Volume 1 Book-2

Voices of Indian Freedom Movement

J. C. JOHARI

VOICES OF INDIAN FREEDOM MOVEMENT

VOICES OF INDIAN FREEDOM MOVEMENT

(VOICE OF NASCENT AND RESURGENT NATIONALISM)

VOLUME I

(Book 2)

Edited and Annotated by

J.C. JOHARI

M.A., LL.B., Ph.D.

AKASHDEEP PUBLISHING HOUSE

New Delhi (India)

1993

AKASHDEEP PUBLISHING HOUSE
4374/4B, Ansari Road
Daryaganj, New Delhi-110 002

PRINTED IN INDIA

Published by Akashdeep Publishing House, New Delhi-110002
and Printed at J.R. Printers, Delhi.

6

DINSHAW E. WACHA

[D.E. Wacha (1844-1936) is regarded as one of the venerable patriarchs of the Indian National Congress. His scathing attack on military expenditure, poverty of the country, excise policy, salt tax, frontier policy and currency question made him so popular that he was also known as the 'Firebrand of Bombay'. His expressions at the first session of Congress held at Bombay in December, 1885 was lauded as the 'first of many great speeches'. He acted as he Joint General Secretary of the Congress since 1895 and had the chance to preside over the seventeenth session held at Calcutta in 1901 that, in the words of Pattabhi Sitaramayya, was so 'marvellous', that 'it should only be read and cannot be quoted'. His brilliant evidence before the Welby Commission (Royal Commission or Expenditure) was widely appreciated. He dubbed the Government of India as merely the registrar of the ukases of 'the Great Autocrat (Secretary for State of India) for the time being at Westminster' and had no reservations in condemning British rule in the name of 'State-regulated immorality in India'. He maintained his intimate touch with the Congress liberals that enabled the British Government to regard him as its one of the esteemed confidants.]

ENGLAND'S FINANCIAL RELATIONS WITH INDIA*

"Our Indian Government in its best state will be a grievance .....It is an arduous thing to plead against the abuse of a power which originates from our own country, and which affects those we are used to consider as strangers."—BURKE.

*A paper written in response to the request made in August, 1903 by the Editor, *Financial News* (Bombay) for insertion in its Jubilee Number.

"It was a superficial view of the relations of England with India to say that there is no direct immediate connexion between the finances of India and those of England. Depend upon it if the credit of India should become disordered, if some great exertion should become necessary, then the credit of England must be brought forward to its support, and the collateral and the indirect effect of disorders in Indian finances would be felt extensively in this country."

—SIR ROBERT PEEL.

"You should not remain longer under the delusion that you have nothing to do with Indian finance. Sir Robert Peel, in 1842, with great sagacity, repudiated the idea that the British tax-payer and the British citizen had no interest in the state of the Indian account."

—W.E. GLADSTONE.

"It is idle any longer to distinguish between English and Indian finance ..... It will be idle ..... if the Exchequer in India is empty to pretend that the revenue of India alone is liable."

—B. DISRAELI.

"The great body of the people in India have, as we all know, no control in any way over the Government. Neither is there any independent English opinion that has any control over the Government, the only opinions being those of the Government itself or those of the Military and Civil Services, chiefly the latter. They are not the payers of the taxes: and, therefore, the Government in India is in the most unfortunate position possible for the fulfilment of the great duties that must devolve upon every wire and just Government,"

—JOHN BRIGHT.

"When the Government of India was transferred from the Company to the Crown many safeguards for economy were swept away, and the substitutes which took their place have proved to be comparatively ineffective.

—PROF. FAWCETT.

"Indian finance has again and again been sacrificed to the exigencies of English estimates."—SAMUEL LAING.

If there be one subject more than another on which the well-informed and fair-minded section of the great British nation may justly be said to be in full accord at present with the views of the Indian people it is undoubtedly the subject of England's financial relations with India. The problem which still awaits solution is not new. Attention has been drawn to it by British statesmen of the front rank from time

to time during the last fifty years and upwards. From the quotations cited at the head of this paper, it will be learned how far Peel and Gladstone and Bright and Fawcett were alive to the responsibilities of Great Britain in its financial relations with India. It is, however, a matter of profound regret that despite warnings from responsible statesmen, publicists, and other persons in deep sympathy with India, and desirous of seeing financial justice rendered to its voiceless people, no satisfactory solution of this difficult question has been yet arrived at. Whatever may have been the iniquities perpetrated by the East India Company, they are condoned and forgotten. With the assumption of the sovereignty of India by the Crown, it was expected that the old, fallacious and unsound methods of finance would be swept away, that the change would ordain a new policy which shall be every way just to India and redound to the honour of England. But during the very first ten years after 1858, two important events occurred which clearly showed how Indian finance was sacrificed to the exigencies of British estimates. There was the threatened invasion of the French Colonels is 1859 which alarmed England. The reserve of 22,000 men at the depot in Woolwich was exultingly pointed out by the publicists of the day. These congratulated the nation on having at its disposal such a body of trained troops but forgetting to point out the ugly fact that their cost was thrown on the revenues of India. Again, in 1868, the entire cost of the Abyssinian War was sought to be foisted on the Indian treasury, in face of the fact that the expedition of Lord Napier against King Theodore arose out of a difference between the British and that Sovereign, and that India had no interest whatsoever in that enterprise.

Between 1837 and 1856 poor India had to undergo the heavy sacrifice of a hundred millions sterling on account of the First Afghan War, the three Chinese Wars, the Burmese and the Persian Wars for which India in no way was partially or wholly responsible. The fact was that England made the war and India paid for it. That was the grievous financial injustice perpetrated during the days of John Company. But the transfer of the Crown in 1858 seemed to have wrought no

change as was fondly anticipated. We have just pointed out the two instances of financial injustice to which India was subjected during the first ten years after that important event. Those two instances conclusively demonstrated the fact that though there was a change of masters, there was no change in the financial policy of India's rulers. No wonder that the Mr. Samuel Laing, who succeeded Mr. Wilson as Finance Minister of India in 1862, declared that India was the "milch cow of England." The milch cow is being continually put into requisition whenever the exigencies of British estimates demand. There is no limit to what have been properly called "misappropriations" of Indian revenue. There is the cost (say half a million pound) of the palatial India Office buildings. There is the cost of the establishment of the Secretary of State for India in Council, say £240,000. It is pointed out that the revenues of the Colonies are never appropriated for the accommodation of the Colonial Office and the maintenance of its establishment. India alone is subjected to that peculiar treatment. The other misspropriations lie in the maintenance of Aden and in the cost of the embassies in different parts of Asia. There was the famous ball to the Sultan. But all these and other minor charges thrown on the revenues of India are nothing in comparison with the continuous inroads of the War Office. The encroachments of that authority have been not numerous but devoid of any justice whatever. Nine-tenths of the unjust charges have been the theme of deliberation by several departmental Committees who, it is needless to say, have almost always been baffled in getting anything like a satisfactory settlement. The Army Amalgamation Scheme of 1859 is at the root of this crying injustice against which India has been inveighing these many years.

India, a poor country, was made a joint partner with England, a most wealthy country, in matters military in the teeth of the opinion of many an Indian Military expert. The fact was conclusively proved before the Select Parliamentary Committee on Indian finance which sat between 1871 and 1874. There was not a more judicially-minded and capable

member of the Committee than the late Professor Fawcett whose strenuous advocacy of India her people still cherish with feelings of gratitude, as much as that of John Bright. Mr. Fawcett declared that "it will be necessary fundamentally to change the present military system and to undo a great part of the work which was done, when under the auspices of Lord Palmerston's Government and in spite of the remonstrance of every Indian statesman of experience the Army Amalgamation Scheme was carried out and India was compulsorily made a partner in all the costly military arrangements of England." Unfortunately, the results of the measure have been most disastrous to Indian finance. The wealthy partner has by her sheer might dragged the poor, whenever occasion required, to save her own estimates, into an acquiescence of her own costly projects, irrespective of their suitability or unsuitability, and irrespective of the financial ability of the weaker of the two, and that even without ever so much as consulting her responsible agents. From 1878 to date the Indian Government has in its many public despatches protested against this one-sided and prejudicial treatment. The full bearings of the mischief were pointed out by Sir Edwin Collen, on behalf of that authority before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure in 1896-7. In one of the despatches that Government feelingly observed as follows: "Millions of money have been spent on increasing the army in India, on armaments and fortification, to provide for the security of India, not against domestic enemies or to prevent the incursions of warlike people of adjoining countries, but to maintain the supremacy of British power in the East. The scope of all these great and costly measures reaches far beyond Indian limits and the policy which dictates them is an Imperial policy. We claim, therefore, that in the maintenance of the British forces in this country just and even liberal views should be taken of the charges which should legitimately be made against Indian revenue. The people of India, who have no voice in the matter, should not be able to complain that an excessive military tribute is demanded from the revenues of this country, while, on her side, England with whom rests the final decision, should be able to show that this settlement has been effected

in a spirit of justice and consideration to India."

This growth of military expenditure to which India has to submit without *if* or *but* may be best seen from the following figures :—

1864.	Army Charges	14·50 Crore	Rupees.
1884.	,,	17.40	,,
1902.	,,	25.75	,,

This is an appalling increase of nearly 80 per cent. Rich England may think nothing of it ; but to improverished India it is indeed most oppressive. The Welby Commission, by an official majority, recommended an appropriation of £234,000 per annum from the British Treasury in relief of so heavy an army cost. But while on the one hand the majority allowed the miserable dole, though disagreed to by Mr. Buchanan and the minority, consisting of Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. Dadabhoy Naoroji and the late Mr. Caine, who were for England sharing a moiety of the whole army charges, there was on the other hand the fresh burden £786,000 on Indian revenues in connection with the increased pay of the British soldiers. The Government of India made out a strong case against its imposition but, as is well-known, the Secretary of State gave away all the strong points of the case before the arbitrator, the Lord Chief Justice of England. There could not have been a more grievous miscarriage of justice and a graver dereliction of duty than this on the part of Lod George Hamilton. India to a man bitterly cried out against it. But let a curtain be dropped over this latest sample of injustice by the very authority charged with protecting Indian interest. To crown all there was the other day that shameful attempt to saddle on the same unhappy country the cost of that precious South African Army Corps which the evil genius of Mr. Broderick suggested and to which the thoughtless and unsympathetic Lord George Hamilton gave his ready assent.

It will be perceived from the above facts how there has been going on a continuous struggle between the Government of India and the British War Office since 1882, when Lord Ripon

successfully contended and recovered a fair part of the cost of the Indian troops sent to Egypt, and how the Welby Commission has partially tried to repair the financial injustice entailed on India. But it is superfluous to state that India is not at all satisfied with the adjudication of the latter body. Indians, however, have rest contended with the accomplished fact in the hope that what has been conceded is an earnest only of that full and fair justice for which they have been agitating these many years. Meanwhile they are not disposed to relax their efforts in that direction. They are bent on continuing their agitation, seeing that at no time within the past twenty years was the prospect of obtaining full justice more hopeful than at present. Two recent events have greatly encouraged them. Firstly, the way in which the nation condemned that mean attempt to debit the Indian revenue with the charges (£ 7,000) of entertaining the Indian Princes and guests invited to attend the Coronation Ceremony of His Majesty the King. Secondly, the well directed criticism on the question of the South African Army Corps as expressed in the House of Commons, and at the public meeting promoted by Sir William Wedderburn, at which Sir Charles Dilke presided and at which Lord Welby, the late Chairman of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, took an active part. The effect of these criticisms cannot be overrated. The British mind has now fairly awakened to a sense of its responsibility. There is also the hope that though Parliament, owing to its many pressing domestic affairs, including the Irish Question, has for years relegated its sacred trust to Providence, the time is fast approaching when it will have once more to resume its Trusteeship and exercise its power and authority over Indian finances so as to prevent those raids on the Indian Exchequer against which India is loudly and bitterly complaining. Parliament must take the necessary steps to remove permanently all causes which are now operating as a great financial injustice to India. It is considered a serious reproach to Parliament that a revenue of well high 115 crores or 76 million pounds of the greatest Dependency of England should be voted away, in a couple of hours, almost on the very last day of its session, before empty benches, without check or control or any respon-

sibility whatever ! It is a grave dereliction of its duty as Trustee to allow the vessel of Indian finance to drift as it has been allowed to, rudderless and compassless, these many years past. Indian earnestly hope that as soon as the present pressing domestic questions are settled Parliament will actively take on hand the Indians financial problem, both in its fiscal and economic aspects, and exercise its healthy and salutary control. They hope that no more "misappropriations" will be allowed and that absolute justice, on a sure and permanent basis, will be secured to India in her financial relation with England. That basis is hardly to be found in the recommendations of the Welby Commission as whittled down by the Secretary of State. But it can be discovered in the recommendations of the report made by the minority of that commission which takes a far-sighted and broad-minded view of what should be the just financial relations. The fundamental principle to be carefully observed is that British rule should be one of justice and righteousness for the benefit of both countries and not for the benefit of Great Britain alone for achieving this essential object. It is highly desirable that some reasonable consideration should be given to the capacity of each to sustain the financial burdens, England being very rich and India very poor. The cost of the European agency, on behalf of India, wherever employed, should be divided half and half between India and the Imperial Exchequer. Thus, as the minority wisely observes, "the British tax-payer would equally with the Indian tax-payer, become interested in checking the excessive employment of costly imported agency, and a useful spirit of inquiry would be aroused in this country with reference to the efficiency and economy of Indian administration." Next, India ought not to be called upon to bear the heavy financial strain of maintaining 75,000 British troops. All through the late war in South Africa, it was demonstrated to the hilt that India could well afford to safeguard herself with 15,000 less troops. Under the circumstance a reduction of 20,000 troops in times of peace might be easily arranged. India does not object to their being quartered in the country. But these should be deemed as a reserved force for Great Britain to be sent abroad at any moment where Imperial interests demand. And, of course,

equity dictates that the revenues of India should be relieved of their entire charges. In fact as the minority recommends "they should be treated as part of the reserve force of the Eastern portion of the British Empire generally, and borne in future upon the British army estimates in that capacity." India's financial relations with England will be deemed to rest on a sound footing only when the two broad recommendations set forth above are carried out in their integrity. And it is on these two points that the attention of Parliament and the British people should be continuously concentrated.

SOME REFLECTIONS ON EDUCATION IN INDIA*

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,

Layman as I am, it is with the utmost diffidence that I venture to stand before you this afternoon and give expression to a few stray reflections which have from time to time occurred to me during the last few years while ruminating on the system of Education which has been in vogue in the country for upwards of fifty years past. It may be taken for granted that similar reflections have occurred to the minds of many others every way better qualified and more competent than myself. I have not the least doubt that there is in the country a large body of practical experts, Indians of course, who have bestowed much thought on our system of State-managed Education. These are the right and proper persons to lay their finger on its weak spots, point out the defects, show the way for their removal, and suggest such reforms as may be deemed most suited to our present environments. I earnestly hope, therefore, that in its laudable desire to promote the cause of Education on sound and progressive lines, the Bombay Graduates' Association will strive during its next active session to secure for its public lectures experts of the character just

*A lecture delivered before the Graduates' Association, Bombay, on 10 November, 1906.

referred to. Among the many distinguished alumni, of whom our University boasts, I can safely say, that there are not a few whom the persuasive eloquence of the Association's trinity of Secretaries, so active and so earnest, could easily prevail upon to emerge from their scholastic seclusion, give the public the benefit of their practical experience and suggest the needed reforms. Surely, the University which gave us in the past two such brilliant men—alas ! too prematurely gone to their last resting place—as the late Mr. Telang and Mr. Ranade, and which is still proud of two equally brilliant scholars as Sir Pherozeshah M. Mehta and the Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale, has in her rank many whose interest in the intellectual progress of the country could be actively aroused for the purpose. I have only to point out in this place the laudable example of Sir Pherozeshah himself who, I am happy to say, is the presiding and directing genius of the Graduates' Association. I do not know if there are in this room even a dozen persons who are aware of the fact of that gentleman having made his first debut in public life by reading a scholarly, and withal practical, paper on Education in London, at the early age of twenty-two. It is indeed a paper as remarkable for its ability as for the writer's precocity of intellect. It displays, even when read at this day, some thirty-nine years after its first delivery, a breadth of view, a liberality of sentiments, and a practical sagacity which tell us at once how the youthful mind of Mr. Mehta was working at that early age, and how well it had grasped the ideals of Education. Surely with such a bright example before them, our latter-day University Graduates in the academic line, ought not to be shy and backward in publicly giving out the thoughts they have thought out in their scholastic retirement on the merits and demerits of the existing system of education in India.

I think, gentlemen, we are all agreed with those modern sociologists, who declare that for the moral and material well being of a people the fundamental requisite is Education in the broadest sense of the word. To say that it is the most important problem of our social welfare is only to repeat a platitude. But we all recognise the fact that this Twentieth

Century of ours has held before us ideals of Education which are not a little different from those which the civilised world entertained half a century ago. During that eventful period there was slowly but steadily to be witnessed a disintegration of the old ideas and the old to system imparting education, from the elementary to higher. There has been going on a silent process of rationalism in every branch of human knowledge and activity. Arts, industries, manufactures, religion, literature, science, indeed everything which advances the moral and material welfare of our common humanity,—all these have been influenced by free thought as distinguished from the previous condition of unquestioning obedience to authority. Free-thinking has weakened respect for authority. For every theory and every dogma which was blindly accepted before it demands reasoned truth. It is only conclusions founded on such truth that are now acceptable. Thus rationalism pervades all branches of human affairs, and the more it firmly keeps each such branch under its inexorable grip, the more the older ideas and ideals seem to crumble and decay. On their debris are founded entirely newer ideals which, it is needless to say, are now slowly revolutionising all human society and its manifold activities. Thus it is that this new intellectualism of the age is influencing mankind and compelling attention to newer ideals which our latest thinkers have formulated, are formulating. The men of deep thought are now kindling a new spark and imparting to human knowledge a new light and a new truth, the beneficent consequences of which will be fully discerned by and by in every walk of life. That this new thought is already moulding the intellectual destiny of our modern world by means of education cannot be gainsaid. The modern educational reformer, in other words, the new school-master, is abroad. He is fast crystallising in the West those new ideals which he thinks should be practically carried out in national education. As yet we only perceive the first faint glimmerings of them. It is the dim dawn of the new bright educational day which is in store for posterity. For one thing it is now generally recognised that there cannot be one hard and fast, one adamantine, pattern in education for people in different strata of civilisation. There cannot be a universal system applicable to all.

Each nation and community must work out its own national salvation in education according to its own environments. The general drift of all investigations on the subject seems to point to the conclusion that every country must adopt the system which is best suited to its present needs, and which is most capable of development in such a way as to meet its future national needs, but, of course, in broad harmony with the new intellectual tendencies alluded to.

The fundamental object is to make education a process of self-instruction, from the cradle upwards. It is only by a rigid but healthful and pleasing, not sickly and painful process of evolution, that education could be made vivifying for humanity in the future. In brief, it may be observed that the world of educational reform is slowly coming into agreement with the original crude doctrine which Pestalozzi first taught a century ago and which Herbert Spencer and other thinkers have greatly emphasised and expanded, namely, that "alike in its order and in its methods, education must conform to the natural process of evolution—that there is a certain sequence in which the faculties spontaneously develop, and a certain kind of knowledge which each requires during the development; and that it is for us to ascertain this sequence and supply this knowledge." The natural method is the golden method. Nothing artificial should be forced on the mind in its state of initial development and growth. Do we not see this natural method supplanting the old artificial one which was in such strong evidence during the first fifty years of the nineteenth century? Survey for a moment the whole horizon of human activity during that period, ask yourselves what were the principal features presented to your gaze. It will be readily confessed that those were uniformity and unquestioning authority—uniformity and obedience in religion, in government, in education, in science, in politics Those were artificial features. But survey again the last fifty years of the nineteenth century and what do you find? What looms most largely on the horizon? This only, that the old features are slowly fading away. They are receding in the background. Do we not at present prominently notice the results of the new evolution of

thought in religion, in government, in education, in science, in politics ? Where is that unquestioning obedience to papal dogmas and papal infallibility ? Look at France, the most advanced Catholic country in the world. Is it possible to conceive that fifty, may twenty-five years ago, the French people would have calmly and wisely assented to the legislation on the disestablishment of Church and State which, in spite of the papal hierarchy, is now taking its even course at the present hour ? Why ? Because of the slow disintegration of the spirit which before held dominant sway in the heart of every Frenchman. He has discovered that unquestioning respect to every papal dogma is inconsistent with right thinking, right judging and right acting, aye if not even conducive to higher national welfare. That in fact it is preposterous for any human being, however devout and however exalted, to claim infallibility which never can be predicted of our fallible humanity. Thus it is that democratic but reasoned Catholicism in France is superseding conservative Catholicism, as is still understood, and clung to by the ecclesiastics who owe loyal allegiance to the court of the Vatican. What, again, is the meaning of those agitating sects in Protestantism in the Church of England which have made such a strong headway in Great Britain during the last fifty years, sects of whom the Non-Conformist is the most influential as it is also the most respected and potential ? Why have agnosticism and rationalism superseded the old doxies ? Why in spite of the most formidable agitation, strenuously carried on by the author of "Fiscalitis," Free Trade still firmly holds its own ? Why are there now so widely prevalent new ideas as to economics and the mutual duties and responsibilities of capital and labour, as to strikes and wages, as to trade unionism, as to profit-sharing and generally as to protection of labour by legislation ? Why all these new ideals are so fast coming to the surface, and vastly influencing the social and economic conditions of humanity in the utilitarian West ? Why is it that in the domain of politics democratic sentiments are also overriding the old aristocratic views on the art of Government ? Why are the privileged classes losing their hold on the masses ? Why do the masses so often talk of mending or ending the House of Lords ? Why

is it that Liberalism is fast spreading its roots and branches far and wide, and why is it that self-government is flourishing in such a remote country as Japan, and why is there a Parliament in its incipient stage at Tehran ? Why is it that the East is now fast regaining its lost liberty ? The answer to all these questions is because the last half of the nineteenth century has brought forth new elements and new forces which are more in consonance with the natural instincts of progressive humanity than before. It is because as the poet rightly sings with the insight of the seer that men's minds are widening by each process of the sun.

The same widening process has been going on in reference to Education. The slow revolution to be now discerned in the more advanced States of the West, say, in the United States, in Germany, in Great Britain, in Switzerland and elsewhere, in the manner and method as well as the matter of imparting public instruction, from the lowest to the highest strata, has its origin in naught else but this new ideal. Here, too, it may be enquired why is it that greater attention is paid and more importance attached than before to physical training ? Why is mental training, exclusive of the physical, which fifty years ago was so general, is now deprecated ? Why is a rational co-ordination of the two activities greatly insisted upon ? Why cramming, once so highly fashionable and keenly pursued for purposes of gaining so many marks in an examination, is now denounced and proscribed ? Why indeed are grammer and immemorial Euclid now dethroned from their high estate ? At any rate why is it that these subjects are considered no longer essential till the scholar, by a knowledge of the concrete, is able to appreciate the abstract reasoning of their studies as he grows up in age ? Why are geography and history altogether taught on a different principle—the most rational—from that which was in vogue for so many centuries ? Last, though not the least, why are new Universities, founded on principles other than those of old, and why have females been admitted freely to all Universities ? It is not difficult to give a reply to each of these questions. It is because the old stereotyped methods and practices, chiefly inherited from the ecclesiastics

of the middle ages, which inculcated unquestioning obedience and authority at the expense of rational thinking, have been swept away. It is within the last half a century that the Progressivists on Education have demonstrated the fallacious, artificial and injurious character of the methods employed in educating the young. Education, as the poet has said, forms the common mind : just as the twig is bent the tree is inclined. The twig was no doubt bent but in a different fashion from what it should be in order to allow the tree to grow in a healthy and natural way. The more, therefore, the system of imparting Education is based in conformity to the promptings of nature, the greater is its potentiality for healthy development and progress in the future. This broad truth has now come to be slowly recognised, and thus it is that the old unscientific and unnatural method, once so universal, is being supplanted by the scientific and the natural, which Pestalozzi originally founded after many a hard struggle. What his system was may be here summarised (*vide* appendix A.) He discovered the principle which regulates the law of man's development and which is the fundamental principle of education. In the degree that this truth is appreciated there will depend the greater intellectual salvation and happiness of the rising generation and of generations yet unborn.

From the foregoing observations it will be plain to you what are the tendencies of the modern system of education in the West, and in which direction they are most likely to gravitate. So far as the tendencies have made themselves practically manifest, it must be acknowledged that they have achieved excellent results. Hence it might be reasonably inquired whether the existing system of imparting education in India, which, it goes without saying, is founded more or less on the old English system, now deemed obsolete and antiquated, and, therefore, hardly adapted to the new ideals to which reference has been made, should not be slowly reformed on the lines indicated. I at once admit that the reform proposed is a radical one. That it is not easy to alter a system which has done good work for fifty years and which, it must be frankly acknowledged, has shown satisfactory

results. But just as we are now agitating for a reform in the Administration itself, with the view of superseding what is obsolete, prejudicial and mischievous, by what is modern, practical and beneficial to the welfare of the people, so, I think, we ought to agitate for a reform in our educational system which shall harmonise with the better ideals of the age. The time is ripe and the sooner we begin to formulate the broad lines of that reform the better.

It will be said that it was only three years ago that the Government of India modified the system by means of legislation. To that plea I would venture to give my own reply without in any way entering on the bitter controversy which raged round that legislation or raking up its dying embers. I content myself with observing that the modifications introduced by the new legislation are more or less of a superficial character and that they can in no way bring about those reforms which are indicated here. Unless there is a radical change in the system from the bottom to the top, of course, slowly and by degrees it would be vain to expect that that legislation will achieve the object in view. Moreover. I am one of those who think that State-managed education, however admirable, is not without its serious drawbacks. Like State-managed currency, such an education is productive in the long run of evil only rather than good. All artificial devices have been known to end in one mischievous result, namely, arrest of natural growth and what arrest such growth must be held to be noxious. Nowhere, so far as my knowledge extends, has a centralised system of education been a complete success. Indeed, wherever it has been introduced it has had to be abandoned or considerably modified after years of practical experience. Nowhere were the prejudicial effects to the moral and intellectual welfare of a people by means of centralised education more palpably discernible than in France. And we all know how far it has done injury to the manhood of the great country. It was Turgot who observed that if one taught children nothing but what was true and if one talked to them of nothing but what they could comprehend there would hardly be any minds with unsound judgement. But let

me come to quite a recent French authority. Let me detain you for a few minutes by quoting some most excellent and pertinent observations on French education made by Monsieur Abbe Martin in 1882 in the pages of the *Nineteenth Century*.

"State education should not be carried to such a pitch as to extinguish individual enterprise ; it should supplement not supplant private effort. In France, since the period of the Revolution, the general tendency of the State has been to usurp the functions of the individual, and it has shown itself monopolising, intolerant and narrow-minded as regards the educations of youth. It claims to be absolute and unique master. Nothing can be done without authority and approbation of the State. Its image and superscription must be stamped on the schools, the masters and the pupils. on the prospectuses, the classical works and the scientific or historical theories and on the diplomas and degrees—upon all alike. No one can teach except by the permission of the State and nothing can be taught but what the State sanctions. In short, there is but one teacher in France, the Minister of Public Instruction ; for all others are merely instruments attuned to the official keynote and led by the official baton."

This description *mutatus mutandis* might be justly applied to the so-called reformed system of education as introduced by the legislation of 1903. It is for you and others enlightened like yourselves all over the country to say whether by such a machine-made system India can ever hope to advance in the right way in matters educational.

To have one legislation for all the different provinces in different states of educational progress is to say the least most unstatesmanlike. It is indeed most inconsistent for the State in one breath to treat different provinces in economic and other legislation according to their respective idiosyncrasises, and in another breath to treat the same provinces alike for a certain purpose of its own But, gentlemen, I must crave your indulgence if I detain you further for a few minutes by quoting Mon. Martin again to make you fully alive to the mischief of State education which is centralised as it has been

lately intensely centralised in this official-ridden country. That educationist infers from the manner in which education was administered by the State in France at the time he wrote, that there were three principal evils of centralised State education. Firstly, a dead level of uniformity ; secondly, a decline of intellectual power ; and, thirdly, weakening of the moral fibre in the natural character. Uniformity is the rock on which all centralised systems suffer shipwreck. "The children in the rural districts and those in the great towns those who belong to the working classes and those whose fathers are in trade or of independent means must be all taught alike."

Gentlemen, you have all to ask yourselves, whether the evil to which Mr. Martin refers is not also to be plainly discerned in India. If I mistake not, it was referred by some of the witnesses who gave their evidence before the Education Commission of 1882, which was presided over by that late accomplished scholar, Sir William Hunter. Proceeds M. Martin : "The same rules are enforced on the inhabitants of Bayonne and of Dunkirk, of the fertile plains of Province and the rugged mountains of the Auvergne. A rich specimen of this Procrustian system has been given to the world of late in the compulsory Education Act. In one of the few clauses of the Bill it is specially provided that all are to be taught the grammar of the French language and the elements of French literature, together with history, geography, geometry, agriculture, morality and patriotism. Our readers can picture for themselves an Auvergnt peasant, or a shepherd of Givandan going up for an examination in the works of Racine, Corneille and Moliers ! Such fantastic schemes betray an utter ignorance of human nature and of children's capacities, as well as the practical working of good elementary schools."

In this respect a great deal could be said, but as it is not my purpose in this paper to enter into any kind of details of the various branches of education, I refrain from expatiating thereon. Its sole object is to stimulate discussion with the view of evoking a good volume of expert opinion by and by, as to how far education in this country should be directed in the

new channels which have been suggested here, and what may be the practical lines on which the reform should proceed, of course, step by step.

Uniformity and Decline of Intellectual Power

But let me return to the other two points of Mon. Martin. As to the dead level of uniformity leading to the decline of intellectual power, he says : "Under a centralised system, there is either perpetual change going on in the teaching staff, the course of studies and the rules, or else everything falls into a state of stagnation."

From our own experience, I think we can safely venture to say we are in accord with what the learned Frenchman has urged. Again : "As all individuality is looked upon with disfavour, even if it not be absolutely contraband, the genius of routine takes possession of the school, and everything is done coldly, mechanically and lifelessly because that spirit of self-devotion, of enthusiastic zeal which is the very soul of education has fled beyond recall. What else could we expect ? When once the office of teacher is looked upon as a mere bread-winner, a trade like any other, it becomes impossible to fight against that feeling of depression which sooner or later takes possession of the mind, which says the principles of life and which, taking refuge in the torpor of hopelessness, refuses to answer either whip or spur."

In my opinion the above is a true picture of the evil of centralisation in State education so far as it knocks out all originality from the individual and turns out teachers and scholars alike into mere machines according to one stereotyped pattern. It was Matthew Arnold who once observed in one of his annual reports that "in the school teaching the decline of the intellectual life caused by a mere mechanical method of instruction shows itself in increasing weaknesses in even those very matters which our changes were designed to revive and foster."

