1885 & 1893
The Imperial Gazetteer of India: Vol. II. Historical, Vol. IV. Administration	Published under the Authority of His Majesty's Secretary of State for India in Council	Clarendon Press, Oxford	1907 & 1908
Children of the Motherland	Annie Besant and others	The Board of Trustees, Central Hindu College, Benares	1906
Indian Unrest	Sir Valentine Chirol	Macmillan & Co., London	1910
How India Wrought for Freedom	Annie Besant	Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar, Madras, S.	

CHAPTER I

RELIGION AND NATIONALITY

THOSE who have studied the history of the political movement of Shivāji know that a religious movement in Maharāshtra preceded it, and led to the great wave of Hindū power which bid fair for a while to re-establish a mighty Hindū Empire on the wreck of the Mughal dominion. In truth, any movement to be strong in India must rest on a religious basis, and so interwoven with religion is the very fibre of the Indian heart, that it only throbs with full response when the religious note has been struck which calls out its sympathetic vibration. And it must be remembered that with Hindūism are bound up a literature—which is the admiration of the world for its sublime spirituality, its intense devotion, and its depth of intellectual insight—a culture which has endured for unknown millennia, and a civilisation so magnificent that the world has not yet seen its equal.

We shall see that it is the assertion of this greatness which most angers the narrow-minded among the opponents of Indian Nationality. They could forgive the imitation of the West; they cannot tolerate the self-assertion of the East. And it is this self-assertion which has been brought about by the religious revival. The hostile eyes of

Christian missionaries, fixed on the evils found in every society, have regarded India as "heathen," and therefore as contemptible, as a land, as Bishop Heber sang of Ceylon :

Where only man is vile.

They point to the abolition of widow-self-immolation and the raising of the age of consent to twelve years as triumphs of Christian legislation, as though the drunkenness of Glasgow should be considered as a proof of the wickedness of their own faith, as though these reforms had not been pressed on the Government by Hindū reformers, and as though the further raising of the age of consent had not been lately urged by Hindūs in the Viceroy's Council, and rejected by the Supreme Christian Government.

The revival in Hindūism was the salient characteristic of the nineteenth century in India, and it gave birth to the National Movement. Later in time came the Zoroastrian revival. The Musalmān has not been so marked, for Islām had not weakened to the same extent. It is gradually entering the National Movement. The chief reviving agencies have been, in order of time: the Brahmo Samāja and its branches; the Ārya Samāja; the Theosophical Society; the Rāmakrishna Mission.

THE BRAHMO SAMĀJA

Of this society—Samāja means Society—Rājā Rāma Mohan Rai was the founder, that extraordinary spirit of fire and steel, whose heroic courage

faced alone the dread and then unbroken force of Hindū orthodoxy, and planted the seed of freedom, the seed distined to grow into a spreading tree, the "leaves of which" are "for the healing of the" Nation. He was born in Bengal in 1774, "of an ancient and honourable Brāhmana family," and his father gave him a first-rate education; "he learnt Persian at home, Arabic at Patna"—a boy of twelve—"(where he studied Euclid, Aristotle, and *Al Qurān*), and Samskṛt in Benares" (*Encyclopædia Britannica, sub voce*). Attracted by Buddhism, he went to Tibet at the age of fifteen, spending some years in travel, but, revolting against the use of images in worship, and otherwise heretical, he aroused so much hostility that he was obliged to fly from home. After his father's death (1803) he returned to Bengal, and was for some ten years in the service of the East India Company; but his outspokenness and his publication of a book against superstition and priestcraft made it necessary for him in 1814 again to seek safety, this time in the freer atmosphere of Calcutta, and leaving the service of the Company, he devoted himself to his life's work.

In Calcutta, in 1814, he drew round him a few men of liberal ideas, who met weekly for study of the Hindū scriptures, and he published some of the Upanishads in Bengāli, Hindi, and English, with comments, and the Vedānta Sūtras in the first two languages. He strove to bring his countrymen back to the purity of ancient Hindūism, and to this end he directed all his strength. Most of all he laboured for education, and brought about the

founding of a Hindū College in 1819, linking together the religious and educational reforms destined to save India, and preparing the way for the introduction of English education, even helping Dr. Alexander Duff, the missionary, to open an English school in 1830. As he wrote against Christian orthodoxy as well as Hindū, he was bitterly attacked by the missionaries of Serampur, especially as he converted one of them from Trinitarianism to Theism, instead of being converted. To his religious and educational reforms his strong and logical mind added social and political—the first Indian to grasp the interdependence between the four lines of Indian progress; and the great agitation he created and led against Sati—the self-immolation of the widow with the husband's corpse—led to Lord William Bentinck's Regulation in 1829, abolishing it in the territories controlled by Fort William.

On August 20, 1828, the Brahmo Sabhā was formed, the "Sabhā" being soon changed into the equivalent "Samāja," and on January 23, 1830, the first temple of the Brahmo Samāja was opened. The trust deed secured it as a building wherein all were welcome to adore "the Eternal, Unsearchable, and Immutable Being who is the Author and Preserver of the Universe"—a quite Upanishadic description; no name was to be given, no image made, no living creature to be deprived of life as sacrifice; but nothing sacred to others was to be reviled or treated with contempt, and only such teaching was to be given as promoted virtue, and strengthened "the bonds of union between men of

all religions and creeds". In those words was struck the note characteristic also of the Theosophical Society and the Rāmakrishna Mission. Splendidly before his time was this heroic man. A group of learned Brāhmanas gathered round him, and among his few early supporters was Rājā Dwārkānāth Tagore—a name to become famous in the annals of the Brahmo Samāja.

In 1830 Rama Mohan Rai went to England on a mission from the Emperor of Delhi, who created him a Rājā, and he reached England in 1831, and gave "much valuable evidence before the Board of Control on the condition of India" (*Ency. Brit.*). It is a pathetic fact that this great servant of India died far from the Motherland, in Bristol, in 1833, and a monument is erected there to him.

The movement he had founded lived on in India, and his friend's son, Debendranath Tagore, joined it in 1842, and became its teacher and inspirer, leading it firmly along the lines of pure Hindūism. Keshab Chandra Sen joined the Samāja in 1857, and his eagerness and eloquence introduced many changes, and ultimately led to the branching of the Samāja in 1865; he became strongly tinctured with Christianity, so that the latter Brahmoism has been called "Christianity without Christ," and he came into close relation with the Theistic party in England and America, being influenced by the writings of Theodore Parker, James Martineau, and Frances Power Cobbe. The members who remained true to the Hindū ideal, under Debendranath Tagore, were termed the Ādi

(original) Brahmo Samāja, while in 1866 Keshab Chandra Sen formed a new Brahmo Samāja, having already in 1864 established the Veda Samāja in Madras. The Prārthanā Samāja in Bombay, founded in 1867, was largely due to the inspiration of his visit in 1864, and his strengthening visit in 1868.

Another split occurred in 1881, those remaining with Keshab Chandra being known as the Church of the New Dispensation, influenced to some extent, perhaps, in his 'central' idea that all religions were true, by Shrī Rāmakrishna Paramahamsa, whom he visited much from 1875 onwards.

The allied movement, the Prārthanā Samāja in Bombay, with its great members, Mr. Justice Rānade, Sir R. G. Bhandārkar, and Sir Narāyana Chandāvarkar, has contributed enormously to the shaping of Indian Nationality by its work of educational, political, and social reform, and it gradually and inevitably became more thoroughly Hindū in spirit, as Nationality grew more and more self-conscious. The Ādi Brahmo Samāja has given to India the two famous Tagores, Rabindranath and Abanindranath, the National Poet and Painter; both added currents to the stream of Nationality. The remaining Brahmo Samājas are a good deal Christianised and therefore Anglicised, playing a smaller part in the National life. Sir Valentine Chirol says of them (*Indian Unrest*, p. 27): "The Brahmo Samāja is still a great influence for good, but it appears to be gradually losing vitality, and though its literary output is still considerable, its membership is shrinking. The Prārthanā Samāja is moribund."

Although Christians and Anglo-Indians thus patronise the Brahmo Samāja, we, who love India, must never forget that to the movement as a whole, India, the Nation, owes much, for it broke and ploughed up the ground of rigid orthodoxy, it faced the greatest difficulties, and, as pioneer, it opened a way for others, the easier to tread because of the devotion and self-sacrifice of the early workers.

THE ĀRYA SAMĀJA[1]

The second great movement was at once more conservative and more aggressive than the Brahmo Samāja, and in much reminds the historical student of the Puritan movement in Great Britain. It has the strength, virility and devotion of its prototype, and much of its iconoclasticism and aggressiveness. Its influence on the life of Northern India has been and is great, and it has been a potent source of independence of mind and character, of a broad and liberal interpretation of Hindūism, of a bold assertion of the value of Hindū culture and self-sufficiency, and thereby has contributed greatly to the building of Indian Nationality. Like Rāma Mohan Rai, it has occupied the whole field of reform, religious, educational, social, political.

The founder of the Ārya Samāja, Mulshankara, later Dayānanda Sarasvati, was a Brāhmana of pure descent, his father rigidly orthodox, his mother, says Lālā Lajpat Rai, "a typical Indian lady". He

[1] This section is drawn from *The Ārya Samāja*, by Lajpat Rai, its greatest living member.

was born at Tankārā, in Morvi, a feudatory State in Kathiawar, in 1824.

Brought up in his father's orthodoxy, the first doubt as to the use of images in worship entered his mind at fourteen, while engaged in the worship of Mahādeva on the Shivarātri night—a fast held in honour of Mahādeva; and on submitting his doubt to his father and being subjected to a violent scolding instead of a rational explanation, the lad, as obstinate as his father, quietly held his tongue, and went on with his studies, ignoring parental authority. When, in 1845, his father tried to force him into marriage, he fled from home, and became definitely a Brahmachāri—celibate student—and after wandering about for some three years, he took Sannyāsa from a regularly initiated Sannyāsin of the Sarasvati Order, and was given the name Dayānanda, thus becoming Dayānanda Sarasvati.[1]

He continued to work with the Brahmo Samāja and its branches, and in Bombay, in April, 1875, he founded the Ārya Samāja. Two years later, in 1877, he founded another group in Lahore, and that became the centre of his work. He invited to India Mme. H. P. Blavatsky and Colonel H. S. Olcott, the founders of the Theosophical Society, and the two movements were for a time allied, but the heads of both were too independent for close partnership; in 1880 the Presidents of the two Societies met, and

[1] Sannyāsa is complete renunciation of the world, entailing poverty and celibacy. The Sannyāsin wanders about, teaching, living on charity. The mendicant preaching friar is the nearest western analogue.

"we agreed that neither should be responsible for the views of the other; the two Societies to be allies, yet independent" (*Old Diary Leaves*, ii, 224). Mme. Blavatsky wrote of the great Hindū with intense admiration, and Colonel Olcott paid him, in *The Theosophist*, perhaps the finest tribute of all that were paid on his passing away on October 30, 1883, recognising in him the noblest of patriots, as well as the greatest of orators, in whom "there was a total absence of any degrading sycophancy and toadyism towards foreigners," and praising his "energetic patriotism" and the "Nationalising influence exerted upon his followers". In truth, it was Dayānanda Sarasvati who first proclaimed: "India for the Indians."

The main tenets laid down by Dayānanda Sarasvatı were: That caste and qualities must go together, and that a man who shows the characteristics of a caste has a right to belong to that caste. That all Hindūs have the duty of studying the Vedas, and every human being has the right to do so, thus placing Hindūism among the world-religions and opening its gate to all; also that the Vedas must be read by the old canons of interpretation and not in the light of later commentaries and beliefs. He further taught that there is a Primeval Eternal Religion; that there is one Spirit, Brahman, permeating the whole Universe; that the Vedas are His Word—Vedas including only the Samhitā, the Mantras; that there are three Eternal Things, God, Soul, Matter; that activity is superior to resignation, and creates destiny. He worked out a full

system of religion and philosophy on the Vaidic basis. The Ten Principles of the Ārya Samāja include the above ideas on God and the Vedas, and basic moral duties; they were formulated in Lahore in 1877, and are the conditions of admission to the Society.

In 1892 the Ārya Samāja split into two, one section maintaining that Dayānanda's opinions were binding on the Society, and that every member must therefore be a vegetarian; the other, that the members were only bound by the Ten Principles, and were free, on everything else, to follow their private judgment. But the division cannot be said to have weakened it, and its strong propaganda goes on as before.

In education, carrying out the eighth of its Ten Principles, "to diffuse knowledge and dispel ignorance," it carries on an immense propaganda, which will be noticed in the chapter on Education. Suffice it here to say that it sends out annually into public life a steady stream of sturdy Hindūs, enlightened and liberal, and devoted to the Motherland. Regarding the sexes as equal, it educates girls as well as boys, and has proved a potent factor in the National movement for raising Indian Womanhood.

Socially it has played a great part in the education of the depressed classes, with its principle of human brotherhood, and its recognition of the fact that hereditary castes did not exist in Vaidic times; it admits the "untouchables" into the Samāja on an equal footing with all others. It stands for monogamy, approves 25 as the suitable

marriage age for men and 16 for girls, and prefers the avoidance of second marriages both for men and women.

Politically, the Ārya Samāja is not, as a body, engaged in politics, but its influence directly fosters pride in the Motherland, patriotism, self-dependence, and independence. Fundamentally Hindū, it stands for Hindū civilisation and Hindū culture, enriching them from everything that is good in the West, but refusing to be dominated by foreign ideals. It builds up a manly and self-reliant character, and if the virile qualities which are regarded as admirable in every other civilised Nation are held to be seditious and treasonable in the Indian, then, and then alone, are justifiable the attacks made on it by the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy, and by the enemies of educated India, such as Sir Valentine Chirol. He says: "The Ārya Samāja, which is spreading all over the Panjāb and in the United Provinces, represents in one of its aspects a revolt against Hindū orthodoxy, but in another it represents equally a revolt against western ideals, for in the teachings of its founder, Dayānanda, it has found an aggressive gospel which bases the claims of Āryan, *i.e.*, Hindū, supremacy on the Vedas, as the one ultimate source of human and Divine wisdom" (*Indian Unrest*, p. 27).

It is this resentment against Indians' daring claim to follow their own immemorial lines of thought, which makes the British yoke so heavy; they claim to deprive a "subject Nation" even of its own ideals, and make it treason to cling to them.

Such an attempt to crush out National individuality has never been made before in India's long history. The Ārya Samāja is thus one of the potent forces working for Indian Nationality, not anti-British but pro-Indian. A free and Self-Governing Nation within the Empire is the inevitable aim of all patriotic Indians, and the indirect, not direct, influence of the Ārya Samāja works necessarily for the reaching of this goal.

Its religious work is definitely and aggressively anti-Christian, and, as Lālā Lajpat Rai points out, "It is not unnatural, then, that the Ārya Samāja should meet with the most merciless criticism and the bitterest opposition from the Christian missionaries" (pp. 262, 263). Itself violent in its attacks, and aggressive in its defence of Hindūism, carrying its counter-attacks into the enemy's camp, it is not surprising that the Christian missionaries, who, before its advent, were accustomed to deference as white people, and to the gentle tolerance of the Hindū in religious matters, should be startled into angry antagonism against the new portent of a vehement and aggressive Hindūism.

The missionaries, identifying the admission of their own superiority with loyalty to the British Crown, set themselves to denounce as disloyal the whole work of the Ārya Samāja, and indoctrinated the authorities with their own suspicions. Hence much trouble and persecution for the Society during the troublous period from 1907 onwards. The splendid work of the Ārya Samāja in late famines and floods has done much to dispel prejudice,

and the Society, for the most part, is now left in peace.

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

This third of the great movements for the rivival of religion in India, was a Society founded in New York, on November 17, 1875, by Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, a Russian lady of noble birth, and Henry Steele Olcott, a colonel in the American army, who had filled high and responsible office with great distinction in the American Military Department during the Civil War. In 1877, an American gentleman who had lately been in India called on the two Founders, and recognised the portrait of a Hindū hanging on the wall as that of a gentleman he had met in Bombay. Colonel Olcott, thus obtaining his address, wrote to this gentleman about the Society, and heard in answer of "a great Hindū Pandit and Reformer, who had begun a powerful movement for the resuscitation of pure Vaidic religion". Correspondence followed, and in May, 1878, the T. S. Council proposed to rename the Society "The Theosophical Society of the Ārya Samāja". Further correspondence, however, showed that this would narrow the T. S. too much, as the Ārya Samāja was Hindū and the T. S. international, so in September an intermediate group was formed under the above name, as a "link-Society". On Swāmi Dayānanda Sarasvati's invitation, the two colleagues left for India, and landed in Bombay on February 16, 1879.

[1] *Old Diary Leaves*, by Colonel H. S. Olcott. The early days in India are taken from this.

Colonel Olcott's first lecture was given on March 23 in the Framji Cowasji Hall, Bombay, on "The Theosophical Society and its Aims," and writing on it he says: "It was a stirring discourse on the majesty and sufficience of Eastern Scriptures, and an appeal to the sentiment of patriotic loyalty to the memory of their forefathers to stand by their old religions, giving up nothing until after its worthlessness had been proved by impartial study" (p. 39). Colonel Olcott remarked, writing on this:

"It should be noted that the view taken then was that the redemption of any Nation must come through its own self-evolved leaders, not from without, and that if the downfall of India was to be arrested, the inspired agent must be sought within her boundaries, not in foreign lands, not among aliens. For ourselves, we utterly disclaimed all pretence of leadership or qualifications for the same. I believe, after twenty years' Indian experience, that this is the sound view, and the only tenable one. I also believe, as I then stated, that this necessary spiritual Teacher exists, and in the fullness of time will appear. For, truly, the signs of his coming multiply daily, and who shall say that our Society, Mrs. Besant, Vivekānanda, Dharmapāla, and others, are not the *avant couriers* of the blessed day when spiritual yearnings shall again fill the Eastern heart, and materialistic grovellings be things of the black past?"

The note struck in that discourse was the keynote of the Society's work in India. Colonel Olcott lectured to the Zoroastrians, and turned the younger

generation from formalism or materialism to a recognition of the living spirituality latent in their religion. He lectured through the length and breadth of India, arousing Hindūs to a sense of their National degradation, urging them to separate the splendid Hindūism of the past from the excrescences that were draining away its life, and he founded many boys' societies for the study of the Hindū religion. He went to Ceylon, and worked for Buddhism, with such effect that to-day there are three colleges and 225 schools in which Buddhism is taught, managed there by Theosophical Societies. Everywhere pride of country arose in the track of his footsteps. The very fact of a Westerner, from progressive America, doing homage to the greatness of the East, touched the heart of India; but how hopeless the task seemed to be in 1879 may be judged by the comment of the India-loving *Amrita Bazar Patrika* of Calcutta on his first lecture in Bombay:

"What can the doctor do when the patient is already stiff and cold? India is dead to all sense of honour and glory. India is an inert mass which no power of late has been able to move. . . . India has no heart, and those of her children who have yet any portion of it left, have been deadened by blank despair. Talk of regenerating India to the Indians! You might as well talk to the sands of the sea."

The India of 1915, throbbing with vigorous life, shouts out her joyful denial of the prophecy of 1879.

The Society fixed its Headquarters in Madras, Colonel Olcott buying the Adyar property at the

beginning of June, 1882, and moving thither in December of the same year. The work went steadily on, the opposition of the missionaries to it steadily increasing, until it culminated in their infamous plot with the steward and the housekeeper at Adyar, in 1884, against Mme. Blavatsky, as it culminated against the Ārya Samāja in the political prosecutions of 1907 onwards. In 1885, we may note a lecture to students by Colonel Olcott in Pachaiyappa's Hall, Madras, where, as ever, he urged the danger of their "irreligious education by Government and their anti-Nationalistic education by missionaries, whose policy it was to destroy their reverence for their National religion". Ever the note is struck that religion must inspire Nationality. "This," he writes (iii, 323), "has been the keynote of all our teaching in Asia from the very commencement, and the creation of the Central Hindū College at Benares by Mrs. Besant has been made possible thereby."

In 1893, Mrs. Annie Besant came to India, and the work thenceforth went on with increased rapidity; she devoted herself first entirely to the revival of religion, knowing that that was necessary to the sense of Nationality in India, and refusing to give any opinion on subjects outside religion, until she had studied the condition of the country and was fitted to form sound opinions on the results of the changes proposed. Hindū at heart, she threw herself into the defence of Hinduism, and justified both from modern and ancient science many of the Hindū practices which had been discarded and

assailed by the Ārya Samāja, thus gradually leading large numbers of the more open-minded of the orthodox into the National movement. Sir Valentine Chirol complains (*Indian Unrest*, pp. 28, 29):

"The advent of the Theosophists, heralded by Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott, gave a fresh impetus to the revival, and certainly no Hindū has done so much to organise and consolidate the movement as Mrs. Annie Besant, who, in her Central Hindū College at Benares, and her Theosophical Institution at Adyar, near Madras, has openly proclaimed her faith in the superiority of the whole Hindū system to the vaunted civilization of the West. Is it surprising that Hindūs should turn their backs upon our civilization, when a European of highly trained intellectual power, and with an extraordinary gift of eloquence, comes and tells them that it is they who possess, and have from all times possessed, the key to supreme wisdom; that their gods, their philosophy, their morality, are on a higher plane of thought than the West has ever reached?"