Lastly, there is the weakening of the moral fibre, says M. Martin : "The evil effects of centralisation on the character of

our people is shown in the want of backbone which unfortunately distinguishes France among the nation."

Here, too, you will agree with me that the parallel stands good for India. Indeed the want of backbone is immensely accentuated, and accentuated most unpleasantly, it is to be feared, by reason of the chief directing and teaching agencies being of one race and civilisation while the students belong to another race and another civilisation. Who will not recall the instances of revolt in schools and colleges of which we now and again hear. What is their true origin ? Does it not lie in the fact above indicated rather than in the one alleged by the deities of our Education Olympus, namely, want of discipline—a canting shibboleth. But you will ask what M. Martin understands by backbone ? He defines it as the "combination of moral and mental strength which is seen in men who respect the rights of others while they maintain their own self-respect." It is to be hoped our countrymen will firmly bear this definition in mind, for, I fear, the number of Indians in each community who have the combination of the two kinds of strength just referred to accompanied by a strong sense of self-respect, cannot be considerable. Great as are the ordinary evils of centralisation in any State or community, it is superfluous to observe that they are a hundredfold greater in this country. Their influence is unspeakable on the education of our youth, who will be the citizens of tomorrow on whom the future welfare of the country must greatly depend. But if M. Martin thus depicts in the most unfavourable colours the evils arising from the system of centralised education in France, he writes in terms of praise about the system in vogue in England where private enterprise in education has been so predominant and which has shown most gratifying results. Wherever there is freedom of action to parents, to pupils, to teachers, as well as to local authorities, as has been the case in Great Britain, similar excellent results must obviously be looked for. In this respect, too, I must ruefully observe that our new fangled educational legislation gives no hope of success. Education is now wholly officialised and that by men who have only a fleeting interest in the welfare of our national education.

Private enterprise in education seems more or less to be doomed, unless the national spirit of freedom and self-respect emphatically asserts itself and overcomes the many obstacles in the way which the precious legislation has ingeniously, but not ingenuously, contrived. Freedom is fettered, if not wholly throttled—freedom in schools and colleges and freedom in universities.

But Mon. Martin is not singular in his observations under this head. That great English social philosopher of the nineteenth century has made similar observations. In that well-known and thoughtful work on Education, Mr. Herbert Spencer has said that : "Along with political despotism, stern in its commands, ruling by force of terror and implacable in its vengeance on the disloyal there necessarily grew up an academical discipline similarly harsh—a discipline of multiplied injunctions and blows for every breach of them—discipline of unlimited autocracy upheld by rods and ferules, and the blackhole."

Thanks, that age of discipline in intellectual education is slowly passing away, though there are survivals of it to be yet discerned here and there. In this country we have what is called benevolent despotism with its "unlimited autocracy," only it is somewhat chastened. Discipline in reality is not upheld by rods and ferules, but all the same we have in the place of these instruments of enforcing discipline moral rods and ferules invented by the self-same autocracy, the baneful effects of which are worse than those of the physical ones. The teacher and the scholar, be he of high or low degree, all alike feel and chafe under them. That is one of the ugliest features on the system of imparting education in the country which needs to be removed. Unfortunately India has had never the benefit of real educational thinkers and reformers of a practical turn of mind. Bombay had the rare luck of having one such at the head of the Educational Department during the latter part of the sixties for a period of three years. The Presidency then felt the broadening influence of Sir Alexander Grant, whose memory we should always cherish. But it is doubtful

that since the educational policy of the Government was laid down by Sir Charles Wood in 1854, whether India has had ever the benefit of the learning and the practical method of imparting instruction of a person of the attainments and liberalism of Sir Alexander Grant. Had there been one such Indian, education as a whole would have decidedly taken a different turn and the Indian mind would have risen to a loftier plane of intellectualism than is to be witnessed today, showing every way more satisfactory results. But it is of no use regretting the past. Our purpose more is with the immediate future.

This brings me to the point which I am desirous you all should well consider. At the best nothing would be lost by provoking discussion on it. I shall consider myself sufficiently rewarded if the discussion eventually leads to any practical results of a tangible character. On my part the more I study the latest literature on the subject the more the conviction grows on me that the future of Indian education cannot be where it stands today. It is impossible that we should be stationary in our educational activity when everywhere else there is a wide awakening and a keen desire to found the future structure of education on new lines which the most advanced reformers of the day have advocated, namely, to lead on education, from the lowest grade to the highest, step by step, and stage by stage in consonance with nature. How from infancy upwards the child should be so instructed as to develop its powers of observation in a natural, instead of artificial way, that is the supreme problem. What is condemned in the old method of imparting instruction is that from child to boy and boy to man, there is too much of artificiality and very little of individuality in conformity to its natural surroundings and environments. A systematic culture of the powers of observation is the first essential. Such powers are not acquired in a day, or a week, or a year. They have to be gently educed and stimulated, and the faculty has to be cultivated step by step in a natural sequence. Thus to determine upon or select a system of instruction on these lines is to easy task. The knowledge of the right methods of culture, physical, intellectual and moral, is of extreme importance. We can only

proceed from the simple to the complex, from the indefinite to the definite till at last we come to the finished structure when the brain itself reaches its maturity. It is entirely unnatural to force on the young mind a course of instruction for which the brain is immature or unprepared. Here, again, Mathew Arnold years ago had to complain of the state of primary education in England. Said be : "The mode of teaching in the primary schools has certainly fallen off in intelligence, spirit and inventiveness. In a country where everyone is prone to rely too much on mechanical processes and too little, on intelligence, a change in the regulations inevitably gives a mechanical turn to inspectors and must be trying to the intellectual life of a school."

What was condemned in England years ago finds currency here in a most aggravated form. But unfortunately that has been one of the noxious features of education. But now that the noxiousness or beneful effects of that system come to be slowly recognised, it was time that Indian education also should be so far modified as to make it conformable to the new system. The new school of reformers are of opinion that body and mind ought to be simultaneously developed, each in its natural order, step by step—what may be the best method of treating the body, and what of treating the mind. Body and mind must accord well so as to bring about at maturity perfect harmony, and as the objective of education is how to make the best citizen, and citizeness also, the reformer should also inquire what may be the best way to live as a citizen, and to use all the faculties nature has endowed us with for our own individual advantage and for the advantage of others.

This primary education becomes of the first importance and derives the highest significance. And since of late it has loomed large in the eyes of our countrymen as well as of the Government itself it would be a great gain were Indian educationists of large practical experience to devise a practical scheme which might modify the existing system of primary instruction in the country so as to make it well fit in it. For it is essential that during the period of transition from the old method to the new, there should as far as possible be the least

disturbance. The task, it must be admitted, is difficult. At the same time it is not such as cannot be overcome by patience, perseverance and examination of models which are available. These would partially facilitate our task if we earnestly endeavour to undertake it in all seriousness. We require, as Arnold said, to simplify our teaching, to present to our children's minds what they can comprehend, to abstain from pressing upon them what they cannot. That is the right way.

It is not possible that within the limits of this short paper I could refer at any length to the models of the four most advanced countries of the West which are called the "Mothers of Education," namely, the United Kingdom, France, Germany and the United States. But I would strongly commend to the notice of all who are interested in the advancement of education on right lines, the book by Mr. R.E. Hughes, of Oxford, the author of "Schools at Home and Abroad." This work is entitled, "The Making of Citizens" or "A Study in Comparative Education." It forms one of the volumes of the Contemporary Science series, published by that enterprising firm of booksellers, known as The Walter Scott Publishing Company, Limited. In my humble opinion no two recent works would furnish better inspiration and information needed for our purpose than those by Mr. Hughes. With it a deep study of Herbert Spencer's work on rationalistic education would enable experts to prepare a skeleton of the scheme of education on the latest ideals which, when generally approved, might be tentatively adopted as a substitute for the one now in existence. Of course, there are other publications and massive blue books by the scores which would furnish ample details. But the works just referred to are an excellent digest and would admirably serve the purpose of formulating the sort of scheme I have here ventured to suggest.

In his book Mr. Hughes has observed that the whole question of reasoned education demanded by the complicated exigencies of the present age, so strenuous every way, is not "which is the best system, but which is the most suitable system." This judicious and practical observation we shall have firmly to bear in mind. It is not always the ideal that is

practical. The ideal is undoubtedly capable of realisation but under certain given conditions. Where such conditions are non-existent or only partially existent, the ideal must be limited by practical considerations. But the comparative method adopted by Mr. Hughes will, in my opinion, be exceedingly helpful. In instituting a comparison between different systems of national training, in order to select one which is most suitable and practical, we are apt to forget that the really vital elements cannot be directly compared. As he says : "We can place in juxtaposition tables and statistics showing the comparative costs of school houses, payments of teachers and other officers, the relative amounts paid for educational purposes by each citizen, amount spent on each child's training in the school, the regularity with which the children attend, the relative efficiency of the school laws, the relative facilities for higher training and many other items ; but the really vital question is not touched by such figures. The question is "which of all these various systems of national training makes the best citizens," and when the question is put thus, one sees that its answer best depends entirely upon what the phrase "best citizens" may connote. The phrase in France does certainly not connote the same attributes as in England or America, so it is immediately evident how difficult, if not impossible, it is to answer such a question as "which is the better educational system—that of Germany or of England." The long and short of it is that as long as national characteristics persist so long will national ideals vary. At the same time it may be repeated what I stated at the outset, that the entire trend of investigations in the different systems of education in vogue in the most advanced countries point to this conclusion that every country has in the main that system of training best adapted to its present needs, and most capable of developing in such a way as to meet future national needs. Another tendency, so far as the Western countries are concerned, is the development and growth of the idea of citizenship. That we are the citizens of State is an idea which is being gradually superseded by the broader one, namely, that we are all citizens of the great world. In this respect, it is also beginning to be clearly discerned that in matters of education

there should be social equalities and equal opportunity. Not that the inequalities, in diverse degrees to be still perceived in aristocratic England and France, caste-ridden and military Germany and democratic United States, could be easily got rid of. But the whole tendency is towards equality—everybody, from the son of the peasant to that of the prince, should have equal opportunities of training the mind which is after all God's gift. Mr. Hughes rightly lays down the dictum that "it is the primal duty of the State to provide every child with equal opportunity for developing the powers he has been endowed with." Happily for India, that has been all along the most agreeable and satisfactory feature of its State education. There is no social distinction in education. The doors are wide for all and they may freely enter who wish to drink deep at the fountain of knowledge. And happily also education in India is wholly free from sectarianism which everywhere else somewhat mars the smooth course of instruction, as it is at this very hour in Great Britain. Church and State are struggling for the religious soul of the innocent child, with the faintest and dimmest notions of what is religion, let alone the many sectarian jargons.

But if State education in India is free from these undesirable elements, it is our duty to remove those defects in training, from the lowest to the highest strata, which are discernible today. They are not unknown. Every Indian of educational experience is aware of them. In my humble opinion not only such defects should be removed but, as I have urged all through in this paper, we must strive after realising the new ideals which are permeating all education in the West, consistent with our existing or even improved environments. In endeavouring to solve the problem in a practical way I would inquire whether education in India is calculated to train the Indian youth to the best citizenship—for after all that is the ultimate goal to be aimed at. Now here, I am afraid, there are drawbacks. They are external as well as internal. The external drawbacks have more or less reference to the political subjection of Indians. The subjection greatly hampers future progress. For one thing there never is forthcoming even now, after a century and a half

of *Pax Britannica*, more than 1.10 crores of rupees for all kinds of education—primary, secondary, higher and technical. No educational progress of a material character could be possible in the world where the State starves its educational institutions. I am not going to enter into any comparative financial statistics on the subject. They have grown too hackneyed. All that I would say in this place is that the miserable dole which the Government of India, boasting of a revenue of 120 crores, spends even now on education is no credit whatever to its own high and refined civilisation or to its reputation for political justice and integrity. The Indian Government is now deriving a net revenue from its abominable drink traffic alone, which, I must ruefully observe, it has in its financial greed pushed in every nook and corner of the Empire, to the extent of 7½ crores. The serious charge hurled by enlightened Indians against the Government is that it is fast converting the poorest masses from a condition of sobriety to insobriety, if not drunkenness. What a happy change in their social and moral condition might be witnessed were the entire revenue levied from the noxious drink traffic wholly spent on education ! But apart from the financial aspect of the matter, I may mention how this political subjection of the Indian people hampers their march towards greater education progress. There is that conflict of interests. Say what they will, there is no such thing as the administration of India purely in Indian interests. It is not like the Japanese Government where the interests of the people are identical with those of the State. In Japan the State conforms to the national sentiments and aspirations in all matters. In India the people may entertain their own sentiments and aspirations about many matters, education included. But the Government being alien never responds to them or responds only in a feeble way. It is this political subjection which in educational matters hampers progress as in others. Thus, we find in this political subjection the key to the starvation of education by the British Indian Government. If in spite of the petty, nay, contemptible expenditure of 1.10 crores incurred on all kinds of education, there is marked progress, it is to be attributed to the natural intelligence of the people and their hereditary instincts for intellectual development. These are the external factors which arrest the growth of education in India.

On the other hand there are some internal factors too which have to be considered. There is the deep rooted conservatism of ages which is best exemplified in the system of caste. Now, I would at once admit that from the Indian point of view there is a deal of good in that system. But with the good there has grown side by side no little evil. It has greatly obstructed both moral and material progress. For one thing it is caste which is partly to be held responsible for the backward condition of industrialism. When the carpenter and the shoemaker continue to be carpenter and shoemaker from sire to son, and from generation to generation, there can be no hope of free and robust industrialism in the land. Again it is at the door of the system of caste that we must lay the absence of female education in the country. It is indeed a most petrifying social phenomenon. How may there be good mothers whose sons may be the future hope and glory of the country when the mothers remain in a state of almost total intellectual darkness? No country can expect to prosper morally and materially where mothers are bereft of that education which is essential to their mental well-being as air, water and food to her physical. Thus it is that we find we have one serious drawback among the Indian community by way of home education, which is even of greater significance than school education. Home education in the Western sense seems to be almost wholly wanting. And so long as not only the majority of the male but the large majority of female parents are illiterate, it is not possible to witness that healthy progress we are so auxious to witness and which elsewhere has lifted nations in the scale of higher civilisation with loftier ideals of life and citizenship. Thus in respect of the internal factors which partially obstruct our onward progress in education on sound Western lines, it is essential that the older environments which have so long worked prejudicially and induced stagnation in the national life should gradually cease to exist and be superseded by those which step by step will contribute to achieve the great aim and object in view. The new ideals of the march of intellect are there: but are we so free as to adopt them? No doubt there is centralisation in Government. But is there not centralisation in our social life also? We are partly suffering, I think, on account of our own

internal imperfections. Is it impossible to make a beginning by way of decentralisation of old ideas and old idiosyncrasies which are admitted to be prejudicial to our greater intellectual welfare ? Unless there is disintegration of those forces which clog our progress, we are bound to meet with obstacles at every turn in our educational progress also. In reality our future educational activity must run parallel to our social activity, specially in matters of domestic reform.

I have now placed before you some stray thoughts which have occurred to me in reference to education in the country. Much no doubt will depend on ourselves. If we are to strive for the higher ideals I have suggested, we must earnestly put our shoulders to the wheel. If the State has a responsibility to discharge in matter of the education of our people it should be remembered that we, too, have a responsibility, and a larger one, to fulfil. By all means let us pray, memorialise and appeal to Government to fulfil to the fullest its part of the responsibility. At the same time let us not be so many drones. In the field of education we should strive to put forth the strength of heroes in order that at last we may win the intellectual battle like heroes. Let us each in our own humble way make our lives sublime in this respect and leave footprints on the sands of time which generations yet unborn may tread. As Mr. Hughes has observed : "Man will not live by bread alone even in the future ; he will need more than ever that broad, deep humanistic culture without which there can be no life. Rather than early specialisation the new age will need an ever-increasing and ever-widening stream of liberal training, stained and tinctured by no polluted feeder of utilitarian studies, but fed by the bright and pellucid sparkling and limpid streamlets that issue from the pure regions of some Parnassian height."

INDIAN MILITARY EXPENDITURE*

Introduction

At this juncture when, in response to elightened Indian opinion, as voiced by the people's representatives in the

*A paper prepared for the Deccan Sabha, Poona, in 1911.

Viceregal Legislative Council in March last, the Government of India, in the Finance Department, is busily engaged in the arduous task of investigating into the details of our overgrown public expenditure, with a view to economy and retrenchment, it would not be unuseful to rivet public attention on one important branch thereof which now absorbs almost the whole of the net land revenue of the Empire. That revenue, according to the latest parliamentary return, stood in 1909—10 at 20·55 million £ or 30·82 crore rupees exclusive of that derived from forests. On the other hand, the net expenditure on military services, namely, the army, marine, military works and special defence works, stood at 19·11 million £ or 28 66 crore rupees. Ten years ago, the net land revenue stood at 16·73 millions sterling, while the net army charges amounted to 15·47 millions £. Accordingly, land revenue has increased during the interval to the extent of 22·8 per cent, against military expenditure which has increased 23·53 per cent. If, therefore, we say that military expenditure has mounted during the period at a faster speed than land revenue, we shall be strictly giving expression to what is the bare truth. Of course, we are perfectly aware of the reasons urged in justification of the increase as more specifically outline in the annual Financial Statement. But their soundness or unsoundness could only be ascertained by impartial experts outside the pale and influence of our Indian Military bureaucracy. None, however, will have the temerity to deny that sufficient grounds exist for investigating into the details of the army charges with a view to finding out how far there is room for substantial retrenchment. After all, it should be remembered that an annual heavy expenditure on an army on a warfooting in times of peace is really an economic waste. A poor country like India can never afford the luxury of such wasteful expenditure which at the best is unproductive and a great bar to that healthy economic development which the Government and the people are most anxious of promoting. It is said that the costs annually incurred on an army on warfooting is a good "premium of insurance." But even such a premium, let it be borne in mind, has to be incurred in proportion to the ability of the country buying the security. There is such a thing as underwriting a

remote risk at too exorbitant, if not "killing," rate. In ordinary life, no individual could afford to insure his life or property at a premium which he cannot afford unless he wishes to incur a heavy debt or go into insolvency. There is a certain well-defined limit in this matter, To go beyond it is in reality to waste the assets of a people. Accordingly, to maintain a costly army, in times of piping peace, on a warfooting, is really a policy of waste, altogether inexcusable in a country like India, admittedly poor in comparison with the poorest countries of the West. The expenditure so incurred could be more wisely and profitably utilised instead for the greater moral and material progress of the people. Scores of objects of popular utility remain unaccomplished by reason of the necessary lack of funds. But while funds in ever-increasing amounts have been and are invariably found for army expenditure, this excuse about the want of the eternal peace for useful public objects is pharisaically urged by the Government—say, for such objects as education and sanitation and for the fostering and development of industries and manufactures which create wealth. The history of Indian military finance from 1885 to date furnishes the amplest evidence of the fact just stated. Look at the sums in increasing amounts annually spent on that expenditure and contrast them with those spent on pressing objects of the highest public utility. As the late Sir Auckland Colvin and Mr. (now Sir Courtenay) Ilbert observed in their joint minute of dissent of 14th August 1885, a minute to which I have made reference at length in the sequel, "a standing army which is larger than is necessary for home requirements will be a tempting and almost an irresistible weapon of offence beyond the border." The imperative necessity under the circumstances of curtailing army expenditure on a war footing in times of profound peace must be apparent to any person who cares to bestow some serious thought on the subject. While the luckless tillers of the soil, to be counted by 20 crores, work hard, year in and year out midest abundance or scarcity which spells their prosperity, or adversity, and pour into the State treasury fully 30 crore Rupees per annum, the product of their incessant toil, here is the Government lavishing on its pampered army of only 2¼ lakhs, a thousandth part of the agricultural population,

the same 30 crores ! and yet that authority is never tired of proclaiming *urbi et orbi* that the land revenue is the backbone of the country's finances ! If that be so, do not commensense and prudence alike dictate that such a backbone should be conserved and made stronger instead of being weakened and wasted in the manner that it is being constantly done ? It will, therefore, be readily admitted, that no branch of public expenditure at this juncture stands in greater need of a fair and reasonable retrenchment than the overgrown expenditure of our army.

Full Intensity of Growth of Army Expenditure

So far reference has been made to the fact of the growing army expenditure which eats away the substance provided for by the labour of the poorest masses, tillers of a soil far from rich. But this growth during the last ten years gives but an inadequate idea of the unproductive expenditure. If we are to emphasise the imminent expediency or retrenchment at this eventful crisis, when the Government finds itself at its wit's end to bring back an equilibrium between revenue and expenditure, we must travel back further afield and endeavour to apprehend the full intensity of the growth since 1885-86. That memorable year first saw the commencement of a new foreign policy, and, consequently, of that larger army expenditure which is now acknowledged in all disinterested quarters to be intolerable. During the preceding years, say, from 1861-62, the process of the consolidation of the Empire was going on. Retrenchment and economy of a severe type were strictly enforced, thanks to the economic conscience of such vigilant and argus-eyed watchdogs of finance and Sir John (afterwards Lord) Lawrence, Lord Mayo, Lord Northbrook and Lord Ripon. The work of consolidation was fully accomplished by the year 1871-72. Between that year and 1876-77 the net army expenditure had averaged 14·50 crore rupees. During the next few years the country was unfortunately at war with the Amir of Afghanistan. It averaged 15·41 crore rupees. In 1880 81 it rose exceedingly high, say, over 21 crores, owing to the disasters which fell British arms in the fresh campaign

which had to be embarked upon by reason of the murder of Louis Cavignari, the British Plenipotentiary at Kabul. The war expenses were all adjusted and paid for by 1882 when the Government of Mr. Gladstone gave a large contribution in aid thereof. Lord Ripon's Government with Major Sir Evelyn. Baring (Lord Cromer) as Finance Minister, was able to bring back military expenditure to 16·50 crore rupees, after having given substantial relief to the tax-payers by a reduction of 8 annas per maund of the salt duty and by the abolition of all import duties save on liquor and arms.

The growth of the army expenditure then from 1884—85 may be exhibited as follows :

	Crore Rs.
1884—85	17 05
1885—86	20·06
1890—91	21 09
1891—92	22·66
1893—94	23·53
1894—95	24·31
1898—99	23 05
1899—1900	26·44

It will be noticed that the first big jump was taken in 1885—86. From 17·05 crore rupees during the preceding year, it mounted up as high as 20·06 crore rupees which was an increase by one bound of fully 3 crore rupees. The year, it should be remembered, was the memorable one which witnessed the warlike activity induced by the Penjdeh "incident" and the expedition immediately after that event to Upper Burmah for the acquisition of the kingdom of the ill-fated King Theebaw under diverse hollow pretexts which might be profitably learned from the Blue Book on that subject. As if that increase of 3 crores was not enough the expenditure was allowed to run higher and higher till in 1899—1900, it rose to 26·44 crore rupees. In other words, in thirteen years more, the increase amounted to 6·38 crore rupees.

The net expenditure between 1900—1901 and 1909—1910, was as follows :

				Crore Rs.
1900—1901	...	...	...	23·20
1901—1902	...	...	...	24·24
1902—1903	...	...	...	26·44
1903—1904	...	...	...	27 21
1904—1905	...	...	...	31·03
1905—1906	...	...	...	29·50
1906—1907	...	...	...	30·25
1907—1908	...	...	...	28·86
1908—1909	...	...	...	29·40
1909—1910	...	...	...	28·66

The annual average amounted to 27·87 crore rupees which is in excess of 1 43 crore of that for 1899—1900. But if we take that the expenditure fairly stood at 23·20 crore rupees at the commencement of the century, then the growth in the last net years amounts to 5·46 crores or an increase of 54·60 lakhs per year ! Thus, the real intensity of the growth may now be gauged. In 1884—85, the expenditure stood at the reasonably moderate figure, 17 05 crores. In 1909-10 it stood at 28 66 crores or an increase of 11·61 or say, at the rate of nearly 46·44 lakhs per annum. We might, under the circumstances of the growth just described, very well presume, that were the Government to sound enlightened public opinion today by means of a plebiscite on the particular expenditure which it should deem well suited for a substantial retrenchment, there could be no two opinions that it would be in favour of the overgrown army charges which absorb almost wholly the net land revenue of the empire. The industrious ryot is taxed in order to provide the needed "food for powder."

Causes of the Increase

I have already observed that the colossal increase has been sought to be justified year after year. Diverse reasons have been assigned for it ; but the soundness or unsoundness thereof, I repeat, can only be ascertained by impartial experts.

These increases have been incurred according to the annual financial statement, for a variety of purposes, such as warlike expeditions on the frontiers and beyond the statutory boundaries of India as defined in the Parliamentary legislation of 1858 for the better Government of India ; on the increase in 1885—86 of 30,000 troops 10,000 European and 20,000 Indian, against which all India protested ; on the construction of a larger number of military roads and defence works, apart from that of strategic railways, the cost of which is not included in the expenditure ; on continual better equipment so-called of the army in general by way of arms and ammunitions,—arms and ammunitions sanctioned and obtained today to be rejected as obsolete or not quite up-to-date tomorrow and the day after ; on pay and pensions of the European branch of the army ; on pay and pensions of the Indian branch ; on mobilisation, the cost of which after being declared in black and white as non-recurring has been off and on incurred under a variety of pretexts, in hatching which the Military Department is, of course, an expert ; on a score of minor objects of supposed military efficiency or utility ; and, last, though not least, on what are known as the home military charges demanded in the spirit of Shylock by that masterful and omnipotent organisation known as the British War Office—charges or exactions of a permanent character, to be computed by lakhs of rupees against which the Government of India itself has repeatedly entered vigorous remonstrances but in vain.

Growth Demands Scarching Scrutiny

But be the reasons what they may, justifiable or unjustifiable, sound or hollow, there can be no two opinions that the army expenditure has steadily grown to a colossal figure and that at a faster speed than the growth of revenue which now demands the most searching scrutiny and overhaul for purposes of reasonable retrenchment and economy without impairing its efficiency, though unfortunately the public have never been informed exactly in what that efficiency is supposed to consist. Each Commander-in-Chief seems to have his own notions of efficiency. What one militant Amurath has laid down as a standard of efficiency is rejected by his successor. Thus, the

standard of efficiency has been a shifting one. It has fluctuated with the views of the head of the military department for the time being. Were the Finance Department to go minutely into the question, it is to be feared that it will have to lay at the door of this shibboleth of efficiency many an expenditure that has been wasted in the past. It is exceedingly doubtful whether it will undertake a task so disagreeable. We have a vivid recollection of the way in which the majority of the Welby Commission under the dominant influence of the War Office and Treasury officials who were its members, tried to explain away, most apologetically, of course, this branch of Indian public expenditure. Their report so far was extremely disappointing, may, against the weight of the convincing evidence, submitted with a variety of statistics adduced by the Government of India itself, and, also against the weight of the evidence of the Indian witnesses and the Secretary of the British Congress Committee in London.

Cry for Retrenchment

Now, it may be observed at this stage that the public demand for a reduction of the growing army expenditure is not a subject of today or yesterday. The Government has been appealed to and memorialised time out of number during the last quarter of a century. It has been *the one* theme of continuous agitation and discussion in the press and on the public platform all over the country since the inglorious days of the Penjedh "incident" and the forcible seizure of Upper Burmah. Many a leading public body has petitioned the Government here, and occasionally even that highest Court of Justice, the British Parliament, which unluckily for us has for years relegated to Providence the trust which Providence had confided to it for our better welfare and greater contentment. The Congress, too, as voicing all shades of responsible Indian public opinion, has from the very day of its birth continued to attract the attention of the governing authorities to the subject in its Resolutions. Again, in the Viceregal Legislative Council, our representatives, from 1893 to date, have consistently protested against the growing expenditure and appealed for a reasonable retrenchment. It will be thus perceived how much

this dead weight of the military octopus has been felt by the tax-payers and for what a prolonged period.

Two Fundamental Causes of Growth

(1) Amalgamation Scheme of 1859

(2) Change of Policy.

Without entering into the details of the growth or animadverting on the injustice or justice of many a charge, we may endeavour to ascertain the fundamental causes which have largely contributed to the expenditure which has now assumed such colossal proportions and which, if allowed to grow unchecked in time, is liable to plunge Indian finances in the most serious embarrassment. These are : (1) The fateful army amalgamation scheme of 1859 : and (2) the change of policy of the Government of India in relation to the frontier and transfrontiers since 1885. As to the amalgamation scheme, it is superfluous at this time of the day to describe it. Sufficient to say, it was forced on the Government of India in 1859 by the Home Government against the almost unanimous opinion of the most trusted and experienced British Officers who had served for a lifetime in the army in this country, notably General Sir G. Balfour whose vigorous condemnation of it may still be read with profit in the evidence recorded by the East India Finance Committee of 1871-74. The net result of that fateful scheme has been that lakhs upon lakhs have been claimed and exacted by the British War Office for a variety of purposes, often of a most unfair and unreasonable character, which have from time to time formed the subject of vigorous remonstrances by successive Governments of India and by many a Secretary of State. These unjust exactions have not been a little fruitful in disturbing the estimates of Indian Revenue. And it is evident to those who have fully studied the financial evils of the greatest magnitude which have flowed from this onerous scheme during the last 50 years and more, that lakhs upon lakhs will continue to be claimed and exacted by the rapacious British War Office in the future till the hardened conscience of England in this matter has been aroused by some great parliamentarian in the House of Commons and the scheme knocked on the head.

Before the direct government of the country was assumed by the Crown in 1858, the European branch of the Indian army, it should be remembered, was partly recruited in this country and partly in England. Its combined strength at the outbreak of the Sepoy Mutiny was 39,379 British and 214,985 Indian troops. After the close of that Mutiny it was decided that the Indian army should be recognised on the basic principle of one European soldier to every two Indian. The entire organisation of the army was to be directed from England by the War Office. Whatever changes took place in the army organisation these had to be adopted here without one if or but, without counting their cost and without a consideration of Indian conditions which are so widely different from those of England. In short, the Indian Government was to be deemed next to negligible and the Indian tax-payer never to be thought of. Is it a wonder that such an one-sided and unfair scheme was condemned *in toto* by Indian military experts from the very day of the amalgamation ? The exceedingly burdensome nature of the scheme was fully inquired into by the East India Finance Committee, consisting of members of both Houses of Parliament, who recorded evidence on Indian affairs from 1871 to 1874. No member thereof was more assiduous in getting at facts, and searchingly sifting them to the bottom than that great friend of India, the late Professor Fawcett. Sir Charles Trevelyan, who was Governor of Madras and afterwards Finance Minister in 1865, observed in his evidence on the scheme, that "it was based on a principle which has been found to be extravagant and crushing in practice." Mr. Fawcett himself after having ably mastered the full details of this "extravagant and crushing" scheme, condemned it in the following scathing terms :—"A few years after the abolition of the East India Company, what is known as the Army amalgamation scheme, was carried out in direct opposition to the advice of the most experienced Indian statesmen. India was then, as it were, bound hand and foot, to our own costly system of army administration, without any regard apparently being had to the fact that various schemes of military organisation which may be perfectly suited to a country so wealthy as England, may be altogether unsuited to a

country so poor as India...A partnership has been established between England and India and as one of the countries is extremely rich and the other extremely poor, much of the same incongruity and many of the same inconveniences arose as if two individuals were to join in housekeeping, one of whom had £ 20,000 a year and the other only £ 1,000. An expenditure which may be quite appropriate to the one whose income is £ 20,000 would bring nothing but embarrassment to the one whose income is only £ 1,000. The money which is expended may be judiciously laid out, but, if the man with thes maller income, finds that he is gradually becoming embarrassed with debt because he has to live beyond his means, it is no compensation to him to be told that he is only called to contribute his proper share of the expenses. His position would be the more intolerable if, like India, after having been compelled against his wish to join the partnership he is forced to continue in it whether he desires to do so or not."