But before Mrs. Besant came, the vivifying process had gone far, and, as we shall see in the chapter on Nationality, a committee had been formed after the Annual Theosophical Convention of 1884 at Madras, composed of delegates and others, forming the organising Committee of the National Congress. The members of the Society joined the Congress, when formed, in large numbers, the National self-respect, aroused by their revived pride in Hindūism, leading to the National Ideal of Self-Government.

The Central Hindū College and other schools, and Colonel Olcott's Panchama (untouchables) Free Schools at Madras, come under Education; suffice it to say here, that the educational was, as with the Ārya Samāja, a necessary step in the great work of Nation-building carried on under the inspiration of the Theosophical Society. But also, as with the similar work of the Ārya Samāja, the work was not corporate, though inevitably growing out of the Theosophical ideal of Brotherhood, "without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste or colour," applied to Indian conditions. Colonel Olcott wrote, speaking of various social reforms (iii, pp. 70, 71):

"As a Society we abstain from meddling with them, though as individuals we are perfectly free to plunge into the thick of either of the fights that they occasion . . . Mrs. Besant's Central Hindū College at Benares, my three Buddhist Colleges, and two hundred schools in Ceylon, and my Pariah Free Schools at Madras, are all individual, not Society activities."

The next step, equally inevitable on applying the ideal to life, was taken when the Benares School laid down the policy of excluding married boys, thus entering the field of Social Reform, and Mrs. Besant's most earnest followers, early in the twentieth century, signed a pledge to delay the marriage of their daughters, and to work for the reception back into caste of England-returned students; after three years of strenuous work they succeeded in inducing the southern India Jagat Guru to receive back into caste an England-returned

Brāhmana. Leagues were formed for Social Service, for the Education of Girls, for Foreign Travel, and other reforming measures.

Finally, Mrs. Besant, in 1913, threw the whole of her influence in India, built up by her twenty years of religious, educational, and gradual social reform, into the National Movement, bringing with her the large party which had gradually grown up round her. Essentially religious in spirit, they bring with them devotion to Hindū ideals, readiness for sacrifice, a burning passion of patriotism, and of devotion to the Motherland.

THE RĀMAKRISHNA MISSION

This mission owes its inspiration to the famous disciple of Shrī Rāmakrishna Paramahamsa, the Svāmi Vivekānanda, who was to his Guru what S. Paul was to Christ, the apostle of his Teacher's ideas and the organiser of them for effective action in the world. Like Rāma Mohan Rai and Dayānanda Sarasvati, the inspirer of this latest powerful vivifier of religion was a Brāhmana. Gadādhar Chatterji was born in 1834, in Kāmapukar, a Bengāli village, and was at first educated by his elder brother, a professor in Calcutta; but Svāmi Vivekānanda tells us that, desiring only spiritual knowledge, the boy became a temple priest—at Dakshineshvara close by—but, consumed with a passion of longing for the Divine vision, he left the temple and lived in a little wood near. Thither came a woman ascetic, who taught him for some years and helped

him in Yoga, and later a Sannyāsin came from whom he took Sannyāsa, and the name of Rāmakrishna. Then, he lived according to different religions, and realised their unity; he performed the lowliest offices—he, a Brāhmana, cleaning the house of a Pariah—and thus for forty years he trained himself, till he gained first-hand knowledge of the inner truths, and was ready to teach. Says Svāmi Vivekānanda: "To proclaim and make clear the fundamental unity underlying all religions was the mission of my Master. . . . He left every religion undisturbed because he had realised that, in reality, they are all part and parcel of the one Eternal Religion" (*My Master*, complete works of Svāmi Vivekānanda, iv, 840).

Round the Saint gathered a group of earnest men, and to him came the simple and the learned, the believer and the sceptic. To him came Keshab Chandra Sen and P. C. Mozumdar; to him many a seeker after God, and of all, the favourite disciple was one Narendranath Datta, a graduate of Calcutta University, who went to him in 1882. When the Saint died in 1886, some of his disciples vowed to spread his teachings, and became Sannyāsins, Narendranath taking the name of Vivekānanda. He retired to the Himālayas for some six years, emerging in 1892, when he visited Madras. Sir S. Subramania Iyer, a devoted Theosophist, struck by the promise of usefulness in the then unknown young man, gave him welcome, and, with some friends, collected funds to send him to represent Hindūism in the Parliament of Religions in Chicago, in 1893.

His striking oratory, his presentation of the truths of Hindūism, took the great audiences by storm, and when the Parliament was over, he lectured on Hindūism in many places, founded several Vedānta Societies, and gained many disciples, some of whom followed him to England in 1895. He returned to America in the winter of that year, coming back to England in April, 1896, and he then lectured and held classes in London, and won that admirable interpreter of Hindū thought and life, Margaret Noble, or Sister Nivedita, although she did not join him in India until January, 1898. Their common love for India drew together Sister Nivedita and Mrs. Annie Besant, and the latter, at Svāmi Vivekānanda's request, presided at the Sister's first lecture at Almora, in the Himālayas.

Svāmi Vivekānanda travelled on the continent of Europe in the summer of 1896, returned to India at the end of the year, reached his Motherland early n 1897, and was welcomed with intense enthusiasm. His passionate eloquence, his contempt for western civilization, his reproaches to all who imitated the West instead of living the East; who, having the privilege of Indian birth, reproduced the customs of another Nation—all these things roused the strongest feeling of Nationality. He lashed the weakness of the modern Indian while holding high the ideals of Hindūism; he raised Hindū civilization higher than the Western, declaring that the one embodied spirituality, the other materialism. India was the spiritual teacher of the world. Sister Nivedita writes of "his love of his country and his

resentment of her suffering. Throughout those years in which I saw him almost daily the thought of India was to him like the air he breathed" (*The Master as I saw Him*, by Sister Nivedita, 1910).

He paid another visit to Europe and America in 1898, his health having broken down, returning in 1900; too ill to lecture, he devoted all his remaining strength to organising his followers for self-sacrificing work, and died—only forty years old—in 1902. But he had nobly accomplished his work, and wherever his followers gather in their Sevāshramas—Homes of Service—they set a high example of beneficent activity, and are ever ready to nurse the sick, care for the suffering, uplift the miserable.

THE RELATION OF THE MOVEMENTS

It is instructive to note that these four religious movements are closely connected, and mark successive developments of the National self-consciousness.

The Brahmo Samāja marked the awakening of the Indian Nation from the state of coma produced by the East India Company; and in that first awakening it was natural that, confused and bewildered, finding herself helpless in the grip of a new and foreign civilization, and with the masses of her people superstitious and ignorant, cut up into endless subdivisions and without sense of unity, she should be dazzled by the light of a strong and imperious rule, and accept dumbly the assertion that the West was the model to be copied. Hence

the Brahmo Samāja; but in its development under Keshab Chandra Sen it lost its value as a reforming and uplifting agency, and only in the Ādi Brahmo and the Prārthanā Samājas was preserved the precious seed of Indian Nationality.

It was this tendency of the Brahmo Samāja towards Christianity and its general westernising influence which made the arising of the Ārya Samāja a necessity for the saving of Eastern ideals. The country was in danger of their total supplanting by western; the anglicising process had gone far enough in establishing English education, by which the ideals of English liberty were placed before each generation in its youth; the spread of the English language had ensured the passage of all valuable western thought to India; it was time that the distinctively Hindū note should be struck, and that an aggressive hard-hitting movement should arise to strike down Hindū superstition, and strike also for Hindū ideals. The Ārya Samāja arose. The missionaries had naturally seen in the later Brahmo Samāja a step towards the Christianising of India—the hopeless task on the accomplishment of which their hearts are set. To their horror they found a new movement had arisen among the most virile of Indian peoples in the North, the Ārya Samāja. Their hatred of this hard-hitting foe, meeting violence with violence, western in its vigorous fighting, if in nothing else, has therefore all the bitterness of disappointed hopes.

The Ārya Samāja saved the essentials of Hindūism, but, by throwing away much that was valuable,

it frightened the orthodox majority, and by its popagandist character it alienated the Mussalmān population. It was too exclusive, too aggressive—all must accept its special form. And it was too arid. There seemed no room for the devotee—a constant and powerful element in Indian life. Thus while we recognise the Ārya Samāja and its patriotic vigour as one of the strongest currents in the stream of Indian Nationality, we see also the need of something more. The West must come as a helper, not as a master, must recognise the greatness of the East, must show respect and not arrogance, and thus prepare the way for India's high place in the world—not only in the East—in the future; must enter into her life, place their western powers of organisation at her service in her struggle for liberty, and catch on their willing shoulders some of the blows aimed at her in the fight.

Hence the Theosophical Society was called to add its quota, and with its recognition of the unity of religions, its service to each in its own sphere, its arousing of the Zoroastrian, the Buddhist, and, to a small extent, of the Islāmic, it brought other religions into the National movement and softened the acerbities of all. It justified those elements in Hindūism which the Ārya Samāja, in its first necessary iconoclasm, had shut out, and so liberalised those of the orthodox not too fossilised to be affected through its influence. Orthodox Hindūism is becoming more liberal, and as the Ārya Samāja has moderated its aggressiveness towards it, the twain are drawing together to the advantage of

both. In social life, Theosophists have rendered and are rendering service by their attitude of perfect friendliness and ignoring of race distinctions. In education their service has been invaluable. In politics they have been strenuous helpers.

The work of the Rāmakrishna Mission has completed the religious impulse, by adding the sweet reasonableness and tolerance of pure and spiritual Hindūism as voiced by its Guru. The occasional expression not only of pride in India but of contempt of the West in Svāmi Vivekānanda, added a probably necessary touch of the lash—almost the lash of hatred.

Thus has Religion inspired Nationality, and Sir Valentine Chirol, cruel and unjust as he was, had true and acute insight when he saw in the revival of Hindūism the genesis of Nationality.

CHAPTER II

THE ECONOMIC POSITION

IN this as everywhere, this booklet is only a signpost. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's monumental work, *Poverty and Un-British Rule in India*, is the book on which many subsequent treatises have been founded. The accuracy of his figures is undoubted, but they are, of course old, and therefore need to be supplemented.

The main economic grievances may best be first stated baldly, and then a few details only can be given in our brief space.

1. The great drain on India is of money raised as revenue from her people, and sent out of the country, to maintain the India Office, to pay pensions to English officials, to pay interest on English capital expended on railways largely controlled from London. This drain reduces India to perpetual poverty, recurring famines, and the huge indebtedness of her agricultural population, now amounting to 500 crores (5,000 millions) of rupees (D. E. Wacha). To this may be added the cost of famine relief, rendered necessary by the recurring famines, and the cost of foreign wars, undertaken for imperial purposes.

2. The crushing and inelastic taxation on the cultivators of the soil, the direct cause of famines, and of the indebtedness just mentioned.

3. The great cost of the British Government, with its highly paid British officials, its continual employment of European experts at high salaries, the multiplication of costly offices, the unknown amount of their occupants' savings transmitted to Great Britain, increasing "the drain," the encouragement given to the employment of Europeans instead of Indians in all important posts outside the Government, and the low salaries paid to Indian officials, so that their spending capacity is small.

4. The unfair treatment of indigenous industries, as the cotton, in which a countervailing tax is placed on cloth produced in the Indian cotton mills, to balance the customs duty levied on foreign imported piece-goods, and the excise levied on Indian salt to counterbalance the customs duty on foreign salt. The refusal to help infant industries to establish themselves, in place of the many industries which have decayed under British rule, and which were the sources of Indian wealth, economic principles based on western conditions being applied without regard to their unsuitability here. The immense exports of raw materials, which should be chiefly worked up here, and the return of them as manufactured goods.

5. The comparative neglect of works useful to India, such as irrigation, education, and sanitation, on the ground of want of funds wasted in 1 and 3.

The books of Dadabhai Naoroji, Romesh Ch. Dutt, Hyndman, and above all, Digby, should be carefully read. Among more recent books those of J. S. Sarkar, S. K. Sarma, M. de P. Webb, and P. Bannerji may be consulted. *The Indian Year-Book*, though written with a strong Government bias, is useful for statistics, and it and the Census of 1911 have been used for the latest figures.

1. THE DRAIN

The word "drain" is sometimes objected to, as connoting that the burden of the white man on India tends to exhaust her resources. That is exactly what it is intended to connote. The other word, borrowed from Lord Salisbury, is "bleeding," and that is still more unpleasant. The noble lord, when Secretary of State for India, wrote in a Minute (26-4-1875; C. 3086-1 [1884, p. 144]): "The injury is exaggerated in the case of India, where so much of the revenue is exported without a direct equivalent. As India must be bled, the lancet should be directed to the parts where the blood is congested or at least sufficient, not to those which are already feeble for the want of it," already "bled white," like the calf, in fact.

Since then we have had the famines of 1877,'96 and '99. Other writers corroborate Lord Salisbury's views. Mr. W. T. Thornton, in *The Westminster Review*, in 1880, remarked: "Railways are good, irrigation is good, but neither one nor the other good enough to compensate for opening and

continually widening a drain *which has tapped India's very heart blood* (italics Mr. Thornton's), and has dried up the mainsprings of her industrial energy" (Digby, p. 205). The Rev. Mr. Sutherland, in the *New England Magazine*, Boston, September, 1900, writing on the causes of Indian famines, says they are not due to failure of rains, nor to over-population, but to "the extreme, the abject, the awful poverty of the Indian people," and that this is due to the enormous foreign tribute, the cost of "the most expensive Government in the world," the army, the foreign wars, which he puts at £100,000,000 sterling, of which England contributed to one war £5,000,000, and to another £500,000. (See *Famines in India*, Romesh Dutt, p. 294.) Once more the "bleeding" appears: "It is the stronger Nation sucking the blood of the weaker" (Digby, pp. 162-170). Mr. Hyndman speaks of it as "an open artery, which is draining away the life-blood of our great dependency" (*Bankruptcy of India*, p. 132). "Even as we look on, India is becoming feebler and feebler. The very life-blood of the great multitude under our rule is slowly, yet ever faster, ebbing away" (p. 152). But of what avail to multiply quotations? As Mr. Hyndman says, the voters of Great Britain are responsible. But do they care? I believe they would care did they know, and that is why this book is written.

When the taxes paid by a country are expended in that country, they are comparatively easily borne; they pay large numbers of the raisers of food, of the producers of clothing, of manufactured

articles of every kind, and by a country wealthy from its agriculture, its manufactures, its trade, its commerce, they may be even heavy without being ruinous ; we shall deal with this in our next section. But in the case of India all goes away from her—a real " drain ".

Sir George Wingate (in *A Few Words on our Financial Relations with India*, quoted by Romesh Ch. Dutt, pp. 101, 102) points out :

" Taxes spent in the country from which they are raised are totally different in their effect from taxes raised in one country and spent in another . . . (these are) an absolute loss and extinction of the whole amount withdrawn drawn from the taxed country . . . Such is the nature of the tribute we have so long exacted from India . . . From this explanation some conception may be formed of the cruel, crushing effect of the tribute upon India."

Mr. Romesh Ch. Dutt himself urges the same contention ; having compared the elastic collections of the Mussalmān rulers with the rigid collections of the British, he says :

" It is forgotten that the whole of the Mughal revenues derived from the land was spent in the country, fructifying agriculture and the industries, and flowing back to the people in one shape or another. Spent on the army, it maintained and fed the people ; spent on the construction of great edifices, or in articles of luxury, it encouraged arts and industries ; spent in the construction of roads and irrigation canals, it directly benefited agriculture. It is obvious that the people of a country

can bear the incidence of heavy taxation better if the proceeds of the tax flow back to the people themselves, than if a large portion of it is sent out of the country, adding to the capital and helping the trade and industries of a distant land" (pp. 100, 101).

Moreover taxes arouse less discontent, if they are levied by a home, than by a foreign Government. Resentment arises against those who tax when they are not of the same blood as the taxpayers, and it must be remembered that, even after the Minto-Morley reforms, the members of the enlarged Legislative Councils had no effective control over the Budget. There is a Budget debate, but no control. They are told what the Government is going to do; they are not consulted as to the incidence and allotment of taxes. Even after the 1919 Reform Act, the larger part of the expenditure is withdrawn, in the Central Legislature, from its control, and of three items in the part left to it, rejected by the Assembly two were restored by the Governor-General and one certified in 1923.

On the condition up to 1921, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji quotes Sir William Hunter as saying:

"I cannot believe that a people numbering one-sixth of the whole inhabitants of the globe, and whose aspirations have been nourished from their earliest youth on the strong food of English liberty, can be permanently denied a voice in the government of their country. I do not believe that races . . . into whom we have instilled the maxim of 'no taxation without representation' as a fundamental right of a people, can be permanently excluded from

a share in the management of their finances" (App. X).

The system of Provincial Settlements makes things worse because less frankly autocratic. There is a Finance Committee, but it may not discuss anything which the Provincial Government is discussing with the Supreme. Any item can thus be withdrawn, and when the Supreme has decided, there is no more to be said.

Let us consider the amount of the drain. In 1898-99, the Secretary of State for India received from India £16,303,197 (Rs. 244,547,955). He spent it in Interest on Debt, etc., Railways, Army, Pensions, Civil Charges, etc. Mr. Sutherland estimates that from twenty-five to thirty millions a year go to England in other ways, including the balance of trade against her. Sir George Campbell, at one time Lieut.-Governor of the United Provinces, puts the public remittances at £16,000,000 and the private remittances and the balance of trade at £16,900,000. Of course the drain varies from year to year; in 1870-74 the public remittances were £17,500,000. The fall in the rate of exchange, again, terribly increased the Indian tribute, which was measured in pounds sterling, making in one year an additional drain of Rs. 117,000,000, according to Mr. C. B. Phipson (Digby, pp. 236, 237). Mr. Hyndman, writing in 1886, puts the drain at £20,000,000, half the net revenue of India from land (*Bankruptcy of India*, p. 131), and, while accepting this as the "admission of a Finance Minister," says it is really over £30,000,000 (p. 150). In a later analysis of the

Statistical Abstract, he makes the drain £33,500,000, from a population of 224,000,000, "whose total gross products are valued at no more than £400,000,000 by officials, and at £300,000,000 by able native statists" (pp. 184, 185). The drain is rising not falling: the Secretary of State is now spending £18,000,000 annually, and in 1908 he drew 25⅓ millions, of which the "Home Charges" were 18⅓ millions (Sarkar, pp. 257, 258). This goes with the general increase of expenditure; that of 1898-9 was £55,312,981, while the estimates for 1911-12 show a total of £78,640,200. The chief items are: Civil Department, from £9,201,441 to £16,837,000; Railways, £9,123,838 to £12,113,800; Military, £17,153,718 to £20,811,900 (Sarma, p. 171). The older figures represent a better state of things than the present. India is nearer bankruptcy than she was when Mr. Hyndman wrote. It is in this ever-increasing evil that lies the chief material need for Indian Self-Government, a National Government in which Indian prosperity will be the chief aim. In the long run, India, prosperous under her own Government, will be a more valuable Imperial asset than India bankrupt under the present foreign rule, which thinks first of Great Britain's temporary advantage, but ultimately will ruin both. Lord Salisbury said in 1877 that the only "true remedy against famine and scarcity is the frugality of the people". But it is a little difficult to be frugal when a man has a constant annual deficit, as we shall see when we come to taxation.

It is often alleged that the "drain" is "payment for services rendered," and is therefore legitimate.

It is forgotten that the services, exorbitantly paid, are not invited but imposed, and that, if India had her way, the services would be rendered by her own people, and the payment would be returned into her own pocket.

2. CRUSHING TAXATION

We must now consider the process of "squeezing blood out of stones," but, alas, the stones are sentient. The masses of the working population in India are chronically underfed, as may be seen by the normally low vitality, so that a failure of one harvest causes millions of deaths, by the numerous cases of death from a blow or a kick, the well-known "ruptured spleen," by the small elasticity in recovery from slight illnesses, by the extraordinary spareness of their bodies, and by the fact that the average life-period in India is 23·5 years, while in England it is 40, and in New Zealand it is 60. (Other causes contribute to this, such as child-parentage, and the frightful struggle for existence.)

Under Indian rulers, the land-tax was levied on produce, not on area, hence varied with good and bad harvests, and with the fertility of the soil; this method had also the advantage that it left to the cultivator sufficient food and seed-grain, and allowed land to lie fallow without tax for renovation, while *now it is* cultivated incessantly, and so gradually deteriorates. Mr. Gokaldas Parakh has pointed out that in some Bombay villages the incidence of taxation per acre is Rs. 2-11-1, Rs. 5-0-7, and

Rs. 5-1-6. Per head it amounts to Rs. 2-7-8, Rs. 3-12-6 and Rs. 8-1-2. In the Report for 1897, out of nine cases, one showed 72 per cent, one 67 per cent of the gross value of the produce. In another district one of 42 per cent, six of over 30. The year before, out of nine cases, there was one of 96 per cent, one of 73, one of 63, and one of 50 (Romesh Dutt, p. 323).

Under the old Hindū rulers from one-twelfth to one-sixth of the gross produce was taken from the cultivator under the law, and this rule seems to have been normally carried out; Megasthenes speaks of the land bearing two crops in the year, giving the cultivators "abundant means of subsistence," and the husbandmen were regarded "as a class that is sacred and inviolable". Fa Hian says that "only those who till the royal lands return a portion of the profit". Hiuen Tsang says that these tillers of royal estates pay one-sixth as tribute. Akbar, as we have seen, claimed one-third of the gross produce, but Mr. Romesh Dutt thinks his collections averaged from one-tenth to one-sixth. The Marāthās claimed one-fourth. Under British rule assessments for the land vary; Sir Louis Mallet, speaking of Madras, puts the land revenue at 50 per cent or one-half of the net produce, and remarks that it is not only large, but uncertain (Appendix M in *Famines in India* should be carefully read). Lord Salisbury says, commenting on Sir Louis Mallet's views, that "we cannot afford to limit all land payments to 50 per cent on the gross produce"! In North India assessments have not been so heavy, but there

landlords also had to be paid rent, the two taking about 30 per cent of the gross produce (landlords 20, Government about 10, sometimes only 8). The variations of assessment offer many opportunities for sophistical argument. When the hardships of a Madrāsi are complained of, we are told that a Panjābi is well off; that the taxation "on an average" is only so-and-so, Northern India being more lightly taxed than Southern. Mr. Shore, of the Bengal Civil Service, as long ago as 1837, said that "the grinding extortion of the British Government has effected the impoverishment of the country and people to an unparalleled extent" (Naoroji, p. 41), and official after official has endorsed this truth. Mr. Marriott in 1836 pointed out that the country was far more prosperous under "native rule" (p. 44), and comments on the beforementioned drain as the "heavy tribute" which India pays to England.

Comparing relative incomes and taxtion, we find that England paid 8½ per cent of her annual income as taxation, India nearly 22 (Naoroji, p. 221); and it must be remembered that England pays out of wealth, India out of poverty; in England the taxes are spent in the country, in India half goes out. Sir E. Baring in 1882 put the income per head in India at 27s., while in England it was £ 33; Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji also works it out at Rs. 20, which at the present rate of exchange is almost 27s. Taxation ten times as heavy in actual money in England on an average of 660s.—the taxation of 1910—is as nothing, whereas 3s. 7½d. out of 27s. is

crushing. The constantly repeated statement that India "is the most lightly taxed country in the world" is true in shillings, but scandalously false in fact. In 1871, Lord Mayo, deducting various items of other taxation, put the land revenue at 1s. 10d. per head (Naoroji, p. 59). In 1910 it was 1s. 8d. per head, other taxes raising the total incidence to 3s. 7½d. per head. In the 175 municipalities, taxation in 1899 was at the rate of 2s. 8d. per head; in 1910 it was 5s. 5d. District and rural boards had taxation of 2½d. per head in 1899, of 3½d. per head in 1910. Taxation is rising, not falling. The total amount raised by pure State taxation in 1910, excluding land, was 35½ crores of rupees, and by local taxation a little over 7½ crores (Sarkar, pp. 317, 318). The land revenue was 26·2 in 1898, 30·1 in 1910 (*Ibid.*, 316), and 32 crores in 1913-14—a steadily rising impost, and it must be remembered that both Mr. Rānade and Mr. Gokhale have pointed out that the amount levied on the land not only leaves no savings to the cultivator, but actually trenches on his subsistence. Hence despite his incessant labour his indebtedness is always increasing. The total net revenue was, in 1909-10, £74,600,000, and in 1913-14, £82,321,800. In 1902-3 it was only £65,300,000. England was *paying in taxes*, when Mr. Naoroji wrote, £2-10 per head. India's *total production* was £2 per head (p. 61). If India is "lightly taxed," why is it so impossible, as is often officially stated, to tax her further? There is no margin; she is taxed up to the hilt. Moreover, some of the taxes are peculiarly cruel, such as the

tax on salt, an absolute necessity of life in a largely vegetarian population; yet Re. 1 per maund of 82 lb. is the tax on it, and 467 lakhs of rupees were the estimated revenue from it in 1913-14. (The outcry against this tax has been so great that it has been lowered to Re. 1 from the Rs. 2·8 per maund paid in 1888.) For some years it was Re. 1·4 per maund. In 1923 it was doubled, *i.e.*, raised to Rs. 2·8 against the vote of the Assembly. It is worse than a bread-tax in England.

The poverty of the cultivators—and "nine-tenths of the rural population of India live, directly or indirectly, by agriculture" (*Imp. Gazetteer*, iii, 2)—would be incredible, were not the facts visible on every side. The *Gazetteer* points out that "a considerable landless class is developing which involves economic danger, because the increase is most marked in districts where the rural population is most congested, or in provinces in which there is special liability to periodic famine" (*Ibid.*). Moreover, the peasantry in many cases can no longer live by their land, but, after the harvest, go into the towns to earn by wages enough to pay the land-tax. The census of 1911 gives 218·3 millions out of 304·2 millions as living by agriculture. It says of Bombay, "that there is a large local supply of labourers". Into Calcutta and its vicinity 1·4 millions migrate annually for industrial employment, the great majority seeking only temporary work for the cold weather; some stay longer, returning home with their savings, their families remaining in the villages.

Mr. Digby gives table after table of the actual "budgets" of labourers, and they are official. In the United Provinces peasants with 5½ acres, one pair of oxen and a plough made a profit over expenses of Rs. 45·14 (£3-1-2) a year; average family five; per head Rs. 9-2-10, nearly, for everything, food, clothing, bedding, religious ceremonies, etc. Another, with 17 acres, has a deficiency of Rs. 15 annually on the land, and, says the investigator (Mr. Crooke, Collector of Etah, ruling a population of 756,528 persons), with bare food and clothing the annual deficiency came to Rs. 138-9. Another, with 7 acres, spends Rs. 50 on food (he pays Rs. 40 as rent), Rs. 7 on clothing, Rs. 2 on householding furniture, Rs. 2 on marriage and funeral expenses, totalling a deficit of Rs. 22 in the year. The official statement sometimes heard, that the people suffer because of thriftlessness and extravagance in ceremonies, may be seen, in the light of the grand total of Rs. 2 in a year for both marriage and funeral ceremonies, to be scandalously false. The extravagance would not cover an English official's "pegs" at his club for a week.

One man, Abe Ram, family of five, 9 acres; "he has no blanket; he ate the bajra before it was ripe" —an unwholesome proceeding; he had two buffaloes (a bull and a cow), and a cow, and sold milk for Rs. 18; he earned by labour (outside) Rs. 15 during the year; his crops sold for Rs. 70-4. His rent was Rs. 68·15—99 per cent of the produce—leaving the royal sum of Rs. 1·5 for the year; he spent

extravagantly Rs. 44 for food and Rs. 7 for clothing, and had a deficit of Rs. 25·11.

Mr. Alexander, Collector of Etawah, says that in *ordinary years* the cultivators live on advances from money-lenders for four months of the year. In a village near Cawnpur, with thirty-five families of cultivators, 171 persons, there was a balance of Rs. 2,590 over expenses of cultivation; for food alone Rs. 3,678 were necessary, so Rs. 1,088 was the deficiency; the sympathetic Sir Antony Macdonnell, Lieut.-Governor of the United Provinces, put as one of the causes of "the ryots' difficulties" "his recklessness in expenditure on festivals"! This is the Lord Macdonnell who objected to an Executive Council for these Provinces on which an Indian should sit. Mr. Irwin, a Deputy Commissioner in Oudh, finds that 173 persons have ten blankets, sixteen resais (bed covers of padded cotton), and twenty-four quilts among them, and in Oudh the temperature in winter touches freezing-point. "The small cultivators, *i.e.*, the large majority, must be always on the brink of want of food," would go over it but for the money-lender. Many say they live on the money-lender's grain for four months, eight months, on their labour. One man, "evidently underfed," had his rent enhanced three years ago. Average income per head 13s. 4d. per annum. Of another group, 10s. 8d. Deficit on the year Rs. 9, Rs. 32, Rs. 17, *for food alone.*

In Bombay, in 30 to 40 per cent of the holdings, the ryot cannot get enough to pay his assessment and feed his family for the whole year "even in

good seasons"; after the harvest, he goes to a town and works as a labourer to earn enough to live. In 567 such villages, the Revision Settlement enhanced the assessment 28 per cent. In the Deccan, in ten years, with crop and cattle losses, and 7 per cent of the population on relief works, the rents were enhanced and regularly collected, with a remission of less than 4 per cent. The annual borrowings Mr. G. V. Joshi has shown, in these districts, are 93 per cent of the total assessment; the assessment was £381,134, the borrowings £358,000. The ryots' debts in the whole Presidency amounted in 1794 to £15,000,000 old debt and about £1,666,667 new annually. The money-lenders practically pay the assessment, and the ryots pay interest on the rent they advance. The ryots' condition, therefore, grows worse every year, new borrowing, mounting indebtedness. "Half of the absentee landlords live in Britain," says a report from the United Provinces. Some of the volumes of these reports were laid on the table of the House of Commons at Mr. Charles Bradlaugh's request, and are presumably buried somewhere in the House. Mr. Digby's published cases are taken from these; pp. 306-508 contain the records of individual cases.

Sir Charles Elliott, Settlement Officer, and afterwards a Lieutenant-Governor, says: "I do not hesitate to say that half our agricultural population never know from year's end to year's end what it is to have their hunger fully satisfied." One hundred millions of men, women, and children always hungry! No wonder he adds that any attempt to

increase taxation would result in financial failure (Digby, p. 509). Missionaries bear evidence to the misery: here is one quotation from the Rev. C. H. Macfarlane, quoted by Digby (p. 564):

"We cannot present harrowing tales of starvation and death as yet. But people are living on one meal on every two or three days; the poorer classes n India are always prepared for this. As one of our Christians said: 'If we can eat food once in two days, we will not ask for more.' In my own missionary experience I once carefully investigated the earnings of a congregation of three hundred, and found the average amounted to less than a farthing per head per day . . . So it comes to pass that, living as they do, and that from hand to mouth, if they fail for a few days to work they have to face starvation, and when famine really comes it is ready to claim its millions as victims unless prompt and timely help is given."

The non-official estimated income in 1850 was 2d. per head per day; officially estimated income in 1882 was 1½d. per head per day! analytical examination of all sources of income in 1900 was less than ¾d. per head per day (Digby, frontispiece). India is on the down-grade.

3. COST OF BRITISH GOVERNMENT

The "drain," of course, is part of this cost, but the burden of British administration in the country itself cannot be omitted. Mr. Digby remarks sardonically that the salary of the then Secretary of State for India during his term of office represented

the average annual income of 90,000 Indians. That is a graphic way of putting it, and true. Outside the "drain," we have the cost in India itself. The Viceroy draws Rs. 2,50,800 a year; the three Governors Rs. 1,20,000 a year each, while Lieut.-Governors have Rs. 1,00,000. The rest of the salaries are proportionate. We have now nine Governors.

A Return, ordered by the House of Commons in 1892 (and made in 1900), gave the annual salaries being paid in India for the services of 13,178 Europeans as Rs. 8,77,14,431; Eurasians were paid Rs. 72,95,026 for 3,309 officials; 11,554 Indians received Rs. 2,55,54,313. None employed on less than Rs. 1,000 a year are noted, so the smaller salaries of ordinary clerks do not come in. In addition, there are leave allowances to Europeans of Rs. 46,36,314, Eurasians Rs. 3,22,120, and Indians Rs. 12,18,743. Pensions, paid in India, were to Europeans and Eurasians (given together), Rs. 23,28,882, and to Indians Rs. 59,81,824. In England out of Indian taxation, Europeans were paid in pounds sterling £3,710,678, or Rs. 5,56,60,173.

Another most unjust imposition on Indian revenues, and one of a peculiarly irritating kind, is that of the alien Church establishment. The Bishop of Calcutta draws Rs. 45,980, and the Bishops of Madras and Bombay Rs. 25,000 each. The Bishops of Lahore, Lucknow, Nagpur, and Rangoon draw Rs. 10,200 a year for five years and then Rs. 12,000 a year, the salaries of "Senior Chaplains". There are 134 Anglican and 11 Presbyterian Chaplains,

receiving regular salaries, while Roman Catholics and Wesleyans receive "block grants," and the churches of all four "may be built, furnished and repaired, wholly or partly, at the Government expense". In addition their schools and colleges receive huge grants, and out of 5,541 scholars in Protestant schools 5,241 are non-Christians. Thus Indian money is spent in supporting a vast agency for insulting and outraging the religious feelings of the Hindū, Mussalmān, and Pārsī "heathen," proving a source of civic strife. There is no conscience clause in Christian schools except for Europeans.

We have seen that the estimated revenue in 1913-14 was over £82,000,000 sterling, and the expenditure was estimated at a little over £81,000,000. It is impossible to say how much the expenditure might be reduced, if the Government was Indian, but in Indian States we find the people better-off, without State debts, and yielding a revenue to the State without distress of twice and thrice the amount yielded by India (see Naoroji, i, p. 259).

Mr. Sarkar says:

"India is a dependency of Great Britain. In consequence of her dependent political position, she has to employ a large number of high English officers ('the *corps d'elite* must be European,' as Lord Curzon said) and a strong garrison of British troops, which numbered 80,591 in 1911. The pensions of all these and their savings while in service in India are sent to England. The English cannot breed and multiply in India. They have to send their children above four years of age to home for

education; a large part of the father's income (sometimes amounting to three-fourths) is remitted to England for maintaining the young ones there. In one year, 1910, above 13,800 European soldiers came to India from abroad and 12,000 were sent back to India or British Africa. Very often these numbers have been exceeded. India has to pay their transport expenses" (p. 119).

Nor can we omit to notice the fact that in the higher educational, legal, and medical services the insistence on English degrees adds to Indian expenses. For the Indian Civil Service, Medical Service, for the Law, Indians must go to England, and spend Rs. 3,000 a year to qualify for higher status in their own land. All this goes to swell the "drain," though not reckoned therein. All requests to hold simultaneous examinations in India, so as to save this cost, were refused. They have now (1923) been begun.

Moreover, Englishmen are appointed to responsible posts of all kinds in preference to Indians, because of the Government *cachet*, stamping the Indian as inferior. The competition for Government service as a means of livelihood has driven down salaries, so that the majority of middle-class Indians are miserably poor, while education increases in cost, and prices rise.

4. INDIGENOUS INDUSTRIES

The huge wealth of India, gained by commerce as well as by internal trade in the past, depended far

less on her agriculture than on her industries. The valuable products of her looms drew in from other lands vast returns in gold, and she worked up her own raw materials. The influx of machine-made goods must inevitably have brought about widespread changes, but a system of Government which had sought India's prosperity instead of Britain's enrichment would have made possible a transition instead of a destruction.

For there are advantages in hand-looms that should not be overlooked; with short-stapled cotton, Dacca weavers produced "the same results as from the finest long-stapled cottons of America," and so fine was the yarn that 250 miles of it went to a pound of cotton (*Imp. Gazetteer*, iii, 201). An Indian, instead of a foreign, Government would have grouped these cottage-industries together, would have introduced co-operative societies—begun only when the industry was decaying—and thus have facilitated the transition, and have preserved what was valuable in the hand-industry. Indian weaving suits the climate better than foreign-made goods: the foreign silk cracks where folded; the foreign gold and silver thread tarnishes. India used to make her own, but in 1913-14 customs duty was paid on £302,778 sterling worth of gold thread imported. Foreign silks do not bear constant washing as do the Indian, nor do they last.

None the less, India brought into competition with western nations would probably, in any case, have had to establish machine industries. But when she began to take them up, and might have worked

up her own cotton instead of exporting raw cotton and importing foreign cloths, the English Government, to protect Lancashire mills, imposed an excise duty on Indian products to balance the customs duty on foreign goods, thus making an "equal" duel between the well-established British giant industries and the Indian infant ones. Of course, the Indian were unable to compete successfully, and meanwhile the hand-products, though of better quality, were beaten out of the market by the cheap foreign goods, and the industries decayed. Half the total production of raw cotton is exported, and another quarter goes out as yarn, leaving only one quarter to be worked up here at home; in 1903-4, 2,032,000,000 yards of foreign cotton cloth came into India, while she produced only 436,000,000 yards (*Imp. Gazetteer*, iii, 205).

There are but nine paper-mills in India; glass, for which the constituents abound, is not made, but in 1913-14 she paid customs duty on £699,246 sterling worth of glass beads and bangles for the wearing of her women; the beautiful vegetable dyes have been killed out by their coarse aniline rivals; oil-seeds are exported where they should be crushed and their oil utilised, no less than 1,608·25 lakhs of rupees worth being exported in 1903-4. For soap she paid customs duty on £500,400 sterling worth in 1913-14, where her own palm-oil might have been used. Cement, for which she has the materials, was imported to the value of £438,991 sterling, and candles £49,300.

Another industry for which her artisans are well fitted is the making of toys, of which £177,986 worth were imported. Yet the artistic toy-carving of Lucknow is dying, owing to foreign competition. In these few trades with the gold thread before mentioned, small manufacturers might have made £2,168,696 worth of goods, as valued for customs, realising from 30 to 50 per cent more in the market. Were India Self-governed these natural products would be manufactured and become a source of wealth, as in former days; now they are swept away by foreign merchants to be coined into wealth abroad, and she would herself make many of the articles imported by them. An Indian Government would place heavy duties on incoming products until the infant industries could hold their own; would advance loans, if necessary, for their establishment. But it is probable that Indian capital would no longer be "shy," if its employment were protected against the competition of well-established foreign firms, so that India, coming into contact with western methods, should not be "hustled" to death before she has time to secure a footing in the new ways. Even in the injury wrought by the war, the English Government has not helped to repair it, though, in one product, ground-nuts, the crop has been left to rot on the ground, where a little help in adapting crushing-mills might have started an industry that would have remained, and have created in India a manufacture which Germany had exploited for her own gain. Without a Government of her own,

India is ruthlessly exploited for the enrichment of Europe.

The Swadeshi (own country) movement, advocating the use of home-produced instead of foreign-produced articles, has done something to check the destruction of indigenous industries. When the Partition of Bengal caused the popular leaders, in 1905, to take it up as a means of arousing Great Britain, by menacing its trade, to a sense of the wrong inflicted, it practically saved the Bengal hand-loom weavers from their steady decline, and replaced them in a secure position. A simple and cheap mechanical device, applied to the ordinary loom, has multiplied tenfold the power of production. As Mr. Sarkar points out (p. 298) the ethical value of Swadeshi is also great, as enabling each person to make a sacrifice for the welfare of the Motherland, and as promoting the spirit of Nationality.

In considering all these questions it is necessary to remember that Indian conditions differ from those in the West. By long tradition, manual workers are trained on special lines, and cannot find work in a new trade if the old one fails them. Hence the law of supply and demand does not work as quickly here as in western Nations, and protection of infant industries is even more necessary than it was acknowledged to be by John Stuart Mill in new western countries. The heavy trade balance against India, the excess of exports over imports of some 24 crores of rupees annually, goes to pay her debts to Great Britain, to liquidate the annual drain,

and much of this is in the form of the raw material, which thus leaves her for no equivalent, but which, kept here, would increase her manufacturing wealth.

Germany, Japan, the United States, have built up great industries with Government help, and India would do the same, had she, like them, a Home Government, whose one aim was the prosperity of its people. Great Britain, naturally, looks first to British interests, and political parties in Great Britain calculate the effect of their Indian trade policy on the votes which determine the fate of Governments at Westminster.

5. PUBLIC WORKS

One of the most frequent complaints of Indian reformers turns on the comparative claims of railways, irrigation, education, sanitation, on the public funds. Government guarantees a minimum interest on capital invested in railways, capital which comes chiefly from abroad; a reserve is set aside to meet this interest, and is thus withdrawn from public use, instead of fertilising works sorely needed by the country. The total capital liability, on the railways classed as State railways, is given in the *Year Book* of 1914 at £334,500,085 sterling (p. 172). The total capital outlay on irrigation works up to the end of 1900-1 is given in the same book (p. 185) as 3,983·72 lakhs of rupees. But it will be easier to compare the relative expenditure if we take the annual charges, when we find in pounds sterling that railways in 1914-15 were put at 11·6 millions (capital)

reduced from 12 millions because of the war; this excludes ordinary expenditure and interest on debt. Irrigation was assigned 1·2 million, increased slightly; education 3·22 millions, and medical relief and sanitation 1·5 million. (These figures are from the Budget statement.) In 1913-14 the non-recurring grants for urban sanitation amounted to 150 lakhs —£1,000,000—distributed to the Local Government, and 13¾ lakhs were assigned for special schemes. Recurring grants amount to 45 lakhs annually—£300,000 (p. 510). Other grants are being made for research and other schemes totalling £319,400 recurring, and £2,366,666 non-recurring, and in some districts land cess is being assigned to this purpose. All money thus spent, though going too largely to European officers, is expended for the welfare of the country. In considering the relative returns to the State from railways and irrigation we find:

	1913-14	1914-15	1915-16
Railways	1·36%	0·53%	0·32%
Irrigation	5·87%	5·44%	5·30%

If we ask why the more profitable expenditure is not preferred, the only answer is that the railways profit English shareholders, while irrigation profits the people of the country.