Financial Burdens of the Amalgamation Scheme

This is exactly the position to which India has been reduced by the mischievous amalgamation scheme of 1859. It has been in force for 52 years during which many embittered controversies have taken place between the India Office and the War Office but in which the former has hardly been ever completely successful. Heavy claims, sometimes of a most irritating character, were preferred against India on which the Secretary of State had had to arbitrate with but little relief to the Indian revenues. More or less he was worsted by the masterful War Office with its clever "experts". Sometimes matters were of so delicate and complicated a character that a small departmental committee or a commission had to be appointed to settle the differences between the War Office and the Indian Government. One of such commissions was presided over by no less a personage of experience and influence than the late Earl of Northbrook who was the Viceroy of India from 1872 to 1876. Of course, the claims of the War Office had been somehow arbitrated upon. But even then they were declared to be exorbitant if not "scandalous."

It would be asked what is the nature of the charges which have been so fruitful of a periodical investigation and the subject of so many indignant and emphatic protests by the Government of India. These might be fully learned from the numerous despatches addressed by that authority to the Secretary of State as occasions arose. But I will give here some of the most important of them. (1) Capitation allowance; (2) depot charges; (3) transport charges; (4) store charges; (5) regimental pay of officers and soldiers and their allowances: (6) furlough charges; (7) field and ordnance, arms and ammunition charges; (8) miscellaneous, and last, though not the least, pensions to retired officers and soldiers. The total of all these, it may be mentioned, came in 1908-09 to 4·67 million sterling or, say 7 crore rupees! But they were not half so burdensome 30 years ago though even then, the Government of the day used to inveigh against it. For instance, in its despatch of 8th February, 1878, it was observed "that placed as it was under the serious responsibility of so administering the affairs of the greatest dependency of the British Crown, that while British supremacy is strictly guarded, the means of securing that end shall not unduly weigh on the people of the country, it was constrained to represent to Her Majesty's Government that the burden thrown upon India on account of the British troops is excessive, and beyond what an impartial judgment would assign in considering the relative material wealth of the two countries and the mutual obligations that subsist between them.....All that we can do is to appeal to the British Government for an impartial view of the relative financial capacity of the two countries to bear the charges that arise from the maintenance of the army of Great Britain, and for a generous consideration of the share assigned by the wealthiest nation in the world to a dependency so comparatively poor and so little advanced as India." Again, the Simla Army Commission, which was appointed in 1879 and presided over by so brilliant and able an administrator as the late Sir Ashley Eden, then Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, and which counted among its members Colonel Sir Frederick (Field Marshal Lord) Robert and other experienced military officers serving in India, was constrained in its report to observe as

follows :—Para. 185.—"We think that the position of the army employed in this country should be organised and administered with regard to the interests of the people of India, and not for the purpose of supplying defects in the system of home defences, and above all, that it should not be made the means of obtaining at the cost of India, advantages for the army at Home which do not entirely affect the interests of the country." In its Military Despatch of 22nd May 1879, the Government of Lord Lytton observed : "A large part of the Home expenditure is for pensions, furlough allowances, the overland troop transport service and stores. The remainder is for payments to the Imperial Government on account of Imperial troops which have been repeatedly investigated, but with results we have not been able to accept as satisfactory." Two years later, the Government of Lord Ripon remonstrated on the burden of these charges in the following telling manner. Para. 44 of despatch No. 401 of 1881.—"It has to be observed that, whereas the British garrison in India has practically remained unaltered in respect of numbers and efficiency for many years past, its cost has been in course of constant increase from the various changes which have been made with organisation of the British army, changes made entirely, it may be said, from Imperial considerations in which Indian interests have not been consulted or advanced * * * It has to be remembered that charges which do not cause any very serious addition to the English estimates, and which are carried on without the least reference to India, involve very much larger charges on the Indian revenues by reason of the much more liberal allowances enjoyed by officers in the country. The conversion, for example, of the first captains of Royal Artillery into Majors gives the officer so promoted an increase of 5 shillings a day in England ; in this country the difference between the pay of a Major and a Captain of Artillery is Rs. 342 a month." Later on, Lord Ripon's Government followed its previours despatch of 1881 by another, of 21 Nos. 1884, in which it gave a succinct account of the principal increases in the Home military charges, from 1864—65, entailing on the aggregate a permanent burden of £ 800,000. The despatch said :—"These additional charges amount to more than £ 800,000 a year.

Some of them were necessary for improvements ; others were imposed with little or no reference to Indian wants, and in most cases without the Indian Government having any voice in the matter."

To give a fair idea of the difference merely in the pay of regimental officers in the British and the Indian army, I would give authentic figures as were submitted in a series of statements to the Welby Commission by the India Office These will at once inform you of the cogency and reasonableness of the main argument advanced by Lord Ripon's Government as just stated above, namely that a single change in organisation or in increase of pay entails an enormous burden on Indian revenues which is hardly ever taken, into account by the Imperial Government at home.

	Monthly pay. Artillery.	
	British	Indian
Colonel Commandant	Rs. 883	910
,, ,,	,, 568	1665
Lieutenant Colonel	,, 589	1002
Major	,, 316	789
Captain with higher rank	,, 263	417
,, without ,,	,, 231	417
Lieutenant after 10 years	,, 175	265
,, 3 ,,	,, 159	265
,, on appointment	,, 130	213

	Monthly pay. Cavalry	
	British	Indian
Colonel	Rs. 950	1023
Lieutenant Colonel	,, 519	1437
Major	,, 393	809
Captain with higher rank	,, 289	503
,, without ,,	,, 289	503
Lieutenant after 10 years Service	196	305
,, 3 ,,	,, 196	305
,, on appointment	,, 178	250
Sub-Lieutenant	,, 132	250

	Monthly pay. Infantry.	
	British	Indian
Colonel	Rs. 888	918
Lieutenant Colonel	,, 422	1402
Major	,, 340	759
Captain with higher rank	,, 273	445
,, without ,,	,, 240	445
Lieutenant after 10 years, Service	170	256
,, 3	,, 153	256
,, on appointment	,, 153	202
Sub-Lieutenant	,, 136	202

It would be seen how costly was an officer of the Indian army in 1895—96, compared to that of the British. But costly as he was in that year, it is superfluous to inform you that he is even more costly today owing to the higher pay since allowed and at the lower exchange of 16 instead of 22*d*. The European soldier, too, is similarly a costlier machine today than what he was fifteen years ago.

I may now quote another extract from the Government of India's despatch of the 20th February, 1895, in which it discussed four ways of reducing military expenditure, but was perforce obliged to say that constituted as the army was, there was no hope of effecting "any material reduction of its expenditure." All that it can do was "to endeavour to restrict the increase of the cost of the army within the narrowest limits compatible with the maintenance of the peace and security of the Indian Empire." In this despatch, the Government further observed as follows in regard to the pay of the British troops: "The pay of the British troops serving in India is not fixed by the Government of this country. It is fixed in sterling by the Majesty's Government and India has to pay in its depreciated currency an increasing number of rupees according as the gold value of the rupees diminishes. Moreover, during nearly every alternation in organisation the British army and charges connected with the interior economy of regiments and batteries have been productive of expenditure and necessarily

been followed by corresponding charges in expenditure on India." In the last 30 years the cost of these measures has amounted to £ 9,34,640, say, 1·40 crore rupees and this in one single item. But we all know that since 1895, the pay of the British soldier has been greatly augmented, so that today the charges under this head may be placed nearly at 2 crores at the least. The two items of the pay of soldiers and officers of the European branch of the modern army alone show how crushing is the burden on the Indian revenues, thanks to the amalgamation scheme.

Another ever-increasing and ever-recurring charge is on account of war material. Science daily advances and with the progress of science what Gladstone called "the resources of civilisation", are also being vigorously forged. War is indeed a great misfortune. The expenses incidental to it are crushing for a poor country like India. But when a large standing army is permanently maintained on a war-footing the expenditure, it will be readily admitted, grows intolerably burdensome. It practically runs to waste. It is tantamount to the destruction of so much of the national income. So that an army kept on warfoating in times of peace is not only burdensome but most prejudicial to the economic progress of the country. Next to the pay of soldiers and officers no expenditure is more costly than that of arms and ammunition. Science yearly forges new weapons of destruction, the basal principle being to devise instruments whereby the largest number of men may be killed in the shortest possible time. So that a dreadful instrument of this nature approved and adopted to-day becomes obsolete to-morrow by reason of a new one which supersedes it. The Indian Government having been for years alive to this disquieting, if not troublesome, aspect of expenditure has no doubt established arms factories in the country itself where it can as far as possible forge all pieces of ordnance and other smaller arms at a lower cost than that obtained from England But neither the skill nor the resources available in the country can produce all that is wanted in order to save the cost of the heavy war material annually imported. These arms and ammunitions cost in 1895 nearly a crore of rupees. In the despatch already

referred to, the Government of India, accordingly, observed as follows : "Everything connected with war material now costs more than it did, and speaking in a general way, larger supplies have to be obtained. So long as military science progresses, so long will the cost of material increase, and add to our military expenditure." And verily it has been increasing as each military budget informs us.

From the foregoing remarks it will be evident that in no way is the amalgamation scheme beneficial to the country. On the contrary, it is a huge millstone hung round poor India's neck. It is so heavy as to break its neck one day with the most unimagined consequences. They increase the pay of the European soldier and officer, and straightway India has to provide from her revenue so much additional expenditure. They increase under some pretext or another the European army, and straightway India has again to provide a larger charge which may be counted by lakhs. But the story of additional charges of a crushing character does not end here. It should be remembered that every increase in the strength of the European army signifies additional charges for both effective and non-effective services—for pay and allowances, for provisions, for clothing, for stores and war material, for exchange, for mobilisation, for transport service and so on ; also for pensions. These are intolerable charges which the army amalgmation scheme has entailed on India during the last 52 years and is still destined to entail till the country is one day relieved of this great incubus.

Such being the case the following extract from the military despatch of the Government of India of 25th March, 1890, will be perfectly intelligible in reference to its criticism on the unctuous plea, eternally urged by rhe War Office, that the charges entailed on India are actual cost only no and more. Para 7 says—"The actual cost to the British exchequer, if calculated by a purely arithmetical method, is undoubtedly the cost of the force in the United Kingdom, which would not need to be kept up if the Empire of India did not exist, and no army had to be maintained in India : but it is nowhere proved that the charges raised on account of that force

represent the actual extra cost to the British Exchequer, while there are many other conditions which would have to be considered before this method of calculation could be accepted. The difficulties in the organisation of the British Army and the necessity for inducing men to join the Army cannot be admitted to arise from the presence of a portion of the Army in India. These difficulties, we apprehend, arose from a variety of causes, which have no direct relation to India. Again, in India Office letter No. 161-W., dated, 21st March, 1876. Lord Salisbury distinctly declined to accept the contention of the War Office on this head. "Nor can we accept," says the Indian Government, without questioning the statement that the Indian drafts are the first reserve for the Indian Army, and that in order to avoid employing these elsewhere, the Home Government pay £500,000 year for the army reserve. In the first place, it must be pointed out that the regiments, batteries and drafts, sent out to India are despached during the whole of the trooping season to supply the places of men being sent home discharged to the reserve or invalidated, and to make good the annual waste of life, so that the assumption of the War Office, in assuming that the 11,500 men referred to will be efficient as a "first reserve" for India could hold good only if war were imminent at a particular moment before the commencement of the trooping season. If war broke out after the trooping season had closed, these 11, 500 men would not be available as a "first reserve." In the second place, Mr. Stanhope observed in his letter of 14th February, 1888, that "it was far from improbable that the same circumstance which necessitated a mobillisation in India might also render it impossible for this country to part with any considerable portion of the small number of regular troops in the United Kingdom." We infer from this statement that India cannot reckon with certainty on receiving even these 11,500 men in case of emergency. If this inference be correct, then it seems to us it cannot be alleged with accuracy, that the reserve is kept up because the services of these 11,500 men are hypothecated to India, and generally it appears hardly reasonable to assume that in regulating the strength of the reserve of the British army the annual drafts for India have been or ought

to be counted in fixing the strength of the army reserve. We do not understand that 16 000 men are kept up all the year round : and the army reserve was instituted in order to give the British army a reserve of trained soldiers and to enable a reduced army to be maintained at home in the interests of India were in no way specially considered. And yet it is on the assumption of the character which the Government of India has proved to be inaccurate that the War Office makes an annually exorbitant charge under capitation allowance and pretends to say that the cost is the actual cost when it is nothing of the kind !

The short service system, whereby there is a more rapid change of British troops, has been similarly alleged by the War Office to be a real benefit to India. The Indian Government was able to point out the fallacy of that statement also. Shorter service means more frequent transport service and other larger expenses. It was established, as that authority correctly says, "because men could not be obtained under existing conditions, under the long service system, and that the Government of the day believed that short service with reserves was better suited to the circumstances of the time than the existing system. It was no consideration for the efficiency of the army or India that asked the short service system and its suitability to the Indian requirements has been gravely questioned on more than one occasion." True, indeed, the short service was introduced because under the industrial condition of England, soldiering had lost all the attraction it had once possessed. The industries and manufactures of Great Britain offer a more remunerative and safe employment compared to the poor and insecure employment of a mere soldier. Had India been allowed to recruit its own European army in this country itself, as was the case with the East India Company, no such difficulty would have occurred and the British troops might have been raised at 50 per cent less cost. To-day recruiting for the territorial army created by Lord Haldane is even more difficult and it is notorious from the immense difficulties recruiting sergeants have met with in their annual campaign of capturing the raw

material to be converted or manufactured into food for powder. The recent organisation of "boy scouts" tells us plainly to what straits the War Minister has been driven to fill up his territorial army to the required strength. In the proportion of the difficulty larger baits by way of pay, bounty, and other doucers have to be offered. All that may be very well for wealthy England but it becomes a crushing burden for poor India.

So far the fact cannot be gainsaid of the grievous consequences that have hitherto flowed, and are still flowing without any check or control, from the unfair and altogether one-sided army amalgamation scheme of 1859. England is to call for any tune she pleases without let or hindrance and India must pay the piper—that is the greatest iniquity.

Change of Foreign Policy and its Disastrous Consequences

We may now turn to the other fundmental cause which has contributed to the growth of military expenditure. In the polity of nations, it is a recognised maxim that expenditure depends on policy. As a government conceives, whether wisely or unwisely need not be considered, what should be its defensive and offensive policy, so are public funds expended in pursuance thereof, very often irrespective of the ability of a people to bear the burden of expenditure. In the debate on the Lords' amendment to the Veto Bill, Lord Haldane said : 'It was perfectly obvious that with every Government the Budget of the year must develop some *policy. The budget of the day was part of the political programme of the year.* With regard to the budget of 1909, I should think that the *governing purpose of that budget was to embody a policy.*'' Continental nations, like Germany, Russia and Austria, with extensive land frontiers and surrounded by warlike neighbours, consider the maintenance of large land forces imperative for purposes either of repelling invasion or taking the offensive, provoked or unprovoked. On the other hand, a nation situated as the English, surrounded on all sides by sea, and having no land frontiers at all, has to maintain a large navy both for attack and defence. Again, there is a country like France with three large seaboards and

also an extensive land frontier beyond which are militant neighbours. Such a country has to maintain both a powerful army and navy. Thus the policy of each country, according to its physical and other conditions, dictates, whether, and what sum it should spend on the army or the navy or both. The expenditure, however, may be reasonable, and within the ability of the people to bear it or it may be most burdensome entailing heavy taxation which may be deemed intolerable. All depends for the time being on the views of statesmen at the helm of Government. Men imbued with the spirit of Spreadeaglism or Chauvinism or Imperialism may maintain forces so large as to entail an exceedingly heavy expenditure. While there may be persons at the head of State who may hold more pacific views, intent on productive rather than unproductive expenditure, and fully alive to the ability of the taxpayers to bear the burden. These would incur a moderate expenditure for the maintenance of the army and the navy. Sometimes this policy wholly depends on the character of the head of the State alone, be it the Kaiser or Tsar or Emperor whose will is law. With a military despot as such the burdens are more or less most grievous.

India is no exception to this general rule. The Indian Government changes from time to time. One adopts a wise policy of neutrality and pacific intentions towards its near and distant neighbours, and therefore maintains a force which is the least costly. But another succeeds and lays down a policy af an altogether opposite character under a variety of pretexts and keeps up an army, the cost of which is exceedingly intolerable to the taxpayer. Apart from the colour of the changing administrations, there is the subordination of the administration itself to the Secretary of State. That functionary, in his turn, has to acquiesce in the decision of the British Cabinet of which he is a member. The Cabinet may decide on a particular line of army policy to be pursued for India. It may happen that such a policy may be fraught with no advantage to the country. All the same he must acquiesce in it. If his conscience would not permit of such acquiescence he might resign to give place to another who would be sufficiently

pliant. Thus to the original evil of the policy which the Indian administration itself might adopt at a time there is the added evil just referred to arising from India's condition as a dependency of England. It is right, therefore, to say that India is in reference to army expenditure, between the upperstone of the Cabinet at home and the netherstone of the Indian Government for the time being at Calcutta.

The Forward School

Instances may now be recalled how the Military policy pursued by the Indian Government has led sometimes to economy but oftener to large and burdensome expenditure on the army. It is well known that tranquillity had been restorted after the dark events of 1857. Sir John Lawrence, who was the Viceroy from 1864 to 1869, firmly maintained a pacific policy towards the tribes and powers beyond India's natural line of defence and was never tempted by any Chauvinistic spirit to unprovoked aggression. That was recognised as a wise and statesmanlike policy conducive not only to peaceful relations on the border, but to greater domestic progress of a useful character. But there was at the time a school in England, led by Sir Henry Rawlinson, formerly a British ambassador at the Court of Persia, and later on a valiant member of the India Council, who from 1855 had striven most sedulously to push India's boundary beyond its natural lines, with the deliberate intention of ultimately acquiring Baluchistan and Afghanistan. That school, owing to the events of 1857, had receded somewhat in the background, but was making strenuous efforts in 1864 to revive the old projects originally put forward by General Jacob and Sir Henry Green, two very able frontier officers. That school was called the "Forward School," and, thanks mainly to the agitation led by Sir Henry Rawlinson, it condemned Sir John Lawrence's pacific policy. It was nicknamed the policy of "masterly inactivity". "Masterly statesmanship" should be the more appropriate epithet seeing how that statesmanship, so well directed by Sir John Lawrence, was continued by his successors till the Viceroyalty of the Marquis of Ripon, barring that of Lord Lytton. Each firmly

resisted all attempts, overt and covert, made by diverse means by the Forward School to give a fillip to their pet project of expansion and aggression. In the Council of Sir John Lawrence there was that soldier statesman—no other than Sir William Mansfield, afterwards the first Lord Sandhurst whose scathing minute against the spread eagle policy so forcibly advocated by Sir Henry Rawlinson, may still be read not only with interest but instruction. Both the Viceroy and the Commander-in-Chief were convinced by their knowledge and experience of the true condition of frontier affairs, and even the first important advance of Russia in Central Asia as signalised by the occupation of Khiva, that it would be most mischievous to the interests of India ever to succumb to the seductive, but by no means wise or statesmanlike policy of the fire-eating forwards who contemplated on some suitable opportunity to extend the thin red line of the map of India to the Oxus and the Pamirs on one side and to Kandahar and Herat on the other.

The Policy of Glory and Gunpowder

The reception of the embassy of Russians at Kabul by Shere Ali in 1875—6 was the first opportunity the Forward School had of pushing their design. And luckily for them, but most unluckily for India there was at the time at home a Jingo Government in office, at the head of which was Mr. Benjamin Disraeli afterwards Lord Beaconsfield, who from his inner consciousness had evolved what has since been known as "the scientific frontier"—that is, such a fluctuating frontier that the more you tried to make it scientific by pushing it forward, the more you shifted it nearer the territories of friendly neighbours for stripping them naked of their vineyards. Lord Northbrook was asked to find some *casus belli* with the Amir and provoke hostilities. That statesman, with a single eye to the interests of India, and with a profound spirit of righteousness worthy of an old fashioned Whig of the seventies, with its robust Liberalism, sternly declined to comply with Mr. Disraeli's mandate. He courageously withstood it till the importunities became so pressing that he deemed it

expedient rather to lay down his high office than be a party to the crime of unprovoked aggression against the Amir. Lord Lytton, his successor, came carrying in his pocket the new policy of Glory and Gunpowder on which his great *guru* had set his heart. Within eighteen months of his arrival, the fat was put into the fire. The match to the gunpowder, as wistfully desired by his *guru*, was ignited. Of course, there was a conflagration. But we need not further go into the history of the origin of the Afghan War. All that I would request you to remember at this stage is the change of policy - from masterly inactivity to unprovoked aggression resulting in the uprighteous war against the Amir, Shere Ali. The Jingo Government at home with the reddest of red "Imperialists" in the person of Mr. Disraeli as Prime Minister, and the Viceroy in India as his obedient instrument, actively launched the bold scheme of the Forward School. It is a truism to say that that policy entailed untold burdens on India by way of military expenditure till the 2nd Afghan War lasted, bringing little or no credit either to British statesmanship or British arms.

Happily for India, there was a change of Government in England in 1880 which, true to its Liberal traditions, had in opposition severely condemned the war and the original unrighteous policy which provoked it. With Mr. Gladstone at the helm of the new Government peace was soon restored, a relief was afforded to the revenues of India by a contribution of 5 millions sterling from the British Treasury, and a most broadminded, sympathetic and conscientious Viceroy, a Liberal of Liberals, was sent to rule over the people.

During Lord Ripon's Viceroyalty, we witnessed the re establishment once more of the old and wise policy of Sir John Lawrence, namely, of confining within the natural lines of the country's defence. Meanwhile, the whole field of military expenditure, as presented by the light of the stirring events of the immediate past, has been just surveyed by the Simla Army Commission and Lord Ripon's Government fully supported its recommendations.

But with the close of Lord Ripon's Viceroyalty, Sir John Lawrence's policy, it is rueful to state, also came to a final close. The so-called "Imperialism" was slowly coming to the front even in old England, and India got her first "Imperial" Viceroy in the person of Lord Dufferin trained and versed both in Oriental and Occidental diplomacy which might well be characterised as Jesuitical. A change of Government soon after his arrival here, took place. Lord Randolph Churchill, with his Imperialistic ideas, became Secretary of State. He completely overthrew the old policy. At each end, say, at Westminster and Calcutta, there was to be found at the helm of affairs a person deeply imbued with the spirit of Spread-eaglism. The Bengal Chamber of Commerce was vigorously plying its suit for the opening up of Upper Burmah by any means. It was urged that British merchants in Mandalay were molested and otherwise obstructed. Exaggerated, if not fallacious, accounts of the so-called anarchical condition of the dominions of King Theebaw were circulated by a venal Press. As a combined result of these events, Lord Randolph Churchill resolved to hoist the British flag at the capital of the Alhambras. The first preliminary step was taken, namely, of augmenting the Indian Army. In defiance of the recommendation of the Simla Army Commission that 60,000 British and 120,000 Indian troops would amply suffice to meet all emergencies and requirements, internal and external, that masterful Secretary issued his mandate to increase the forces by 10,000 European and 20,000 Indian soldiers. Thus the Jingo policy was fully set in motion and it is a truism to say that since that time, more or less with temporary interruption, that policy has been allowed to have its free away in India. It was brought in evidence before the Welby Commission by Sir David Barbour and Sir Auckland Colvin, two of the ablest Civilian Finance Ministers we have had, that the military policy, leading to large military expenditure, happens to be greatly in the ascendant when there is a strong Commander-in-Chief and a weak Viceroy or when both are strong. Conversely, with a strong Viceroy, full of pacific intentions, the military policy receives a considerable check.

Thus, it has happened that every impetus given to the military policy has constantly disturbed our finance. A budget balanced with some care and caution has been converted into one of deficit. Observed Sir A. Colvin : "One disturbing element in Indian finance is the constant frontier trouble—small expeditions with a nearly balanced budget may just have the effect of creating a deficit." And speaking of expeditions generally, he further observed that they are "inherent in the Indian system as that they have been more frequent of late in consequence of the adoption of a certain policy." Indeed, he emphatically declared that the net result of a strong military policy was the wrecking of Indian Finance. And the late Sir Edwin Collen was obliged under the cross-examination of Lord Welby to admit that "everything depends on an economic Viceroy."

It is superfluous to say that more or less the military policy held its ascendancy during the Viceroyalty of Lords Lansdowne and Elgin. There was the Kashmir imbroglio and the subsequent occupation of Gilgit, Hunza and Nahyar. The Chitral expedition followed and later on the inglorious expedition to Tirah. All these were the fruitful products of that ascendancy. But the policy became exceedingly mischievous during the masterful and "strenuous" Viceroyalty of Lord Curzon. No Viceroy came to India more steeped in the reddest of red Imperialism than he. It eventually led to that so-called "peaceful" expedition to Lhassa, with the ulterior object of threatening China in South-west Yunan. His ludicrous Spread-eaglism and pompous Caesarian attitude in the Persian Gulf is well-known. In his person Lord Curzon demonstrated to the hilt the truth of the statements made by high officials of State before the Welby Commission, that Indian finance was liable to the greatest disturbance with a strong Commander-in-Chief and a too militant Viceroy. But for the fat profits chiefly derived from the enormous coinage of rupees, the financial disturbances would have been seen at a very early date. The taxation imposed last year might have been earlier imposed by Lord Curzon himself. His surpluses were in reality windfalls and spent after the manner of spend-

thrifts, though we must acknowledge the remission of the salt duty. No doubt Lord Kitchener fell out with Lord Curzon, but the quarrel had reference rather to on administrative than a military problem. The autocratic Viceroy could not brook another Turk near his throne. But in the matter of the new-fangled organisation carried out by Lord Kitchener entailing further permanent burden on the revenue, Lord Curzon was one with him. To add to India's misfortunes, there unluckily happened throughout the three Viceroyalties that she had weak Secretaries of State, with no grit to check and control the strong military policy which was having its ful and free sway in the Viceregal Council. Thus, the policy having been what I have described above, is it a matter of surprise that from the days of Lord Dufferin to those of Lord Curzon, military expenditure, as already shewn in the early part of this paper, was allowed to amount upwards by leaps and bounds ?

Will There be any Material Retrenchment ?

I think I have fairly demonstrated how far two fundamental causes have largely operated in the growth of army expenditure ; firstly, the mischievous amalgamation scheme, and secondly, the equally mischievous "forward policy" of both the Government of India and the Home Government since 1885. Unless, therefore, the two principal causes which have contributed to the increase of 11·61 crores of rupees from 1885—86 are removed partially or wholly, I for one am not sanguine of any substantial reduction of military expenditure. We may take it for granted that the able officers at the head of the Finance Department will conscientiously discharge their duty, minutely examine the increases under each head of the grant for the annual army services and recommend such reduction and economy as to them may seem reasonably compatible with "efficiency", whatever may be understood by that word. We may consider ourselves lucky if they can show a saving of half a crore if ever so much. But assuming that it comes to that amount, we may inquire how long will it last and how soon may it be absorbed by fresh recurring expenditure. Experience informs us that all this labour which the Finance Department may undergo and all the savings they may effect will be so

much labour lost and wasted. Reductions there have been in the past, but they have been uniformly swept away by the force of the irresistible tide of military requirements. To take the latest and most striking instance. It would be in your recollection that the Welby Commission had recommended that India should be allowed a reduction in its Home military charges to the extent of £ 2,50,000. But before two years had elapsed the War Office jumped a mine on the Government by saddling our finances with £ 7,86,000 of annual permanent expenditure by way of increased soldiers pay. That fresh burden would have been impossible had there been no amalgamation scheme.

Then as to the policy. If you take into consideration that the new policy of aggression and expansion commenced with the augmentation of 30,000 soldiers, you will find that the additional cost by way of small wars, expeditions, mobilisation, up-to-date ordnance and other arms of precision, war material, and have absorbed many a lakh of rupees every year. In reality, the military candle has been kept burning on both these accounts without a thought of the burden on the inarticulate tax-payer. On the one hand, the amalgamation scheme entails from time to time a burden on our far from elastic revenue which the Government of India is powerless to prevent, and, on the other hand, there is the ascendancy of the military element in the Viceregal Government which leads to other increases of expenditure. It would be obvious, therefore, that until the amalgamation scheme, I repeat, is denounced in Parliament by some member of the vast military knowledge and experience of the late distinguished Sir Charles Dilke, and another of an equitable character is substituted instead, there can be no hope of any cessation of additional expenditure of a permanent character. You will never be able to keep it rigidly stationary at a certain figure as was the case from 1861—62 to 1884—85, with slight interruption. Policy also must be modified. That can partly be accomplished in two ways by our Indian representatives in the Viceregal Council. Firstly, by vigorously supporting the Government of India which for years past has been unsuccessfully remonstrating with the Home Government

in respect of charges dictated purely by Imperial interest in which India has no concern or next to none. Secondly, by a vigilant watch over all branches of military expenditure incurred in India which under existing circumstances may be deemed voidable.

Reduced Expenditure Postulates Change of Policy

In reference to policy it may be of importance to draw your attention to the very pertinent observations made by the Government of India in their despatch of 25th March, 1890, to which I have made reference in the sequel.

Much water has flowed under the bridge since then, but it may be fearlessly said that the Government is no way nearer to-day in successfully achieving its object than it was twenty years ago.

Simla Army Commission's Reports

I now come to my last point, namely, the proposed reduction in the strength of the army itself. I need not wait gentlemen, to inform you that if even half of the additional troops which were increased in 1885 is reduced there would result a substantial saving which would afford great relief to the revenue and which might be very well utilised for some of the most deserving and trying objects of public welfare. But before I further descant on this part of my subject, which is of immediate practical urgency I would detain you for a few minutes by taking you back to the report of the Simla Army Commission as it is of the highest importance in the consideration of the proposed reduction.