Another reason why the expenditure on railways is less pleasing, may be said to be sentimental. The railway arrangements are made for the comfort of Europeans, and Indians of all ranks are discriminated against. This is most, but not exclusively, true as regards the huge bulk of the travelling population,

from whose payments dividends increase; these are extremely badly provided for, treated with brutal harshness, subjected to innumerable inconveniences and indignities, and shut out of decent arrangements at stations; the gentry, nobility, and princes are also excluded from station sleeping apartments—a night having sometimes to be spent in waiting—provided exclusively for a few Europeans only.

CHAPTER III

EDUCATION

"I BELIEVE, Sir, that it is the right and the duty of the State to provide means of education for the common people. This proposition seems to me to be implied in every definition that has ever yet been given of the functions of a Government. About the extent of those functions there has been much difference of opinion among ingenious men . . . The very narrowest sphere that ever was assigned to Governments by any school of political philosophy is quite wide enough for my purpose. On one point all the disputants are agreed. They unanimously acknowledge that it is the duty of every Government to take order for giving security to the persons and property of the members of the community.

"This being admitted, can it be denied that the education of the common people is a most effectual means of securing our persons and our property? Let Adam Smith answer that question for me; he says: 'The education of the poor, is a matter which deeply concerns the commonwealth. Just as the magistrate ought to interfere for the purpose of preventing the leprosy from spreading among the people, he ought to interfere for the purpose of

stopping the progress of the moral distempers which are inseparable from ignorance.'

" I say, therefore, that the education of the people is not only a means, but the best means, of attaining that which all allow to be a chief end of Government; and, if this be so, it passes my faculties to understand how any man can gravely contend that Government has nothing to do with the education of the people " (*Speeches of Lord Macaulay*, pp. 223, 225).

These were the words in which Macaulay pleaded in the House of Commons in 1847 for the first grant of £100,000 for the education of the people of England under the scheme of National Education proposed by the Committee of the Council on Education. The argument is as cogent for India in 1923 as it was for England in 1847.

Macaulay, in the same place, in 1833, had pleaded that India might be so governed as to enable her to rise to the English level of freedom and civilization, and had asked: " Are we to keep the people of India ignorant in order that we may keep them submissive? " (P. 78.) Coming to India, he carried out the principle he had pleaded for in Parliament, and in 1835 he, as the Legal Member of Council, and Member of the Council of Education, penned the celebrated Minute which, while showing a ludicrous ignorance of the value of Oriental literature, turned the scale in favour of English, as opposed to Oriental education, and was followed quickly by a Government Resolution, affirming the principle of establishing English education. Lord

William Bentinck's Government declared that " His Lordship in Council is of opinion that the great object of the British Government ought to be the promotion of European literature and science among the natives of India, and that all the funds appropriated for the purposes of education would be best employed on English education alone ".

There had long been in India a system of free education, carried on by learned men, both Hindū and Mussalmān, who were supported by the rulers and by gifts from the general body of householders. To centres of learning scholars flocked from all parts of the country, and were sheltered, fed, clothed, and taught. Still the tradition survives of education thus freely imparted, and the Indian boy asks for education as his right, insisting on it when refused. In addition to those innumerable centres of higher learning :

" Village schools were scattered over the country-side, in which a rudimentary education was given to the children of the trading classes, the petty landholders, and the well-to-do cultivators. . . . Seated under a tree or in the veranda of a hut, the children learned to trace the letters of the alphabet with their fingers in the sand, or recite in monotonous tones their spelling, or a multiplication table which extends far beyond the twelve-times-twelve of the English school-room.

" Simple mensuration and accounts and the writing of a letter are the highest accomplishments at which this primitive course of instruction aims " (*Imp. Gazetteer*, iv, 407, 408).

In the *Rāmāyana* it is stated that in the reign of Rāmachandra's father every person could read and write. Whether this be accurate or not, the idea of widespread elementary education is clearly familiar to the writer, and such education was imparted in the schools above mentioned. Adult education was carried on by the recitations of wandering Sannyāsins, round whom groups gathered at eventide under the village tree. Both these institutions survive down to the present day, but both are decaying away.

The first educational institutions under British rule were the Madrāsa for Muhammadans, founded by Warren Hastings in Calcutta in 1782, and a college for Hindūs in Benares, established by Jonathan Duncan in 1791. By the Charter Act of the E. I. Company in 1813, the Company were compelled to spend one lakh of rupees a year in encouraging indigenous learning and western science (this was entirely ignored), and in 1815 Lord Hastings expressed his wish to see a system of education introduced.

A struggle was then going on between the advocates of eastern and western learning. Rāma Mohan Rai, with his keen foresight, was at this time a powerful influence on the side of teaching English, and inspired the opening of a Hindū College in Calcutta in 1817 to instruct "the sons of Hindūs in the European and Asiatic languages and sciences". The Christian missionaries were divided in their educational work. Dr. Carey and others promoted vernacular education, and founded the

Serampore College, then in the Danish possessions, in 1818, openly for converting Indians to their faith, and in 1820 a College was founded in Calcutta, to train Christian youths "to preach among the heathen". But in 1830 Dr. Duff, again aided by Rāma Mohan Rai, opened a school to give "literary, scientific, and religious education through the medium of English," and thus gave a powerful impetus to its study, his belief being that Christianity would best spread through the knowledge of the English tongue. While it is true that English education owes much to Christian missionaries, it is also true that their main object has always been conversion rather than education, education as a means to conversion. The Indians, however, ignored the Christianity and took advantage of the education, which qualified them for the minor posts open to them as clerks in Government offices.

We must not omit to notice Mountstuart Elphinstone's Minute on Education, March, 1824, in which he urged the spreading of the knowledge of western science, but he wisely added the proviso that Indian literature should not be neglected :

"It would surely be a preposterous way of adding to the intellectual treasures of a Nation to begin by the destruction of its indigenous literature : and I cannot but think that the future attainments of the natives will be increased in extent as well as in variety by being, as it were, engrafted on their own previous knowledge, and imbued with their own original and peculiar character."

This generous wish to help the Indian Nation is very characteristic of the Englishmen who came to India at this time, men who looked forward to India's liberty—statesmen more than bureaucrats—and who saw in English education the training for the enjoyment of English liberty.

Outside these, the impetus towards English education was, on the Indian side, due to Rāma Mohan Rai and the group of men round him, the desire for it spreading in ever-widening circles; and, on the side of the Government:

"The very forcible reason that without some kind of organised training of Indians in English composition and ideas, the practical work of administration, which demands an ever-increasing number of clerical assistants to meet the needs of steadily accumulating office work, could never have been carried on" (*Indian Year-Book*, 1914, p. 212).

This imperative necessity for supplying large numbers of clerks and subordinate officials, if the British Government were to be carried on, imposed the direction taken by education, and it aimed at this supply, not at the training of classes able to assist in the material development of the country. The inherent defect of a foreign Government has come out strongly in education, the Government supplying its own needs, not the needs of the country, and thus leaving the great wealth-making enterprises to be initiated and managed by foreigners, instead of Indians. Technical, industrial, commercial education have all been neglected in favour of literary, and the scientific training was so

poor that, until lately, a man might become a B.Sc. without having touched a test-tube!

Literary education, however, designed to supply competent clerks and subordinate administrators, was seized upon by the great Brāhmana caste and turned to higher ends; they quickly began to assimilate the spirit of English literature, and to breathe with delight the air of liberty which permeates its noblest masterpieces; they studied with keenest interest the development of English institutions, and saw how Freedom

broadened down
From precedent to precedent.

The fascination exercised over these subtle and powerful brains by the legal profession was largely due to the fact that the history of law in England is a history of widening Freedom, and for constitutional reform the weapons are mainly legal. Indian judges have been the ablest advocates of Indian liberty, and the strength of the movement for Self-Government lies in the legal profession.

English education in India has thus been an education for the learned professions; Government has only since 1854 nibbled at elementary education for the masses, and has left them extraordinarily illiterate. It is elementary education for the masses which all Indian Reformers demand—universal, compulsory and free.

There are three streams of English education in India: the Government, the Missionary and the National. These affect only a "microscopic minority" of the population. The same three

agencies carry vernacular education to the lamentably small proportion of the population of school-going age which resorts to the primary schools. It is the extension of Government education to the remainder of the vast neglected majority, and the extension of the school period to at least six years, which are the crying needs of the day.

Before tracing the evolution of education further, we will just glance at its present position, so that the vastness of the problem to be solved may be realised.

The total population of India is 319,075,132, according to the *Indian Year-Book* of 1923, including the Indian Feudatory States comprising about 70,000,000 of this. But for educational purposes it is usual to take the whole population of India, 319,075,132, and subtract 3,000,000 for those whom the census-takers could not classify as to illiteracy or literacy, leaving a population of 316,075,132 as a basis. The *Indian Year-Book* gives the actual number of boys and girls in public and private institutions—primary, and high schools and colleges—at 8,377,027 (p. 463). The percentage of children of school-going age in the population must of course depend upon the period termed "school-going". From six years of age to fourteen is the school-going period in Germany and Austria; from five to thirteen in France. In England it is from five to fourteen, and from twelve to fourteen exemption may be had for cause shown. England and Wales have a population of 36,000,000, and have 6,000,000 of registered scholars. In India the

Government estimate is from six to twelve, yielding a school-going population of 15 per cent of the whole population. Out of this, 6,964,048 boys and 1,412,979 girls were in primary schools. The percentage of boys and girls in school out of the whole population is only 3·4 (p. 454). In America 18,000,000 out of 91,000,000 are in the elementary schools, one-fifth of the whole population, or 20 per cent; 390,881 boys were in high schools and 29,369 in colleges, while only 16,884 girls were in high schools and 279 in colleges. 3·4 of the population in 1923 is the outcome in numbers of the educational benefits bestowed by British rule in India. But education of the "microscopical minority," the graduate population, that is a benefit beyond all price, for it is the seed of Indian Self-Government.

At first, Government education was confined to those who sought it on English lines, and in 1854, after nearly twenty years, there were only 12,000 students in their schools. Sir Charles Wood, in this year, issued his famous Despatch, and Government Orders based on it established "Departments of Public Instruction intended to combat the ignorance of the people, which may be considered the greatest curse of the country". It also proposed the establishment of three universities, and those of Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras were incorporated by their respective Acts in 1857. "Grants-in-Aid" were initiated, and enabled many schools to be opened under private management. The Commission of 1882-3 (Sir W. Hunter, President), issued by Lord Ripon, that true friend of India, declared that

primary education was the part of the educational system which had "an almost exclusive claim on local funds set apart for education," and strove to encourage private enterprise.

But the Public Service Commission of 1886-7 made an unfortunate change in educational administration. It divided the Educational Department into: (*a*) an Imperial (or Indian) Educational Service, composed of graduates of universities in the United Kingdom *only*, with a maximum of Rs. 1,600 per mensem; (*b*) a Provincial Educational Service composed of Indians, the maximum pay Rs. 700 per mensem; (*c*) a Subordinate Provincial Service, with maximum Rs. 400 per mensem. This division has caused great discontent, as no Indian, however able, can pass into the higher service unless he has a British degree, and thus he can never rise beyond Rs. 700 a month, a salary which stamps his inferior position.

The expansion of education after 1882 was so great, that by 1901 Lord Curzon, then Viceroy of India, determined to check it, and for this purpose he called a Conference at Simla to consider Indian education, to which he invited Europeans only, and the deliberations of which were kept secret. The next step was that in 1902 another Commission—the Indian Universities' Commission—was constituted in a way that created much discontent and began its ill-omened work; little time was given to it; it did not publish the evidence recorded by it, and one of the two Indian members dissented from its findings. It was universally viewed by the

educated Indians as an English plot against higher education, and it had as its outcome the University Act of 1904, which reduces the Indian Universities to a mere Government department, and which was gallantly, but fruitlessly, opposed by Mr. Gokhale at each stage, despite Lord Curzon's anger and harsh rebukes. Mr. Gokhale complained that "it is not fair to the people of this country that the higher education of their children should be under the exclusive control of men who want to leave this country as soon as they can, and whose interest in it is, therefore, only temporary". He declared that the measure was reactionary, and "it is because we feel that this Bill is of a most retrograde character, and likely to prove injurious to the cause of higher education in the country, that we are unable to approve its provisions, and it is because I hold this view that I deem it my duty to resist this Bill to the utmost of my power".

His prognostications have proved true; the Indians are constantly opposed on all vital matters; the Senates were cut down, and four-fifths of their members were mere appointees of Government, thus depriving them of all independence, and lest any trace of it should appear, Government reserved the power to revise their list every five years.

Its results were lamentable: fees were raised so as to make education costly; private effort was discouraged; Government control increased; and higher education became a Government machine, in which examinations became more and more exacting, until in 1915 in Madras, the university has

rejected 90 per cent of the candidates going up from its recognised schools for admission, and 72 per cent of the candidates from its own colleges for the intermediate examination. And this despite the supposed greater efficiency in education, and the ruin of many schools "not up to the mark".

Lord Curzon's fatal policy in education, like his folly in Bengal, is driving India into angry hatred of the local Governments. Sir Valentine Chirol, who, of course, praises Lord Curzon, says that the increased stringency of the entrance examinations "had resulted in a healthy decrease in the number of matriculations, while the standard had been materially raised" (p. 232). Only where a foreign Government rules, which is opposed to the raising of the Nation out of ignorance, could there be rejoicing over the "healthy decrease" of matriculations. He proposes further raising of fees, in order to further still more the "healthy decrease".

Most primary schools are managed by local bodies, not directly by Government, and it is probable that no scheme of universal, free, and compulsory private education will be successfully launched until village councils (panchāyats) are everywhere re-established, and the village schools placed under their control. Every school should have a manual training annexe, where the village crafts should be taught by the craftsmen. The spreading of co-operative societies in villages is also helpful in this direction, and a few are beginning to make a small charge on their profits for education.

It is particularly with regard to education, as to industry, that Indian politicians feel need for Self-Government. They see that in Japan, within 40 years, the mass of the people are being educated, and compare Japan's educational progress under its own Government with the educational results in India under the British Government—3·4 of the whole population after 88 years. Japan has 5,000,000 pupils in her 27,000 primary schools, exclusive of all others. And her population is only 50,000,000; she has in her primary schools 10 per cent of her whole population.

As long ago as 1896, Mr. Gokhale compared education as provided by the British Government in Great Britain and as provided by the British Government in India. In Britain education is compulsory; every child must go. In India in 1894, only 12 per cent of the school-going age were in school. In Britain, it is free, though our last chapter showed the average income of the Britisher. In India a small percentage of free places is allowed in public schools, despite the poverty of the people. In Britain in 1895 out of less than 40,000,000, 32,000 persons were receiving university education; in India, 16,000 out of 230,000,000. Only 16,000!—and in 1910 Sir Valentine Chirol rejoices over a "healthy decrease" when it had risen (1909-10) to 22,920. Mr. Gokhale refers to the Despatch of 1854, "which the Education Commission rightly described as the great Charter of Indian Education," for it said: "In 1854 the education of the whole people of India was definitely accepted as a State duty," and this

was confirmed in 1859. The liberal policy suggested by Lord Ripon's Education Commission of 1882 was approved by his Government, which promised to consider any request for financial help from the Local Governments, but Lord Dufferin in 1886 followed a contrary policy, and asked Local Governments to decrease rather than increase their demands.

"If in England and the Colonies from ten to twenty per cent of the revenue raised by taxation returns to the people in the shape of education, why should we alone be asked," queries Mr. Gokhale, "to be satisfied with a pittance of less than two per cent?" "Education," he says solemnly, "is the sheet-anchor of the people's progress; and the expenditure incurred to educate the people will be found to be a source of strength, when the subsidies to the wild tribes and the demarcations of scientific frontiers are found to fail." (*Address to the Tenth Annual General Meeting of the Bombay Graduates' Association*, 1896.)

Mr. Gokhale, as a member of the Supreme Council, did his utmost to bring about compulsory education, and in 1910 he brought forward a resolution on the subject, and on receiving the promise from the Government, that they would consider the matter, he withdrew it. In 1911, he brought forward a Bill to "make better provision for the extension of elementary education," a Bill of a most cautious and moderate character, providing for the gradual introduction of compulsion, the abolition of school fees in the case of persons unable to pay, and

the very short period of four years—from six to ten—for education. He urged that:

"Even if the advantages of an elementary education be put no higher than a capacity to read and write, its universal diffusion is a matter of prime importance, for literacy is better than illiteracy any day, and the banishment of a whole people's illiteracy is no mean achievement. But elementary education for the mass of the people means something more than a mere capacity to read and write. It means for them a keener enjoyment of life and a more refined standard of living. It means the greater moral and economic efficiency of the individual. It means a higher level of intelligence for the whole community generally. He who reckons these advantages lightly may as well doubt the value of light or fresh air in the economy of human health. I think it is not unfair to say that one important test of the solicitude of a Government for the true well-being of its people is the extent to which, and the manner in which, it seeks to discharge its duty in the matter of mass education. And judged by this test, the Government of this country must wake up to its responsibilities much more than it has hitherto done, before it can take its proper place among the civilised Governments of the world."

Taking the figures of the census of 1901, he showed that only six per cent of the whole Indian population could read and write, while even Russia, the most backward European country, had twenty-five per cent. The percentage of the population in elementary schools was 1·9 (in 1923, 3·4), while in

Great Britain, Canada and Australia it was from twenty to seventeen. The Philippines came under American rule thirteen years before he was speaking, and the U.S.A. introduced there a system of education, and had six per cent of the population at school in thirteen years, while Britain after eighty years had two per cent. In Baroda, under Indian rule, primary instruction was made free and compulsory for boys between six and twelve, and girls between six and ten. In 1909 a percentage of 8·6 of the whole population was achieved, and of children of school-going age there were 79·6 per cent of boys at school against the 21·5 per cent in British India, and 47·6 per cent of girls against the British Indian percentage of 4. The Gaekwar was spending in 1909 6½d. per head for education against 1d. per head in British India. Is it wonderful, we may ask, under such conditions, that educated Indians would prefer to govern themselves?

The Council allowed the Bill to be introduced, and it was sent to the Local Governments, and circulated by them among Boards, etc., the bodies dominated by official opinion. On March 18, 1912, Mr. Gokhale moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, but the noble effort of the great patriot to educate his people was foredoomed to failure, and the Bill was rejected by 28 votes to 13.

More and more educated Indians are feeling that that which England, Japan, and Baroda have been doing, they could do for themselves if they were Self-Governing. That a foreign Government will

not do it for them they realise, for an educated Nation could not be kept in thrall.

As we have seen, Christian missionaries were among the earliest pioneers of English education, and they have played a great part in it ever since. They have given a sound secular education, but have done much harm to religion, not by conversion —for conversion among the educated classes is rare —but by turning their pupils into materialists to a serious extent. The wave of materialism which swept over India was due less to the purely secular Government institutions than to the missionary establishments, where the ancient religions were treated as superstitions, and the boys quickly added Christianity to the same category.

The civil danger of missionary education lies in the large number of aliens by whom it is carried on; Germans, French, Italians, Danes, Swiss, Americans, all take a hand in the education of Indian children—a condition of things neither dignified nor safe. They have been much favoured by the Christian Government, especially in South India, where they dominate the Senate of the University and the Education department, and obtain the most lavish grants of public money, when there are "no funds" for helping non-Christian institutions. Moreover the "efficiency" so rigorously enforced on the jealously-eyed "native" institutions is relaxed for the "Christian," and irregularities are winked at in their case which are seized on to injure the struggling schools under Indian control.

The National education carried on under Indian control has gradually created a new type of student, the equal intellectually of those educated in Government colleges, but with an earnest religious spirit joined to a patriotic backbone and a willingness to sacrifice himself for the Motherland, which is all his own. The older generation of Government students, in the nobler days of English education, showed the two latter qualities, but too often missed the first. The addition of religion gives the joyous optimism which marks the younger generation. We have seen the help given in the early days of Brāhmoism to education. The educational work of the Ārya Samāja has been magnificent; their Ḍayānanḍa Anglo-Veḍic College at Lahore is an institution based on the ordinary principles of English education, with the Ārya Samāja religious teaching and the study of Samskṛṭ, the Veḍas and Hinḍū literature added. Lālā Hansrāj, a brilliant young scholar, dedicated his life to it, and in 1886 the School Department was opened. It has since been conducted entirely by Hinḍūs; its fees have been about half those of the Government institutions: in 1913 it had 1,737 school and 903 college students, and it sends out into the public life a steady stream of sturdy Hinḍūs, enlightened, liberal, and devoted to the Motherland.

The Gurukula schools are on the old Hinḍū system; the boy is given over to his teacher after the sacred thread ceremony, and remains with him, apart from his family, till he is twenty-five years of age. How these young men will shape as they

come out into the world cannot yet be said. There are many other schools carried on, and the Samāja is a leader in girls' education, and has many schools for the depressed classes.

The Theosophical Society started and nurtured the Central Hiṇḍū College at Benares, a successful institution, in which Hiṇḍūism is an integral part of the education given. It has never taken any money from Government, but has depended wholly upon voluntary gifts. After fifteen years of independent life, being recognised as the leading National Hiṇḍū institution, it was handed over to the Hiṇḍū University, as the University College, thus expanding into fuller and larger life. The Society has founded several girls' schools as well as boys, in different parts of India, and the Theosophical Trust includes a college and some twenty schools. The Society has also a number of schools for the depressed classes, five in Madras and many in connection with its Lodges, and in Ceylon it has three Buḍḍhist colleges and 225 Buḍḍhist schools. Its members have instituted religious examinations, attended by thousands of children annually.

The Rāmakrishna Mission, we believe, has some schools for outcastes.

The Mussalmān College at Aligarh is another great Indian institution, though permitting rather more Government interference than the others, and the community has other scattered schools.

The first direct movement towards English education in point of time was taken by a business man in Madras Presidency, Pachaiyappa Mudaliar

employed by the East India Company. His life was a very brief one, but forty years, spent in the turmoil of the Anglo-French conflicts, from 1754 to 1794, but in that short span he started English education in India, leaving a part of his fortune to spread a knowledge of the English language, thus becoming the pioneer in that, until then, untrodden path. Out of that, the Hindū college and school, bearing his name, have grown up in Madras, and other schools at Conjiveram and Chidambaram, the trustees of "Pachaiyappa's Charities" controlling the largest high school and the largest secondary school in the Presidency, and a well-equipped college with 700 students. It has now developed into a residential college, to become, it is hoped, a South India University.

There are some National schools in different parts of the country, and a noble movement was started by the National Council for Education in Bengal. But continual Government opposition and suspicion made its way very rough, and it was deserted by some of its supporters, probably in consequence of Government pressure and police annoyance. It is now secure, thanks to the great benefaction of Sir Rash Behari Ghosh, its noble leader. The Ferguson College at Poona is a great educational institution, built up by much self-sacrifice and devotion.

Has English education caused disloyalty in India? Sir Valentine Chirol has no doubt of it. *The Times* has no doubt of it. Presumably Lord Curzon had no doubt of it, since the

Hon. Mr. Raleigh, in introducing the Universities Bill of 1904, said it had been a blessing and a curse, for we owed to it "the discontented B.A.'s," and the "great army of failed candidates who beset every avenue to subordinate employment". Mr. Gokhale pointed out in answer that Indians educated at Oxford and Cambridge came back even more discontented. He went on:

"The truth is that this so-called discontent is no more than a natural feeling of dissatisfaction with things as they are, when you have on one side a large and steadily growing educated class of children of the soil, and on the other a close and jealously-guarded monopoly of political power and high administrative office. This position was clearly perceived and frankly acknowledged by one of the greatest of Indian Viceroys—Lord Ripon—who, in addressing the University of Bombay in 1894, expressed himself as follows: 'I am very strongly impressed with the conviction that the spread of education, and especially of western culture, carried on as it is under the auspices of this and the other Indian universities, imposes new and special difficulties upon the Government of this country. It seems to me, I must confess, that it is little short of folly that we should throw open to increasing numbers the rich stores of western learning; that we should inspire them with European ideas, and bring them into the closest contact with English thought; and then that we should, as it were, pay no heed to the growth of those aspirations which we have ourselves called

forth. To my mind one of the most important, if it be also one of the most difficult, problems of the Indian Government in these days is how to afford such satisfaction to those aspirations and to those ambitions as may render the men who are animated by them the hearty advocates and the loyal supporters of the British Government.' My Lord, I think it is in the power of Government to convert these 'discontented B.A.'s' from cold critics into active allies by steadily associating them more and more with the administration of the country, and by making its tone more friendly to them and its tendencies more liberal. This, I think, is the only remedy for the evil complained of, and I am sure, there is none other."

The question must be faced. Lord Curzon's policy of "healthy decrease" has intensified the discontent. It can only be met in one of two ways: abolish education, and face a revolution; or spread education and establish Self-Government in India.

This is no new question. It was seen by Macaulay, and the second alternative was chosen by him. Speaking in the House of Commons in 1833, on the question of admitting Indians to high office in their native land, abolishing the colour bar, he said:

"Are we to keep the people of India ignorant in order that we may keep them submissive? Or do we think that we can give them knowledge without awakening ambition? Or do we mean to waken ambition and to provide it with no legitimate vent? Who will answer any of these questions in the

affirmative ? Yet one of them must be answered in the affirmative, by every person who maintains that we ought permanently to exclude the natives from high office. I have no fears. The path of duty is plain before us: and it is also the path of wisdom, of national prosperity, of national honour.

"The destinies of our Indian empire are covered with thick darkness. It is difficult to form any conjecture as to the fate reserved for a State which resembles no other in history, and which forms by itself a separate class of political phenomena. The laws which regulate its growth and its decay are still unknown to us. It may be that the public mind of India may expand under our system till it has outgrown that system ; that by good government we may educate our subjects into a capacity for better government ; that, having become instructed in European knowledge, they may, in some future age, demand European institutions. Whether such a day will ever come I know not. But never will I attempt to avert or to retard it. Whenever it comes, it will be the proudest day in English history. To have found a great people sunk in the lowest depths of slavery and superstition, to have so ruled them as to have made them desirous and capable of all the privileges of citizens, would indeed be a title to glory all our own. The sceptre may pass away from us. Unforeseen accidents may derange our most profound schemes of policy. Victory may be inconstant to our arms. But there are triumphs which are followed by no reverse. There is an empire exempt from all

natural causes of decay. Those triumphs are the pacific triumphs of reason over barbarism; that empire is the imperishable empire of our arts and our morals, our literature and our laws."

The day is here. But Macaulay is dead.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji is an educated Indian who became, and probably still is, very discontented. He remarked:

"We are made B.A.'s and M.A.'s and M.D.'s, etc., with the strange result that we are not yet considerded fit to teach our countrymen. We must yet have forced upon us, even in this (Education) Department, as in every other, every European that can be squeezed in" (p. 211).

Again:

"The introduction of English education, with its great, noble, elevating, and civilising literature and advanced science, will for ever remain a monument of good work done in India and a claim to gratitude upon the Indian people. This education has taught the highest political ideal of British citizenship, and raised in the hearts of educated Indians the hope and aspiration to be able to raise their countrymen to the same ideal citizenship. This hope and aspiration as their greatest good are at the bottom of all their present sincere and earnest loyalty, in spite of the disappointments, discouragements and despotism of a century and a half" (p. vi).

He writes to the India Office in 1880:

"The thousands that are being sent out by the universities every year find themselves in a most

anomalous position. There is no place for them in their Motherland . . . They may perish or do what they like or can, but scores of Europeans must go from this country to take up what belongs to them, and that in spite of every profession, for years and years past and up to the present day, of English statesmen, that they must govern India for India's good . . . The educated find themselves simply so many dummies, ornamented with the tinsel of school education, and with them their whole end and aim of life is ended. What must be the inevitable consequence ? "

Moreover, he quotes well-known Englishmen; Sir John Malcolm says (pp. 57, 58):

" If we do not use the knowledge we impart it will be employed against us . . . If these plans are not associated with the creation of duties that will employ the minds which we enlighten, we shall only prepare elements that will hasten the destruction of our Empire."

The Duke of Devonshire is very definite (pp. xi, xii):

" It is not wise to educate the people of India, to introduce among them your civilisation and your progress and your literature, and at the same time to tell them that they shall never have any chance of taking any part or share in the administration of the affairs of their country, except by getting rid in the first instance of their European rulers."

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji also points out that English education is unifying India, and that a sympathy of ideas and aspirations is developing

among the people; political union is the first fruit of the awakening, "as all feel alike their deprivation and the degradation and destruction of their country . . . Politics now engross their attention more and more" (p. 207).

On all sides it is now admitted that the loyalty of the educated classes to the Crown and the Empire in this hour of sore trial has been perfect. How is it then that education has at once made them deeply resentful and yet loyal? The answer is very simple. English Education has made them see the glory of English liberty, and they are passionately desirous of sharing it. English education has made them realise that they are the intellectual equals of Englishmen, and that even if they were not, they have exactly the same right to govern their own country as the Englishmen have to govern theirs. Hence English education has made them profoundly discontented with the autocracy of the Secretary of State, administered here by a haughty bureaucracy, whereof Macaulay said in prophetic words:

"God forbid that we should inflict on her the curse of the new caste, that we should send her a new breed of Brahmins, authorised to treat all the native population as Pariahs" (*Speeches*, p. 73).

But English education has also made them loyal, because they believe that the best realisation of their aspirations is becoming a Self-Governing unit in the Federal Empire of which Great Britain will be the centre, and because they thus desire, they are *fighting* for that Empire to-day.

CHAPTER IV

THE NATIONAL MOVEMENT

THE rising spirit of Indian aspiration, nourished on English education, could but inspire patriotism and desire for freedom. The movements dealt with in Chapter I, passing into education under National control, inevitably sought expression in concerted political action, and the editor of *The Indian Mirror*, writing in 1889, tells us—himself having been present—that a very successful Convention of the Theosophical Society at Adyar had been held in the Christmas week of 1884, and he proceeds (quoted in *The Theosophist*, September, 1889):

"The delegates who attended the Convention were most of them men who, socially and intellectually, are the leaders of the society in which they move in the different parts of the country. When the Convention closed, and the delegates broke up to return to their homes and to everyday work, a dozen or so of their number as well as a few Madras Hindū gentlemen met by private arrangement at the house of one of the best known and most esteemed citizens of Madras.

"The editor of *The Indian Mirror* was one of those who attended the Annual Convention of the Theosophical Society and the subsequent meetings at Madras, at which the first programme of the Congress was drafted and its organisation sketched out. Among those who were then appointed members of provisional committees were the following gentlemen:

"Hon. S. Subramania Iyer, M.R.Ry. P. Rangiah Naidu, and M.R.Ry. P. Ananda Charlu, Madras.

"Babu Norendranath Sen, Babu Surendranath Bannerji, and Babu M. Ghose, Calcutta.

"Hon. V. N. Mandlik, Hon. K. T. Telang, and Dadabhai Naoroji Esq., Bombay.

"Pandurang Gopal Esq., and M.R.Ry. Cuppuswami Vijiaranga Mudaliar, Poona.

"Babu Kasi Prasad, and Pandit Lashminaraya, N.W.P.

"Sardar Dyal Singh, Benares.

"Lālā Harischandra, Allahabad.

"Babu Charuchandra Mitter, Bengal.

"Lālā Sri Ram, M.A., B.L., Oudh."

The meeting was not held at the Headquarters of the Theosophical Society, as its President thought that would compromise the neutrality of the Society, but at the house of the famous Hindū patriot Dewān Bahādur Raghunath Rao. These provisional committees took up the matter of organisation, and it was decided in March, 1885, to hold a "Conference of the Indian National Union" in the Christmas week of that year. The meeting was to be held at Poona, but cholera broke

out a few days before the date of meeting, and it was decided to hold the Congress—the name decided on—in Bombay. There seventy-two representatives of the First National Congress met, sent up from all parts of the country to embody the claims of India as a Nation, and with them about another thirty devoted friends and supporters.

Babu W. C. Bannerji of Calcutta was the First President; he was proposed by the "Father of the Congress," Mr. A. O. Hume, seconded by the Hon. S. Subramania Iyer, supported by the Hon. K. T. Telang, and unanimously elected. In that meeting, held at noon on December 28, 1885, modern India became articulate, and from that day onward none could say that she consented to her own bondage. It was a remarkable assembly, including men whose names became household words: Dadabhai Naoroji, P. M. Mehta, D. E. Wacha, N. G. Chandravarkar, G. Subramania Aiyer, P. Ananda Charlu, Gangaprasad Varma, Norendranath Sen, Gopal Ganesh Agarkar, Sitaram H. Chiplonkar, P. Kesava Pillai—brave men and true, ready to face ridicule and official disapproval for their country's sake. Among friends were the Hon. Sir William Wedderburn, Ḍewān Bahādur R. Raghunath Rao, the Hon. M. G. Ranade, Professor R. G. Bhandarkar, and Lālā Baijanath. The President defined the objects of the Congress as:

"(a) The promotion of personal intimacy and friendship amongst all the more earnest workers in our country's cause in the parts of the Empire.

"(*b*) The eradication, by direct friendly personal intercourse, of all possible race, creed, or provincial prejudices amongst all lovers of our country, and the fuller development and consolidation of those sentiments of national unity that had their origin in their beloved Lord Ripon's ever memorable reign.

"(*c*) The authoritative record, after this has been carefully elicited by the fullest discussion, of the matured opinions of the educated classes in India on some of the more important and pressing of the social questions of the day.

"(*d*) The determination of the lines upon, and methods by, which during the next twelve months, it is desirable for native politicians to labour in the public interests."

It is interesting to note the nine resolutions with which the Congress began its great work. The first asked for a Royal Commission on Indian Administration; the second for the abolition of the Council of the Secretary of State; the third for reform of the Local Legislative Councils by the admission of elected members, the creation of Councils for the N.W.P. and Oudh, and the Panjāb, the submission to these Councils of budgets, the right of interpellation, the creation of a Standing Committee of the House of Commons to receive and consider protests; the fourth asked for simultaneous examinations. Then came two on military expenditure, and one against the annexation of Burma. The eighth directed the resolutions to be sent to political associations, and the last ordered that the next sitting of the "Indian National

Congress" should be held in Calcutta, on December 28, 1886.

The meeting created much stir, and the Bombay representative of *The Times* wrote on it, and remarked that "for the first time, perhaps, since the world began, India as a Nation met together". It noted that no one touched on the "question of their ability to govern themselves," and said that, while

"There was much crude talk, much of that haste which only makes delay, and that ignorance which demands premature concessions, there was also much of most noble aspiration and a sense of partiotism and national unity, which is a new departure in the races of theEast."

On this first meeting *The Times* commented:

"The first question which this series of resolutions will suggest is whether India is ripe for the transformation which they involve. If this can be answered in the affirmative, the days of English rule are numbered. If India can govern itself, our stay in the country is no longer called for. All we have to do is to preside over the construction of the new system and then to leave it to work."

The Times sees with a true prescience that, though nothing is said of Self-Government yet, such a Congress must go in that direction.

"To throw it (the Viceroy's Council) open to elected members, and to give minorities a statutable right to be heard before a Parliamentary Committee, would be an introduction of Home Rule

for India in about as troublesome a form as could be devised. Do what we will, the Government of India cannot be made constitutional. . . . The educated classes may find fault with their exclusion from full political rights: political privileges they can obtain in the degree in which they prove themselves deserving of them. But it was by force that India was won, and it is by force that India must be governed, in whatever hands the government of the country may be vested."

The second Congress, with Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji as President, was attended by 440 delegates, all elected, a great change from the first, and was representative of all parts of India, and the crowds of interested visitors amounted to thousands. It was noticeable for the introduction of a resolution appealing to the Government to allow Indians to volunteer, and Rāja Rampal passionately complained that the nature of Indians was being degraded, and that England was "systematically crushing out of us all martial spirit, and converting a race of soldiers and heroes into a timid flock of quill-driving sheep". If that were completed, he said, India would have reason to regret that she had ever had anything to do with England.

The Congress drew attention to the "increasing poverty of vast numbers of the population of India," and urged representative institutions to deal with it. Moulvi Syed Sharfuddin pointed out that "we want to be legislated for by people who have a real knowledge of our habits and customs; by people who understand us, who are of us, not by

foreigners and strangers, however good their will". The principles of such representation were carefully laid down. Another resolution touched a matter of constant grievance, and asked for the separation of judicial from executive functions. It was at this Congress that Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya first appeared, and carried the audience by storm.

The third Congress at Madras, under the presidency of Mr. Badruddin Tyabji, reiterated the resolutions of the second, but also asked that the higher grades of the Army might be opened to Indians and Military Colleges established, and that Indians might be allowed to possess and wear arms —modifying the Arms Act; Mr. Ali Muhammad Bhimji voiced the general feeling: "Who does not feel the degradation of not being allowed to become a volunteer? Who does not feel the humiliation of being debarred from the use and practice of arms?" Several speakers alluded to the value of Indians in the defence of the Empire that would accrue if their prayer were granted, should England ever be involved in a great war. That day has come, and the ungenerous policy of England has deprived her of help that would have ended the war in a few months; she has had a few who have battled gloriously, where she might have had millions, like Russia, which has always given commissions to the people of the countries she conquered. The Congress also asked for technical education and the encouragement of indigenous industries, and began the first tentative steps towards organisation, which culminated in the present Constitution,

sketched in 1907, and finally passed after various amendments in 1912.

It is impossible here to trace in detail the growth of this splendid National organisation, as it took up, year after year, the various political questions concerning the Nation's welfare. While regarding the "National Party" as interested in all questions touching National progress, it considered itself as only the "political organ" of that party, excluding all other questions which might divide, and uniting on one political platform all who desired the political enfranchisement of India. It is the standing proof of the power of initiation and organisation in Indians, most of all shown in the troublous years 1905 to 1910. Its growing strength roused against it all that was reactionary in India, the pride of the white race, the autocracy of Government, the whole strength of the bureaucracy. The Viceroy, the Marquis of Dufferin, made the most unwise speech against it, charging it with sedition, grossly misrepresenting its aims, and inventing the scornful phrase which became famous, of the "microscopical minority" of educated India. But Congress grew the stronger for the storm, and three millions of men took part in the election of the 1,500 delegates, of whom 1,248 attended the fourth Congress, held at Allahabad in 1888. The Congress year by year repeated its demand for representative institutions and the other points we have noted, and dealt with each great public question as it arose with rare ability and courage, as might be expected in an

assembly containing the intellectual flower of India.

The growing spirit of Nationality began to chafe, more and more, against the immobility of the governing class in India, and the indifference of Great Britain. The terrible famines of 1877, 1878, 1889, 1892, 1896-7, and 1899, and the appearance of plague in 1896 added urgency to the increasing poverty and the ever-growing indebtedness of the masses, and indignation grew vehement against the want of any adequate attempt to deal with the causes of distress. Educated India felt at once its duty to its own people and its helplessness to save them; and out of this, the sense of the need for representative, and ultimately for Self-Government, grew apace. The 1889 (fifth) Congress was notable for the presence of Charles Bradlaugh, M.P., who raised an immense enthusiasm, and who was appointed, with the consent of his own constituents, to bring in a Bill in the House of Commons, in India's name, as "Member for India," for giving representative character to the Councils.

At Poona the differences concerning method between the leaders of the National Party commenced to show themselves. Mr. Bāl Gangādhar Tilak, an intensely patriotic and ultra-orthodox Hinḍū, became, with Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal and Mr. Arabindo Ghose, leaders of a "new party," sometimes referred to as "the extremists". Mr. Tilak was willing to maintain the connection with Britain, if Self-Government were granted; whereas

his two colleagues tended to the view that the only salvation for India lay in totally repudiating any co-operation with the British. In holding this view they were much encouraged by the unfortunate advent of Lord Curzon as Viceroy, with his reactionary policy in education and his high-handed partition of Bengal. Another section followed the leadership of Mr. Justice Ranade, a man of rare ability and courage, with liberal and reforming views. The Moderates, headed by Mr. Surendranath Bannerji, Mr. Gokhale, Sir Pherozeshah Mehta, Mr. D. E. Wacha, and the great bulk of the Congressmen, who, while normally "His Majesty's Opposition," as they sometimes called themselves, were ready to co-operate with the Government where they agreed with the measures proposed. In a free country, the two parties would have represented the Liberals and the extreme Radicals of Britain; in a country ruled by the foreigner, their domestic variances were taken advantage of to maintain its subjugation. Lord Curzon's policy of aggravation, his repression of all the seething feelings he had provoked, his closing of all safety-valves, maddened the high-spirited populations of Bengal and Maharāshtra; violence was openly advocated.

But the real blame for that advocacy lay with Lord Curzon, who had initiated a veritable reign of terror; in 1903, Mr. Lal Mohan Ghose, as President of the Congress at Madras, had complained of the Russian legislation under which Indians were living, and he reminded the British Nation that while *lettres de*

cachet were abolished in France in 1789, they were practically instituted in India in 1818 and 1821, and were revived by Lord Curzon, so that the brothers Natu at Poona had been lately arrested and confined for a considerable period without any charge being made, or any trial. He spoke of the "Sedition Act of Draconian severity," and the prosecutions under it, and the Official Secrets Bill, which had made the most honoured feel unsafe. Even the *Englishman* spoke of the latter as a deliberate attempt to Russianise public affairs. Violence of the Government caused violence among the people, as it has done in other lands. England has used, and is still using, in India the violent methods of repression that she has ever condemned in other autocracies.