In its letter to the President appointing the Commission the Government declared the main object for which it was instituted, namely, "to assist Government in determining what share of the unavoidable reduction can be borne by the military charges without injury to the general efficiency of the army, and in what manner such savings can best be effected, In order that the Government may be put in a position to decide on this most important question, investigation of your

Commission must be comprehensive and exhaustive, embracing in fact the whole subject of military organisation and expenditure; you are requested to study carefully the improvements in administration which have been recently introduced into the British and other European armies and to consider how far such changes can be advantageously introduced into the Indian armies. The great problem of modern military organisation is to provide the largest and most efficient force in war with the smallest permanent peace establishment and expenditure ; and it is to a solution of this problem that the labours of your Commission must specially be directed." The Commission responded to this reference as follows:—

"Nearly two-thirds of the border of the Indian Empire is protected by the sea. So long as Great Britain is the mistress of the seas, the seacoast of India is protected by the fleet of England and the Indian army need provide only for defences at four or five sea ports. The external foes which the Indian army may have to meet on its land frontier are Russia and Afghanistan on the north-west ; Nepaul or Bhootan on the north-east; wild tribes of the Assam, Cachar and Arracan border on the east; and Burma on the south-east. It is not probable that Indian will come in contact with China or Persia on the land frontier of British India for some-time to come. For operations againt Russia or Afghanistan assisted by Russia, a force of two army corps of 50,000 to 60,000 fighting men might possibly be necessary. None has ever suggested that the army of India should be maintained at a strength necessary to put into the field a larger force than this. Two divisions of all arms would probably suffice for the requirements of a war with Nepaul ; while, against other external forces, a single division of all arms would, if communications were maintained, be enough."

It will be noticed that the recommendation of the Army Commission to have 50,000 to 60,000 European and 100,000 to 120,000 Indian troops was made after due deliberation and a most cautious and careful survey of the conditions on the frontier and the then position of Russian advance in Central

Asia the recommendation was agreed to by Lord Ripon's Government. But on his retirement and on the change in the Ministry in 1885, the Forward School found in Lord Randolph Churchill an active advocate to carry out its design. His mandate went forth to increase the European troops by 10,000 and Indian troops by 20,000. Nothing special had happened on the frontier and no change in the attitude of Russia had occurred to justify such an increase. Two of the members of Lord Dufferin's Government were so convinced of not only the non-utility of the increase but of its possible evils that they placed on record their trenchant dissent which bears date 14th August, 1885. Both the late Sir Auckland Colvin, that brilliant administrator who was then Finance Minister and Mr. (now Sir Courteney) Ilbert observed in their joint minute that "there seems every reason to apprehend that the increase of our forces beyond the needs enumerated by the army commission my prove a weapon less of defence than of aggression. We are of opinion that as no circumstances have arisen which from a military point of view have not already been foreseen and guarded against the proposal to increase the strength of the army of 27,000 men should be negatived. We are further of opinion that it may lead to the advocacy and possibly to the adoption of projects for the extension of our present frontier." And again : "It has been already pointed out that the existence of such a force would be no mean agent in bringing about the very risk which it is meant to obviate. A standing army which is larger than is necessary for home requirements will be a temptation, and almost an irresistible weapon of offence beyond the border." How prophetic was the warning will be readily admitted when we recall the events which have taken place on the frontiers since 1885. Who is unaware of the acquisition of Upper Burmah, of the occupation of Gilgit, Hunza and Nagyar which eventually culminated in the expedition to Chitral. Later on there were those expeditions in the Malakand Pass and the territories of the Afridis and Oekzais. Still later on there was that disastrous expedition to Tirah. All these have cost millions of money which might have been well avoided. But the addition to the forces was, as the two members of the Government

wisely forewarned, a direct incentive to frontier expeditions and land-grabbing. The plea has been put forward that they were all necessary in order that the frontiers may be kept free of turbulent tribes and Russian intrigues and complications. Russia had all through been held up as a bogey and Imperial interests were urged for the purpose as if the quarrels of Great Britain with Russia on the European Continent had any concern with India to justify an unnecessarily large standing army on the Indian border. The Government of India felt sore on this point. It had more than once remonstrated with the Home Government but in vain. In one of these most important despatches they were constrained to observe as follows :— "Millions of money have been spent on increasing the army in India, on armaments and on fortifications to provide for the security of India, not against domestic enemies, or to prevent the incursions of the warlike peoples of adjoining countries, but to maintain the supremacy of British power in the East. The scope of all those great and costly measures which is far beyond Indian limits and the policy which dictates them is an Imperial policy. We claim, therefore, that in the maintenance of British forces in this country a just and even liberal view should be taken of the charges which should be legitimately made against Indian revenues." But all through the remonstrances and appeals of the Indian Government have gone in vain while many more millions on arms and ammunitions, mobilisation, fortification, strategic railways and a variety of other objects too numerous to be detailed here, have been incurred from year to year, till the entire military expenditure, exclusive of strategic railways, stood at 28'66 crores in 1909-10.

Opinion of two Members of the Welby Commission on Army Charges Foisted on India

I hope I have now made it clear how far the *policy* pursued by the Imperial Government has been largely contributory to the expenditure which now absorbs the whole of the net land revenue of the empire. So able and levelheaded a member of the Royal Commission on Indian expenditure as the late Sir James Peile, in his separate minute to the Majority Report,

has observed : "It is needful to rememeber that the foreign military policy pursued in India, while it certainly aims at the safety of India, is also the policy of a great European State, and therefore a policy of mixed elements. The dictum that India should contribute part of the cost of British military operations in which India has a direct and substantial interest may easily be turned round. Here there is a partnership which implies joint objects and interest, and that I think is a reason for great consideration in dealing with the home effective charges." Again, the late Mr. Buchanan, who was also a member of the Commission, and became afterwards Under-Secretary of State for India, observed in his own minute that "in so far as the military defence of India is concerned, India pays everything and the United Kingdom nothing, and yet the maintenance of the military defence of India is one of the greatest of Imperial questions. The military strength of India is the main factor in the strength of our Empire in the East. In virtue of that strength Great Britain is a great Asiatic Power."

Prima Facie Grounds for Reconsidering Present Army Strength

The question then remains whether the time has not come when the entire policy of the Imperial Government, so far it is a great Asiatic power, should not be impartially considered on its own merits. If that policy is to be firmly maintained, then how may the growing expenditure be kept under check and control ? Indian revenues, as we are all aware, are subject to the greatest fluctuations either on account of physical calamities or external economics and politics which the polity of the Imperial Government force on this dependency. At present the Indian Government is sorely tried as to how to balance the two sides of the annual account. With the threatened extinction of the opium revenue the position two years hence is certain to be more embarrassed than it is at present. Either enhanced or new or both kinds of taxation will become inevitable or ways and means of retrenchment must be found to bring about an equilibrium in the balance sheet. As far as retrenchment has to be considered, I do not think that there can be any two opinions about military expenditure being the first which

ought to be taken on hand. We may economise civil expenditure as best we may; but it is neither so burdensome nor so crushing, let alone its productivity, as military. Having regard to the fact that the Russian bogey has been dispelled and that there is no reason whatever to apprehend any external attack from that Power on our frontiers in future there is no reason to have such a large standing army as is maintained at present. Moreover, many more miles of railways, strategic included, have been constructed at the expense of crores of rupees which have vastly facilitated transport and mobilisation. That fact ought to add additional weight towards the consideration of the question of retrenchment. There is, again, a considerable force of armed police which did not exist when the Simla Army Commission made the report. Next, the reserves and the Volunteer force also have been greatly augmented. Thus, view as you may the position at present from any point, you are irresistibly led to the conclusion that on every ground a case for retrenchment has been made out. Even so redoubtable an organ of the military bureaucracy as the *Pioneer* observed in its issue of 7th July as follows: "The argument that because a certain establishment laid down fifty years ago was appropriate to the wants of the Indian Empire, this estimate can never be liable to modification is surely one that could have only been brought forward from a scarcity of better ones. Circumstances are always altering; the balance of power is substantially shifting the dissolution of old combinations and the formation of new events in the outside world, such as new railways, new lands, new inventions, not to speak of campaigns and battles in whatever distant lands they may occur, are continually altering the relations of a country's military resources to the necessities, and making the forces that were ample at one time insufficient at another and *vice versa* * *. The menace that looked so black has rolled away for good, as far as human foresight can go. A strange shift of international politics has brought us into relations of friendliness and common interests with the power who for many long years seemed infallibly destined to close with us in a life and death struggle for the possession of India. Can it be said that the removal of such a weight offers no *prima facie* ground for a reconsideration of the scale of our

own military establishment ?" But the Russian bogey having been laid low by the Anglo—Russian agreement, the Forward School is now screaming that China is massing troops on the Nepaul Frontier and that affairs in the Persian Gulf, owing to the construction of the Bagdad railway, demand watchfulness and preparedness ! These are two bogies but they need not frighten anybody. For on the face of it it is absurd to expect China, or for that matter Siam, ever contemplating an attack on the north east frontier. Says the *Pioneer* : "To suppose that China would contemplate serious hostilities in those remote jungles while she lies open to blows over the heart from the British Navy would be to suppose her statesmen infatuated indeed. Then we are warned about the political situation of the Gulf, but it is not obvious how matters there should affect the Indian Army."

So far these fresh bogies may be at once dismissed from our mind. We need not tarry to consider them for a moment, utterly puerile as they are and opposed to all possibilities. On the other hand, to again quote the Allahabad paper, "it cannot be denied that the internal duties and responsibilities of the Indian Army have lightened very greatly during recent years, firstly, because it has no longer to act as counterpoise to a body more than twice its strength in the shape of the Native States' armies, and partly because of the enormous improvements in communications In brief, all the evidence seems to indicate a good *prima facie* case for the reopening of the question."

How may Retrenchment be Effected ?

A *prima facie* case being made out, let us consider how may a reduction in the cost of the Army be affected. There are, I think, only two ways of doing it. Either the Army should be brought down to the strength at which it stood before Lord Randolph Churchill increased it in 1885, or if that is not to be, then justice demands that the burden on the Indian revenues be lightened by a fair and reasonable contribution yearly from the Imperial Exchequer in consideration of the unquestionable service the retention of the present standing Army of India

renders to the Imperial Government, namely, in maintaining its supremacy in the East as a Great Asiatic Power.

As to the first alternative, even the *Pioneer* recommends it; but it would propose a reduction in the strength of the Indian troops alone. This is opposed by the unanimous voice of the Indian Press which voices enlightened Indian public opinion. For just consider what an Indian soldier costs and what a European. It appears from the Finance and Revenue Accounts for 1909-10 that the total cost of the European Army, consisting of 24,696 officers and 72,739 warrant officers and soldiers, in all 75,268, is a sum of Rupees 8.60 crore Rupees by way of regimental pay and allowances, provision, and the charges paid in England. The total cost of the Indian Army consisting of 30.15 officers and 160,411 warrant officers and men, in all 163,426 came to 6.40 crore Rupees for regimental pay and allowances and provision. Thus each European costs 1,142 Rupees and each Indian 392; in other words, it costs 3 times more to maintain European troops than Indian. If the strength of the European is brought back to that at which it stood up till 1885, say 50,000, the saving by the reduction of 10,000, in all now would mean 1.40 crore rupees. To obtain the same retrenchment of 1.40 crore Rupees would require the reduction of 28,000 Indian troops. Is it not wiser to curtail that limb of the Army which is needless and most costly? If, however, there is to be a reduction both in the European and the Indian Army, then it would be well to maintain a force of 50,000 for the former and 100,000 for the latter. The saving then would be in round figures nearly 3 crores—a very substantial saving indeed giving the greatest relief to the revenues and relieving the tax-payers from any fresh taxation which might be otherwise inevitable. With even a reduction of 5,000 European and 10,000 Indian soldiers the saving will be about 1¼ crore Rupees.

Of course, the *Times* and the other Chauvinistic papers in London, and their counterparts here, have been screaming aloud against the reduction of a single European soldier, but it is to be hoped that the prudent and economic Government of

Lord Hardinge will not be deterred by that irrational hue and cry from courageously facing the financial situation in the face and rendering that just financial relief to India which is called for. There is the greater hope of this, seeing how vigorously has the Under-Secretary of State in his budget speech laid emphasis on army retrenchment. By all means maintain the basal principle of having one European soldier for every two Indian. But it would be most unjust that while a European costs Rs. 1,404 per annum and an Indian only Rs. 492, to curtail the strength of the latter only and wholly maintain that of the former. That would be a crying injustice and otherwise impolitic from all points of view. But if the Chauvinist organs of British public opinion are anxious to see no European soldier reduced, then, they ought to be prepared in all conscience and equity to recommend to the British Treasury to bear a part of the cost of the European army in India, seeing that it is partially maintained in Imperial interests alone.

This brings me to the second alternative of the contribution to the Indian revenues from the British Treasury. So unbiassed and fair-minded a member of the Welby Commission as Mr. Buchanan observed in his minute to the Majority Report that "on general grounds and from our recent experience of the help that India's military strength can give to the Empire it is established beyond question that India's strength is the Empire's strength, and that in discharging these Imperial duties India has a fair claim that part of the burden should be borne by the Imperial exchequer. There may be difficulties as to the method of making the charge and the amount. As to the equity of the claim on the part of India there can be no doubt." I am sure every enlightened and fair-minded person, be he European or Indian, will endorse the justice of the suggestion which Mr. Buchanan had made but which, of course, did not commend itself to the majority of his colleagues. But the cogency of his reasoning and the fairness of his proposal must be deemed to stand as good, if not better, to-day than they were first made fourteen years ago.

Conclusion

Summarising, I may say that no substantial retrenchment can be effected in the Army expenditure unless the strength of the entire force, European and Indian, is brought back to what it was in 1885. There are most cogent reasons for such a reduction, seeing that the conditions which prevailed from 1885 till the date of the Anglo-Russian convention have altogether changed for the better. There can be no fear of external aggression from any European or even Asiatic Power, either from the north-west or north-east. The internal duties of the troops have been considerably lightened by the increased reserves, by the larger volunteer force, by the armed native police and by the trained Army of Native States. Thirdly, there has been enormous improvements and facilities of communication. Fourthly, more fortifications, military defence works, and strategic railways have been constructed. Lastly, the army to-day is infinitely more efficient every way in arms and accoutrements than it was in 1885. Each and every one of these are strong reasons in favour of a reduction. Apart from that, it is highly imperative to modify considerably the Army Amalgamation scheme of 1859 which has been the perennial source of increased Army charges for European troops, not infrequently of a character to embarrass the Indian exchequer as the Government of India has to its cost felt time out of number. It is an unequal partnership of a most burdensome character and withal so unjust that it offers next to no voice to the Indian Government to resist crushing charges imposed from time to time. The scheme, from the very first, has been condemned by experts, some of whom have not been slow to observe that it is a convenient instrument for the War Office when opportunity offers to serve the exigencies of British estimates. Such an one-sided and grossly iniquitous scheme needs either to be ended or mended. And, lastly, the Imperial policy in reference to the maintenance of its supremacy as an Asiatic Power in the East requires to be so far modified as to diminish to a large extent the financial liabilities and obligations it imposes—liabilities and obligations which should equitably fall on the British Treasury and against which the

Government of India has persistently protested and appealed to the Imperial Government but hitherto in vain.

WELCOME ADDRESS TO THE 30th CONGRESS*

Brother Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen

Though we are meeting today in this great "Unconventional Convention" under the dark shadow of a triple tragedy, unprecedented in its thirty years' history and though the dismal clouds of war still hang over the Empire like a vast funeral pall, I feel it my duty and a great honour and privilege, delegates to the Thirtieth Indian National Congress, to offer you, on behalf of the Reception Committee, a most hearty and cordial welcome. I know that you have responded in such strength and numbers at nothing else than the simple call of Duty. In the present condition of mental anguish and pain at the three lamentable events of a heart-rending character which have occurred within the short space of ten months, it is indeed a source of solace and comfort to see around me some old friends yet of the Congress in its earlist stages, friends, alas, too few but still spared to march in the vanguard of leaders and bravely to hold aloft the scared Standard of the Congress on which are inscribed in indelible letters the watchwords of Liberty, Progress, and National Unity, which in the fullness of time are destined to lead us to the cherished goal of Self-Government under the beneficent aegis of the great Anglo-Saxon race in whose hands an inscrutable Providence has for so long happily entrusted the destinies of the millions of this great country.

It is indeed to me, personally, an exceedingly sad reflection, in the midst of the mournful circumstances that have occurred, that so many of the founders of the Congress which took its birth in this city just thirty years ago, have, alas, gone to their

*Welcome adress address to the delegates as Chairman of the Reception Committee of the 30th Annual Congress held at Bombay on 27 December, 1915.

last resting place. Many have gone full of years and honours, a few before their time, and some at a time when their need was the sorest. The Congress can never forget the name of Allan Octavian Hume who was indeed its father. Neither can it be ever oblivious of the memory of his earlier colleagues in the great national work, colleagues like W.C. Bonnerji, K.T. Telang, Ananda Mohan Bose, Budrudin Tyabji, Ananda Charlu, Rangaya Naidu, Pandit Ajodhya Nath, Pandit Ganga Prasad Varma and others. But it was a cruel stroke of fate that deprived us at the beginning of this year, of the youngest but the most faithful and indefatigable of workers in the person of the good and gentle Gopal Krishna Gokhale. As if that was not enough, the hand of the Reaper deprived us only two months ago, as if in electric succession within eight days of each other, first of that great and sympathetic Englishman, no other than Sir Henry Cotton, whose love for the people of this country in which he was born was as great as the zeal, loyalty and statesmanship which he served his Government. And lastly, Sir Pherozeshah Mehta, whose swift and sudden death has not yet dried the tears of millions of his countrymen whom he served so uninterruptedly and selflessly for well nigh half a century. The whole country laments the death of these three great pillars of the Congress, and its people smite their heaving breasts with cruel blows. To me, I assure you, the shock, coming as it does in the autumn of my life, has been so great that I feel dazed. It is impossible to realise the loss which the motherland has sustained by the death of her three sterling sons. I seem to hear all around convulsive sobs and grievous moans. Never before had we to mourn such a triple tragedy. All that could be said in appreciation of these sturdy Congressmen has been ere now said to full and overflowing. However, the many eulogies and panegyrics that have been pronounced seem to act on those who survive like those dull narcotics numbing pain of which the Poet has sung in his doleful elegy. It has been said that those who die nobly have not lived in vain. That sentiment might, with absolute truth, be predicated of the three who have gone, we fervently hope, to swell the fulness of the eternal psalm and to ripen slowly to a higher birth. No storied urn, or animated bust will ever bring the

spirits of these dear departed friends—the benefactors of the Indian race—back to their mansions, but their good deeds will live from generation to generation in the hearts of the people. They have left foot-prints which the present and coming generations might in all humility tread if they wish to lead their country to a higher destiny.

While warmly welcoming you all, brother-delegates at this Congress, allow me, please, to tell you at the very outset that conscious as I am of my poverty to emulate the wealth of intellect of Sir Pherozeshah Mehta, his elegant diction, the stately dignity of his sonorous sentences, his penetrating political insight and sagacious statesmanship and, above all, his ringing eloquence combined with the charm of his magnetic personality. I crave your indulgence and patience, whilst standing in his place as Chairman of the Reception Committee, to give my own homely thoughts in my own simple language. First of all I cannot but echo the sentiments and feelings which have prevailed and are still prevailing among millions of the population whose representatives you are in this great assemblage from far and near from the farthest confines of the land to those of this Presidency and the City, regarding this terrible war raging on the Continents of Europe, Asia and Africa. It is a monster scourge, unrecorded in the history of the world, ancient or modern, the end of which not even the most prophetic eye is yet able to foresee. But we are all confident that the end, whenever it comes, will be a triumph of those who are fighting for the emancipation of oppressed nationalities from the barbaric militarism and tryanny of those who vainly aspire in their lust of unconquerable ambition for a world empire, undreamt of even by him who had conquered the ancient world. In this great moral combat, England once more has drawn her sword, as she did a century ago, but with the added strength of the entire Empire which is under her sway. Nobly have the daughter colonies from Canada to Australia come to her support with a spirit of burning patriotism which shall go down as a bright page in history. And equally nobly have the teeming millions of India rallied round her glorious Standard and the bravest of them are shedding

their life blood for the cause of the same freedom which they know is so important and invaluable for their own progressive civilisation. The sterling loyalty of the Indians has been demonstrated to the hilt, while the sceptics and the scoffers who loudly lisped of their so called lip-loyalty have been silenced. Such indeed is the time's spirit and such is the one imperishable lesson it has taught. Princes and people alike have vied with one other with a united heart and identity of purpose and interest to prove to the great British nation their gratitude for peace and blessings of civilization secured to them under its benign aegis for the last hundred and fifty years and more. Who could have dreamt three years ago that India's indigenous sons would go forward and take their place in the fighting line, side by side with the Armies of Britain and her Allies on the soil of Europe and that they would achieve those miracles of valour which the Generalissimo of the Army, Sir John French, has nobly recorded in words not to be mistaken and which have been so generously accentuated by our Most Gracious Majesty the King-Emperor himself. India is fully prepared to undergo every form of sacrifice which her rulers may demand and that not with the remotest idea of boons political or any other in the near future, but actuated only by the one all-overpowering motive of standing by their side in this their greatest hour of world crisis, on the ultimate issue of which hangs the future weal or woe of human liberty in the entire civilised world. It is in this spirit of loyalty and devotion that the Princes and people of India are working and shall work, I am perfectly confident, till the arms of Britain and her Allies have achieved their glorious triumph. As sure as day the Teuton is being driven to his destiny. As a writer prophetically said some years ago, "the stone throne of Germany with its feet of cannon balls is part of the befitting and to be expected destiny of the Hohenzollerens as Sedan is the natural end of Napoleon." In connection with this war there is but one serious disappointment to which I cannot refrain from making reference in this place. Many an enlightened and intelligent person, irrespective of caste or creed, in every province of the Indian Empire, has applied from the very date of the declaration of war, to go to the front and

fight side by side with the soldiers of the regular Indian Army. Even to-day thousands on thousans are willing and ready to take up arms in the great cause for which the Allies are fighting. But, unfortunately, the permanent Bureaucracy of the land have sternly, if politely, refused those applications, the why and the wherefor of which has never been made known. It is this attitude of the Government, in the midst of the great tragic crisis, that has given the bitterest disappointment to which many a leading organ of public opinion has given full expression. Russia, which has millions of population, but less numerous than that of India, has already raised and is still raising a popular army full of ardour and patriotism to overcome the forces of the modern Vandals who are such enemies of liberty and freedom. The Colonies are similarly raising corps after corps to give succour to the mother-country, but strange to say that while millions in India are on the *qui vive* to offer their services, a kind of proscription has gone forth from the Governing Authorities that they shall not be enrolled. This is indeed an un-English attitude which is irreconcilable with the entire policy of British administration in every other part of the Empire. I am only echoing the universal sentiments and feelings of our countrymen when I venture to say in this place that the Rulers of India still seem to mistrust the people. I will not enlarge on this subject, but I do trust and hope that wiser counsels will prevail at the seat of Government and a broad and statesmanlike policy will be soon adopted which will dismiss for ever this un-English spirit of mistrust and remove that galling disappointment which millions feel. Our Rulers have only to read aright the statesmanlike policy which Imperial Rome adopted, the policy that welded together the various subject races under her away from distant Britain and Gaul to Mesopotamia and Persia and armed them to the teeth to support her invincible Standard against every foe of the Empire. Surely, what Imperial Rome did in the days of the zenith of her military glory, can be wisely and unhesitatingly followed to-day by the great British Empire which in its extent far surpasses that of the ancient Mistress of the World, stretches as it almost does from one end of the globe to the other. Is it necessary to say that with the millions of this

country enrolled for war service. England can oppose her enemies if needed for the next quarter of a century without exhaustion ? The British Government need never think of compulsory military service in the old country which has already sacrificed almost the whole flower of her manhood and youth, if it only contemplated without the least spirit of misgiving the overwhelming strength which could be secured by turning the Indian population into a voluntary army which might astonish, if not stagger, humanity.

Virility in a people is as much essential as material prosperity to their orderly and healthy progress. There should be a happy co-ordination of the arts of war and peace. Material prosperity alone is prone to lead to effeminacy or as the poet has said "men decay where wealth accumulates," So too excessive exercise of virility alone is unproductive of prosperity and often leads to stagnation, if not arrest, of all social progress and welfare. History teaches us that that nation survives the longest which possesses in itself both the elements of virility and material prosperity in the highest degree. Indeed, Great Britain has herself shown to the world, in this unhappy war, a brilliant instance of what co-ordination of great wealth and material resources with a spirit of virility can achieve. Are we not entitled to say that this co-ordination alone has enabled her to raise the large army of over three millions without any previous compulsory military service ? Wealth alone at this hour could not have accomplished this miracle which is the admiration of the world. Side by side with her material prosperity was to be discerned all through that fostering and stimulating of the soldierly spirit in her militia first, in her volunteers next, and, lastly, in her territorials. We all devoutly hope that, profiting by this great achievement, Great Britain will not deny any further to the Indian people the exercise of arms, the want of which for so many years, has led to their emasculation.

Leaving now this external factor which, at present, dominates the people of this country with one heart and one mind, let me take note of some of the outstanding domestic factors

which have moulded her destiny for the better during the eleven eventful years since our great National Convention last assembled in this city. First and foremost must be noted the Morley-Minto Reform which has greatly expanded the Constitution of the older Legislative Councils that had been brought into existence since 1892. And though the elective basis has not yet been fully recognised in response to the universal voice of the people, we have, with our characteristic spirit of contentment, accepted the homeopathic dose of popular reform which the combined statesmanship of Lords Morley and Minto have vouchsafed to us. We are thankful for the privilege accorded to us for a freer discussion of the Budget, though here too the niggardliness of the boon is plainly discernible. A popular budget in the sense that it is known in Great Britain is yet a possibility only of the future. There is yet no element of democratisation in the method and manner in which the different Legislative Councils are privileged to prepare and discuss it. The Annual Budget in no way reflects popular wants and wishes. It is still the child of the single individual who is entrusted with the portfolio of Finance tempered only by the light of such criticism as may be thrown on it by the representatives of the people. As yet there is no attempt of a serious character based on a deliberate policy of the decentralisation of Imperial Finance. Neither is its provincial finance so far decentralised as to give a free and healthy movement to local self-government. Centralisation seems to be still stereo-typed and I need not tarry to inform you how chilling, nay, petrifying, is its effect on the economic welfare of the people. Apart from the niggardly boon accorded for the discussion of tbe budget in the Imperial and Provincial Councils, and the privilege of moving Resolutions there is nothing special to which we can refer. The Morley-Minto Reform is only an outer crust of the bread for which the people are still crying. We are, however, thankful that the privilege has been accorded of two Indians obtaining seats in the India Council and of one Indian being associated in the Executive Council of the Imperial and Provincial Governments. But there too, the method and manner of appointment by nomination is deemed to be far from satisfactory, for the

people have absolutely no voice in their nomination. Thus, if we consider the principal features of the Morley-Minto Reform, we find that they are so exceedingly defective and hardly in harmony with the growing popular sentiment and wishes that it is inevitable that sooner or later the defects which presently accompany them will have to be removed.

The other features which have distinguished the decade may be very briefly referred to here. Just as the Congress had for long voiced the reform of Legislative Councils on an elective basis, so did it in the first instance crystallise on its own platform the popular demand for decentralisation of the administration generally. Next, the expediency of extending the higher offices of the State to Indians in harmony with their greater progress and lastly the enforcement of the equal rights and privileges of Indians as citizens of the British Empire in the oversea dominions of Great Britain. As to the Decentralization Commission, of which our distinguished countryman, the late lamented Mr. Romesh Chandra Dutt, was one of its conspicuous members, you are all aware of the mass of evidence taken by it in this country some years ago. Their report in ten volumes has long since been published, but we have not yet seen any finality thereon from the Imperial Government. As a matter of fact, it would seem that the mountain has laboured only to produce a ridiculous mouse. To the Indian population at large, who anticipated some important recommendations therefrom of a far-reaching character, the Resolution of the Imperial Government is a great disappointment. Practically it is only right to say that Decentralisation has made no progress whatever and the matter stands where it was before the Commission was appointed. But it is not for me to say what has often been said of Royal Commissions that they are generally known to be devices for shelving difficult or inconvenient problems. They seldom solve them. Their character has been well typified in the following couplet :

"Promise, pause, prepare, postpone,
And end by letting things alone."

As to the report of the Public Service Commission, of which the late brilliant Mr. Gokhale was its most prominent

Indian member, it has for the present not been allowed to see the light of the day and it is useless, therefore. to speculate on the recommendations which the Commissioners, like the Macbethian Witches, may have secretly boiled down in their cauldron for our weal or woe. All that we may wish for is, that when published, it will in no way give rise to discontent leading to fresh agitation. In this matter of the Public Service no finality can ever be reached, be there as many Royal Commissions or other devices, so long as Indians are deliberately baulked under various pretexts of their legitimate aspirations and ambitions.

Lastly, it is a matter of great satisfaction that the deep and abiding sympathy of our beloved Viceroy has been so greatly instrumental in having a Commission appointed which has led to a fairly satisfactory settlement of the problem which has so long rankled in the heart of every Indian at the hardship, injustice and disabilities to which our countrymen were subjected in South Africa. The sagacity which prompted Lord Hardinge to send Sir Benjamin Robertson as the unofficial Ambganador on behalf of his Government to use his most friendly influence to bring about a happy ending of the disagreeable dispute cannot be too highly praised. Of course, there yet remains the recognition of the principle that all subjects of His Majesty the King are entitled to equal rights and privileges of British Citizenship in every nook and corner of the Empire where waves the British flag. And we are all greatly indebted to his Lordship for the further pronouncement he made in the matter in the Viceregal Legislative Council some time ago. So far then it is a matter of satisfaction to record that the principal grievances of the people, as voiced by the Congress, in its annual Sessions during the last ten years, have had a partial redress and so far we beg to acknowledge our gratitude to the Government. In the matter of all public grievances, wherever raised, whether in the civilised parts of the world or in backward countries it seems to me that it is the course of wisdom for "shepherds of people" to satisfy those grievances in time, before they lead to unrest with its many attendant evils which can bode no good to the State and

to the people alike. As that great American scholar and statesman, Mr. Lowell, has observed: "It is only by the instigation of the wrongs of men that what are called the rights of men become turbulent and dangerous. It is then only that they syllogise unwelcome truths. It is not the insurrections of ignorance that are dangerous but the revolts of intelligence. It is only when the reasonable and the practical are denied that men demand the unreasonable and impracticable; only when the possible is made difficult that they fancy the impossible to be easy."

At present the air is thick with another popular grievance which, as time goes on, will demand the highest counsel of perfection and the most mature political wisdom for purposes of redress. It is, of course, in consonance with the constitutional creed laid down by the Congress, that Self-Government under the British Rule is its *ultima thule*. But the way, I am afraid, to the promised land is long and beset with difficulties which it would be wisdom on our part to take cognisance of. A hasty or rash step or a precipitate move, calculated to endanger the patriotic aspirations breathing in every enlightened unit of the Empire, is most inexpedient and absolutely undesirable. We must so balance our minds as not to be carried away by sympathy for liberal maxims into wild transports of revolutionary rapture. Great organic measures, as the constitutional history of free countries teaches us, are always preceded by a reasonable period of discussion. A variety of ideas on Self-Government, more or less of a crude or nebulous character, now mooted in the country, need to be well moulded into a crystallized form and to be tasted in the crucible of practical politics before they could be materialised. It is only by such a slow and measured process that we can reach the goal. It is not the multiplicity of organisation which is wanted. What is most essential and of paramount importance is the concentration of responsible opinion, well-reasoned, well-balanced and well-directed, which might unmistakably reveal the fact that India is of one mind and one heart. There are lions in the path who will have to be overcome and we should not forget another important fact that bureaucracy, in every part of the

world, is stubborn and unwilling to move. Their pace of progress is the pace of the tortoise. In practical politics we cannot omit to take into account these elements. It would not be inappropriate here were I to quote the opinion of a distinguished member of the Anglo-Indian Bureaucracy in reference to all Indian political progress. It was Sir Auckand Colvin who in 1884 observed in that remarkable but exceedingly statesmanlike paper entitled "If it be real—what does it mean?" contributed to the *Pioneer*, as follows: "While the English mind in India has been tempted to stand still, arrested by the contemplation of the fruits of its efforts in former times, and by the symmetry of the shrine, the pride of its own creation, in which it lingers to offer incense to its past successful labours, the Indian mind has been marching on, eager and anxious to expand its own sphere of action, and to do what it, for its own part, has to do."