Things went from bad to worse, until Lord Curzon, having done his work, departed, and when the Congress met in its Twenty-first Session at Benares in 1905, all was dark; but it hoped for help from the newly-arrived Viceroy, Lord Minto, combined with the advent to power in Britain of the Liberal Party in that year, to heal the wounds made by Lord Curzon. The state of affairs brought about by Lord Curzon is graphically described in the official Congress Report of that year (pp. 2, 3):

"The Congress met at a great crisis in the political fortunes of this country. Never since the dark days of Lord Lytton's viceroyalty had India been so distracted, discontented, despondent; the victim of so many misfortunes, political and other; the target for so much scorn and calumny emanating

from the highest quarters—its most moderate demands ridiculed and scouted, its most reasonable prayers greeted with a stiff negative, its noblest aspirations spurned and denounced as pure mischief or solemn nonsense, its most cherished ideals hurled down from their pedestal and trodden under foot—never had the condition of India been more critical than it was during the second ill-starred administration of Lord Curzon. The Official Secrets Act was passed in the teeth of universal opposition. It was condemned by the whole Press—Indian and Anglo-Indian—protests from all quarters poured in, but Lord Curzon was implacable, and the Gagging Act was passed. Education was crippled and mutilated; it was made expensive and it was officialised; and so that most effective instrument for the enslavement of our National interest, the Indian Universities Act, was passed, and the policy of checking, if not altogether undoing, the noble work of Bentinck, Macaulay, and Halifax, which for more than half a century has been continued with such happy results to the country, came in full swing. In the matter of employment of Indians in the higher grades of the public service, Lord Curzon, after several years of cajoling and shufflings, evasions and mystifications, finding that his critics were too shrewd to be caught by fine phrases, was at last compelled to throw off his mask, and tell the educated Indians publicly, with that downright frankness which is the last refuge of a baffled Machiavellian, that the bar sinister of race was between them and the higher posts which they

coveted, that their hopes in that direction were vain and doomed to disappointment, and that in relying upon the Queen's Proclamation they were relying upon a broken reed. The secret circulars encouraging the employment, on a more extensive scale, of Eurasians and Christians at the expense of the other Indian communities also saw the light, and did much to shake public confidence in his outward professions. The unlucky Convocation Address raised the National temper to fever-heat, and the whole country was shocked and amazed. The whole Indian people, smarting under the afflictions of plague and famine, of broken pledges and repressive measures, rose as one man against the monstrous and studied insult flung with a high magisterial air, at everything that they loved and revered, at their religion, their literature, their social institutions—at the forces which shaped their past, the hopes which animate the present, the ideals which beckon them onward from a dim and distant future. Never in the whole course of the history of British rule in India was the highest representative of the Sovereign denounced so strongly, publicly, and universally, from one end of the country to the other, as was Lord Curzon for his unjust, unwise, and impolitic pronouncement."

This bitter denunciation voices accurately the hatred felt by educated India towards Lord Curzon. Of this Congress the Hon. Mr. Gopal Krishna Gokhale was President, and he declared that to find a parallel to Lord Curzon's administration it was necessary to go back to the times of Aurangzeb.

"The Indian's only business was to be governed, and it was a sacrilege on his part to have any other aspiration. In his scheme of things there was no room for the educated classes of the country." How bitter was the feeling aroused by the Partition of Bengal was shown by the words of this sane and cautious Reformer: after mentioning the men who had endeavoured to avert it, he declared: "If the opinions of even such men are to be brushed aside with contempt, if all Indians are to be treated as no better than dumb, driven cattle, if men, whom any other country would delight to honour, are to be thus made to realise the utter humiliation and helplessness of their position in their own, then all I can say is: 'Good-bye to all hope of co-operating in any way with the bureaucracy in the interests of the people.' I can conceive of no graver indictment of British rule than that such a state of things should be possible after a hundred years of that rule." When such words came from a Gokhale, it may be imagined how the hot, proud youth of Bengal felt the ruin of their Province. Mr. Gokhale went on to justify the use of the boycott of English goods as an extreme measure, necessary to force the wrong done to Bengal on the attention of Great Britain, and he declared:

"The domination of one race over another—especially when there is no great disparity between their intellectual endowments or their general civilisation, inflicts great injury on the subject race in a thousand insidious ways. On the moral side, the present situation is steadily destroying our

capacity for initiative and dwarfing us as men of action. On the material side, it has resulted in a fearful impoverishment of the people."

Mr. Surendranath Bannerji marked well the service Lord Curzon had done India by his tyranny:

"He has built better than he knew; he has laid broad and deep the foundations of our National life; he has stimulated those forces which contribute to the upbuilding of Nations; he has made us a Nation; and the most reactionary of the Indian Viceroys will go down to posterity as the architect of the Indian National life."

And really Lord Curzon was a blessing in disguise, for his oppression forced the Nation into resistance. The unhappy side was that the young men, many of them ruined for life by suspicion and injustice, and driven from school and college for a few hot words, had rushed into secret conspiracy and began to plan insurrection. Krishnavarma stimulated them from his safe European retreat, insinuated and at last openly advocated murder. The cruel ill-usage of Indians in South Africa added to the excitement, and when the Twenty-second Congress met in Calcutta in 1906, under the presidency of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, 20,000 people, including 500 ladies, met to voice their protest against the South African outrages, to justify boycott, to demand the reversal of the Partition of Bengal, to claim Self-Government and National Education.

Dr. Rash Behari Ghose, the great lawyer, complained of the prosecution of schoolboys, and the prohibition and violent dispersal of public

meetings, the shameful breaking-up by force of the Provincial Conference at Barisal, the Russian methods adopted by Englishmen; and he called on "the august Mother of free Nations, the friend of struggling Nationalities and of emancipation all over the world," to rise to the height of her duty. In his Presidential Speech, Mr. Naoroji claimed for the Indian the right of the citizen, and declared that India's claim "was comprised in one word, Self-Government, or Swarāj, like that of the United Kingdom, or the Colonies".

Things went hardly during 1907; riots broke out in Rāwalpindi; six men in high position were accused of inciting them; they lay in prison for six months while evidence was being manufactured, being refused bail, and on their trial they were triumphantly acquitted, the evidence being declared to be "suspicious, if not fabricated"; the Ārya Samāja came under suspicion; Lālā Lājpat Rai, a selfless and noble patriot, truly called "the idol of the Panjāb," was suspected, without any proof, of tampering with the loyalty of the Sikhs, and the wicked old ordinance of 1818 was used against him and others, the Russian ordinance which allowed deportation without trial; "eminent Indians have been seriously suspected and charged with the highest offences against the State, *viz.*, exciting sedition, rioting, and the like, in most cases without justification"; there were press prosecutions; young men were publicly flogged, some were condemned to hard labour; the people were furious that a Liberal Government, with a John Morley ruling India, should discredit all Liberal traditions,

break up public meetings, and pass a most arbitrary and tyrannical measure, the Seditious Meetings Act (November 1, 1907); the *Yugantar* openly preached murder, and when the editor was sent to gaol, there was a meeting of Bengal ladies to present his mother with a congratulatory address.

Naturally feeling ran high, and when the Congress met at Surat in 1907, on December 26th, the two parties which have already been mentioned, and which had been going further apart in these troubled years, broke out into violent opposition ; the sitting was suspended ; and when the Congress reassembled on the 27th, an organised attempt was made to break up the meeting ; the disorder was so great that the President, Dr. Rash Behari Ghose, declared the meeting adjourned.

Then came the prompt and statesmanlike action that saved the Congress. The President, with Sir Pherozeshah Mehta, Messrs. Surendranath Bannerji, D. E. Wacha, G. K. Gokhale, and others called a meeting of delegates for the next day : 900 attended, Dr. Rash Behari Ghose presided, Sir Pherozeshah Mehta, Mr. Surendranath Bannerji, Mr. Gokhale, and Lālā Lājpat Rai led the meeting, and a committee of 100 members was elected to draft a Constitution, meeting at Easter. Mr. Gokhale proposed the list, and it was seconded by Dewān Bahādur L. A. Govindaraghava and carried, and Sir Pherozeshah Mehta and Messrs. Gokhale and D. E. Wacha were elected Secretaries.

The Committee met at Allahabad on April 18th and 19th, 1908, and drafted a Constitution, which

was circulated. The Congress met at Madras in 1908, making the acceptance of constitutional methods the condition for admission, discussed and warmly welcomed the Reform proposals published on the 27th of November of that year, maintained its old position on all important measures, demanded the repeal of the deportation regulation, and the swift removal from the Statute Book of the Criminal Law Amendment Act and the Newspaper Prevention of Crimes Act, both passed that year, condemned the outrages that had occurred during the year, and demanded free and compulsory education. Since then the Congress has gone steadily on: the Constitution was worked under tentatively for two years, amendments being invited, sent up, and ordered by the Allahabad Congress of 1910 to be reported on by the sub-committee by October, 1911, and to be laid before the next Congress at Calcutta in that year; some further amendments were proposed at Bankipur in 1912, and then the Constitution and rules as amended were passed by that Congress.

Though the so-called "Extremists," or "New Party," have held aloof since 1907, the Nation recognises the Congress as embodying its will, and it is recognised by the Government also as the representative of the people, Lord Hardinge, receiving a deputation from it, and pointing out that its members could now bring before the Legislative Councils the measures they had advocated on the Congress platform.[1]

[1] The Congress of 1916, held at Lucknow, was noteworthy for the reunion of the differing sections, Mr. Tilak and

1908 saw the beginning of murderous outrages, the wild actions of young men, stirred up by inflammatory appeals, falling on hearts rendered furious by oppression, despairing of gaining liberty by constitutional means, and like all revolutionists, believing that crime ceased to be crime when committed for the sake of gaining freedom. In 1908 the first bomb was thrown by a young man who, as a boy of sixteen, had been expelled from school for refusing to salute the Lieutenant-Governor, and then refused admission to any other school—a cruel and extravagant punishment for boyish rudeness. He was caught hold of and used as a tool; threw the bomb into a carriage containing two ladies instead of, as he thought, a Government official; they were killed and he was hanged for the crime. Other murders followed, and panic spread among the officials—not unnaturally, few as they were among millions—and there was none strong enough to grasp the situation, to throw away Russian methods, and, by remedying wrong and giving liberty, pacify the angry people in the only sure way.

Lord Minto, left to himself, might have done it, for he was of the fairest and truest British type, but with a rampant bureaucracy here clamouring for coercion, and a timid and bewildered Secretary of State in England fearing a rebellion, he was forced

Mr. Chandra Pal both attending and supporting the resolution for Self-Government, thus marking the end of the Surat schism. The resolution represented the united demand of India—Muslim and Hindu.

into a compromise. Only his firmness saved the Indian Councils Act of 1909, which gave much that the Congress had demanded, though the clever manipulation of election and appointment gave the enlarged Councils a steady Government majority, though a technically "non-official" one, save in the Supreme Council, where it was nakedly and unashamedly official. The Congress of 1909, at Lahore, through the mouth of its President, the Hon. Pandit Madan Mohan Mālaviya, lamented the Regulations which had largely neutralised the original scheme of reform, had created separate electorates for Muhammadan but not for Hinḍū minorities, and had introduced other undesirable and unsound changes; as also the changes brought about in the Act itself in Parliament by Lord Curzon and Lord MacDonnell, the evil geniuses of Indian liberty.

The following year, 1910, was marked by the passing of another Press Act—still in force—which virtually places the Indian Press at the mercy of the Executive, enables the latter to check criticism, to demand ruinous security which can be forfeited at will, to confiscate presses, and thus to destroy any journal to which it objects. The supposed appeal to the law has proved to be delusive; the High Courts are powerless. No less than 208 prosecutions have taken place under this Act during 1910, '11, '12, '13, the highest figure, 77, being reached in 1913. The two leading Mussalmān papers, the *Comrade* and the *Zamindar*, have been prosecuted, the *Comrade* destroyed and the *Zamindar* kept under close supervision. Every Indian

editor lives under the sword of Damocles, for there is no rule of application save the whim of the particular official.

The result of the oppression is that criticism is tinged with bitterness, and resentment is universal. No good Government fears criticism, and the sensitiveness of the bureaucracy is the proof of its weakness. The whole of the Russian legislation should be repealed, all the fetters on press and meeting removed. The claim of the police to intrude without warrant into private houses, where political business meetings to which the public are not admitted are being held, should be stopped by the authorities, and these constant incitements to violent resistance should be put an end to. House-searches for objectionable literature, now made without reason and in the houses of respectable and well-known gentlemen, should be abolished; the Criminal Investigation Department should cease to send its officers to shadow well-known patriots, and confine its attention to criminals; the police should be taught that they are the servants of the people, not a force of mercenaries maintained by a foreign Government to coerce them, so that they may no longer be dreaded by the ignorant and detested by the educated.

The Acts that should be repealed at the close of the war, if the Government do not trust the people enough to repeal them now, are: the *lettres-de-cachet* system, embodied in Regulation III of 1818 (Bengal), Regulation II of 1819 (Madras), Regulation XXV of 1827 (Bombay), Act XXXIV of 1850, and

Act III of 1858. The State Offences Act, XI of 1857, only applying to any District that is or has been in a state of rebellion, and providing for trials of persons charged, should either be repealed, or the clause which excepts European-born natural subjects of the Crown should be expunged. The laws as to the Punitive Police—XXIV of 1859 (Madras) and V of 1861—should be repealed. So also the Indian Arms Act, XI of 1878, passed in panic under the influence of the Afghanistan War. It is not only felt as a constant humiliation, but it leaves the people at the mercy of armed dacoits and a prey to wild beasts. The Government can neither protect the people, nor will allow them to protect themselves. The whole group of panic legislation in 1907-1910 must go: the Prevention of Seditious Meetings Act, VI of 1907, making a meeting of more than twenty persons, even in a private house, a public meeting in a proclaimed area, and forbidding any public meeting without police permission—except Sheriffs' meetings and others specially exempted; forbidding any lecture, address, or speech likely to cause excitement, or on "any political subject"; the Press Laws, VII of 1908 and I of 1910, imposing securities and allowing forfeiture of presses under the most arbitrary conditions, the pretended safeguards having proved fallacious, and every newspaper being subjected to the interpretation of the Act by the Local Government—which lately, in Madras, warned certain papers for a letter from an Englishman in a discussion on servants' virtues and vices, in which both sides were printed:

the Explosive Substances Act, VI of 1908; the Criminal Law Amendment Act, XIV of 1908; the amendment of the Press Acts of 1867 and X of 1890 to a mere registration of books, if needed at all. Let the Government depend on the ordinary Criminal Procedure Code, and break these weapons unworthy of Britain. Let it meet the people frankly face to face and hear their grievances. Only when coercion is abolished, can a full and free discussion of the necessary changes be carried on.

This sketch would be incomplete, slight as it is, without a mention of the Servants of India Society, established by Mr. G. K. Gokhale on June 12, 1905, to "train men prepared to devote their lives to the cause of the country in a religious spirit". Three years' study and training are spent in the Society's Home in Poona, and two more as ordered, making a five years' probation. The promises are rigid:

"(*a*) That the country will always be first in his thoughts, and that he will give to her service the best that is in him.

"(*b*) That in serving the country, he will seek no personal advantage for himself.

"(*c*) That he will regard all Indians as brothers and will work for the advancement of all, without distinction of caste or creed.

"(*d*) That he will be content with such provision for himself and his family, if any, as the Society may be able to make, and will devote no part of his energies to earning money for himself.

"(*e*) That he will lead a pure personal life.

"(*f*) That he will engage in no personal quarrel with anyone.

"(*g*) That he will always keep in view the aims of the Society and watch over its interests with the utmost zeal, doing all he can to advance its work, and never doing anything inconsistent with its objects."

The members are not yet numerous, but they are a host in themselves, well trained in knowledge, utterly devoted. After Mr. Gokhale's passing away (February 19, 1915) the Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri was chosen as the head of the Society, and a better choice could not have been made.

The "New Party" under Mr. Tilak, the Left Wing of the National Party, has been much crippled by the prosecution of its leaders in the troubles provoked by Lord Curzon. The fear felt by the Government was shown by the terrible severity of the sentences passed, while a justification of their main contention—unhappily striven for by a minority by crime—as to the wrong done to them was given in the noble action of the King-Emperor and his Government at Delhi, which reunited the severed parts of Bengal and turned "sedition" into loyalty to the Crown.

Among the causes which have worked to make strong and to unify the National Movement has been the ill-treatment of Indians in the Colonies; the heroic Passive Resistance Crusade in South Africa, under Mr. Gandhi, stirred the whole Nation into passionate sympathy, and it was on the threshold of uprising in anger when Lord Hardinge, with

consummate tact and insight, put himself at its head, and voiced its demand, compelling its protest to be listened to, and with the aid of Mr. Gokhale and Mr. Gandhi bringing about a partial settlement which may be improved in the future.

Of the strength of the National Movement there is no doubt. It has purged itself of the excesses provoked by oppression, and its demand is clear and strong, the demand of a Nation that has reached self-consciousness, and that is determined to be free.

CHAPTER VI

SELF-GOVERNMENT

THE Government of India is an autocracy, vested in the Secretary of State, as representing the Crown; he goes in and out with party changes, but is not directly responsible to the House of Commons. The East India Company had powers vested in it by renewable charters, the last of which was passed in 1853. The two bodies wielding authority —the Directors of the Company and the Board of Control established in 1784 as the dominions of the Company grew, rendering necessary the first interference of Parliament in 1773—were swept away by the Government of India Act, 1858, by which the Government of India and the powers of the above two bodies were vested in the Crown; the change was announced in India on November 1st, 1858, by the Queen's Proclamation. The Company then ceased to have any authority in India, and was dissolved in 1874, after a chequered existence of 274 years.

The Charter Act of 1833—made for twenty years —was passed in a fortunate time, when Macaulay, then in the House of Commons, "was Secretary to the Board of Control, and James Mill, Bentham's

disciple, was the examiner of Indian correspondence at the India House" (p. 81).[1] In this debate was made Macaulay's famous speech, already quoted, referring to India becoming self-governing under Britain's guidance, and there was a very general view that that consummation was to shape Britain's policy. It was the era of statesmen administering a trust, not the era of bureaucrats, clinging to privileges and powers as against the interests of the people of the country.

The "Governor-General of India (instead of Bengal) in Council" was made the supreme authority and the Council consisted of three members, with a fourth member with limited powers, and four Presidencies—Bengal, Agra, Madras, and Bombay—were constituted, Madras and Bombay having Councils of two members only; these Council members received their appointments from the Secretary of State. The Presidency of Agra was never formed, the constituting of it being suspended by an enactment of 1835, but it was made, in 1836, a Lieutenant-Governorship without a Council; the long overdue granting of a Council—though the population numbers 48 millions—was proposed by the Secretary of State in 1914, and supported by the Supreme and Local Governments, but suspended by the action of Lords Curzon and MacDonnell in 1915, causing the strong agitation now going on in the

[1] Consult throughout Sir Courtenay Ilbert's *Government of India*, here quoted, ed. 1915. The statements, dates, etc., are based thereon, and the references, where not otherwise noted, are to its pages.

United Province (Agra and Oudh), and the formation of a League to obtain it. The important section of the Act, as leading towards Self-Government, and one eloquently pleaded for by Macaulay, was § 87, which declared that " No native of the said territories, nor any natural-born subject of His Majesty resident therein, shall, by reason only of his religion, place of birth, descent, colour, or any of them, be disabled from holding any place, office, or employment under the Company " (pp. 88, 89). The Charter Act of 1853 continued that of 1833, with additional provisions, and added to the Governor-General's Council, for " legislative purposes," seven additional members, including four representative members from Bengal, Madras, Bombay, and the North-Western (now United) Provinces. It also provided for a fourth Presidency and a second Lieutenant-Governorship, and an Act of the following year gave the Governor-General of India in Council power to take under his control any part of the Company's territories, appointing the necessary administrative officers. Under this, Chief Commissioners (a title recognised in 1870) have been appointed in various parts.

The Act of 1858 created the Secretary of State for India, with the India Council of fifteen members, whom he could overrule or ignore at pleasure. The Civil Service Examination was then established.

In the Proclamation of Queen Victoria, on taking over the rule of India, occurred the words which repeated in more admirable language the pledge of 1833; she said (quoted by Naoroji, p. v):

"We hold ourselves bound to the natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to all our other subjects, and these obligations, by the blessing of Almighty God, we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil.

"And it is our further will that, so far as may be, our subjects, of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified, by their education, ability, and integrity, duly to discharge.

"When, by the blessings of Providence, internal tranquillity shall be restored, it is our earnest desire to stimulate . . . and to administer its government for the benefit of all our subjects resident therein. In their prosperity will be our strength, in their contentment our security, and in their gratitude our best reward. And may the God of all power grant to us and to those in authority under us strength to carry out these our wishes for the good of our people."

Mr. Naoroji also quotes the following:

Lord Lytton, the Viceroy (on the assumption by Queen Victoria of the title of Empress, 1st January, 1877), at the Delhi Assemblage, said:

"But you, the natives of India, whatever your race and whatever your creed, have a recognised claim to share largely with your English fellow-subjects, according to your capacity for the task, in the administration of the country you inhabit. This claim is founded in the highest justice. It has been repeatedly affirmed by British and Indian statesmen

and by the legislation of the Imperial Parliament. It is recognised by the Government of India as binding on its honour, and consistent with all the aims of its policy."

Lord Lytton, as Chancellor of the Calcutta University, March, 1877, said:

"The Proclamation of the Queen contains solemn pledges, spontaneously given, and founded upon the highest justice."