Thus it is that while the dry bones in the valley have been galvanizing themselves into life for the last 30 years and Indian humanity has been taking large strides in all matters affecting its political, social, educational and industrial welfare and is instinct with manifold activities in all directions, the Bureaucracy has been almost standing still before its venerated but obsolete shrine, making *puja* to it, while unconscious of all the progress that has been so quickly going around it. That hierarchy still seems to be little aware that the country has rapidly passed through the transition stage ever since the epoch-making Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon, and that it is now entering on a stage which is in every respect a radically different one from that to which its members have been accustomed since the mid-Victorian age. Self-Government is bound to come, I venture to say, albeit, by measured stages, from precedent to precedent. Of course, there are those enthusiastic and ardent, though impatient, idealists who seem to entertain the belief that they have only to pronounce aloud the shibboleth of Self-Government to realise in a trice the accomplishment of their ideas. To such I have only to refer to the sage observations which that stalwart Congressman and robust friend of India, the late Sir Henry

Cotton, made in the course of his address in this very city eleven years ago, as the President of the twentieth Session of Congress : "The process of reconstruction cannot be effected otherwise than by slow and gradual means. Many years must elapse before we can expect the consummation of a reconstructive policy. But it is a policy which we should always keep before our eyes. In the cautious and gradual

* * * * * * * * * * *

development of representation, in the increase of your power and influence in India itself, involving the ultimate extension of autonomy, we shall find the appropriate and natural prize and legitimate goal for Indian aspirations."

So far as to the impatient idealists. As to the members of the distinguished Service, the men in power and authority, I need not say that it would be idle for them any longer to deny the ideal altogether to the Indians or to say that the country can never be ready for it or to put every obstacle in the way of its realisation. And the sooner, therefore, they prepare themselves to meet the wishes and sentiments of that New India, rising fast before it, the better it will be for their own existence and their reputation for administrative sagacity. In his memorable "History of Civilisation", Buckle has observed : "Men have recently begun to understand that, in politics, no certain principles having yet been discovered, the first conditions of success are compromise, barter, expediency and concession. It will show utter helplessness even of the ablest rulers, when they try to meet new emergencies by old maxims. It will show the intimate connection between knowledge and liberty ; between an increasing civilisation and an advancing democracy. It will show that for a progressive nation, there is required a progressive polity ; that within certain limits, innovation is the solid ground of security ; that no institution can withstand the flux and movements of society, unless it not only repairs its structure but also widens its entrance ; and that even in a material point of view no country can long remain either prosperous or safe, in which the people are not gradually extending their power, enlarging their privileges,

and, so to say, incorporating themselves with the functions of the State. Neglect of these truths has entailed the most woeful calamity upon other countries."

Such is the undoubted truth which history has deduced from past politics of great States which, we fain hope, will be ever present before the mind of the rulers of present India and serve as the basis of the coming polity of reconstruction. Let us earnestly pray that this terrible war now waging may by the mercy of Divine Providence be brought to a satisfactory and peaceful close whereby our rulers may be enabled to respond to the popular appeal by laying down a far seeing policy which will give a first instalment of genuine and living representation in the active government of the country broad-based upon the people's will. And you will all agree with me that no one is more capable of formulating such a beneficent policy in this direction, on a sound and liberal basis than our present beloved Viceroy, whose sagacious and sympathetic statesmanship has already achieved for him a name and fame as imperishable as that of Canning and Ripon, in the annals of British India.

With these observations, Brother Delegates, I once more tender you our heartiest welcome to this Congress, whose deliberations, I devoutly hope, will be crowned with success.

SIMULTANEOUS EXAMINATIONS*

Sir, I am sorry to say that the arguments urged against the resolution brought forward by my friend, the Hon'ble Mr. Malaviya, do not convince me. As far as the difficulties are concerned, I have heard of these difficulties before in almost all official arguments brought against simultaneous examinations ; these arguments are very old and they are being trotted

*Speech in the Imperial Legislative Council on 21 September, 1917 in support of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya's resolution on simultaneous examinations.

out every time. I see that this time also they have been trotted out by the Home Member. I remember reading these things thirty years ago when the House of Commons passed a resolution (in 1892) in favour of simultaneous examinations, and the Government of India issued a blue-book in which all these arguments, which are now being trotted out, were repeated. So far, then, they are all stock arguments which are dragged in every time in order to oppose this very simple and just resolution which has been brought forward to-day. Now as to the difficulties, what are they ? The Home Member says there are difficulties in the matter of holding examinations both in England and in India at the same time. How far the conducting of an examination in England and in India is a horrible, a terrible, thing I do not know ! The same questions might leak out in England as out here. No, there is nothing in that reasoning. I may say, Sir, that the local Cambridge examinations, Junior and Senior, are simultaneous examinations : questions are, of course, put on the same day in England and in the different centres in India, in Madras, Calcutta, Bombay and elsewhere : the answers are all sent to London where they are, of course, examined and one list is made out in which the results are declared. Where is the difficulty in the case of the Civil Service Examinations ? I do not see any difficulty that the Civil Service Commissioners can find so far as these examinations are concerned. Even with regard to the *viva voce* part of these examinations, surely, there are more than one or two Civil Service Commissioners ; one of them can always be deputed when the examination takes place to come out here and conduct the *viva voce* examination on the same day that the London candidates are examined there. Where is the difficulty ? I do not see any at all. Sir, it is the case, that when there is a selfish interest to be preserved and conserved, difficulties always arise ; red herrings are drawn across the path and this is one of the red herrings which the Honourable Home Member has brought forward to-day.

The Hon'ble Sir William Vincent :—"I really must rise to a point of order. It was only quoting the arguments which

had been advanced against the proposal ; I did not pretend to put forward arguments of my own. I think that it is unfair to suggest anything else."

The Hon'ble Sir Dinshaw Wacha :—"That may be ; the arguments in general are the arguments of the Civil Service."

The Hon'ble Sir William Vincent :—"The Hon'ble Member may say that they are the arguments of the Civil Service, but he has no right to father them on me."

The Hon'ble Sir Dinshaw Wacha :—"The Hon'ble Member is a member of the Civil Service, and I consider that he is here as Home Member and as a member of the service which governs India.

Well, Sir, as to the other arguments. In former days, when the Congress was held, we were told that it was a Hindu Congress and that the Muhammadans did not join in it. "Of course, when there is a difference of opinion, how can we agree to all the propositions urged by a Hindu Congress." So we were not unfrequently told by the Government. But the Hindus and Muhammadans are amalgamated. There is unanimity of thought, speech and mind between both communities. Government now trot out the question of Brahmins and non-Brahmins. That is the usual way with the bureaucracy, and there is nothing particular about it. I understand it to be intelligent enough. But what if there are Brahmins and non-Brahmins ? There is the Charter Act which lays down clearly that 'proved merit and ability' shall be the only qualifications for the public service. One may be a Brahmin, or non-Brahmin, or an Australian, or a Canadian, or a Negro or a Hottentot, what about that ? So far as the Service is concerned we are to have the best men for the Indian Government. There is nothing further to be said about it. Take the case of the Civil Service in England. Is there any distinction made between the Welsh, Scotch, English, Irish, and so on. There are men of all races and denominations. Take the Austrian Government. Does the Home Member mean to say that none of the representatives of the different communities and races there hold very high appointments or are appointed governors

or posted to high offices ? Did the Austrian Government complain that there was a Magyar or a Slav or a Czech or some one of that sort in its public service ? There is that difficulty : but what does it matter ? Why then should we have any more difficulty here with Brahmin preponderance or Muhammadan preponderance or Parsi preponderance or any other ? The Charter Act is clear on the point ; it says 'men of proved merit and ability' shall only be employed in the public service. Then it is laid down that there shall be no 'governing caste' in India. Where is the governing caste ? The governing caste is the Civil Service ; they are the governing caste, and yet the Brahmin is denounced. I cannot at all, Sir, understand that argument. Therefore, so far as the two principal arguments urged by the Home Member are concerned, they do not, I am sorry to say, hold water at all. Then, look at the other side. There is what you call a list of 'present discontents.' It is not one discontent but there are six, perhaps more ; and in this list of present discontents, simultaneous examination holds the first place. And why ? Because it is the oldest discontent against which for more than fifty years, from 1860 onwards, the people have been crying and crying. Time after time it has been brought before Parliament and still nothing has been done. And up to this time not a single strong argument has been brought forward against it. All the arguments that have been brought forward by Government here or by the Secretary of State before Parliament are these specious and fallacious arguments only. That is the position ; and yet after fifty years of education, after universities have been established and thousands after thousands of students have passed through them, after being told that India is rapidly progressing in educational matters and in moral and material condition, you say 'No simultaneous examinations shall be held.' As my friend, Mr. Jinnah, put it well 'why should there be any examination at all in England ? The examination is for service in India : if that is the case what does it matter whether it is held in India and in England alike ? It is the old story of the Saxons and the Normans. I will not use any strong words as to how the Saxons felt when the Normans got appointments and how they chafed under their disabilities. I wish the Home Member and

all the other Members of the Service will put themselves in the category of the Saxons and us in the category of Normans and say how they would feel and how they would like to be governed by them. I say to the Civil Service, enter into our skins, into the skins of us, Indians, and find out what the Indian feeling and sentiment is. The answer is as far as India is concerned, 'the service is Indian and the examination must be confined to India alone.' Let Australians, Canadians, Irishmen come, let them all come. We welcome them but of course, those who have shown the best merit and ability should alone be employed. But at present these are all the artificial barriers of the bureaucracy and it is for these reasons that simultaneous examinations are opposed by the service. With these words I support the Resolution.

INDIAN RECRUITS IN THE INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE*

Sir, so far as I understand the present Resolution it is this, that half the number of the members of the future Civil Service should be Indians. The objection urged against it is the maintenance of British character, that is to say, that the Indian administration should have as its chief characteristic British character. Well, Sir, I fully and very frankly admit that the British character of the Indian administration must be maintained. British character has done a great deal of good to India during the last 125 years. I believe, that for the good of India the stamp of British character on the administration should be maintained. I believe that, so far as that future goes, even my Indian friends will not dispute the proposition. It is understood, of course, that the British character should be there. The question then is, why there should be any preponderance ? As I, Sir, said in my speech last time, the Charter Act of 1833, only prescribes that in the services of India men of 'proved merit and ability' alone should of course be requisitioned, irrespective of creed and race ; and in subsequent acts

*Speech in the Imperial Legislative Council on 24 September, 1917 on the Indian Civil Service.

up to now, so far as I am aware, there has been no such condition made that there should be a preponderance of the British, as far as the Civil Service is concerned. In order to understand clearly the whole question, we must go back to the genesis of this covenanted Civil Service. Those who have studied the history of the East India Company will easily understand that the covenanted service came more and more into existence with the territorial sovereignty of that Company. The company was a trading company at first. Then it became a territorial sovereign and its territorial sovereignty demanded, of course, a certain amount of administrative ability. That administrative ability in those days was not to be found in India. The administration had to be carried on in English and a knowledge of English was non-existent in India at the time. As they advanced, Indians have, of course, risen to high offices on account of the English education they have received. Universities have been established and so forth. But the genesis is this, that because the East India Company from the days of its sovereignty was obliged to import covenanted servants, or clerks as they were then called, the tradition of predominance has gone forth, and from that time that tradition has remained as many other traditions have remained. But a time came, particularly after the transfer of the East India Company to the Crown, when there was a change. From that time forward a sort of rivalry began, very dim at first. But it became very transparent and acute later on as the competitive Civil Service examination was established in 1855, and Indians began to compete. Then, of course, with the advance of Indian education on one side and the numerical strength of the Civil Service on the other side, there ensured that rivalry, a rivalry of supremacy, as to whether it was the British service which should preponderate or whether it was the Indian service which should preponderate ; and all the friction that has occurred and which continues to prevail is owing to this rivalry for offices on the one side and on the other. Every time this question has been discussed the Government of India have brought forward this expediency of maintaining British character on the administration. But, admitting as I say, that the British character of the administration should be maintained, where is the necessity

to have this limit that only 25 per cent of the appointments should go to Indians and no more? I think, Sir, that the cause of justice and the cause of fair play, both demand that this limit should not exist. If I, personally, were asked I should say have no limit whatever. As Indians advance more and more in administrative capacity and ability, and in strength of character, I think, that the character of the British administration itself should be so amalgamated with that of the Indian character, that, necessarily, the future Government of India must consider that the Indian administration should be Indianised as far as possible, and therefore, the number of Europeans in the Civil Service should, as far as may be practicable, be limited to a very small number. 'Thus far and no further' should be the limits. We have not yet come to that finality, and I am afraid, that finality will not be reached for another quarter or even half a century. In the meantime, of course, the administration must be carried on, but simultaneonsly Indian aspirations now rising should be reasonably satisfied. It is the duty of the Government to see that those aspirations as so satisfied. The question is how may they be satisfied? All this unrest which is going on in the country has its root cause in many things. One of these, one of the most important, is this question of preponderance of the British in the Civil Service. It is but fair that as Indians advance in administrative ability, in strength of character and in other desirable ways the Government of India should see that the administration is more and more Indianised, slowly and steadily. That being my opinion, I consider, Sir, that the proportion of half and half is a very good one to be given, though, as I say, the time must come, must inevitably come, when even this half and half proportion must be increased, and the present figures will have to be reversed, that is, the Indian Civil Servants should consist of 75 per cent, and the British Civil Servants of 25 per cent. That will be the final stage. I am not a prophet, but living among my own countrymen and knowing their spirit of loyalty and appreciation of British administration, I have no doubt that will eventually be the outcome. But for the present, Sir, I consider the Hon'ble Pandit's Resolution is a very good one, and that the half and half proportion it recommends should be established."

SALARIES AND ANNUITIES IN THE INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE*

Sir, it is often said that India is a land of anomalies and among the greatest of those anomalies are the economic and financial anomalies. The services which the Indian Civil Service have rendered in the past are no doubt very great. It has been acknowledged so, not to-day, not yesterday, but for the last 40 or 50 years. It has been also said that the Service is the most liberally paid in the whole world. My friend, the Honb'le Pandit Malaviya, has just made a comparison of the salaries of high officials of State in different countries, especially in Japan. My friend, the Hon'ble Mr. Sastri, pointed out how the different services are paid in Ceylon and the Federated Malay States. All this shows that even taking into consideration the fact of expatriation, which is always trotted out in this connection,—taking everything into consideration,—the Indian Civil Service, and all the other cognate services connected with it, are very highly paid. Not only are they highly paid; but were the course of the charges of the Civil Departments of the administration for the last 25 years traced and analysed—and any body can refer to the officially recorded figures for himself—it would seem that these charges are continually increasing one way or other. Appointments have been multiplied, technical and others specially. Technical appointments were greatly multiplied during Lord Curzon's time for the sake of what is called efficiency. That is one of the directions in which the charges have gone up high. We have been hammering at all these increased civil charges for years past; I have written brochures on the subject; I have forwarded copies of them to the Government of India. I have pointed out therein that while the revenue is increasing at a slow pace the expenditure is increasing at a higher pace, particularly in the civil administration. Take even the last ten years. You will find from the latest parliamentary return that while the ratios of revenue are rising at a lower percentage,

*Speech in the Imperial Legislative Council on 25 September, 1917 in support of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya's resolution.

those of expenditure are rising at a higher percentage. I have not, of course, the actual figures before me here and, therefore, I won't commit myself; but I assure this Council that if they analyse those figures they will find that these charges are excessive already, and that they are more than the revenue can afford. That is the case; and there can be no question that an impartial commission—(not a commission of the kind of the Public Services Commission we have had, which was never an impartial one in my opinion, because it was an inspired commission; vested interests like those of the Civil Service were greatly protected, and not only protected but sought to be increased as we actually find from the Majority Report)—I say if an impartial commission were appointed, composed of men from outside India; men who have, perhaps, had larger experience of administration and the cost of administration of different countries of the world they would find that we can reasonably reduce the expenditure on the Civil Services. Remember, Sir, that this scale of salaries of the Civil Service was fixed years ago, somewhere about three-quarters of a century ago—I think it was in the time of Lord Cornwallis or Lord Bentinck; and at that time the great reason assigned for such large salaries of the covenanted servants, was the expatriation. At that time there was no Suez Canal: there were very few steam navigation companies; besides, there were many other difficulties and inconveniences. Civilians were separated from their homes and families and frequent furloughs were not possible. Taking those conditions into consideration the salaries were fixed at a high rate. Consider, Sir, what has happened now, 75 years have passed since the fixing of the rates. The Suez Canal has been in operation for the last 47 years. Navigation companies by hundreds have been started here, there and everywhere. Any Civilian can go to-day within a fortnight to his home and return within three months, as many Civilians and Judges of the High Court are actually doing every year, while drawing their full salary to which they are entitled on account of the privilege leave. That being so, and many other social amenities, which were very hard to obtain in the days of Lord Cornwallis and Lord Bentinck, being available now, Civilians in Madras or Bombay or

Calcutta or any other Province can at any time they like be in the midst of their homes. Yet, in spite of all these most favourable conditions, they continue to get the old rate of salaries and different kinds of allowances, which Mr. Sastri related in his speech. But it is of no use, crying wolf, for this is an old antiquated story of high civilian salaries and other charges of civil administration. We are helpless in the matter. We are helpless even to-day, notwithstanding our reformed Council. I doubt, whether this proposition will be carried, but even if it were carried I do not know whether the Government of India will give effect to it. There will be score of reasons assigned to decline it. We all understand that these are old stories ; and that there is nothing new in them. But times have changed and I do hope, that the Government will take a very considered and reasonable view of matters, particularly having regard to the fact to which my friend, Mr. Sastri, referred, namely, the comparatively poor ability of Indian tax-payers. What is that ability ? Compare it with the ability of almost all other civilised countries in the world, and we shall find it most deplorable. It is a cypher, a zero, compared with the wealth of countries like France, England, United States, Austria, and even Turkey I should say. That being the case, it should be always a consideration for the Government of India, if they are governed by statesmanship, that the ability of the tax-payers should be their first care in reference to the question of the salaries of Civilians.

For my part I consider that old times have changed, and the time has come when the salaries should be revised with reference to the market rate prevailing all over the world. The market rate may be high or low ; but fix the salaries at the market rate. Further, I would say there should be no agreements and no covenants. These covenants are most burdensome : they bring in their train costly furlough allowances, pensions, and a lot of other charges. I say all these must be abolished. Civilian gentlemen, members of the government, of course sit down for five years and pass Resolutions after Resolutions that posts of this or that character shall carry consolidated salaries of so much or so much. But they have no such consolidation

for themselves. The governing principle seems to be that those that have much shall be given more and those that have less shall be deprived of whatever little they have. This is what they are doing now, particularly so far as the masses of poorer servants are concerned. I consider, Sir, therefore, that a revised rate of consolidated salaries should take the place of the existing salaries and allowances on the basis of the market rate whether the supply comes from England, or Wales, or from Australia, or Canada, or South Africa or even from Japan, I do not care. India wants efficient but less costly service from any place in the world. But we need not go to any place in the world at all ; India itself has abilities enough to work on salaries lower than those prevailing at present. The next thing is that each post must be assigned its proper adequate market salary. I do not know whether members of the Government of India who are now drawing Rs. 6,000 per month or Rs. 5,000 really deserve that salarly ? Suppose we advertise for a Home Member of the Government or for a Finance Member, cannot we get one for a less sum than Rs. 6,000 ? I submit, Sir, that I can get you from America a good financier or administrator for Rs. 3,500 or 4,000. I am talking frankly on this subject. The Civil Service has its traditions, and those traditions are, that they must be bequeathed from generation to generation. There is nothing new that from time to time these traditions are trotted out. It has gone on for the last 75 years. These Civilian interests have become vested ; and whenever vested interests are attacked, the reply is 'This is impossible, and that is impossible, you cannot do this and you cannot do that ; the war is with us and we must not discuss this, that and the other.' They are all mere plausible pretexts to say *non-possumus*. I am sorry to have to say all this, but we must speak frankly and express our honest convictions on the subject. If we are to express the feelings and sentiments of the Indian people generally, then, I do say that the Indian Civil Service ought to be abolished, and that a new Service in its place should be created ; and you can get a new Service from any part of the world, if not from India alone, and that on lower salaries. That reconstructed service will solve largely the question of economic employment, and

at the same time save to the State a large amount of revenue for purposes, as Pandit Malaviya said, of education, sanitation, and a hundred other utilities for which we are famishing. For these reasons, Sir, I think the time has come when the Government of India should take into consideration this particular Resolution of my friend, Mr. Sastri. It is a very good resolution. If it is impartially considered, I think that the Government of India ought to pay no heed to the recommendation made by the Public Services Commission, that about a crore of rupees at this juncture should be added to the burdens of the tax-payers. With these remarks, Sir, I take my seat.

7

SURENDRANATH BANERJEA

[S.N. Banerjea (1848-1925), known as 'the silver-tonged orator of India' is regarded as one of the founding fathers of the Indian National Congress. Through the power of oratory he could move the audience immensely and was nioknamed as 'the Burke of India'. His dismissal from the Indian Civil Service in 1873 on some 'fabricated' charges changed the course of his life. In 1876 he established the Indian Association in Calcutta with the cooperation of Anand Mohan Bose, Sivanath Sastri and Dwarkanath Ganguly whose one of the objectives was to agitate for the introduction of representative government in India. For many years he worked as the Editor of *Bengalee* that fearlessly criticised the policy of the British government particularly at the time of Ilbert Bill controversy. In 1883 he was sentenced to two months' imprisonment on the charge of making critical comments on the behaviour of the Chief Justice of Calcutta High Court that was interpreted as 'contempt of court'. In 1890 he visited England as a member of the Congress delegation led by A.O. Home that included prominent figures like P.M. Mehta and W.C. Bonnerjee. In 1897 he brilliantly deposed before the Welby Commission. From 1894 to 1900 he worked as a member of the Bengal Legislative Council. He presided over the Congress sessions held at Poona in 1895 and at Ahmedabad in 1902. Like M.G. Ranade, he subscribed to the view that the British rule was 'providential' and yet he laid stress on Indian unity and her glorious past. He strongly pleaded for self-government in

India. Though known for being a great moderate leader through and through, he lost his patience and worked with the militant nationalists on the issue of partition of Bengal.]

THE INDIAN ASSOCIATION*

After my return from England in June, 1875, and along with the work of organizing the students and infusing into them a new life and spirit, I began seriously to consider the advisability of forming an Association to represent the views of the educated middle-class community and inspire them with a living interest in public affairs. There was indeed the British Indian Association, which, under the guidance of the great Kristo Das Pal, who was then secretary, valiantly upheld the popular interests when necessary ; but it was essentially and by its creed an Association of land-holders. Nor did an active political agitation, or the creation of public opinion by direct appeals to the people, form a part of its recognized programme. There was thus the clear need for another political Association on a more democratic basis, and the fact was indeed recognized by the leaders of the British Indian Association. For some of its most distinguished members, such as the Maharaja Narendra Krishna, Babu Kristo Das Pal, and others, attended the inaugural meeting of the new Asssociation, and encouraged its formation by their presence. And let me gratefully add here that, throughout, the relations between the new Association and the British Indian were of the most cordial character, and this was due largely to the influence and example of Kristo Das Pal, one of the greatest political leaders that Bengal, or India, has ever produced. Mr. Ananda Mohan Bose and myself joined hands in this matter. I had more leisure than he, but we were in frequent consultation.

Associated with us in our efforts to organize a new Association upon popular lines was a devoted worker, comparatively unknown then, and, I fear, even now, whose memory deserves to be rescued from oblivion. Dwarakanath

*From Banerjea's *A Nation in Making*, Chapter V.

Ganguli began life as a teacher, and while yet young embraced Brahmoism. In the schism that took place between the two wings of the Brahmo-Samaj he sided with the dissentients and actively promoted the establishment of the Sadharan Brahmo-Samaj. An ardent lover of what he believed to be the truth, when he took up a cause he threw his whole soul into it. His co-operation in the organization of the new Association was of great value, to us ; and so long as health and strength were spared to him he worked in the cause of the Association with an energy and devotion, the memory of which, now that he is dead, his friends cherish with affectionate gratitude.

After a year's preparation, the Indian Association was established on July 26, 1876. The name was the subject of anxious consideration among our friends. Pandit Iswar Chunder Vidyasagar and Mr. Justice Dwarakanath Mitter, while still a member of the Bar, had formed the idea of organizing a similar Association which was to be the voice and the organ of the middle classes. The idea had to be given up as it did not at the time meet with much support ; but the name they had chosen for their proposed organization was the Bengal Association. We thought that such a name, or anything like it, would restrict the scope of our work. For the idea that was working in our minds was that the Association was to be the centre of an all-India movement. For even then, the conception of a united India, derived from the inspiration of Mazzini, or, at any rate, of bringing all India upon the same common political platform, had taken firm possession of the minds of the Indian leaders in Bengal. We accordingly resolved to call the new political body the Indian Association.

The inaugural meeting was marked by an incident that deserves a passing notice. Babu Kali Churn Banerjee, who, next to the Rev. K.M. Banerjee, was the foremost Indian Christian leader of his generation, and who subsequently became President of the Indian Association, opposed its formation, chiefly on the ground that a similar Association, under the name of the Indian League, had been established a few months before. I replied to his arguments, and the public meeting ratified the resolution creating the Association.

The Indian League did useful work. Babu Sisir Kumar Ghose of the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, Dr. Sambhoo Chunder Mookerjee of the *Rais and Rayyet*, and Babu Motilal Ghose, were its moving spirits. It has ceased to exist and some of its leading members have joined the Indian Association.

I attended the inaugural meeting of the Indian Association under the shadow of a great domestic bereavement. At eleven o'clock on the morning of July 26, my son died. I had some idea that the meeting would not pass off quietly and that there would be opposition offered to the establishment of the Association. I made up my mind, despite my personal sorrow and with the full concurrence of my wife, that I should attend the inaugural meeting. No one at the meeting knew anything at all about my bereavement, though it became widely known on the following day. This is not the only time that I have had to perform a public duty under the weight of a great personal bereavement. My dearly beloved wife died on December 23, 1911 ; on the 26th I attended the meeting of the Indian National Congress of that year, and, in the absence of the gentleman entrusted with the duty, I had to propose the election of the President, Pundit Bishen Narayan Dhur, about whose public career I had only a very general idea.

The Indian Association supplied a real need. It soon focussed the public spirit of the middle class, and became the centre of the leading representatives of the educated community of Bengal. Mr. Ananda Mohan Bose was elected Secretary, Babu Akshay Kumar Sirkar, who has since made a name for himself as a Bengalee writer, was appointed Assistant Secretary. I held no office, but I was one of the most active members of the Association. In view of my removal from Government service, I kept myself in the background, but I worked zealously for the Association, knowing no higher pleasure or duty, and bent upon realizing through this institution the great ideals which even at that early period had taken definite possession of my mind. They may be set forth as follows : (1) The creation of a strong body of public opinion in the country ; (2) the unification of the Indian races and peoples

upon the basis of common political interests and aspirations ; (3) the promotion of friendly feeling between Hindus and Mohamedans ; and, lastly, the inclusion of the masses in the great public movements of the day. I worked for these ideals ; others have worked for them too, for they were in the air, and the possession and property of every thoughtful and patriotic Indian ; and now, after nearly fifty years of public life, I have the gratification of feeling that, if they have not been wholly realized, they are within a measurable distance of accomplishment. The Indian Association materially helped to promote these ideals. They were the natural and normal development of the efforts of the great men of the past, under the new conditions created by the closer touch of our best minds with the political thought and activities of the West.

Upon my mind the writings of Mazzini had created a profound impression. The purity of his patriotism, the loftiness of his ideals, and his all-embracing love for humanity, expressed with the true eloquence of the heart, moved me as I had never before been moved. I discarded his revolutionary teachings as unsuited to the circumstances of India and as fatal to its normal development, along the lines of peaceful and orderly progress ; but I inculcated, with all the emphasis that I could command, the enduring lessons of his noble life, lived for the sake of others, his lofty patriotism, his self-abnegation, and his heroic devotion to the interests of humanity. It was Mazzini, the incarnation of the highest moral forces in the political arena—Mazzini, the apostle of Italian unity, the friend of the human race, that I presented to the youth of Bengal. Mazzini had taught Italian unity. We wanted Indian unity. Mazzini had worked through the young. I wanted the young men of Bengal to realize their potentialities and to qualify themselves to work for the salvation of their country, but upon lines instinct with the spirit of constitutionalism. I lectured upon Mazzini, but took care to tell the young men to abjure his revolutionary ideals, and to adopt his spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion in the paths of constitutional development. I persuaded Babu Jagendranath Vidyabhuson and Babu Rajani Kanto Gupta, both distinguished Bengalee writers, to

translate into our language the life and work of Mazzini in the spirit of my addresses, so as to place them within the reach of those who did not understand English. I soon popularized Mazzini among the young men of Bengal. No dire consequences followed, for the conditions that create the revolutionary spirit were wanting. They are the work of Governments that misread the signs of the times, and not of the so-called agitator, or of the ardent patriot who works for the amelioration of the lot of his people.

Within a year of the foundation of the Indian Association, the first great opportunity presented itself for realizing some of those great ideals that had given birth to the Association. Reactionary rulers are often the creators of great public movements. They will no doubt deny the charge or repudiate the credit ; but they certainly sow the seeds which in the fulness of time, ensure the enthronement of popular opinion and the triumph of popular causes. The reduction of the maximum limit of age, for the open competitive examination for the Indian Civil Service, from twenty-one to nineteen years, by the orders of the Marquis of Salisbury, then Secretary of State for India, created a painful impression throughout India. It was regarded as a deliberate attempt to blast the prospects of Indian candidates for the Indian Civil Service. The Indian Association resolved upon organizing a national movement. A great public meeting was held at the Town Hall on March 24, 1877. It was presided over by Maharaja Sir Narendra Krishna Bahadur, and was representative of the whole of Bengal. Not only were the leading men of Calcutta present, but also delegates from the interior of the province. Keshub Chunder Sen, who had never in his life taken part in any political meeting, was persuaded to move the election of the President.

This meeting was one of the biggest public demonstrations held in Calcutta ; it was destined to be the forerunner of similar and even more crowded meetings held all over India. The agitation was the means ; the raising of the maximum limit of age for the open competitive examination and the holding of simultaneous examinations were among the ends ; but the

underlying conception, and the true aim and purpose, of the Civil Service agitation was the awakening of a spirit of unity and solidarity among the people of India. It was accordingly resolved to appeal to the whole of India and bring the various Indian provinces upon the same common platform (a thing that had never been attempted before), and to unite them through a sense of a common grievance and the inspiration of a common resolve. It was an inspiring ideal, and to me it appealed with overwhelming effect.

I was appointed Special Delegate to visit the different provinces. This was of my own seeking ; the conception was mine, and the agent for carrying it out was myself. I went about collecting subscriptions, and entered upon the task with alacrity and enthusiasm. Taking advantage of the summer vacation of the Metropolitan Institution, where I was then employed as Professor, I started for Upper India on May 26, 1877, accompanied by Babu Nagendra Nath Chatterjee, a member of our Committee, who was well-known at the time as a most eloquent speaker in the Bengalee language. We started about the hottest time of the year, and Babu Nilcomol Mitter of Allahabad, with whom I was in correspondence regarding this tour, warned me that I was incurring a grave risk. Risk or no risk, I had made up my mind and there was no going back. We went straight to Agra, where my friend, the late Babu Abinash Chunder Banerjee, was stationed as Subordinate Judge.

Abinash Chunder Banerjee and myself had been playmates. He passed the examinations of the Calcutta University with great credit. After obtaining the B.L. degree, he established himself in the United Provinces, with a view to practising as a lawyer ; but he soon exchanged the Bar for the Bench and joined the Judicial Service. In early life he had been a staunch adherent of the Brahmo-Samaj, when Calcutta was seething with excitement under the eloquence of Keshub Chunder Sen ; but when I saw him at Agra in 1877 he had gone back to the old faith. But whether as a Brahmo, or as a Hindu, he was one of the finest of men and one of the most agreeable of

companions. His brilliant career on the Bench was prematurely cut short but his memory is still cherished with affection by those who knew him, and he will be remembered as the worthy father of a still more famous son, the late Dr. Satish Chandra Banerjee, whose early death Bengal and the United Provinces mourn. We met after a long time, and revived the memories of olden days. The whole plan of campaign we settled there.

It is worthy of attention that in those days Government servants were permitted to attend political meetings and to take an interest in political affairs. At the Bankipore meeting held in connection with this question, the young Maharaja of Cooch-Behar, then a ward of the Government, attended, and Major Hidyat Khan Bahadur, C.S.I., a military officer, seconded one of the resolutions. But with the development of public life and the growth of public spirit in the country, the attitude of the Government has changed. Under recent orders public servants may attend political meetings, but they are not to take part in them. As a matter of fact, they usually do not even attend ; for, whatever the published orders may be, the settled official attitude towards all public efforts is one of suspicion, if not of mistrust, and the subordinate officers take their cue from those in authority over them. I use the expression 'all public efforts' advisedly, for even the Ramkrishna Mission, a mission of benevolence and philanthropy without a tinge of politics in its aims or aspirations, was the subject of jealous watchfulness by the Criminal Investigation Department. Under the Reforms, however, the authorities are beginning to have a more rational outlook upon political and public demonstrations.

At Agra the Civil Service Memorial, which I had taken with me (it was the Calcutta Memorial) was translated into Urdu and lithographed. It was decided that I should proceed at once to Lahore and hold the first public meeting in the capital of the Punjab. It was felt that a demonstration there would be far more impressive and telling than one held in any other place in Upper India. At Lahore I was received with the

utmost kindness by my countrymen of all denominations, Hindus, Mohamedans and Sikhs. It was an exhibition of friendliness that was a revelation to me. It showed that a common system of administration and education had prepared the ground for the realization of one of our most cherished ideals, namely, united action by the different Indian provinces for the fulfilment of our common national aims and aspirations. At a crowded public meeting of all sections of the Indian community held at Lahore, the Calcutta Resolutions and Memorial on the Civil Service question were adopted. At another public meeting I spoke on the question of Indian Unity, and a political Association under the name of the Lahore Indian Association was formed. Its constitution was modelled on that of the Indian Association of Calcutta. It was affiliated to that body. It was, I believe, the first political organization in the Punjab that provided a common platform for all sections of the Indian community. It has done valuable public work for the province.

In the Punjab I formed friendships, the memory of which, though the friends, alas, are now dead, is a grateful treasure of my life. There for the first time I met Sirdar Dayal Singh Majeetia. Our acquaintance soon ripened into warm personal friendship. He was one of the truest and noblest men whom I have ever come across. It was perhaps difficult to know him and to get to the bottom of his heart, for there was a certain air of aristocratic reserve about him, which hid from public view the pure gold that formed the stuff of his nature. He threw himself actively into the work for which I had been deputed. I persuaded him to start a newspaper at Lahore. I purchased for him at Calcutta the first press for the *Tribune* newspaper and to me he entrusted the duty of selecting the first editor. I recommended the late Sitala Kanta Chatterjee of Dacca for the post, and his successful career as the first editor amply justified my choice. His fearless courage, his penetrating insight into the heart of things, and above all his supreme honesty of purpose, the first and last qualification of an Indian journalist soon placed him in the front rank of those

who wielded their pen in the defence of their country's interests.

The *Tribune* rapidly became a powerful organ of public opinion ; it is now perhaps the most influential Indian journal in the Punjab, and is edited by a gentleman who in his early career was associated with me as a member of the staff of the *Bengalee*. But it is not the only gift that the Sirdar gave to the Punjab. He gave away all he had for the benefit of his country ; and the Dayal Singh College is an enduring monument of one of the worthiest sons of the Punjab, whose early death all India mourns in common with the province of his birth.

Prominently associated with Sirdar Dayal Singh Majeetia in the public work to which I have referred, were Dr. Surajball, Pundit Ramnarain, and last but not least, Babu Kali Prosanna Roy. Dr. Surajball was a graduate of Oxford and rose to a high position in the service of the Kashmir State ; Pundit Ramnarain was an able lawyer. He was the first Indian who officiated as a judge of the Punjab Chief Court, and if he had been spared he would have been confirmed in that appointment. Kali Prosanna Roy was a brilliant lawyer who, after qualifying himself for the Bar, had taken up his residence in Lahore to practise his profession. As an advocate he hardly had an equal at the Lahore Bar. But he was not a mere lawyer ; he was an agreeable companion, and an earnest Indian patriot. He took a prominent part in all public movements ; and, when failing health compelled him to retire to his native village in Bengal, he endowed it with works of public utility. The name of such a man should be rescued from oblivion. But I am afraid, in this country, public services are often readily forgotten ; for the prevailing temper is one of criticism and not of service, or of *admiration* for service.

Leaving Lahore, I visited Amritsar, Meerut, Allahabad Delhi, Cawnpore, Lucknow, Aligarh, and Benares. At all these places crowded public meetings were held, at which the Calcutta Resolutions and the Civil Service Memorial were

adopted, and, wherever practicable, political organizations were formed to act in concert with the Indian Association of Calcutta. Such Associations were formed at Lahore, Meerut, Allahabad, Cawnpore and Lucknow. Thus a network of organizations was started, and the foundations were well and truly laid, as subsequent events fully proved, for united and concerted action among our representative men, over an area extending from Calcutta to Lahore. The movement with all its potentialities was to receive a still further expansion when, in the following year, upon the selfsame errand, I visited Madras and Bombay and some of the towns in the western presidency.

My tour through Northern India, great as was its political potentialities, was to me a source of unmixed personal pleasure and instruction. I came in contact with all the leaders of thought in Northern India belonging to a generation that has now passed away. Sir Syed Ahmed, Pundit Ajodhyanath, Pundit Bishambar Nath, Raja Ameer Hossain of Mahmudabad, Babu Aishwarya Narayan Singh, Babu Hurrish Chunder, and Babu Ramkali Chowdhury of Benares, were men of whom any community might well be proud. They differed in their temperaments, in their intellectual capacity, and even in the quality of their civic spirit, but they all loved the motherland and were eager to serve her.

The most famous of those whom I met was undoubtedly Sir Syed Ahmed, the founder of the Aligarh College and one of the greatest leaders of the Moslem community under British rule. He did not know a word of English, but, more than any other Mohamedan leader of his generation, he realized how necessary English education was for the advancement of his community, and he had the will to resolve, and the genius to organize. a movement for imparting it upon a scale of far-reaching comprehensiveness, and under conditions of permanence and utility that have immortalized his name. He received me with the utmost kindness, and our friendly relations continued, notwithstanding differences of opinion, which the Congress movement subsequently gave rise to.

He presided at the Civil Service meeting at Aligarh, which accepted the Calcutta Revolutions, among which was one in favour of simultaneous examinations. It is worthy of note, however, that, as a member of the Public Services Commission of 1887, he signed the report of the majority, and did not join Sir Romesh Chunder Mitter and Rai Bahadur Nulkar in their support of simulaneous examinations.

It can serve no useful purpose to recall at this distance of time the memory of controversies that are now past and well-nigh forgotten. We lost his championship and the great weight of his personal influence and authority in the controversies that gathered round the Congress movement. His Patriotic Association was started in opposition to it. But even the greatest amongst us has his limitations. The Patriotic Association has disappeared ; the Congress has continued to live and flourish. But let bygones be bygones. Let us not forget the debt of gratitude that Hindus and Mohamedans alike owe to the honoured memory of Sir Syed Ahmed. For the seeds that he sowed are bearing fruit ; and to-day the Aligarh College, now raised to the status of a University, is the centre of that culture and enlightenment which has made Islam in India instinct with the modern spirit, and aglow with that patriotic enthusiasm which augurs well for the future solidarity of Hindus and Mohamedans.

The success that had attended my efforts in Northern India encouraged my friends to depute me on the same mission to Western and Southern India. I started for Bombay in the winter of 1878. The Bombay leaders had already been informed of my mission ; and they received me with kindness and cordiality. Mr. Vishanarain Mandlik, Mr. Kashinath Trembuck Telang, and Mr. (afterwards Sir) Pherozshah Mehta, were the leaders of Bombay public opinion. All of them are now, alas, dead and gone. A public meeting was held in Bombay, and the Civil Service Revolutions and Memorial were in substance adopted. I then proceeded to Surat, and Ahmedabad, the capital of Gujarat. Civil Service meetings were held and the Calcutta Resolutions were adopted in both places. I them

returned to Bombay, and from Bombay I proceeded to Poona, where I was the guest of the late Mr. Ranade.

Mr. Ranade was then a Subordinate Judge, but his official position never overshadowed his instincts or interfered with his duties as a citizen. He was a constant figure on the Congress platform as a visitor, and he was the power behind the throne, guiding, advising and encouraging the Congress leaders in their work. His simplicity, the charm of his manners, his intellectual eminence, and his genuine and all-consuming love of country, fascinated all who came in contact with him. I was his guest at Poona, and he treated me as a member of his family.

From Poona, where a meeting was held and our Resolutions where adopted, I proceeded to Madras, where I became the guest of Dr. Dhanakatu Raju. I called on the Madras leaders, including Mr. Chensal Row, the Hon'ble Humayoon Jah Bahadur, and others, and I urged them to hold a public meeting to discuss the Civil Service question. For some reason or other a meeting could not be held ; and we had a conference of leading men at Pacheappa's Hall, at which our Memorial and Resolutions were adopted. Madras to-day, so instinct with the public life of India, is very different from what Madras was in 1878. To-day it is fully on a line with the rest of India as regards its public spirit and its efforts for the public good. In 1878, it was the only place in all India where I found it impossible to hold a public meeting upon a question of vital interest to our people, and in regard to which there was practical unanimity all over India.

I returned home from my tour as quickly as I could, for I had important work in Calcutta. Our programme was, after securing absolute unanimity of opinion all over India, expressed through public meetings at various centres, to carry on the agitation in England and make the voice of India heard there, through our chosen representative, belonging to our own people and uttering our sentiments. Mr. Routledge, late Editor of the *Friend of India*, writing about this novel departure, said

that it was 'an inspired idea.' We claimed for it no special illumination. It was prompted by love of country, as pure and as warm as ever glowed in any human breast, and the sequel proved that it was a golden idea, fruitful of a rich harvest.

It may not be out of place here to pause for a moment, to consider the net result of the tour I had undertaken all over India. For the first time under British rule, India, with its varied races and religions, had been brought upon the same platform for a common and united effort. Thus it was demonstrated, by an object-lesson of impressive significance, that, whatever might be our differences in respect of race and language, or social and religious institutions, the people of India could combine and unite for the attainment of their common political ends. The lesson thus learnt was to be confirmed and deepened by subsequent events to which I shall refer later on, and it found its culminating expression in the Congress movement, The ground was thus prepared for this great national and unifying movement. The public men of the time were not forgetful of the lesson thus taught ; and a deputation of the Puna Sarvajanik Sabha, which visited Calcutta in 1878, pointedly referred to it at a conference held in the rooms of the British Indian Association, as opening the way for the united political efforts of an awakened India.

Sir Henry Cotton in his book, *New India*, which at the time created a unique sensation, thus referred to my tour : "The educated classes are the voice and brain of the country. The Bengalee Babus now rule public opinion from Peshawar to Chittagong ; and, although the natives of North-Western India are immeasurably behind those of Bengal in education and in their sense of political independence, they are gradually becomming as amenable as their brethren of the lower provinces, to intellectual control and guidance. A quarter of a century ago there was no trace of this ; the idea of any Bengalee influence in the Punjab would have been a conception incredible to Lord Lawrence, to a Montgomery, or a Macleod ; yet it is the case that during the past year the tour of a Bengalee lecturer, lecturing in English in Upper India, assumed the

character of a triumphal progress ; and at the present moment the name of Surendra Nath Banerjea excites as much enthusiasm among the rising generation of Multan as in Dacca.'

The All-India Memorial on the Civil Service question was addressed to the House of Commons. It was a memorial that sought to obtain a modifications of the orders of the Secretary of State for India, by raising the limit of age for the open competitive examination to twenty-two years, the maximum limit now in force, and it contained a further prayer for simultaneous examinations in India as well as in England. The Memorial might have been despatched by post to the House of Commons, as had been done in similar cases in the past. But a new idea had taken possession of the public mind. We had brought all India upon the same platform upon a public question that concerned the entire educated community ; and we felt that so unique a demonstration should find its suitable expression through the voice of an Indian representative explaining to British audiences this pressing grievance of his countrymen. I was asked to be our delegate to England. I had to decline it for reasons that were apparent on the surface. In England, in view of my antecedents, my advocacy for the wider employment of my countrymen in a service from which I had been removed, would be liable to misconstruction. The choice of the Indian Association fell upon Mr. Lalmohan Ghose, and Mr. Lalmohan Ghose's phenomenal success in his mission fully justified the selection. His marvellous gifts of oratory were unknown to us, for he had never before taken to public life as a serious occupation ; and when they were displayed in a manner that extorted the admiration of his audience, among whom was the greatest of living orators, John Bright, the revelation was a bewildering and an agreeable surprise. Carnot took credit for discovering Napoleon while the latter was yet an unknown young subaltern. The leaders of the Indian Association warmly congratulated themselves on having discovered one who the first Indian to stand for Parliamentary honours, and who was destined to occupy a leading place in the ranks of our public life.

But a deputation to England was a costly affair. There were of course the prophets of evil who, Cassandra-like, told us that the money would be wasted and that the deputation would prove futile. Our success in the Civil Service agitation all over India had inspired us with confidence; and we were in no mood to listen to the counsels of timidity. I applied myself to the task of collecting subscriptions; and in less than six months' time I had raised the necessary funds, chiefly among our middle class people.

The only substantial sum that we obtained was from the Maharani Swarnamoyee. I fortified myself with a letter from Babu Bankim Chunder Chatterjee, the great Bengalee novelist, who evinced the utmost sympathy with the whole movement. Armed with this letter and accompanied by my indefatigable friend, Babu Dwaraknath Ganguli, we called upon Rai Rajib Lochan Rai Bahadur, manager of the Maharani Swarnamoyee's estate, at his house at Berhampore. The old man received us with kindness, but he promised us only one-half of what we wanted. We thanked him, of course, though we made it clear that we expected more. We took leave of him, and, as we were about to step into the street from his house, he summoned us back and said, 'I have reconsidered the matter and promise the whole amount you want.' We thanked him very heartily and left his house, blessing him and the Maharani Swarnamoyee. This was the first and last time that I met Rajib Lochan Rai. The present generation knows him not. Soon his memory will pass out of the public recollection. But if the Maharani Swarnamoyee was, during her lifetime, known as the 'Lady Bountiful' of Cossimbazar, Rai Rajib Lochan was the inspirer of her beneficence, the power behind the throne. It was he who rescued the Cossimbazar Estate from forfeiture, and under his wise counsels the Maharani Swarnamoyee applied its vast resources to acts of private charity and public usefulness, which during her lifetime made her name a household word in Bengal,

I feel tempted to quote in this place an instance that illustrates the catholicity of her beneficence, which rose superior to all considerations of creed and colour. An Afghan merchant

from Ghazni came and sought my help to recover certain moneys that he claimed from Government for supplying camels during the Afghan War of 1878. He came to me as a pauper and indeed a ruined man. He had lost his case and he had not even money enough to enable him to return home. I estimated the cost of the return journey to Ghazni at Rs. 150; and I applied to the Maharani for the money, telling her the whole story. She sent me Rs. 150, and the poor Afghan returned home, rejoicing and blessing the Maharani.

The money having been raised for the purpose, Mr. Lalmohan Ghose was placed in charge of the Civil Service Memorial to Parliament, and was deputed to England as the representative of the Indian Association.

Mr. Lalmohan Ghose's work may be said to open a new chapter in our history, in the potentialities it disclosed of what might be done by Indian deputations to England. He set to work with resolute energy, and he received valuable help from Mr. Chesson, Secretary of the Aborigines Protection in Society, and from Sir David Wedderburn, brother of Sir William Wedderburn, who is perhaps less known to the present generation than his distinguished brother, though he was one of the earliest to suggest representative government for India, and I had the honour of corresponding with him on the subject. A great meeting was held at Willis's Rooms under the presidency of Johan Bright. Mr. Ghose spoke with a power and eloquence that excited the admiration of all, and evoked the warmest tribute from the the President.

The effect of that meeting was instantaneous. Within twenty-four hours of it, there were laid on the table of the House of Commons, the Rules creating what was subsequently known as the Statutory Civil Service. Under the Parliamentary Statute of 1870, the Government of India were empowered, subject to rules that were to be framed, to make direct appointments of natives of India of proved merit and ability to the Covenanted Civil Service. For over seven years the Government of India had slept over the matter. But so great was the impression created by the demonstration at Willis's Rooms,

having behind it the sentiment of united India, that the Rules, which were only four in number and had been delayed for seven years, were published within twenty-four hours of that meeting.

Thus the deputation of an Indian to England voicing India's grievances was attended with an unexpected measur of success; and the experiment was in future years tried again and again, confirming that wisdom and foresight of those who had conceived the idea and carried it out. Indeed, Mr. Lalmohan Ghose was, soon after his return to India. again deputed to England by the Indian Association. It was during his stay on this occasion that he stood as a candidate for Parliamentary election in the Liberal interest ; and if it were not for the Irish vote that went against him, almost at the last moment, he would have been entitled to the high distinction reserved for India's Grand Old Man, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, of being the first Indian Member of Parliament. At any rate he prepared the ground and was a pioneer in the cause.

Long afterwards, in 1890, when I visited Deptford, Mr. Lalmohan Ghose's constituency, to address a public meeting upon Indian questions, I found that there was a kindly remembrance of him, among his old friends and supporters. His genius and eloquence had made an abiding impression upon all who had heard him or had come within the reach of his personal influence. To the people of India the early death of such a man was a catastrophe. I had known him since 1869, and for forty years we were united by ties of the closest friendship. In later years, ill-health and his growing infirmities had somewhat weaned him from public life ; but his interest in public affairs never waned, and, whenever he took part in them, his judgment was as clear and his utterances as emphatic as ever.

REACTIONARY GOVERNMENT AND ITS CONSEQUENCES*

In these memoirs I have not always followed the chronological order in developing the incidents of my life. Taking up

*From *A Nation in Making*, Chapter VI.

a particular chapter, I have sometimes found it more convenient to close it and begin a new one, some of the events related being of prior date. The reduction of the age limit for the Indian Civil Service examination was but a part of a reactionary policy in relation to India that was associated with the administration of Lord Salisbury as Conservative Secretary of State for India. India is said to be beyond the pale of party politics. In the opinion of educated India it is a misfortune that it should be so; for we cannot forget that it was because India was a potent factor in determining the issues of party politics that Warren Hastings was impeached, and that for the first time, to quote the language of Lord Morley in his Life of Burke, 'it was definitely proclaimed that Asiatics had their rights and Europeans their obligations under British rule.' The moral result of that impeachment was a striking gain for India. But since then things have changed, and both Liberals and Conservatives have, from the front benches, uttered the shibboleth that India lies outside party considerations. Sir Henry Fowler, then Secretary of State for India, declared from his place in Parliament that every member of Parliament was a member for India. The sentiment was greeted with cheers, it was palpably so noble and so instinct with the consciousness of duty to an unrepresented dependency. In India, however, it evoked a smile of incredulity. For we all know that what is everybody's business is nobody's business, and each year the truth is painfully impressed upon our minds when we read the accounts of the debates on the Indian Budget in the House of Commons and of the empty benches to which the oratory of the speakers is addressed. Both parties have been scrupulously impartial in their attitude of indifference towards India.

A great deal, indeed, depends upon the personality of the Secretary of State for India. The policy pursued in relation to India is dominated by his personal character and his personal sympathies, and is only partially moulded by the general drift of the policy of the party to which he belongs. Each minister is more or less supreme in his department, subject to the public opinion of the country as reflected in the prevailing tendencies

of Parliament. That is our reading of the situation. It was Lord Derby, a Conservative Secretary of State, who gave us the great Proclamation of 1858. It was Sir Stafford Northcote (afterwards Earl Iddesleigh) who founded the State scholarships for the encouragement of Indian students seeking to complete their education in England. It was again a Liberal Secretary of State, the Duke of Argyll, who abolished them It was a Conservative ministry that laid the beginnings of popular representation by giving us the reformed and expanded Legislative Councils under the Parliamentary Statute of 1892. Latterlys' however, the Liberal party have really tried to be more or less true to their principles in the Government of India, and the most notable illustration of this view is afforded by Lord Morley's Reform Scheme of 1909, the modification of the Partition of Bengal, and the pledge of provincial autonomy given by the Despatch of August 25, 1911.

Lord Salisbury's regime as Secretary of State for India was distinctly reactionary. He was responsible for sending out to India as Viceroy, Lord Lytton, of whom the Marquis of Hartington (afterwards Duke of Devonshire) said, from his place in Parliament, that he was the very reverse of what an Indian Viceroy should be. His son, however, the present Lord Lytton, Governor of Bengal, is a ruler of a different type. Professing to be a Conservative, he is really an advanced Democrat, with genuine sympathy for Indian aspirations. Many years later, in the nineties of the last century, Lord Salisbury, when Prime Minister, sent out Lord Curzon, and the story of his viceroyalty is one that all the ingenuity of Mr. Lovat Fraser of *The Times* has failed to whitewash.

But I am, perhaps, anticipating coming events. I have already referred to the reduction of the limit of age for the Indian Civil Service and the agitation to which it gave rise. Lord Salisbury's Viceroy, Lord Lytton, gagged the Vernacular Press, and disarmed the population of British India. These two measures, the Arms Act and the Vernacular Press Act provoked widespread agitation, in which I took my humble share.

In the dark days of the Indian Mutiny, when the British Empire in India was really exposed to serious danger, Lord Canning and his advisers did not think it necessary to disarm the Indian population. The Afghan War in Lord Lytton's time (which, by the way, was a grievous blunder, the whole policy that dictated it having been undone) caused no serious excitement in India, none at any rate among the Hindu population, and little, on hardly any, among the Mohamedans, except the perhaps on the frontiers. The Arms Act was unnecessary in sense that it was not required as a measure of protection against internal revolt ; it was mischievous because it made an irritating and invidious distinction between Europeans and Indians, a distinction that has recently been done away with. It inaugurated a policy of mistrust and suspicion, utterly undeserved and strongly resented by our people, and it imposed upon us a badge of racial inferiority. We protested against it at the time. We appealed to Mr. Gladstone, and he supported our protest and condemned it and the Vernacular Press Act in his speeches in the Midlothian campaign ; but, unhappily, when he became Prime Minister he did us only partial justice—he repealed the Vernacular Press Act, but the Arms Act he left untouched.

The Vernacular Press Act was passed at one and the same sitting of the Imperial Legislative Council in April, 1878. The measure was deemed to be so urgent that the country was not given time to discuss it. The rules of business of the Council were suspended, and it was passed on the very day that it was introduced. In times of excitement bureaucracy is sometimes apt to avoid discussion in the belief that publicity would be fatal to its pre-ordained policy, and that a measure, once passed into law, and embodied in an administrative arrangement, would be regarded as a settled fact, never to be unsettled. Recent events have dissipated the delusion ; and our present-day officials have in a variety of ways shown that they have a better conception of the potency of public opinion. The Vernacular Press Act itself has been repealed ; the Partition of Bengal, the most settled of settled facts, has been unsettled. When an unpopular measure is passed, the public for the

moment submit as to the stroke of an inevitable fate. They bide their time; they gather their forces; they renew the attack, and the idols of the bureaucracy are swept away from their places of worship, and remain only as enduring monuments of administrative unwisdom and the waste of administrative energy and resource.

The Vernacular Press Act came upon the educated community as a bolt from the blue; but that something of the kind was coming had long been anticipated. To the Delhi Assemblage of 1877 the Press was invited. I attended the Delhi Assemblage as the correspondent of the *Hindoo Patriot*, then the leading Indian paper in Bengal, under the editorship of that prince of Indian journalists, Kristo Das Pal. I was not connected with the Press at this time in any definite capacity, but, when I was in London in 1874—75, I had acted as the London correspondent of the *Hindoo Patriot*. To me it was a labour of love, a discipline and a training, and also an opportunity of showing my admiration and gratitude to one to whom I was bound by the ties of personal kindness and public duty. At Delhi I organized a Press Association consisting of all the members of the Indian Press who attended the Assemblage, and we waited in deputation upon the Viceroy with an address. I was the youngest member of the Deputation, but I represented the greatest Indian paper in the country. I stood upon my rights, as there was some difference of opinion as to who should be our spokesman; and to me was accorded the position of the head of the Deputation. I read the address. We had no casket, for we could get none made at Delhi within the time allotted. In the address we made pointed reference to the report about the coming restrictions on the Press, and we expressed the hope that the liberties so long enjoyed might be continued. The Viceroy, as might have been expected, was reticent and said nothing in reply to this part of the address. We felt that we had done our duty in communicating our hopes and fears, and for the time the matter ended there.

Within less than fifteen months, the Vernacular Press all over India, save that of Madras, was muzzled. In the Council

Chamber not a single dissentient voice was raised. Maharaja Sir Jotindra Mohan Tagore, who was then a member of the Imperial Legislative Council, had been, so the report went, sent for and spoken to by the Viceroy, and he voted with the Government, The *Hindoo Patriot* wrote against the measure, but not with the warmth that usually characterized its patriotic utterances. Maharaja Sir Jotindra Mohon Tagore was one of the most prominent members of the British Indian Association ; and his vote hampered the independent judgment of that body. They could not disavow him, one of their most trusted colleagues. I have no desire to justify the Maharaja's vote on that occasion. But in judging of a public man acting in circumstances of extreme difficulty we must endeavour to place ourselves in his position and recognize his difficulties and his environment. Be it noted that public opinion was not so strong then as it now is, and that, so recently as during Lord Minto's Viceroyalty, the Indian members of the Imperial Legislative Council, with two honourable exceptions, supported a Press Act (now repealed), in one sense a far more drastic measure than the Act for which the Maharaja had voted. Nor should the fact be overlooked that the Maharaja, subject to the limitations of his position, was thoroughly patriotic and supported public movements whenever he could. His vote at the Council meeting was no doubt indefensible, but it admits of palliation. In judging of the honoured dead, let us weigh the good with the evil ; in his case the good certainly preponderates.

Be that as it may, the educated community in Bengal was roused to a sense of anxiety and alarm at the Vernacular Press Act, and the manner of its enactment. The feeling was deepened by the inaction of the British Indian Association and of some of our leading men. It was fortunate that the Indian Association had been formed five years before, and that there was this organization to voice the sentiments of the middle class. We were resolved to do all that lay in our power to bring about the repeal of the Press Act. I went about personally canvassing our leading men. I well remember the discouragement I met with from more than one quarter.A Brahmo

leader who shall be nameless said to me, 'Mr. Lethbridge, the Press Commissioner, has seen me on the subject. We had a long talk. I have a responsible position to maintain ; I cannot join you.' Another leading man, whom I saw, said to me, 'I wish you all success ; but we cannot help you.' Such was the cold reception that we met with amongst those upon whose help and co-operation in this matter we felt we had a right to count.

Far different was the attitude of some of our Christian friends, including Dr. K. M. Banerjee and the Rev. Dr. K. S. Macdonald of the Free Church of Scotland. From the very first, they were with us and encouraged and helped us. The Rev. Krishna Mohan Banerjee (better known as K. M. Banerjee) was among the earliest Indian converts to Christianity. A scholar and a man of letters, it was not till late in life that he began to take an active part in politics. He was associated with the Indian League and subsequently became President of the Indian Association. Once thrown into the vortex of public life, he was drawn into its deeper currents. He joined the Corporation and became an active member of that body. He was then past sixty ; and though growing years had deprived him of the alterness of youth, yet in the keenness of his interest, and in the vigour and outspokenness of his utterances, he exhibited the ardour of the youngest recruit to our ranks. Never was there a man more uncompromising in what he believed to be the truth, and hardly was there such amiability combined with such strength and firmness.

It is this type of character that I am afraid is fast disappearing from our midst. The suavity and old-world manners of our people are becoming rare, while the militant aggressiveness of the West is usurping its place. Dr. Banerjee threw himself heart and soul into the movement, and his association with it and that of the Rev. Dr. Macdonald gave it a non-sectarian and cosmopolitan character. The cry of political movements being seditious had not then been raised ; but it was a distinct source of strength and inspiration to us that we had with us these two highly-honoured representatives of the Christian

community of Calcutta in what was the first great political demonstration of the middle class community in Bengal.