Jubilee of 1887. The Queen-Empress, in reply to the Jubilee Address of Congratulation of the Bombay Municipal Corporation, said:

"Allusion is made to the Proclamation, issued on the occasion of my assumption of the direct government of India, as the charter of the liberties of the Princes and Peoples of India. It has always been and will be continued to be my earnest desire that the principles of that Proclamation should be unswervingly maintained."

These pledges have not yet been redeemed; they are admittedly treated as "scraps of paper". The Duke of Argyll (later Secretary of State for India), speaking in the House of Lords on March 11, 1869, said frankly:

"With regard, however, to the employment of natives in the government of their country, in the Covenanted Service, formerly of the Company, and now of the Crown, I must say that we have not fulfilled our duty, or the promises and engagements which we have made" (Naoroji, p. 46).

In the first National Congress, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji quoted the Report of five members of the

India Council, which, after quoting § 87 of the Act of 1833, said :

"It is obvious therefore that when the competitive system was adopted, it could not have been intended to exclude natives of India from the Civil Service of India.

"Practically, however, they are excluded. The law declares them eligible, but the difficulties opposed to a native leaving India and residing in England for a time, are so great that, as a general rule, it is almost impossible for a native successfully to compete at the periodical examinations held in England. Were this inequality removed, we should no longer be exposed to the charge of keeping a promise to the ear and breaking it to the hope" (*Report of First Congress*, p. 41).

Mr. G. Mukerji quoted a confidential minute of Lord Lytton referred to, Mr. Naoroji tells us, in the Despatch of the Government of India, May 2, 1878, the same Lord Lytton who is quoted above in his public utterances :

"The Act of Parliament is so undefined, and indefinite obligations on the part of the Government of India towards its native subjects are so obviously dangerous, that no sooner was the Act passed than the Government began to devise means for practically evading the fulfilment of it. Under the terms of the Act, which are studied and laid to heart by that increasing class of educated natives whose development the Government encourages, without being able to satisfy the aspirations of its existing members, every such native, if once admitted to

Government employment in posts previously reserved to the Covenanted Service, is entitled to expect and claim appointment in the fair course of promotion to the highest posts in that Service. We all know that these claims and expectations never can, or will, be fulfilled. We have had to choose between prohibiting them and cheating them; and we have chosen the least straightforward course. The application to Natives of the competitive examination system as conducted in England, and the recent reduction in the age at which candidates can compete, are all so many deliberate and transparent subterfuges for stultifying the Act and reducing it to a dead letter. Since I am writing confidentially, I do not hesitate to say that both the Governments of England and of India appear to me, up to the present moment, unable to answer satisfactorily the charge of having taken every means in their power of breaking to the heart the words of promise they have uttered to the ear" (*Ibid.*, pp. 48, 49).

After these frank confessions it is needless to labour the point further.

The Indian Councils Act, 1861, remodelled the Governor-General's Council, took away from it the power of interpellation and of discussing measures of the Executive, found inconvenient, and limited it "strictly to legislation" (p. 100). It gave expanded powers of legislation to the Governors of Madras and Bombay, who might nominate members "for legislative purposes," and similar nominated Legislative Councils were

established for Bengal, the North-West Provinces, and the Panjab.[1]

The Indian Councils Act, 1870, gave further powers to the Governor-General to overrule his Council, and, as quite truly said, the Councils were "a sham" and "a farce".

The Indian Councils Act, 1892, enlarged the number of members of the Indian Legislative Councils, and allowed discussion of the budget—not any power over it—and asking of questions under prescribed restrictions (p. 107).

A step forward was made in the direction of the reforms asked for by the National Congress, in 1909.

In 1906, Lord Minto, the Viceroy, drew up a Minute, pointing out that the growth of education demanded changes in the Government—the result prophesied by Macaulay and others—and appointed a Committee of his Council to consider "these novel conditions".

Sir William Hunter had foreseen these conditions when he said:

"I cannot believe that a people numbering one-sixth of the whole of the inhabitants of the globe, and whose aspirations have been nourished from

[1] The curious nomenclature may be a little puzzling to English readers. The Governor "in Council" means in his small Council, appointed by the Secretary of State, and this is now usually spoken of as the "Executive Council". It is practically his Cabinet. Then, Governors being allowed to nominate "additional members for legislative purposes only," these, with the Executive Council, make the "Legislative Council" in each Province.

their earliest youth on the strong food of English liberty, can be permanently denied a voice in the government of their country. I do not believe that races . . . into whom we have instilled the maxim of 'no taxation without representation' as a fundamental right of a people, can be permanently excluded from a share in the management of their finances." (Quoted by Naoroji, p. x.)

Sir John Malcolm says—following out the same line of thought:

"We are not warranted by the history of India, nor indeed by that of any other Nation in the world, in reckoning upon the possibility of preserving an Empire of such a magnitude by a system which excludes, as ours does, the natives from every station of high rank and honourable ambition. . . . If we do not use the knowledge which we impart, it will be employed against us. . . . If these plans are not associated with the creation of duties that will employ the minds which we enlighten, we shall only prepare elements that will hasten the destruction of our Empire. The moral evil to us does not thus stand alone. It carries with it its Nemesis, the seeds of the destruction of the Empire itself." (Quoted by Naoroji, p. xi.)

It was Lord Minto's supreme merit that he realised that the time foreseen by these men had come, and that, if the Empire were to last, it was necessary to enter on the path which would lead to Indian Self-Government. The results reached were sent to Lord Morley, Secretary of State for India, who expounded his views thereon in the House of

Lords on December 17, 1908. These caused the joy expressed by Congress in its session of that year. The Act embodying these views was introduced on February 17, 1909, and received the Royal Assent on May 25, with an amendment insisted on by the House of Lords, which compelled the Secretary of State, who was empowered to create an Executive Council for Provinces under Lieutenant-Governors, to submit the proposals to both Houses of Parliament. (It was this proviso which enabled Lords Curzon and MacDonnell to prevent the United Provinces from having an Executive Council in 1915.)

In 1907 two Indians had been placed on the India Council, and in March, 1909, Lord Morley had appointed the first Indian member, Mr. (now Sir) S. P. Sinha, to the Viceroy's Executive Council. One Indian was, later, appointed by the Secretary of State to each of the Executive Councils of Madras, Bombay, Bengal, and Bihar and Orissa.

The most important step in the direction of Self-Government in this Act was the introduction—so long demanded by the National Congress—of the principle of election into the Legislative Councils. The Act gave power to the authorities in India to frame Regulations, and these have largely taken away from its value, and were severely criticised in the National Congress of 1909. They were revised in 1912.

The majority in all the Legislative Councils, except that of the Viceroy, is nominally non-official; in the latter there is an official majority of 4. In the

Supreme Council 27 members are elected out of 68: in Madras, 21 out of 48; so also in Bombay; in Bengal 28 out of 53; in Bihar and Orissa 21 out of 44; in the United Provinces 21 out of 49; in the Panjāb 8 out of 26; in Burma 1 out of 17; in Assam 11 out of 25; in the Central Provinces 7 out of 25. In all cases the Viceroy, Governor, Lieutenant-Governor, or Chief Commissioner is also a voting member and has a casting vote—not often needed. Moreover, of elected members, to take one example, Madras: the Chamber of Commerce, all English, elects 1; the Trades' Association, nearly all English, elects 1; the Planting Community, all, or nearly all, English, elects 1; Landholders elect 5, and are very much influenced by the Government. The other electorates, Corporation (1), Municipalities and District Boards (9), University (1), are largely English, or appointed by English. The Muhammadans (2) are freeing themselves. It will be seen that patriotic members have a very "hard furrow to plough". Nominated members are, as a rule, more official than the official, though there are some very good ones, and the words a "non-official" majority are entirely misleading. We should always speak of the "elected minority".

The Province, under its Governor—or other Chief Officer—with his Legislative Council—is divided into Districts, with the District Magistrate, or Collector, at its head; in some Provinces, Districts are grouped into a Division, with the Commissioner as highest officer. District Boards and Municipalities—spoken of below—are practically their councils.

Below these come Taluq Boards (in Madras) and similar bodies in other Provinces. The lowest unit is the village, with its headman, accountant and watchman. The old Village Council, or Pañchāyaṭ, has been re-established in some Indian States by their Chiefs, with the happiest results, and some have been established voluntarily in British India and have proved successful. Their general establishment is one of the aims of reformers, as they form the natural basis for Self-Government, and are welcome to the villagers. Co-operative Pañchāyaṭs work well; Forest Pañchāyaṭs are being experimented with in Madras Province; Irrigation Pañchāyaṭs, proposed by Mr. M. Ramchandra Rao in the Madras Legislative Council, are looked on fairly favourably by the Government, and the Decentralisation Commission reports in favour of establishing a Village Pañchāyaṭ in every village.

The new Member for Education in the Viceroy's Council, the Hon. Sir C. Sankaran Nair, is an authority on the subject, and a Bill for their establishment is to be brought in, in the Madras Parliament—a local body for the discussion of political and social questions—by Mr. T. Rangachariar, and is to be made the basis for popular education on the subject.

The *Report of the Decentralisation Commission*, in Part III, chap. xviii, p. 236 *et seq.*, remarks that the "villages formerly possessed a large degree of local autonomy, since the native dynasties . . . regarded the village as a whole. . . . This autonomy has now disappeared. . . . Nevertheless, the village remains the first unit of administration; the

principal village functionaries—the headman, the accountant and the village watchman—are largely utilised and paid by Government, and there is still a certain amount of common village feeling and interests". In Madras Province there are nearly 400 "Local Fund Unions," administered by Pañchāyaṭs, the headman of each village in the Union being *ex officio* a member of the Pañchāyaṭ. The Commission is not in favour of these, but thinks it "most desirable" to constitute and develop village Pañchāyaṭs for the administration of local village affairs. The Pañchāyaṭ should be elected by the villagers, assembled in meeting, and be assigned definite functions (pp. 240-245).

The first Act creating Municipalities (outside Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay), if we omit a local permissive Bengal Act in 1842, was a general and permissive Act in 1850, allowing town Committees to be formed which might levy indirect taxes. After this many local Acts were passed, and many Municipalities formed; Lord Mayo's Government passed a resolution in 1870, which recommended the "development of Self-Government" and the "strengthening of municipal institutions," associating Indians and Europeans more in the administration of affairs. Twelve years later, Lord Ripon's love for India led him to make efforts to widen civic liberty, and in 1883-4 Acts were passed in which "a wide extension was given to the elective system," and committees were allowed to elect a private citizen as Chairman instead of an official (*Imp. Gazetteer*, p. 286 *et seq.*).

In 1906-7, there were in the whole of India only 19 towns with populations over 100,000, and 91 below 5,000. Between 5,000 and 100,000 there were 236, and between 10,000 and 100,000 there were 391. Altogether, India contained in 1906-7, 737 municipalities, 5 less than in 1900-1. Each of the three Presidency cities has its own Act; we are concerned with them only as regards Self-Government; in Bombay (1888), with 72 Councillors, there are 36 elected by Wards, 16 by justices, 2 by University Fellows, 2 by the Chamber of Commerce—56 in all—and 16 nominated by Government. Calcutta (1899) has 50 Commissioners, 25 of whom are elected by Wards, 4 are appointed by the Chamber of Commerce, 4 by the Trades' Association, 2 by the Port Trust, and 15 by Government. Madras (1904) has 36 Commissioners, 20 elected by Divisions, 3 by the Chamber of Commerce, 3 by the Trades' Association, 2 by bodies chosen by the Government and 8 appointed by it. Bombay elects its own President, but in Calcutta and Madras the Local Government appoints the Chairman.

District Municipalities Acts lay down the conditions for the towns in seven Provinces, and vary in their details. In Bombay half are elected, half appointed. In Calcutta two-thirds are elected; in Madras, "part" are elected and part appointed, the Governor in Council fixing the proportion and the election or appointment of the Chairman.[1]

[1] All the Acts now in force have been edited by Mr. P. Duraswami Aiyangar, in 2 vols., *The Law of Municipal Corporations in British India.*

District Boards in Madras, taken all together, have nearly one-half of their members elected, but they must be chosen from the members of the Sub-District, or Taluq Boards, and the members of the Taluq Boards were nominated until 1914, but are now elected. In Bombay at least things are better, for one-half of both Taluq and District Boards must be elected. In Bengal, half the members of the District Boards are elected by the Sub-District Boards, and in the more advanced districts two-thirds of the Sub-District Boards are elected, while in others they are nominated.

The Chairman of the District Board is nominated, and is generally the Collector (*Imp. Gazetteer*, p. 301).

We have here the material for a very practicable scheme of Self-Government, election being made universal and nomination done away with, save in very backward tracts, hill-tribe areas, and the like, the power to proclaim which might be left in the hands of the Governor's Cabinet in each Province.

The tentative scheme which has been put forward by the present writer as a basis for discussion, and which has aroused some enthusiasm, is in outline as follows:

Main Principle: That each person shall have a vote, but that universal suffrage shall be limited to the election of Councils exercising control over small areas where only simple questions arise; that as the area becomes more extensive, and the questions arising more complicated, the interests concerned larger and more interdependent, the problems to be solved more complex and further-reaching,

the electorates shall diminish in number, greater age and higher education being demanded as qualifications. The system suggested is one in which each has a voice, "with a share of the power of guidance over the things he (or she) understands, in which knowledge, experience, and high character shall be the credentials for power, and in which the area over which that power extends shall be proportioned to the development of these characteristics in the one who seeks to wield it".

1ST GRADE COUNCILS: Village (rural) and ward (urban) Pañchāyaṭs. *Electors*: All adults resident in the area, of sound mind, free from crime, age twenty-one and over. *Duties*: Civil and criminal jurisdiction over petty cases arising within the village; construction, maintenance, and control of the village school and attached workshops, the funds being chiefly supplied by the Provincial Parliament and assigned to the Pañchāyaṭ through the District Council, the Education Department in which would fix the curricula and inspect the schools of the District; sanitation; irrigation and wells; maintenance of roads within the village; lighting; tree-planting; club and readingroom; credit bank and co-operative society. Other functions will accrue—arrangements for games, amusements, discussions, lectures, etc. The Ward Councils would take up a similar class of duties, adding inspection of foodstuffs, of dairies and cowsheds, of wells and tanks, towns-scavengering, provision of stands for hired vehicles and carts, troughs for horses and cattle, and the like small municipal work.

2ND GRADE COUNCILS: Sub-District or Taluq Boards, and Municipalities below a certain population. *Electors*: The members of the Village Pañchāyaṭs in the Sub-District and Ward Councils, and men and women residing in the sub-district or ward, of the age of twenty-five and over, with education up to school-leaving level. Proportional representation desirable. *Duties*: The control of Secondary and High Schools; the establishment of model farms in the country and technical institutes in towns; the control of lighting, water-supply, canals and roads, where this part of the administration may be assigned to them by the District Boards; where Co-operative Societies are not established, they should hold agricultural machinery for hiring to villagers, establish granaries for storage of grain, dairy-farms with stud bulls to be hired to villagers, breeding-stables for horses, and generally they should organise industry, wherever individual capitalists or Co-operative Societies are not available. This side of their work, however, will be of late growth, as the people find it to their advantage to act collectively rather than individually.

3RD GRADE COUNCILS: District Boards in the country and Municipalities in towns over a certain population. *Electors*: The 2nd Grade Councils, and all men and women resident in the district or town over the age of thirty, and educated up to the Intermediate or other equivalent standard. All the business which concerns the whole district or town would be under their control; roads, local railways, colleges—agricultural, industrial, arts,

science, etc.—the assignment of the proportion of local taxation to be raised in the sub-divisions of the district, and so on.

4TH GRADE COUNCILS: The Provincial Parliament. *Electors*: The Councils of the 3rd Grade, and all men and women over thirty-five, resident in the Province and educated to the graduate level. *Duties*: The control of the Universities within the Province, and of all Provincial matters. All Provincial legislation would be its work; the levying of taxation, and the assignment of financial grants, of the levying of minor local taxes, the division of duties among the lower Councils, the whole of the administration of the Province and its relations with other Provinces and the Supreme National Government. The Cabinet of Ministers each with his own portfolio—education, law, home, agriculture, etc.—would be members elected to the Parliament and responsible to it. It is a moot point whether the Governor, appointed by the Crown should receive the resignation of a Ministry defeated as a whole in Parliament, according to the present party system, and should call on a leader of another party to form a new Cabinet, or should call on the Parliament to elect the Ministers holding portfolios, so doing away with the "party" system, and making each man responsible for his own portfolio only.

Provincial Autonomy would be complete, and the Provinces, including the Indian States, would form the United States of India, with a Federal Parliament, the National Parliament, above them. The

National Parliament would be elected by the Provincial Parliaments, and have its own Ministry, controlling national affairs, army, navy, railways, post, customs, etc. Some such Federation is necessary to meet the varieties of types, customs, development, and general conditions over the vast areas of India, and to unite it into one Nation.

By the National Parliament would be elected India's representatives in the Parliament of the Empire.

Such is a possible scheme of Self-Government, offered as a contribution to debate. It utilises existing materials, but replaces everywhere election by the people for selection by a Government.

I sum up this little book, which seeks to justify India as a Nation claiming her freedom, with an appeal I wrote in *New India*, a daily paper, at the close of some articles on Self-Government. It puts, as strongly as I can put it, India's appeal to England:

O English Nation! Great and free and proud. Cannot you see? Cannot you understand? Cannot you realise that your Indian brothers feel now as you would feel if a foreigner ruled in your land? That to be a stranger in your own country, an alien in your own land, with no rights save those given by grace of a Government not your own, your inferiority taken for granted, your capacities weighed in alien scales, and measured by the wand of another Nation —you could not bear such a state, such an outlook. India is patient, as you would not be. She does not

want to break the link; she wants to remain part of the Empire; but an equal part, a Self-Governing Community, standing on a level with the Self-Governing Dominions. Is this passionate longing, sedition? Is this ineradicable hope, treason? You dare not say so, you, who bred Hampden, and Sidney, and Milton; you, whose glory is your Freedom; you, who boast of your Empire as an Empire of the Free. Who dared to ask if you were fit for freedom? Charles I asked it. James II asked it. History records the answer that you gave.

What does India want? She wants everything that any other Nation may claim for itself. To be free in India, as the Englishman is free in England. To be governed by her own men, freely elected by herself. To make and unmake Ministries at her will. To carry arms; to have her own army, her own navy, her own volunteers. To levy her own taxes; to make her own budgets; to educate her own people; to irrigate her own lands; to mine her own ores; to mint her own coin; to be a Sovereign Nation within her own borders, acknowledging the paramount power of the Imperial Crown, and sending her sons to the Imperial Council. There is nothing to which any man can aspire in his own land from which the Indian must be shut out here.

A large claim, you say. Does the Englishman ask less for himself in England? If yes, what is there strange that an Indian should ask the same for himself in India? What is the radical difference between them, which should make an Indian *content* to be a thrall? It is not the "angle of vision" that

needs changing. It is the eye, purified from pride and prejudice, that can see clearly, and the heart, purged from arrogance, that can beat with healthy strokes.

England and India hand-in-hand. Yes, that is our hope, for the world's sake. But that it may be so, Justice must replace inequality; for India can never be at rest, till she is free.

APPENDIX I

PRIMARY POVERTY IN INDIA

From *New India*, January 23rd, 1917

DR. GILBERT SLATER and the Rev. D. G. M. Leith have done a useful service to the Indian poor in the investigation made as to the necessary expenses of a poor family of four members. Being two people approved by Government, their letter was published in *The Madras Mail*, and it will not therefore be regarded as the work of wicked agitators, intent on poisoning the minds of the people. The main point is: It costs As. 2-9 daily to feed a man in gaol, or Rs. 5-2-6 per month of 30 days. The writers knock off the Rs. 0-2-6 and put the man's food outside gaol at Rs. 5. The wife's food is put at Rs. 4, and that of two children at Rs. 2-8 each. Rent is put at Re. 1, as is fuel; clothing and miscellaneous at Re. 1. Total, Rs. 17. How many of the Madras labourers earn this sum? How many of the agricultural poor approach it? Rs. 17 per mensem means Rs. 204 a year. Divided among a family of four, it gives Rs. 51 per head per year. The average

income per head in India is Rs. 20. Comment is needless.

A Letter from Doctor Gilbert Slater and the Rev. D. G. M. Leith to the Editor of "The Madras Mail," of January 22nd, 1917

SIR,—A group for the study of social questions, which meets here under the auspices of the Triplicane Sociological Brotherhood, has been endeavouring to collect and interpret facts relating to the economic condition of various classes of wage-earners in Madras. It seemed desirable to have some standard by which to judge whether a family income were sufficient for the maintenance of physical efficiency. Such a standard has been worked out for York and for Belgium by Mr. Seebohm Rowntree, and by other enquirers for other places, and those families whose income falls below requisite amount are held to be in a condition of "primary poverty". Similarly, our circle desired to fix a standard to determine the limits of primary poverty in Madras.

We proceeded as follows. We took the prison diet for an adult male prisoner doing hard labour as a basis, and purchased in a bazar the commodities specified in such quantities as they are ordinarily purchased by manual workers. We then weighed out the purchases and made the necessary calculations to ascertain the money which the Madras worker must spend to get the same diet as in prison.