The Town Hall was secured, and the day of the public meeting was fixed. Here an incident occurred that is worth recording. On the day fixed for the public meeting, information was received in Calcutta that, in view of the possibility of the outbreak of War with Russia, Disraeli, who was then Prime Minister, had directed the despatch of six thousand Indian troops to Malta. As a matter of fact, war did not break out, but this was one of those political fireworks in which the imaginative genius of the semi-Oriental Premier delighted to indulge. The announcement made a great impression in Calcutta. It was the talk of the town and of the Calcutta Bar Library. It was seriously suggested to Mr. Ananda Mohan Bose by his lawyer friends of the Bar Library that the Town Hall meeting should be postponed. A hint was given to him that serious consequences might follow, and a suggestion of a criminal prosecution was made, if we persisted in holding the meeting, in spite of the uncertain situation in Europe. Mr. Ananda Mohan Bose hurried to my house. It was then three in the afternoon ; the meeting was to be held at five o'clock, We discussed the matter. I said that it was one of the first great demonstrations of the Indian Association and of the middle class party in Bengal, and that, if it were to be postponed, it would never again be held. The people would lose faith in us, and it would mean the beginning of the end. I added that our constituents were the people. As for the consequences, my friend, who was a lawyer,and I agreed that nothing serious need be apprehended, so long as we were moderate and kept within constitutional bounds. We decided to hold the meeting and face the consequences, whatever they might be.

It was one of the most successful meetings ever held in Calcutta. It sounded the death-knell of the Vernacular Press Act, and, what is even more important, it disclosed the growing power of the middle class, who could act with effect for the protection of their interests, even though the wealthier

classes were lukewarm, and official influence was openly arrayed against them. It was a lesson that the middle class of Bengal never forgot, and which they have since utilized in many useful directions. It indeed marked a definite and progressive stage in national evolution ; and was the creation of the builders of the Indian Association.

The agitation against the Vernacular Press Act was continued. The Indian Association addressed a letter to Mr. Gladstone, expressing their gratitude to him for his support of the liberty of the Press in India. The draft of the letter was mine. The Rev. Dr. K. M. Banerjee revised it. It elicited an autograph reply from the Right Hon. gentleman, which is still preserved among the archives of the Association. When in 1909 I visited the Oxford Union along with other members of the Imperial Press Conference, I was shown a record of the proceedings of the Union in Mr. Gladstone's own handwriting. He was then Secretary or President of the Union, I forget which. The writing was fine, clear and bold. The letter in the possession of the Indian Association is altogether a different specimen of handwriting, bearing traces of the change that age had wrought.

One of the earliest acts of Lord Ripon's administration was the repeal of the Vernacular Press Act. It is interesting to notice how some of those who had zealously upheld the measure were now equally zealous in supporting its repeal. The discipline of the Civil Service is one of its notable characteristics. Consistency is no part of its creed. It obeys the lead given by its seniors and elders with scrupulous fidelity. We have had a recent and somewhat notable illustration of this in its attitude in regard to the modification of the Partition of Bengal. The modification of the Partition was strongly resented by the Bengal Civilians. It was felt more or less as a blow aimed at the prestige of the Service. But among those who signed the Despatch of the 25th August, 1911, recommending the modification, was a prominent Bengal Civilian who had identified himself with the working of the Partition and with a well-known circular letter, which was one of the earliest

indications of the birth of the reactionary policy that followed the Partition. The popular leaders have no quarrel with these tergiversations. But they note them as showing that strong convictions are perhaps a clog to official advancement in India, and those who change as the ruling official mind changes have the best prospects of official preferment.

Lord Ripon's assumption of the Viceroyalty was a relief to the Indian public. The reactionary administration of Lord Lytton had roused the public from its attitude of indifference and had given a stimulus to public life. In the evolution of political progress, bad rulers are often a blessing in disguise. They help to stir a community into life, a result that years of agitation would perhaps have failed to achieve. They call into being organized efforts which not only sweep away their bad measures, but create that public life and spirit which survives for all time to come, and is the surest guarantee of future and abiding progress. Lord Lytton was a benefactor, without intending to be one; and, more recently, Lord Curzon was a benefactor in the same sense, but perhaps on a larger scale.

We in India knew little or nothing about Lord Ripon or his antecedents. There were two circumstances that were in his favour. He was the nominee of Mr. Gladstone, who had thoroughly identified himself with the pupular view in India regarding the Vernacular Press Act, and he was a convert to Roman Catholicism and had suffered for his faith We remembered what *The Times* wrote of him, when, giving up his great position in the social and public life of England, he deliberately faced the prospect of ruin by embracing the Roman Catholic faith. I was in England at the time and I remember the great stir it caused. I imagine differences of creed gave rise to stronger feelings in those days than they are now apt to evoke. *The Times* had a leading article in which it prophesied that Lord Ripon was a lost man. But in those days educated India, following the dictum of Cobden, approved what *The Times* disapproved; and we welcomed Lord Ripon as a ruler who had suffered for the

faith that was in him. Events showed that we were fully justified ; for one of the very first things that he said on assuming his great office was that he had it in charge from Her Majesty the Queen-Empress to look to the municipal institutions of the country ; for there the political education of the people really began.

This declaration of a great policy was an open invitation to those who were working for the uplift of their country to cooperate with the Government for its realization. We of the Indian Association at once set to work. We issued a circular letter, and we sent round delegates inviting the rate-payers of our mofussil towns to move the Government for the re-organization of their municipalities upon a popular and elective basis. I myself visited various parts of Bengal, including Bhagalpore, Monghyr (now in Behar), Rajshahi, Bogra and Pabna. Public meetings were held in these places, at which I spoke. Our delegates visited many other centres in the interior. In those days there was no Criminal Investigation Department and the police did not think that it was a part of their duty to dog the footsteps and watch the movements of political workers. Our work was therefore easy ; and our countrymen everywhere received us with open arms.

Political work in the mofussil was then a new thing, and the new-born enthusiasm for political progress that we were able to evoke in the most distant parts of the province is one of the most pleasant and enduring reminiscences of my life. Everywhere the Bar lent us firm support, and the zamindars hardly ever failed us. The truth is that political work in those early days was not regarded with suspicion by the official classes ; and the people, left to their own impulses and unhampered by the spirit of Non-co-operation, did their duty. Of course, it was impossible to visit every town or to send delegates to every considerable place in Bengal. From such places as we could not visit we obtained written opinions on the subject of Local Self-government. Having thus ascertained the views of the country on the Viceroy's proposals, we drafted a memorial and convened a public meeting at the Town Hall.

We took advantage of this demonstration to thank the Viceroy for the repeal of the Vernacular Press Act, and to press for the abolition of the Arms Act. I moved the resolution on the subject of Local Self-government, which was in these terms :—

'That this Meeting feels deeply grateful to His Excellency the Viceroy for his recent Resolution, which seeks to confer upon the people of this country the inestimable boon of Local Self-Government ; and ventures to express its earnest and confident hope that the measures adopted by His Excellency for the purpose will be of such a character as to secure a fair and satisfactory working of the scheme. And with this view this Meeting would respectfully beg to make the following recommendations : (1) That the constitution of the Local Boards and of the Municipalities should be based on the elective system ; (2) that their Chairman should be an officer elected by them, and on no account be the Magistrate-Collector of the district : (3) that the functions and powers vested in the existing Committees should be increased in view of their amalgamation in the proposed Local Boards.'

It will be seen that the views set forth in this resolution formed the main features of the resolutions on Local Self-government issued by Lord Ripon. They urged (1) the constitution of the local bodies upon a popular and elective basis, (2) the enlargement of their powers, and (3) the election of their chairman by the local bodies themselves. These were the basic principles of the Resolutions of the Government of India. The meeting was held on February 18, 1881 ; the resolutions of the Government of India were issued in October, 1881, and May, 1882. Here was a conspicuous instance of almost perfect accord between the official and the popular view, and be it noted that it was Lord Ripon who soon after, as Chancellor of the University of Calcutta, declared that the time was fast approaching when popular opinion even in India would become the irresistible and unresisted master of the Government. No Viceroy did more to promote this blessed consummation. The impress of his policy has left its enduring mark upon Indian administration, and more than one Viceroy has essayed to walk in his footsteps.

But the question of Local Self-government formed only a part of the larger movement for the strengthening of public opinion and the enthronement of the popular view. Even before we had taken up the question of Local Self-government, the attention of the Bengal leaders had been drawn to what indeed is the most vital of our problems, namely, representative government for India. The Indian Association had appointed a committee, and I had already placed myself in communication on the subject with Mr. Shaw, late of the Bombay Civil Service, and Sir David Wedderburn.

In this connection it may not be altogether out of place to notice the steady development of our national aspirations. In the sixties of the last century, and even earlier, the efforts of our national leaders were directed to securing for the people of India an adequate share of the higher offices of trust and responsibility under the Government. The Queen's Proclamation of 1858 had stirred their ambitions in this direction, and in season and out of season they pressed for the redemption of the pledges contained in that message. In Western India, the movement was led by Mr. Nowroji Furdoonji and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, India's Grand Old Man. In Bengal, the movement was represented by the British Indian Association, and found ardent advocates in men like Kristo Das Pal, Rajendra Lal Mitter, Romanath Tagore, Degumbar Mitter, and others.

But the ground was now to be shifted. A higher platform appeared in view, and a brighter vision presented itself to the gaze of educated India, There is evolution in all things, even in the slow movements of public life. The efforts of the last few years had stirred a strange and hitherto-unfelt awakening among our people, and had created new hopes and aspirations. It was not enough that we should have our full share of the higher offices, but we aspired to have a voice in the councils of the nation. There was the bureaucracy. For good or evil, it was there. We not only wanted to be members of the bureaucracy and to leaven it with the Indian element, but looked forward to controlling it, and shaping and guiding its

measures, and eventually bringing the entire administration under complete popular domination. It was a new departure hardly noticed at the time, but fraught with immense potentialities. Along with the development of the struggle for place and power to be secured to our countrymen, there came gradually but steadily to the forefront the idea that this was not enough, that it was part, but not even the most vital part, of the programme for the political elevation of our people. The pursuit of high ideals has an elevating effect upon the public mind. Great as is the gain when the object is attained, its indirect results, in the widening of our vision, in the strengthening of our moral fibre, in the all round impulse that it communicates to national activities, are even more enduring, more pregnant with unseen and undreamt of possibilities for the future. The demand for representative government was now definitely formulated, and it was but the natural and legitimate product of the public activities that had preceded it.

STUDY OF INDIAN HISTORY*

Those who have their eyes open, and are capable of observing what is going on around us, cannot fail to be painfully impressed with a fact, which we would all do well seriously to ponder over. We have amongst us writers in almost all the varied branches of human knowledge. We have poets, novelists, critics, translators, writers on law, mathematics, philosophy, and even on some of the abstruse branches of physical science. But there is one great department of human knowledge, which remains almost wholly unexplored by us ; yet it is a department which would yield treasures of priceless value to the ardent inquirer, where we would hold communion with the master-minds of ancient India, with Valmiki and Vyasa, Panini and Patanjali, Gautama and Sankaracharya. I propose this evening, gentlemen, to draw your attention to this noble study, the study of the history of our own country. I propose to point out its multifarious advantages. I propose to show that the study of the history of

*Address delivered at the anniversary meeting of the Young Men's Union held at Calcutta on 24 June, 1876.

our own country, while, perhaps, it cannot be said to possess that fascinating interest, which belongs to those branches of human knowledge which have reference to the amelioration of the miseries, or the promotion of the happiness of our race, nevertheless, presents topics of deep and living interests, and round which, the heart of the truly genuine patriot might cling with devout and reverential affection. The study of the history of our own country illustrates in a striking manner the great truth, that miserable and degraded as we are, our degradation has followed upon a chain of sequences, every link of which is explicable, that the iron hand of Fate has not been upon us, that we have not been made the hopeless victims of unprecedented calamities, and that whereas circumstances have wholly controlled our destinies, we might, if we chose, have partially controlled those circumstances and thus have changed the face of India, and perhaps of the world at large. Such an assurance is calculated to fill us with hope, to inspire us with enthusiasm and to add stimulus to those noble and patriotic efforts, which are being made on all sides around, and which seem to me to be typical of a regenerated nationality into which, I fervently hope, we are now about to enter.

Up to this time, gentlemen, my attention has been confined to what might be called the objective advantages to be derived from the study of the history of our own country. I now pass on to the consideration of some of the subjective advantages, advantages affecting the human mind, to be derived from the study of the history of our own country. The study of the history of our own country, and indeed the study of all history, is calculated to restrain the exuberance of the imagination.. Now, I say,gentlemen, that next to physical science, I know of no subject which is so well calculated to restrain the exuberance of our imagination as the study of history.

But there remains yet another subjective advantage, to be derived from the study of Indian history, of greater moment and wider import than the one to which I have already referred. The study of the history of our own country furnishes the strongest incentive to the loftiest patriotism. I ask, what Hindoo is there, who does not feel himself a nobler

being altogether, as he recalls to mind the proud list of his illustrious countrymen, graced by the thrice immortal names of a Valmiki and a Vyasa, a Panini and a Patanjali, a Gautama and a Sankaracharya ? I ask, what Hindoo is there, whose patriotism is not stimulated, whose self-respect is not increased, as he contemplates the past history of his country ? For ours was a most glorious past. We were great in literature, in science, in war, but, above all, great in morals. I would detain you for hours and hours together, were I to expatiate upon the points of beauty and excellence connected with the wounderful language and literature of our fathers. But, I think, gentlemen, I should more profitable occupy your time, if I were to pass on to the consideration of some of those scientific truths, which the ancient Aryans of India have bequeathed to us as a priceless legacy.

Well, then, our ancestors were the inventors of the decimal notation ; and without the decimal notation, the world could not go on for a day. It is of use in the pettiest commercial computations, as well as in the most difficult astronomical calculations. The ancient Hindoos made considerable progress in the science of geometry, and in trigonometry, enunciated problems which were not known even in Europe till about the 16th century. But it is in the science of algebra that the Hindoo mind displayed to the best advantage its marvellous power and resources.

The Hindoos were the inventors of the science of algebra. The first Arab writer on algebra was Mahomed Musa Karizmi. Now, there could be no doubt that he obtained his algebra from the Hindoos. He abridged an astronomical work founded upon the Indian system, and he was the first to communicate to his coun n (ı the Indian method of computation. A writer who knew so much of Indian mathematics, who was familiar with our astronomy and our method of computation, might reasonably be presumed to have been familiar with our algebra as well. Indeed, the Arabs do not lay any claims to originality in this respect. And it also appears that the Greeks were indebted to the Hindoos for their algebra. Th: first Greek

writer on algebra was Diophantus. And we have strong reasons for believing that Diophantus is under very great obligations to the Hindoos for his algebra. In 1579, Bombelli published a treatise on algebra. Bombelli says in this work that he had translated a part of Diophantus, and found that Diophantus cites Indian authorities. Thus, then, Diophantus was familiar with the Indian writers on algebra, and as he often cites them as his authorities, it must be presumed that he was greatly indebted to them.

Passing now from the domain of mathematics, let us dwell for a few moments on the achievements of the Hindoos in some of the other departments of science. The Hindoos had made considerable progress in chemistry. They knew how to prepare sulphuric acid, nitric acid, muriatic acid and a great many other chemical substances. We have also good reasons for believing that the Arabs got their chemistry from the Hindoos, and it was the Arabs who first introduced chemistry into Europe. We are thus then driven to the conclusion, that great science whose wonderful results fill the world with so much admiration, and which have contributed in no small degree to promote human happiness and ameliorate human suffering, was of Indian origin. Nor were the Hindoos behind-hand as regards the science of medicine. The Arabs openly acknowledge their obligations to our ancestors in this respect. Indeed, so great was their respect for the Hindoo physicians, that two of their number, Saleh and Manka, were retained at the court of Harun-al-Rashed.

But the Hindoos were not only great in literature, and in science, they were likewise great in war. The Hindoo books treat of the subject of tactics. The division of the army into centre, flank, wings and reserve, was recognised. Rules are laid down for the order of march and the choice of position. The subject of encampment also received attention.

But the point which possesses the deepest interest in connection with Hindoo military science, is the question as to whether our ancestors had any knowledge of firearms. Sir

Henry Elliot and perhaps also Professor Wilson incline to the view that the ancient Hindoos were acquainted with the use of firearms. Sir Henry Elliot conjectures that they were of an explosive character. The opinions of Wilson and Elliot derive considerable support from the testimony of Greek authors—from the testimony of Philostratus, of Themistius, of Clesias and Delian. But, gentlemen, in spite of the weight which must always belong to the opinions of such eminent Oriental scholars as Wilson and Elliot, I am led to believe from arguments* which, I am afraid, time will not permit me to enter into, that our ancestors had probably no knowledge of firearms.

But the ancient Hindoos were not only great in literature, great in science, great in war, they were above all great in

*These arguments are as follows--If the ancient Hindoos were familiar with the use of firearms of any kind, how they came to lose all such knowledge. Is it at all likely considering the advantages which such knowledge would confer, that they should ever have forgotten the use of firearms, and forgotten it so completely that it is now a matter of warm discussion as to whether they ever possessed any such knowledge? The necessity there would be, in a rude and turbulent age, of constantly taking the field, whether for purposes of offence or defence, would keep up and improve the knowledge of firearms, and it is easy to see how upon such knowledge the national existence would often depend. Unless, therefore, a satisfactory explanation is given as to how the Hindoos came to lose all knowledge of firearms, we are afraid, we must conclude that firearms were not known amongst them. Then, again, we know that it was the bow which the ancient Hindoos chiefly relied upon in the field of battle. Now, if they possessed any kind of firearms, it seens scarcely likely that they should have given the preference to a weapon infinitely inferior in point of usefulness to firearms. Finally, we know that from the earliest times elephants formed an important part in the Indian army. Now this could hardly have been the case, if firearms were in use, that they are apt to take fright at the report of guns. Unless, therefore, we suppose that the nature of elephants has, in these modern times, undergone a complete change they could not have been employed so much in the field as the ancient Aryans appear to have done.

The above points seem to require explanation before we should feel ourselves at liberty to accept the views of Elliot and Wilson.

morals. If our country had produced no other great man than Sakya Muni, I conceive we should have been entitled to the gratitude of posterity. The two greatest characters that have adorned the annals of humanity are undoubtedly Sakya Muni and Jesus Christ. It will not be for me to institute any comparison between these two illustrious worthies of the human race. Mine will not be the hand that will tear down the veil of sanctity with which the veneration of ages has enshrouded these gifted mortals. I am more concerned here to-night to point out the moral grandeur of ancient India, as typified and exemplified in the life of the great founder of Buddhism. Have the pages of history nobler instances of self-sacrifice to record than that of Sakya Muni ? Born the heir to a magnificent principality, with troupes of servants to obey his behests, with a loving wife and affectionate parents, he resolved to forswear the temptations of his lofty position, to rise high above them, and to consecrate his life and his energies to the great task of praeching to the benighted nations of the earth, the lessons of truth and religion. High mountains, broad rivers, impervious forests, the horrors of the stake, the sword of the executioner, the knife of the assassin, presented no obstacles to the slow, the silent, the steady progress of the religion of Gautam Buddha. From the frozen waters that skirt the coast of Kamaschatka to the extreme south of the island of Ceylon, from the green and verdant isles the fringe the Chinese seas to the arid steppes of Central Asia. Buddhism became the predominating religion. The shivering inhabitant of Siberia, the yellow-complexioned Chinese, the swarthy native of Ceylon, the semi-naked barbarian of the steppes, all acknowledged the great Hindoo as their apostle. Gentlemen, Sakya Muni was a Hindoo, and so are we : but I ask, where is his heroic and noble self-endurance, where his soul of fire, his heart of love, embracing within its bounds not only man but the whole range of animated beings, aught that could breathe, aught that could feel from the meanest protoplasm to man, the lord of creation ? I ask you, gentlemen, whether standing in the presence of this noble Hindoo, this illustrious scion of a royal race, who flung away the splendours of a throne, in order that he might become the apostle of humanity, you do not feel something

of his noble and heroic self-endurance, something of his fervid patriotism, something of his boundless love for mankind? If you do not then, I say, call not yourselves the countrymen of Sakya Muni, pride not yourselves on the splendour of his immortal achievements. There is a higher consanguinity than that of blood, a nobler relationship than that of fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, wives, the consanguinity—the relationship which arises from the unity and the harmony of sentiments, views and aspirations. If the noble example of Sakya Muni does not stimulate your patriotism and increase your self-respect, then, I say, you are not his countrymen though the same blood runs through your veins the same sun warms you, the same moon emparadises your nights and the same vaulted canopy of heaven, bespangled with its myriads of stars, spreads like a pall over your head.

But, gentlemen, besides Sakya Muni, there were other lights, though not so bright or so gorgeous, which shone on the Indian firmament. It is not necessary that I should allude to them. Contemporary testimony is, indeed, unequivocal with regard to the moral excellence of the ancient Indians. I dare say, you have all heard of Arrian. He is the historian of Alexander's Indian expedition. Well, Arrian says in his "Indica"—and I quote this remark with a degree of pride and satisfaction, more to be conceived than described—Arrian says that, "No Indian was ever known to tell an untruth". This statement has been regarded as an exaggeration, and that even by so accomplished a scholar as Mr. Cowell. But it finds corroboration from a new and almost unexpected quarter. I have already had occasion to remark that, about the beginning of the 7th century of the Christian era, the great Chinese traveller. Hiouen Tsang visited India. Hiouen Tsang, we have already seen, had unexceptionable opportunities of forming a correct judgment with regard to Indian affairs, Well, then, the following is Hiouen Thsang's estimate of the Indian character. He says : "The Indian's might be fickle, they might be frivolous, they might be volatile, but they knew not what fraud was." Thus, then, gentlemen, we have the testimony of two writers, separated by age, separated by country, separated

by religion, separated by traditions, associations, habits and institutions, separated in short, by everything that constitutes the difference between man and man, uniting to speak in support of the character for truthfulness which our Aryan forefathers bore. And is it possible, in the face of the concurrent testimony of two suchwitnesses whose reputation for veracity is so high, and one of whom, at least, had ample opportunities of forming a correct judgment about the Indian character, to regard the statement of Arrian, as an exaggeration ? No, gentlemen, our ancestors were a most truthful people. They were likewise one of the bravest nations on the face of the earth. Arrian says, they were the bravest soldiers that Alexander encountered on the plains of Asia. In short, as regards everything that constitutes real manliness of character, as regards everything that constitutes true nobility of disposition, the Indians of those days outstripped all Asiatic races and have become the model for our guidance and our imitation.

Our great epic poems—the Ramayana and the Mahabharta—are a monument of the moral worth of our ancestors. Where shall we find a nobler character than that of a Rama or of a Yudisthira ? Where shall we find sublimer precepts of morality than those taught in the Ramayana and the Mahabharata ? The solemnity of pledges, the great duty of filial obedience, the absolute necessity of self-sacrifice in the discharge of solemn obligations, the supreme virtue of chastity, the sacredness of truth, heinousness of perjury, are all enforced with a degree of eloquence, of pathos, of sincerity, of depth of conviction, as cannot fail to leave an impression on the mind of even the most careless reader of the Ramayana and the Mahabharata.

Gentlemen, let us sit at the feet of our ancestors and hold communion with the master minds of ancient India...Approach reverentially the sacred records of your sires. Remember, that you are studying the sayings and doings of your revered ancestors, of those for whose sake alone you are now remembered, for whose sake alone the intellectual elite of Europe even now

feel a deep and an ardent interest in your welfare. If you cannot attain the intellectual eminence of your ancestors, why not strive to emulate their moral grandeur. The road to moral greatness is not so steep, or so slippery. And permit me to remind you, that upon the moral regeneration of your country depends its intellectual, its social, and its political regeneration...

Gentlemen, I invite you to this noble task, the moral regeneration of your country, a task, in every way worthy of your highest ambition...If you indeed accomplish this noble task, your names will be emblazoned in characters of gold in the ineffacable pages of history and will be handed down to remote posterity to receive the countless blessings of unborn generations. Gentlemen, you have your choice between a life of active and patriotic duty and a life of indifference, of carelessness, of disregard of sacred obligations. Countrymen of Valmiki and Vyasa, make your choice, and whether you choose the one line of conduct or the other, remember the hopes of posterity are centred in you and that your great fathers from their high places in heaven are looking down upon you.

INDIAN UNITY*

It has been remarked by Tennyson, somewhere in his poems, that the path of human progress is streaked with blood, that the car of human civilization rolls forward amid the corpses of men, women and children. This remark seems to me to be pregnant with truth. The history of the human race abundantly proves it. The Asiatic invasion of Alexander superficially considered seems but a long catalogue of wanton bloodshed, of indiscriminate slaughter. But if you examine the matter a little deeper, another feature of the case presently reveals itself to view. The Asiatic invasion of Alexander served for the first time to bring the East and the West into close and intimate contact, served for the first time to bring the Western mind into close and intimate communion with the Eastern mind. And what was the result of this contact, this communion ?

*Address delivered at a meeting of the Students' Association held in Medical College, Calcutta, on 16 March, 1878.

Eastern science with its amazing results, with its complicated method, with its marvellous developments, for the first time lay unfolded before the awe-struck gaze of the Grecian people. From amid the blood and confusion of battle, from amid the clanging of martial music, from amid the groans of the dead and the dying, the Greek mind seized with wonderful grasp those cardinal principles of Eastern science, which were henceforth to become the regulating maxims of Western science, and which in the fulness of time were to confer such unspeakable and untold blessings upon the human race. A party of savants had accompanied the expedition of Alexander. These men were the intellectual beacons of the age in which they lived, men who have left the imperishable stamp of their genius upon the thought and culture of succeeding generations. These wise men of the West had access to the scientific records of the Assyrians and the Chaldeans. There they discovered that the two methods under which scientific investigations had been carried on in the East, were observation and experiment. Observation and experiment had been in the East the prolific mother of great discoveries. Nature, when questioned under the guidance of this two-fold method, had yielded up the hidden secrets that lay embosomed within her. Observation and experiment had done great things for Eastern science. Might they not be made to perform a similar duty for Western science? So spoke Aristotle and the band of illustrious men whom he was surrounded. A new era dawns upon the history of Grecian science. Observation and experiment were now to regulate Western science, as they had before regulated Eastern science. The blood, therefore, that was shed in the Greek expedition was not shed in vain. The treasure that was lavished in that expedition, was not lavished in vain. Out of that blood, out of that treasure, there rose the proud fabric of European science. There was thus, under the orderings of Providence, a distinct mission associated with the expedition of Alexander. That mission was to lay, deep and secure, the foundation-stone of the noble temple of Western science upon the firm and immutable basis of observation and experiment.

In the same way the Roman Empire had a mission of its own to accomplish. Roman civilization followed in the path

of Roman conquest. The legionaries of Rome bore aloft the banner of human progress Under Roman influences, Europe emerged from her primeval barbarism. But the great mission of Rome was not accomplished, her predestined course in history was not run till Christ had appeared on the scene, till she had prepared men's minds for the acceptance of those great, those sublime, those eternal truths for which the immortal founder of Christianity lived and died.

What were those truths which Christ preached ? What were those principles which he sought to impress on the minds of men and for which, when the hour came, he offered himself up as a meek sacrifice on the blessed Cross. The sum and substance of Christ's teachings is embraced in the simple but comprehensive formula of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man. Christ taught that all men were equal, he taught that every man who drew the vital air was the equal of his fellow man. He taught that in Heaven's great book, in the eternal rolls of Light, there was no distinction between the black man and the white man, between the European and the Asiatic, between the Roman and the barbarian. And the policy, the precepts, the maxims of imperial Rome had prepared men's minds for the admission of this great principle of equality. Roman Law admitted of no distinction between the Roman-born and him who was not so born. In the eyes of the Roman Law, all Roman subjects were equal. There was not a right, not a privilege, not an immunity which a Roman enjoyed and which was not shared by the obscurest inhabitant of the most distant part of the Roman Empire. There was not an office in the State to which a Roman subject might not aspire. He might aspire to fill the senatorial rank, he might aspire to be the governor of a province, the commander of an army or the confidential adviser of his sovereign. Rome's mission, then, was accomplished when under the shadows of her imperial throne, Christ first taught in his simple and noble eloquence, the great principle of equality, that principle which was to receive its last solemn seal and sanction amid the blood and smoke of the great French Revolution.

Rome then had a mission of her own to accomplish. There was a mission associated with the expedition of Alexander. And am I to understand that England has no mission in the East to accomplish ? Aye, she has a glorious mission to fulfil here, a mission far nobler than it ever fell to the lot of Greek, Macedonian or Roman to accomplish. It is England's mission in the East to save, regenerate, emancipate from the chains of ignorance, error and superstition, 150 millions of human beings, to heal the wounds that have been inflicted on them by the rapacity of their former rulers, to develop in them a self-reliant, manly, energetic character, to spread through the land the great blessings of peace, contentment and happiness, but above all England's noble mission in the East is to help towards the consummation of Indian unity, to reconcile the jarring conflicts of the diverse Indian nationalities to bring them nearer together, to evoke in them a sentiment of brotherhood and make them feel that they have to make common cause for the redress of common grievances .

Gentlemen, I cannot help thinking that it is our proud privilege to live in one of the most interesting epochs in the history of our country, one of those epochs, which, if I am at all allowed to make a forecast of the future, will not be without its influence on the fortunes of after generations. Those fierce animosities, those bitter dissensions, those degrading passions which in the past and the preceding centuries had converted this beautiful country of ours into one vast ensanguined plain, have now happily subsided, and we live in an era of unexampled peace, prosperity and happiness. For this great result we are indebted to the British Government. If at this moment the semi barbarous hordes of Afghanistan, bursting our barriers, are not sweeping across our country, it is because of the omnipotent might of the British ruler. If, at this moment, happily the sentiment of brotherhood has been universally evoked in the minds of the Indian races, it is because under the auspices of British rule, the varied and diversified peoples that inhabit this great country have been welded together into compact and homogeneous mass.

But I ask, gentlemen, is this after all a season of unmixed congratulation? Have we no mournful reflections to darken the horizon of our thoughts? May we not, occupying the vantage ground that we now happen to occupy, emancipate ourselves from the present, look back into the past and question the past? May we not resuscitate the dying embers of a by-gone age and endeavour to fan them forth into a living flame, full of light for our future guidance? May we not occupying the intellectual eminence that we have attained, invoke the genius of history and call upon her to declare what were the circumstances, what the incidents, what the causes which brought about our fall and have perpetuated our degradation? The Goddess of History thus questioned, is sure to return one answer, and it will be an answer atonce decisive and unequivocal in its character. The Goddess will answer—"Indians, your dissensions, your jealousies, your animosities, have brought about your fall and have perpetuated your degradation. Learn to respect the holy principle of union. Learn to love one another as brothers. Learn to make common cause for the redress of common grievances and the great God of nations, the Protector of the rights of fallen peoples, may yet from His high place in Heaven look upon you with compassion, may yet in His infinite mercy ordain the dawning of a bright day for your country." So will speak the Goddess of History and she will point to facts in Indian History in support of her statement.

But, perhaps, it will be said that the question of Indian unity, of the intellectual, moral and social union of the Indian peoples, is a dream, is a chimera, the phantom of an excited imagination. It will be said that India throughout the long period of her chequered history, has presented the spectacle of a country, inhabited by peoples, separated by language, separated by religion, separated by manners, and customs, separated in short by everything that constitutes the distinctive difference between races and peoples. Why then, it will be said, at this time of the day commit the monstrous absurdity of talking of Indian unity?