The result was as follows :

	Prison Daily Allowance. Oz.	Bazar Price. As.	Ps.
Flour (ragi, cholum or cumbu) ...	15	1	0
Rice	5	0	4½
Dhal	5	0	6⅛
Vegetable	6	0	6
Oil	½	0	2
Tamarind	½	0	½
Salt	¾	0	⅛
Curry powder	¼	0	1½
Onions	½	0	½
Total ...		2	9

A daily cost of 2 annas and 9 pies is equal to Rs.5-2-6 per month of 30 days. Allowing off the odd annas and pies, as the labourer might buy vegetables, say, a little more cheaply, we have left Rs. 5 as a reasonable allowance for food for a man doing manual labour.

We next consider the case of a family consisting of a man, wife and two children too young to earn. We estimated that as three years is the normal interval between births and children begin to earn very early, three children unable to contribute to the family income is the largest number that is at all frequent in wage-earning families, and that we might therefore take the family as above specified as a fair

average. We took a sort of average of the opinions of our members as to the proportion which normally subsists between the food consumed by a woman or child and that of a man, and for other necessary expenses, with the result that we allowed

	Rs.	A.	P.
For man, for food per month	5	0	0
For wife ,, ,, ...	4	0	0
For two children ,, ...	5	0	0
Rent (repairs, etc., and ground rent for a hut).	1	0	0
Clothing	0	8	0
Fuel	1	0	0
Miscellaneous	0	8	0
	17	0	0

The estimates for rent, clothing, and fuel were based on actual budgets collected by members of the circle from men of the working classes. It appeared that such an average family would be in a condition of primary poverty if the wages earned by the man and his wife fell below Rs. 17 per month. The question was discussed whether anything should be allowed for the wife's earnings, and, if so, how much? It was thought that under the actual conditions in Madras, the wife would have opportunities for earning some money without sacrificing the welfare of the children, and that earnings of four annas per day for about 24 days a month during eight months in the year might be estimated, which makes an average of Rs. 4 a month.

If this be so, then earnings of not less than Rs. 13 per month for the man are necessary to keep the family above the line of primary poverty.

Our circle would be very grateful for criticisms of the above calculations.

GILBERT SLATER

Triplicane D. G. M. LEITH

APPENDIX II

Extracts from Speech by the Secretary of State for India, in the House of Commons, 14th March, 1917

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. Chamberlain): The Army of India, before the War, consisted of 78,000 British troops, and 158,000 Indian troops, or a total of 236,000 men. In addition to these, there were 18,000 Imperial Service troops. That force was organised for a purpose not confined, of its own motion, by the Indian Government, but laid down after consultation with the Imperial Government at home, to discharge duties which it was then contemplated the Indian Army might be called upon to fulfil. The Indian Military Budget in the year before the War amounted to £20,000,000. This country has, under the Resolutions of the House, borne the extraordinary charges attendant upon the employment of Indian troops elsewhere. The Indian Military Budget for this year, instead of being £20,000,000, is £26,000,000. That additional £6,000,000 of expense is, I may say, almost entirely due, and directly due, to the circumstances of the present great War. What use has been made of

the Indian Forces, constituted as I have described, in the course of this struggle? Indian troops have fought, I think, in almost every theatre of the War —in France, in Egypt, at Aden, on the Suez Canal, in Gallipoli, in East Africa, and in West Africa.

HON. MEMBERS: Mesopotamia!

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Neither the House nor I am likely to forget that they have fought in Mesopotamia—nor will that Army! Let the House cast itself back to the anxiety felt in relation to our Army in France in the winter of 1914. Nearly one-third of the forces were drawn from India. They were the first of the oversea troops. The Indian Army provided the first defence of British East Africa, and repelled the first Turkish attack on the Suez Canal. The Army in Mesopotamia, which in the last few days has retrieved—how gloriously retrieved!—the check and misfortunes of our earlier operations, and which has struck a blow that resounds throughout the whole of the Eastern world, and not the Eastern world alone, is an Army which, from first to last, through all its sufferings, hardships, and disappointments—and in its triumphs!—is in the main an Indian Army based upon India. It is difficult when one reviews the deeds of the Indian Forces in this War to select for illustration any particular instance, but the House will not forget, and the country will not forget, such episodes as in France the recapture of Neuve Chapelle in October, 1914, by the 47th Sikhs and the 20th and 21st Companies of Sappers and Miners. The 47th Sikhs lost in that attack 178 out of 289 engaged;

and the Sappers and Miners lost 119 out of 300. They will not forget the attack of the Garhwal Brigade at Neuve Chapelle on 10th March, and I am sure the House will forgive me, on this occasion in particular, for referring to the actions—the glorious actions—of the Indian regiments in Gallipoli. Who is there who can read without emotion of the action of the 14th Sikhs at Cape Helles, when the supporting troops on the other side, unable to get to them, fought their way, and held on to the last, with the loss of nearly all their British and nearly all their Indian officers, and with a loss of 430 men out of 550 engaged? When a day or two afterwards the same ground was traversed again in a successful advance of our troops, the General who was in command has told me every Sikh had fallen facing his enemy, and most of them had one of their enemies under him. May I remind the House that on that occasion, fighting alongside them, were the Lancashire Fusiliers? No narrow spirit of sectional or racial jealousy animated either of them on that day, but one glorious emulation as to how best they might serve the Empire, how best they might do glory to it.

I am going to ask the House to listen to a brief summary of what the Indian Army has contributed. On the outbreak of War there were 530 of the Officers of the Army in India on leave in this country. They were made over to the War Office to help them to organise the New Armies, which it was necessary to create here. Before the close of last year over 2,600 British officers had been drawn

from India, apart from those who accompanied their units abroad, and the total number of British officers in India before the War broke out was less than 5,000. On the outbreak of War the Indian Army Reserve of Officers consisted of forty members. It comprises now over 2,200, of whom about 800 are on field service. Apart from the Indian Army Reserve of Officers, commissions have been given in the Indian Army to 271 cadets from Quetta and Wellington, where military schools corresponding to Sandhurst have been established since the War began. Of the rank and file—again, I say, I have not tried to get the very latest figures—the total British and Indian Forces which have gone on active service must approximate a figure of 350,000, and the Army, as I have reminded the House, before the War was 236,000. All the units of the Indian Forces have been kept well supplied with drafts, and, in order that that might be done, the establishments of the Cavalry regiments in India have been increased by 20 per cent, and the establishments of the Infantry regiments have been increased by 40 per cent. New units have been created, drawn not wholly from those classes or races which were recruited before the War; and in particular I note on this occasion—because I am anxious to correct a mistaken answer which I gave some months ago—that a company of Burma Pioneers was enlisted in consequence of the desire of the people to take their share in the great struggle. There is another experiment which has been made, which I am watching with the greatest interest and with earnest

hopes for its success. A Bengali double company has been created, and I hope it will justify its creation.

I leave the direct supply of combatant troops, and the House will not blame me if I spend a moment over the medical services. The medical arrangements of the Indian authorities, whether at home or abroad, have come under severe criticism, and this is not the occasion for me to offer any justification or any defence; but I want to tell the House in a few words what the Government of India did from the narrow resources—for, after all, they were narrow resources—at their disposition. Forty field ambulances, six clearing hospitals, thirty-five stationary hospitals, eighteen general hospitals, nine X-Ray sections, eight sanitary sections, seven advanced depots, and one general medical store depot have been sent on service overseas. The personnel provided for these units and other services amounts to 258 officers of the Royal Army Medical Corps, 704 officers of the Indian Medical Service, 40 lady nurses, 475 assistant surgeons, 854 sub-assistant surgeons, 720 British nursing orderlies, 2,840 Indian ranks, and nearly 20,000 Indian followers. In order to meet the heavy demands on the Indian Medical Service nearly 350 officers have been withdrawn from civil employment, and some 200 private practitioners and civil assistant surgeons have been given temporary commissions. In the subordinate branches, 205 assistant surgeons and 560 sub-assistant surgeons in various kinds of civil employment have been

released for military duty. May I say at once, whilst abstaining from any plea in defence of either the Secretary of State for India or the Government of India in connection with the military arrangements, that, as far as I know, all the testimony from everyone who has had experience concurs in this, the devotion and self-sacrifice of the officers of the Medical Service attached to the Expeditionary Forces have not been exceeded, and could not be exceeded, in this War? The House knows that this is not the last word of the Government of India on the subject. They have just made service compulsory for men of European birth and Anglo-Indians in India, and they have opened registers for Indians to volunteer for the defence of their own country.

I am afraid of wearying the House—[HON. MEMBERS: "No!"]—because a catalogue, even a catalogue of forces in battle, is apt to be monotonous; but no account of the effort of India would be complete, or pretend to be complete, which did not take account of the services of the Imperial Service Troops. The Imperial Service Troops have done, and are still doing, very valuable work in the different theatres of war, notably the Mysore Lancers and the Bikaner Camel Corps—a contingent recently increased at the special request of our army authorities—are serving in Egypt; the Kashmir Rifles, Jind Infantry, and Faridkot Sappers in East Africa, and the Maler Kotla Sappers in Mesopotamia. The Kashmir and Jind Durbars received a special message of congratulation from

General Smuts on the efficiency of their troops, and the Sirmur Sappers had the distinction of assisting in the gallant defence of Kut under General Townshend. I do not dwell upon the gifts of the Ruling Princes and Chiefs and the generosity of the people of India towards funds either for the direct supply of military necessities, or for the relief of the distress and suffering caused by the War. If I were to attempt to catalogue their gifts my speech would never end. They have shown unrivalled generosity. The House will have noticed the latest gift of all, that from His Highness the Nizam, of £100,000 to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to be used to combat the submarine campaign. They have given aeroplanes, which I saw described in a letter by an Indian the other day as "a heavenly catastrophe" against which our enemies could not stand up. They have given aeroplanes; they have given weapons and material of war; they have given ambulances, and they have given to the relief of the suffering. I must mention, in passing, the large miscellaneous personnel which has been supplied from India in connection with the Supply and Transport, or in connection with the railways which India has constructed or worked in East Africa, in Aden, and in Mesopotamia. I will just mention, and do no more, the Labour Corps which she has supplied for various theatres of war, and which are now, in response to the request of our military authorities, being recruited on a larger scale than hitherto. I mention, and I do no more, the great output of supplies for transport, including even from

the narrow resources of India, 300 motor and armoured lorries, cars, vans, mobile kitchens, and so forth.

It is not desirable that I should give particulars of the output of munitions of war, but as an illustration of what India has done in that respect, with her very narrow and limited resources, I may say that her output of small arms ammunition has been increased threefold, and her output of shells and cartridges for field-guns has been increased twelvefold. I could give other details, but that is sufficient to give the House some idea of the military contribution that India has made. I beg hon. Members to remember that India has no such resources to draw upon as we have, no such developed industries, no such masses of skilled labour for the supply of any machinery that may be required for the supply of many of the raw materials which can be obtained in this country. Having been accustomed to draw for the supply of her Army out of the markets of this country, when she was being urged to increase her efforts and was increasing them she was constantly held up because this country, from the greater needs of the other theatres of war at the moment, could not supply from our resources the deficiencies of hers.

I ask the House to remember that whilst all this effort of India has been made under all these difficulties, they are not the only difficulties or anxieties which have confronted the rulers of India. I speak in this matter quite as much for my Noble Friend who preceded me at the India Office as for

myself, and quite as much for the late Viceroy as for the present; indeed, even more so, for the anxieties were greater in the early days than they have been at any time since. Some day, when the archives give up their secrets, the widespread character of German plots against this Empire will be made known. There was no field which offered the least chance of success which the Germans did not try to exploit, and they confidently counted upon India as a promising theatre for their operations. I cannot speak of the information we have in any detail now, but it is enough if I say that it was such as necessarily caused anxiety to the Government of India. I may remind the House that early in 1915 emigrants returning from the Pacific Coast who had been exposed to German and other seditious and anarchical influences, carried sedition into India itself. The Government of India had its own difficulties to face even in the midst of this great War. It had its own responsibilities for the peace and well-being of the populations under its control, and it had to take care—in fact, it was its duty to take care—that in doing everything it could to help the Empire, it did not so strip the resources of India that these nefarious projects could not be dealt with. I am glad to say that the efforts of the Government of India were seconded by the Princes, the Chiefs, and the peoples of India, and nothing is more satisfactory than the fact that when these emigrants, poisoned with seditious teaching, returned to India to spread the plague in districts which they thought were ripe for it, it was the peasants of the villages who

turned against them and supported the Government, from which they derived justice, liberty and peace.

The House must remember that it is not only the internal security of India but also the frontier security, which must be a constant preoccupation of the Indian Government, and while it was making these efforts in the comparatively early months of the War, the Indian frontier was subject to six or seven eruptions of the untamed tribes of the frontier, such as in other times, when no such events were in progress, would have filled the columns of our newspapers, and would have occupied public attention here. All these attempts to break the peace of India and of the frontier were resisted, and successfully resisted, by the forces on the frontier. I think the House will agree that having regard to those responsibilities, and to their means of making these efforts, the military effort of the Government and peoples of India has been no mean contribution to the success of the Empire in this War.

Very briefly I would just like to say that my review of the contribution of India to the War is not complete, and it cannot be complete without some mention of the aid rendered by India in producing and supplying for our needs products, raw or manufactured, which were of vital importance to us. Her mineral resources have been of first-class consequence to the War. Take a single instance, that of the wolfram mines of Burma. Before the War the whole output was 1,700 tons, and that went to Germany. The exports now are at a rate equalling half of the pre-War production

of the whole world, and they do not go to Germany, except in such a form as we should all wish. Then there is manganese ore, saltpetre, mica, shellac, jute bags, raw jute, tanning materials, wool, army blankets, oil seeds, wheat, rice, and forage. All these things we have drawn from India, and all these India has contributed to help the Empire in its struggle. The list of commodities is a long one, and it has recently been calculated that the value of the Indian exports of direct National importance is over £3,000,000 a month, a figure which may reach or even exceed £5,000,000 during the season of heavy wheat shipments. The significance of these figures will be appreciated when it is stated that the total value of Indian exports to all destinations is, roughly, £12,000,000 a month, and to this country £4,000,000.

The adjustment of trade to meet the necessities of the War has led to the adoption in India of elaborate resources of State control, not merely in regulating the destination of exports and in providing transport facilities, but in direct State purchase, in fixing prices, in ensuring that adequate supplies are forthcoming and in stimulating production. To meet all these needs no single course of action has sufficed. We have employed different means almost as numerous as the commodities themselves. It may, however, be stated broadly that three guiding principles have been observed. The existing agencies of trade have been utilised; the existing channels of trade have been followed wherever possible; and in regulating the prices, the aim has been on the one

hand to meet the demands of His Majesty's Government and the Allies at reasonable rates, and on the other hand to secure a reasonable profit to the Indian producer, so that while profiteering is prevented producing is stimulated. That concludes my review of the general contribution of India to the War.

INDEX

BIBLIOGRAPHY

HISTORY

TITLE	AUTHOR	PUBLISHER	DATE
"RULERS OF INDIA" SERIES *Edited by Sir William Wilson Hunter*			
The Marquess Cornwallis	W. S. Seton Karr	Clarendon Press, Oxford	1890
Mountstuart Elphinstone	J. S. Cotton	do.	1892
The Earl of Mayo	Sir William Wilson Hunter	do	1892
The Marquess of Hastings	Major Ross of Bladensburg, C. B.	do.	1893
The Earl of Auckland	Capt. L. J. Trotter	do.	1893
The Marquess Wellesley	Rev. W. H. Hutton	do.	1893
The Struggle between the Mahrattas and the Mogals	Mukund Wamanrao Barway	Printed at Tattva-Vive-Chaka Press, Bombay	1914
The Rise of the Marāthā Power	Justice M. G. Ranade	Punalekar & Co., Girgaum, Bombay	1900

TITLE	AUTHOR	PUBLISHER	DATE
A Brief History of the Indian People	W. W. Hunter	Morrison & Gibb, Edinburgh	1881
The Indian Empire: Its People, History and Products	Sir William Wilson Hunter	W. H. Allen & Co., Ltd., London	1893
Travels and Travellers in India, A.D. 1400—1700	Edward Farlay Oaten	Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., London	1909
Progress of the Madras Presidency during the last forty years of British Administration	Dewân Bahadur S. Srinivasa Raghavaiyangar	Printed by the Supt., Govt. Press, Madras	1893
India. Forty years of progress and reform; being a sketch of the life and times of Behramji M. Malabari	R. P. Kasakaria	Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press, Warehouse, London, E. C.	1896
India and Her People	Swâmi Abhedânand	The Vedânta Society, New York	1906
The Ârya Samâj—An account of its aims, doctrine and activities with a biographical sketch of the Founder	Lajpat Rai	Longmans, Green & Co.	1915
A History of Civilisation of Ancient India (based on Samskṛt literature) in 2 Vols. (2000 to 320 B.C.) and (320 B.C. to A.D. 1000)	Romesh Chandra Dutt	Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd.	1893

TITLE	AUTHOR	PUBLISHER	DATE
An essay on the Civilisation of India, China and Japan	G. Lowes Dickinson	J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd.	1914
Tavernier's Travels in India (originally published in French in 1676)	Jean Baptiste Tavernier	Bangabasi Office, Calcutta	1905
Voyages	Francois Bernier	Paul Marret, Amsterdam	1699
Early History of India, including Alexander's Campaigns	Vincent A. Smith	Clarendon Press, Oxford	1908
History of Indian Shipping and Maritime Activity from the earliest times	Radhakumud Mookerji	Longmans, Green & Co., London	1912
The Fundamental Unity of India	do.	do.	1914
Critical and Historical Essays in 2 Vols.	Lord Macaulay	Longmans, Green, Longman Roberts & Green, London	1864
Speeches	do.	do.	1863
ECONOMICS			
The Economic History of British India	Romesh Dutt	Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd.	1902
Famines and Land Assessments in India	do.	do.	1900
India in the Victorian Age: An Economic History of the People	do.	do.	1904

TITLE	AUTHOR	PUBLISHER	DATE
Indian Trade, Manufactures and Finance	Romesh Dutt	E. Press, Calcutta	1905
Prosperous British India · A revelation from official records	William Digby	T. Fisher Unwin, London	1901
Indian Finance	Henry Fawcett	Macmillan & Co., Republished from *The Nineteenth Century*	1880
Some Economic Aspects of British Rule in India	G. Subramania Iyer	Swadesamitran Press, Madras	1903
Elements of Indian Taxation	Leonard Alston, Litt. D.	Macmillan & Co.	1910
Sketches of Indian Economics	R. Palit	Ganesh & Co., Madras	1910
Poverty and Un-British Rule in India	Dadabhai Naoroji	Swan Sonnenschein & Co.	1901
Four papers on Commerce and Statistics	D. E. Wacha	D. B. Taraporewalla & Sons, Bombay	1915
The Bankruptcy of India: An inquiry into the administration of India under the Crown	H. M. Hyndman	Swan Sonnenschein-Lowrey & Co, London	1886
Economics of British India	J. S. Sarkar	M. C. Sarkar & Sons, Calcutta	1913
ADMINISTRATION			
The Indian Municipality: Some practical hints on its everyday Work	H. T. S. Forest	Thacker Spink & Co.	1909

TITLE	AUTHOR	PUBLISHER	DATE
The Law of Municipal Corporations in British India (in 2 Vols.)	P. Durâiswami Aiyangar	Printed at the Guardian Press, Madras	1913
The Administration of India 1859 to 1868, in 2 Vols.	I. Thomas Prichard	Macmillan & Co.	1869
Modern India: A Sketch of the System of Civil Government	George Campbell	John Murray	1852
The Government of India: Being a Digest of the Statute Law	Sir Courtenay Ilbert	Clarendon Press, Oxford	1915
Suggestions for the better governing of India	Sir F. S. P. Lely	Alston Rivers, Ltd., London	1906
India for the Indians—and for England	William Digby	Talbot Bros., London, E.C.	1885
Manual of the Administration of the Madras Presidency, in 3 Vols.		Printed at the Government Press, Madras	1885 & 1893

THE IMPERIAL GAZETTEER OF INDIA

The Indian Empire Descriptive Vol. I. Historical Vol. II. Economics Vol. III. Administration Vol. IV.	Published under the Authority of His Majesty's Secretary of State for India in Council	Clarendon Press, Oxford	1907 & 1908

BLUE-BOOKS

TITLE	PUBLISHER	DATE
Statement Exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India during the year 1911-12 and the nine preceding years	Printed under the Authority of His Majesty's Stationery Office by Eyre and Spottiswoode, Ltd., London, E.C.	1913
Statement Exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India during the year 1912-13	do.	1914
Statistical Abstract relating to British India from 1903-04 to 1912-13	do.	1915
Report of the Royal Commission upon Decentralisation in India	Printed for His Majesty's Stationery Office by Darling & Son, Ltd.	1909
Government of Madras Local and Municipal Department No. 734	..	.
Report on the working of the Local Boards and Union Panchāyats in the Presidency of Madras for the year 1913-14	Issued by the Secretary to the Government of Madras	Jan. 1915
Government of Madras Local and Municipal Department G.O. Nos. 199, 200, M.	..	Feb. 1915