Gentlemen, I have stated the arguments against Indian unity as strongly as the case admits of, in order to point out that these arguments are not wholly unanswerable in their character. I invite your attention once more to the terms of the proposition you are considering. India is inhabited by peoples separated by language, by religion, by manners and customs. Is their intellectual, social and moral union possible ? I say such a union is possible—is practicable ; and I appeal to the facts of history in support of the statement.

Let us take the example of Switzerland, to begin with. Switzerland, you are aware, is a federal country, enjoying the blessings of a republican government. Switzerland is divided into a number of Cantons. Well, there are Roman Catholic Cantons and there are Protestant Cantons. There are French-speaking Cantons, and there are German-speaking Cantons. But in spite of those differences of language and religion. Switzerland is a united country, and never was the strength of the Swiss Union, the compactness of that homogeneity more strikingly exemplified than on that memorable day when that great oppressor of our race, Napoleon Bonaparte endeavoured to wipe out this little republic from the face of Europe.

Take again the case of Belgium. Belgium is a united country, and it would have been truly remarkable if it were not, considering how limited its area is. Well in Belgium, there are the Wallons, and there are the Flemish-speaking populations, there are again Roman Catholic Belgians, and there are Protestant Belgians. But Belgium is a united country in spite of religious and linguistic differences.

Let us how take the case of Germany. In Germany, we do not, indeed, meet with those strongly marked linguistic differences, we notice in the case of Belgium and Switzerland, but I know of no country where in modern times the spirit of religious difference, I had almost said, the spirit of bitter religious hatred has been carried to a greater or more extravagant length than in this confederated German Empire. And if it were not that this was the 19th century, that Germany was placed in the midst of the hallowed, the consecrated, the peaceful influence

of modern civilization. Germany would to-day have presented the spectacle of a country deluged with bloodshed on the altar of religious differences. Germany is united in spite of strongly marked religious differences in her people.

I shall take one more instance, and this time it will be Italy. Italy, you are aware, was united in 1870. But the idea was a very old one. Dante had sung of Italian unification. The highest minds in Italy had aspired to bring about the consummation of that great event. Again and again there rose up poets. princes, philosophers and statesmen, with whom the great dream of their lives was the dream of Italian unification. But it was believed there were insuperable obstacles to the unification of Italy. The Italians had become a degraded people. They had forgotten the glorious memories of the past. They had forgotten the great deeds of their sires. They had forgotten the patriotism of Brutus, the eloquence of Cicero, the martial achievements of Caesar. Differences of language added to the confusion. The Neapolitan understood not the Roman, the Roman understood not the Venetian. They were all brothers, born of the same illustrious progenitors, the inheritors of the same great memories, yet they knew not one another, understood not one another, they were strangers in each other's sight. But was there no hope for Italy ? Was she for ever to remain in the grovelling depths of continued misery ? Aye no. The day of Italy's deliverance was fast approaching. The fiat had gone forth, the celestial mandate had been issued that Italy was to be saved. The hour had arrived. The men were there. Under the guidance of Mazzini and Garibaldi Italy rose to the conception of Italian unity ; and through acts of noble and unheard-of self-sacrifice, which have shed lasting glory on the honoured names of the martyred patriots of Italy, the Italian people brought about the unity and the independence of their country. The unification of Italy was effected notwithstanding dialectical differences.

Thus, then, gentlemen, from the instances I have just cited, we are naturally led to conclude that there may be linguistic differences, but they do not form iusuperable barriers to the

consummation of a national unity. A point has thus been gained in the argument. But it is my contention that the considerations I have just urged against national unity lose much of their weight when we bear in mind the wholly altered circumstances under which we now live. Modern India is very different from ancient India. The conditions of life in modern India are very different from the conditions of life in ancient India. We may deprecate the change. We may regret the circumstance. But there is no denying the fact that we are in the midst of a great revolution along whose current we are irresistibly borne. English civilisation has been introduced into our midst, and along with it have been introduced certain revolutionary agencies of mighty potency, which are operating with powerful effect upon the framework of Indian society, thinning away its vital parts and greatly helping the cause of Indian unity. Foremost amongst these agencies English Education claims our attention. The traveller who visits the cities of Delhi and Agra is struck with wonderment at the magnificent works of architectural beauty which still grace these once imperial capitals. They remind us of Moslem supremacy. They are the silent monumental records of by-gone times. They remind us of the generosity and humanity of Akbar, of the splendour of Shah Jehan, of the religious bigotry of Aurangzeb. England indeed cannot boast of such monuments of architectural magnificence; but her claims to the lasting gratitude of posterity will rest upon a surer, more permanent and durable basis upon the conviction which is deep and earnest in us, *viz.*, that under the auspices of English rule were, for the first time, sown the seeds of a civilization containing the germs of India's future greatness, of her political, moral and intellectual regeneration.

The question might be asked how is English Education helping the cause of Indian union. I have mentioned that one of the obstacles of national unity is the diversity of dialects that prevails in India. English Education partly removes this difficulty by supplying a common medium of communication between the educated classes. I may not know Maharati, an educated native of Bombay may not know Bengali. But we can

hold intercourse with one another, correspond with one another through the common medium of the English language. Nor is this all. English Education has uplifted all who have come under its influence to a common platform of thoughts, feelings and aspirations. Educated Indians, whether of Bengal, Madras, Bombay or the North-Western Provinces are brought up under the same intellectual, moral and political influence. Kindred hopes, feelings and ideas are thus generated. The educated classes throughout India are thus brought nearer together.

Railways also are greatly helping to bring about a feeling of of unity and sympathy between the Indian races. Railways have abriged distances. The distance between Calcutta and Delhi is not thousand miles but is only a question of about 44 hours. The distance between Calcutta and Lahore is not 1,000 miles but is only a question of about 52 hours. The distance between Calcutta and Bombay is not 1,900 miles but is only a question of about 61 hours. The means of communication being so easy, we have taken more largely to travelling. We know one another now much more intimately than we ever did before. Those prejudices which had separated us for ages are fast disappearing, and the patriot sees in the distant horizon the faint streaks of that dawn which are to usher in the day of his country's regeneration and union. Railways are thus helping to promote Indian union.

The existence of a native Press is also calculated to bring about the same result. If I had addressed you day before yesterday, I should have said that the native press was a free press. But within the last forty-eight hours a law has been hurriedly enacted which has put a gag into the mouth of the Vernacular press, has enveloped its fate in deep gloom, has dealt a terrible blow at the cause of Indian progress and enlightenment. The law which has been enacted, and the circumstances under which it has been enacted strongly remind us of our degradation, of the stretches to which the exercise of arbitrary power might be carried in this country, and how it has become necessary that we should interpose an effective and

at the same time a thoroughly constitutional barrier against the reckless exercise of such great power. This is not the time nor the place to enter into a discussion of the merits of this most important measure of law, but there are one or two remarks which I feel bound to make with reference to a matter which must be uppermost in the minds of most of us here present. The law has been described to be an "enabling" measure, a "preventive" measure, a "non punitive" measure. Now, the concluding section of this non-punitive Act declares that nothing in that Act will exempt a person punished under it from being punished under the provisions of any other Act against which he may have offended. Now let us take the case of an unfortunate editor who has given security and who in the opinion of the Magistrate has been guilty of criminal intimidation. He forfeits his security and he is also liable to punishment under the penal code. Under this preventive and this non-punitive law, a man may thus be punished twice. The law was passed at one and the same sitting, the standing orders having been suspended. The usual course is, when a measure is introduced into the Supreme Council, to refer it to a Select Committee ; the Bill is also to be published in the Government Gezette, so that the public might have an opportunity of discussing the merits of the proposed measure of law. Nothing of the kind was done in the present instance. These formalities were quietly dispensed with, and the Bill became Law the same day it was introduced. Now I ask what justification was there for this undue and precipitate haste. Was the atmosphere infected with treason ? Were daggers floating about in the air ? Were the Russians knocking at the gates of Peshawar ? Was this great Empire, the embodiment of English justice and humanity in the East, this Empire resting upon the willing allegiance, the steadfast devotion and the fervent loyalty of 250 millions of human beings, tottering to its foundations ? If there is peace, happiness, contentment throughout the length and breadth of this country. I repeat what need was there for this great precipitate haste ? But I forget Sir Alexander Arbuthnot has told us that it was intended to avoid agitation and hence was it that the Bill became Law at one and the same sitting. The Government, I venture to think, is

greatly mistaken if it really believes that by hastily carrying the Bill, it will avoid agitation. There will be an agitation on a vast, extensive scale commensurate with the greatness of the occasion, the importance of the subject. There will be an agitation which shall extend from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin and from the Indus to the Brahmaputra, an agitation which shall be truly national in its character and shall include the varied and inversified races and peoples that inhabit this great country, and I declare I shall cheerfully bear my humble share in the great national work. It matters not who sympathises with us, and who does not. We shall do our duty manfully, fearlessly and courageously. It matters not if we are cried down as "stump orators." It matters not if we are described as "young men ambitious for fame and distinction." It matters not if our motives are misconstrued and we are held up to the ridicule and, it may be, the execration of our European rulers. I repeat, we shall do our duty fearlessly, manfully and courageously. We shall borrow a noble page from England's glorious history, that page wherein are blazoned forth in characters of glittering gold (O God ! may the spirit of those words last till the end of time) "England expects every man to do his duty". We shall borrow that page from England's history, fasten it on our banner, and unfurl that banner before the gaze of our own countrymen and of stagnant Asia. India too expects every man to do his duty.

The Brahmo Samaj may also powerfully help to bring about Indian unity. Amongst the obstacles to national unity, difference of religion occupies not wholly an unimportant place. The Brahmo Samaj, by uniting Indians of varied creeds and beliefs under the bonds of a common faith, may help to remove this great difficulty and foster and promote Indian union. And it seems to me that the Brahmo Samaj possesses special facilities for bringing about this great end. This creed of simple monotheism which it preaches and holds up for our acceptance has in all ages and times possessed an almost irresistible attraction for the minds of thoughtful Indians. But let me not be misunderstood. The Brahmoism which is thus to knit together the varied creeds of India under the bond of a

common faith must not be merely the Brahmoism of prayers, of thanks givings and meditations. It must be the Brahmoism of practical life. It must be that form of Brahmoism which going deep into the life of the individual, must influence his every-day conduct. It must be that form of Brahmoism which while inculcating the great principles of the unity and the omniscience of the Deity, will at the same time, teach man that his highest duty is to love his fellow man, to serve him, to work for him and to live and die, if necessary, for his happiness, his prosperity and welfare.

Thus, then, gentlemen, it appears that the circumstances under which we live are wholly different from those of ancient India. Any arguments, therefore, founded upon the past of India, can have no application in the present day, the facts being so different. But if in spite of the arguments I have urged it should be thought that the consummation of Indian unity must necessarily take such a long time that for all practical purposes it must be pronounced to be impossible of realisation. I ask what possible difficulty would there be to the unification of the interests of the educated classes spread throughout the different parts of India ? We are not separated by language ; English supplies us with a common medium of communication, and removes one of the great difficulties to national union. I know there are those who would give worlds to create dissensions amongst us. I know there are those who would raise mountain barriers between us, who would interpose an ever-widening gulf of bitter animosities between us, who would rend asunder the bonds of sympathy which ought to subsist between us, brothers born of the same mother. And these men would fain be our leaders, our guides, our instructors. I know not how you regard their tricks, but for my parts, my feelings towards them are those of pure, simple, unmitigated contempt and abhorrence.

Sometimes ago an influential journal, published in one of the most important cities in the North-Western Provinces, had an article headed "Bengali Babus and India". Well, in that article the writer remarked that the Bengalis possessed special

aptitude to master Law, Medicine and the lower Mathematics. Aye forsooth, the Bengalis possessed some capacity to master the lower Mathematics. And the writer ventured to make this statement in the face of the broad fact that there was at least one Bengali gentleman, your worthy President, who passed a most difficult Mathematical examination, perhaps the most difficult in the world, in a way highly creditable to himself and honourable to his country. Well, the writer in question, after having treated his readers to this most important piece of information, went on to observe that the natives of other parts of India would not have the Bengalis as associates, much less as leaders. Now, gentleman, I think I speak the sentiments of my educated countrymen, when I say that we Bengalis do not aspire to occupy the position of leaders. We are only anxious that the light which is in us, that the light under which we have basked for so many long years, should spread over the whole of India and chase away that cimmerian darkness which has settled over the intellectual and moral atmosphere of this great country. And I am in a position to give the lie direct to the other part of the statement to which I have referred. Last summer, gentlemen, an important mission carried me through the whole of India, and wherever I went, I was received with open arms and treated as a brother by my countrymen from the banks of the Beas to the briny waters that wash the coast of Madras.

There may thus be a unification of the interests of educated India ; is not such union necessary and desirable ? Have we no grievances to redress ? I do not put this question by way of reflection upon the Government of this country. Every country, however well governed, has its grievances. The French have their grievances. The Germans have their grievances, the Swiss have their grievances, and even the English enjoying the freest institutions in the world have their grievances also. It would indeed have been truly remarkable if a country situated as India is, without the blessings of representative institutions, had no grievances to redress, no complaints to make. And is it not necessary in order that we might obtain the redress of our grievances, that the voice of united India should be heard

with respect to them ? United representations must necessarily carry much greater weight with the English nation and the English Parliament than the prayer of this particular province, or of that particular province. A remarkable unanimity of feeling has already been evoked throughout India, I mean upon the question of the admission of our countrymen into the ranks of the Covenanted Civil Service. All India is of one mind upon this great question. And I am sure that with reference to all other questions affecting national interests, there is a similar unanimity of feeling among the educated classes throughout India.

But, gentlemen, I am not content to allow this question—the desirability and importance of promoting a feeling of sympathy and union between the different modern races and peoples—rest upon mere intellectual considerations. I desire to place this question upon the exalted basis of the human emotions. Are not all Indians brothers ? Ought they not then to live and act as brothers ? The ground which we tread is holy, round us sleep our revered sires. Beware how we live in this land. Let us live in it as loving brothers. But if we cannot do so, then do thou, O God of Nature, hurl against us the thunders of Thy wrath, for by so living we desecrate and pollute the memories of our sires.

The cause of Indian unity stands in need of missionaries. No cause has ever prospered which has not had its missionaries, its apostles and prophets. The cause of Italian unity had its apostles and prophets, its Mazzinis and its Garibaldis. Who will be the Garibaldis and Mazzinis of Indian unity ? Who amongst us will emulate their self-sacrifice, their matchless patriotism, their unflinching devotion to the interests of their country ? Their revolutionary spirit is not indeed needed for the benefit of India. The march of progress which has already commenced under English auspices must not be disturbed. May England long continue to rule India for the glory of England and the benefit of India. But we want the inspiration to noble actions to be derived from the blessed names and sanctified examples of the immortal apostles of Italian unity. I repeat who will be this apostles of Indian unity.

Young men, whom I see around me in such large numbers, you are the hopes of your country; your country expects great things from you. Now, I ask, how many of you are prepared, when you have finished your studies at the college, to devote your lives, to consecrate your energies to the good of your country? I repeat the question and I pause for a reply. (Here the speaker paused for a few seconds. Cries of "all," from all sides of the gallery). The response is in every way worthy of yourselves and of the education which you are receiving. May you prove true to your resolve, and carry out in life the high purposes which animate your bosoms.

Gentlemen, I have a strong conviction and an assured belief that there comes a time in the history of a nation's progress, when every man may verily be said to have a mission of his own to accomplish. Such a time has now arrived for India. The fiat has gone forth; celestial mandate has been issued that every Indian must now do his duty, or stand condemned before God and man. There was such a time of stirring activity in the glorious annals of England, when Hampden offered up his life for the deliverance of his country, when Algernon Sydney laid down his head on the block to rid his country of a hated tyrant, when English bishops did not hesitate in the discharge of their duty to their Fatherland to descend from the performance of their ecclesiastical functions and appear as traitors before the bar of a criminal court. These are glorious reminiscences in England's immortal history, which Englishmen to this day look back upon with pride and satisfaction. It is not indeed necessary for us to have recourse to violence in order to obtain the redress of our grievances. Constitutional agitation will secure for us those rights and the privileges which in less favoured countries are obtained by sterner means. But peaceful as are the means to be enforced, there is a stern duty to be performed by every Indian. And he who fails in that duty is a traitor before God and man.

In holding up for your acceptance the great principle of Indian unity, I do not lay any claims to originality. Three hundred years ago, in the Punjab, the immortal founder of

Sikhism, the meek, the gentle, the blessed Nanak preached the great doctrine of Indian unity and endeavoured to knit together Hindus and Musulmans under the banner of a common faith. That attempt was eminently successful. Nanak became the spiritual founder of the Sikh Empire. He preached the great doctrine of peace and goodwill between Hindus and Musulmans. And standing in the presence of his great example, we too must preach the great doctrine of peace and goodwill between Hindus and Musulmans, Christians and Parsees, aye among all sections of the great Indian community. Let us raise aloft the banner of our country's progress. Let the word "Unity" be inscribed there in characters of glittering gold. We have had enough of past jealousies, past dissensions, past animosities. The spirits of the dead at Paniput will testify to our bloody strifes. The spirits of the dead in other battle-fields will testify to the same fact. There may be social differences between us. But there is a common platform where we may all meet, the platform of our country's welfare. There is a common cause which may bind us together, the cause of Indian progress. There is a common country, let us all. Hindus, Musulmans, Christians, Parsees, members of the great Indian community, throw the pall of oblivion over jealousies and dissensions of by-gone times and embracing one another in fraternal love and affection, live and work for the benefit of a beloved Fatherland. Under English auspices there is indeed a great future for India. I am confident of the great destinies that are in store for us. You and I may not live to see that day. These eyes of ours may not witness that spectacle of ineffable beauty. It may not be permitted to us to exclaim Simeon like, "Now Lord, lettest thouthy servant depart in peace." It may not be permitted to us to exclaim like the Welsh bard on the heights of Snowdon, "Visions of glory, spare my aching sight." But is it nothing to know when you are dying, when you are about to take leave of this world, of its joys and sorrows, when the past of your life is unfurled before you, when eternity opens wide its portals, is it nothing to know at that last awe-inspiring supreme moment of your lives, that you have not lived in vain, that you have lived to

help in the cause of your country's regeneration ? Let us all lead worthy, honourable and patriotic lives, that we may all live and die happily and that India may be great. That is my earnest and prayerful request. May it find a response in your sympathetic hearts.

THE VERNACULAR PRESS ACT*

Gentlemen, I beg to move the Second Resolution. The Resolution runs as follows : "That having regard to the devoted loyalty and attachment of the people of India to the British Crown, to which willing and ungrudging testimony has from time to time been borne by many high and distinguished authorities, both here and in England, to the peace and contentment that reign throughout the country, this meeting desire to record its emphatic opinion that a repressive and retrograde measure like the Vernacular Press Act is unnecessary and uncalled for, and is opposed to the interests of justice as it altogether dispenses with the usual safeguards of judicial investigation, and substitutes in their place the discretionary authority of executive officers."

Gentlemen, the Resolution which I have just read speaks of the devoted loyalty and attachment of the people of this country to the British Crown. It is rather a matter of great regret that at this time of day, after having lived for more than a century under the fostering influences of English rule and English civilization, the task should have devolved upon us to speak on the subject of our loyalty, and not only that, but that it should also be necessary that we should endeavour to establish our loyalty by unimpeachable facts and unassailable arguments.

But the necessity clearly exists. The new Act is a direct slur upon our loyalty. Where would have been the necessity for such an Act in the midst of a contented, happy, and above

*Speech at a public meeting held in the Town Hall, Calcutta, on 17 April, 1878 to consider the desirability of petitioning British Parliament on the subject of Vernacular Press Act.

all a loyal people? Therefore, I repeat, gentlemen, the Act is a direct reproach and a reflection upon our loyalty. The question, therefore, is, are we loyal, or are we not? Before I proceed to offer my observation on this most important subject, it becomes necessary that I should hasten to draw a distinction. Loyalty to the Crown is to be distinguished from subserviency, from obsequiousness to this officer or that officer. We may criticise the acts of individual officers but such criticisms are not incompatible with allegiance to British rule in this country. The question then is, are we loyal, or are we not? Are we wanting in loyalty, in dutiful homage, unswering allegiance to the throne of her who rules over this country, whose matchless purity of character, whose generosity of disposition, whose keen and ardent interest in the welfare of her Indian subjects have created in our minds the highest respect for her person, and have planted deep her throne in the affection of the teeming millions of this country. Gentlemen, I put the question, are we wanting in loyalty to this great, wise, virtuous, beneficent ruler—our beloved Empress? Let us appeal to facts. If we are to be condemned, let it not be upon vague generalities, upon mere assumptions, upon futile theories. You are all, gentlemen, familiar with the well-known maxim of English law,—"The king can do no wrong." This is no more a cardinal maxim of English law than it represents a principle implanted deep in the inborn instinct of the Indian races and peoples. We are essentially a loyal people. By instinct, by tradition, by association, we are loyal. With us the king is a semi-divine personage. He is the embodiment of justice, purity and truth. Given to the performance of his pledges, he claims the unconditional homage of his subjects. And some of the greatest of our poets—those master delineators of the prevailing sentiments of the age in which they lived,—have clothed this feeling in suitable form and appropriate diction. Valmiki has taken advantage of this feeling in his immortal poem of the Ramayana. Witness the burst of grief that overpowers the good citizens of Ayodhya when their beloved heir-apparent Rama, accompanied by his devoted consort, leaves the home of his father to retire into the wilderness. Witness again the wailings, the lamentations, the dolorous cries of mourning

that fill the air on the death of the aged monarch, Dasaratha. Witness the transport of joy, the manifestations of rejoicings, that fill all hearts, when Rama returns home to take possession of the throne of his father. I say we are essentially a loyal people, and however much English education might have revolutionized our mental constitution, it has not abated by one atom that character for deep and intense loyalty which has marked the history of our race from the earliest times. Gentlemen, you have all read of Pindari war, that war which England undertook in the first quarter of this century in the interests of civilization, to rid the country of those Pindari robbers, the eternal enemies of progress and good government. When that war was raging, when its flames had covered the firmament with their lurid glare, there was not a house, there was not a domestic circle which did not offer up its prayers to the God of battles, invoking his blessings for the success of British arms. This fact appears from a petition which the native community sent up to the Supreme Court in 1823. Our fathers prayed for the triumph of British arms; aye, the fathers of those who have met here to-night to vindicate their character for loyalty, and to hurl back with scorn and indignation the charge which is sought to be brought home to them—that they are disloyal and faithless to that government under whose protecting care they have enjoyed the inestimable blessing of security of life and property, and have made such rapid strides in civilization and enlightenment. Great God! was it reserved to our lot that we should have to vindicate our character for loyalty, in the face of these instances of devoted allegiance to the British crown?

Passing over the Afghan War, we come to the dark days of the Indian Mutiny. It was essentially a military revolt, with which the people at large had no sympathy, and from which they sedulously kept themselves aloof. Not only did they not sympathise with that revolt, not only did they resist the temptation of joining their countrymen in arms against the British Government, but when the hour came, they manfully stood by their English rulers, and rendered them important

services. How many daring feats of valour were performed by the native soldiery, in arms against their own countrymen and in support of British supremacy ; how numerous, how manifold were the services rendered by native gentlemen for the maintenance of the existing order of things ? Deo Narain Singh does not live, but we invoke his shade to bear witness of his trials and sufferings, his gigantic exertions to crush out the seeds of rebellion and restore peace and order. But for the memorable services of that great man, the last vestige of British power would in the days of the Mutiny, have disappeared from the sacred and ancient city of the Hindus. Those were days when loyalty displayed itself to the greatest advantage, and was appreciated most.

Now, gentlemen, let me draw your attention to a recent illustration of the same principle. Do the annals of a subject race present an instance of loyalty more cordial, genuine, earnest and enthusiastic than that with which the Prince of Wales was welcomed, when he did us the distinguished honour of visiting India ? That manifestation of loyalty elicited from His Royal Highness the warmest expression of his heartfelt satisfaction and approbation. Is there a nobler instance of loyalty than that which was displayed on the occasion of the Delhi assemblage ? While Englishmen were wrangling about the propriety of calling their Queen, Empress ; while they were discussing, with no small amount of warmth and ardour, the constitutional question involved in this change of name, the people of India, from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin, from the Brahmaputra to the Indus, assembled by their tens of thousands in the capital cities of the provinces and districts to exchange congratulations and compliments, and to invoke the blessings of God on the new relationship which it had pleased Her Majesty to assume as regards her Indian subjects. These, gentlemen, are some instances of loyalty, which might be adduced in refutation of the charge which has been laid against us. But fortunately, loyal as we are, our loyalty has received recognition from persons of the highest position, not excluding Her Most Gracious Majesty the Empress herself. I, therefore, beg to be allowed to read extracts testifying to our

loyalty in the most glowing terms. I shall begin with the testimony of Lord Canning. I hold in my hand a book which contains a letter written to the late Maharajah Shrisih Chander Roy Bahadoor of Nuddea. The letter is dated 17th of December 1857. Thus writes the Home Secretary to the Maharaja :

"The Governor-General-in-Council wishes you to rest assured that the Government of India will not forget, that England will not forget, that, if unhappily the mutineers and rebels of India are to be reckoned by thousands, the peaceful and loyal subjects of the Queen in India are numbered by millions."

This is the testimony of that kind and humane Governor-General whose sense of justice and fairness had made his name a household word with us.

The next will be an extract from a message which Her Imperial Majesty was pleased to send to the Viceroy on the Ist January 1877 :

"We have witnessed with heartfelt satisfaction the reception which they have accorded to our beloved son, and have been touched by the evidence of their loyalty and attachment to our House and Throne."

This then is the testimony of that gracious, wise and good sovereign who rules over us. Lord Lytton was pleased to speak in similar terms, when the deputation from the Native Press Association waited upon His Excellency on the auspicious occasion of the Delhi assemblage. I have not been able to lay my hand upon the extract, but I was one of those who composed the deputation, so I am able to speak to the testimony His Lordship was pleased to bear. I shall, in the next place, read an extract from the Administration Report of Bengal for 1875-76.

This is what Sir Richard Temple says : "At heart and in the truest and best sense the Bangalis are thoroughly loyal. In this respect, there are not in all British India better subjects

of the Crown. And, under all circumstances, adverse or propitious, they evince a steady, industrious and law-abiding spirit which must command regard and esteem from every Englishman who knows them."

The remarks apply to Bengal alone, for Sir Richard was at the time Lieutenant-Governor of these Provinces. Gentlemen, if time allowed, I might produce such an array of extracts, testifying to our loyalty, as might detain you here all night.

We are then loyal : and ungruding testimony to our loyalty has been borne by persons in the highest positions. But the Resolution also speaks of the peace and contentment that reign throughout the length and breadth of the country. There is peace ; none can gainsay that. But, perhaps, it will not be so readily admitted, that there is contentment reigning throughout the country. Talk of contentment in the face of that rising at Surat ! Why, the people were in arms against the authorities only the other day, in one of the most important cities in the Western Presidency, and how could it then be maintained that the people are contented ? I say, there is contentment as regards the the existence of British rule in this country, though we may complain of the particular manner in which the administration is occasionally carried on. I do not believe that there is a single native of India who does not wish from the bottom of his heart that the English rule might continue long, for the benefit of India and the glory of England. We know full well the immense and endless debt of gratitude we owe to England. We know full well the incalculable blessings which English rule has been the means of conferring upon the people of this country. The English rule in this country is essentially a progressive rule. The Government of to-day is not the Government of 25 years back. What were the dreams of our fathers are realities with us. What are our fondest hopes and aspirations will be the cherished privileges of those who come after us and live to enjoy the benefits of British rule. We are loyal, we are contented. Why, then, burst upon our heads this bolt of thunder in a cloudless sky !

It has been remarked by the immortal founder of modern jurisprudence that every law is an evil. It is an infringement of the natural liberty of man, an encroachment upon his innate rights and privileges. It, therefore, becomes the bounden duty of those who introduce any measure of law, to justify it by facts and arguments. Much more is this duty incumbent on those who introduce a repressive measure of legislation, like the one under discussion. Therefore, we are driven to the conclusion, that it is for Government to prove that the Act is necessary, and not for us to show that the Act is unnecessary and uncalled for. It must also be said, in justice to the Government, that they have made out the strongest case possible under the circumstances, and have brought forward all the facts and arguments in support of their position. But what are they ? Let us examine the facts. The justification of Government is contained in the speeches of Hon'ble Members, the statement of object and reasons, and above all, in the translation of extracts from the vernacular journals. I hold these extracts in my hand. The main objects of the law, as stated in the first paragraph of the statement of objects and reasons, is to empower the Government to suppress seditious writings more effectively than is practicable under the present law. Sir Alexander Arbuthnot remarks that within the last three or four years, there has been a steady increase in the number of seditious writings in the vernacular papers, and that the evil has become worse than ever within the last 12 months. Thus it has become necessary to pass a special law on the subject.

But the question at once occurs, is there not already a section in the Penal Code to repress sedition ? Why, we all remember that in the year 1870, when Sir F. J. Stephen was Law Member of the Supreme Council, a section was added to the Penal Code, defining disaffection and punishing sedition. But that law is pronounced to be inefficient. I ask, have you tried it ? Have you experimented with it ? Have there been prosecutions under it ? Have editors of vernacular papers been charged under its special provision ? If not, what have you to assume that the law is ineffi-

cient ? And if inefficient and unworkable, why not rather amend and improve it than introduce a new law ? But, gentlemen, the Government has strong objections to prosecute editors of vernacular papers for sedition under the Penal Code. It has, therefore, thought fit to introduce this special law. Its grounds are not many. The chief of them runs somewhat as follows :—The ordinary criminal law punishes an offender after the crime has been committed ; the special law seeks to prevent the commission of an offence. The Government wants to prevent, not to punish. Hence the special law.

Gentlemen, I invite your attention to the term of this argument, for upon this arguments rests the entire superstructure of the Act. The ordinary criminal law punishes. This special law prevents. I must at once pause to point out the fallacy of this reasoning, which seeks to draw a distinction between the criminal law that punishes and the criminal law that prevents. Why does the criminal law punish ? Is it not to prevent the commission of an offence ? The end and aim of the ordinary criminal law, therefore, is to prevent. The end and aim of the special law is likewise to prevent. What need is there, then, for the special law ? But the analogy does not stop here. The *modus operandi* is in both cases the same. The ordinary criminal law prevents by means of punishment. The special law prevents also by means of punishment. For that law contemplates that the offending editor will be deterred from writing seditious articles through fear of forfeiting his bail bond, which amounts to a fine, and which is therefore, a punishment. Hence, it will appear that the end and aim of the ordinary criminal law is precisely the same as that of the special law, and the *modus operandi* is the same in both the cases. What necessity—what justification then is there, I ask, for this law ?

There is another argument adduced in support of the measure. The Government is anxious to prevent the dissemination of the poison of sedition. If prosecutions for sedition

were instituted under the Penal Code, the poisonous matter complained of would be quoted in the various papers, and that would help to disseminate the poison. But what, then, if the poison were allowed to disseminate? Why, the safety of the state, says Government, requires that the poison should not be allowed to spread. The supreme need of the safety of the State is invoked, and we are asked to fall down before this dread divinity and to hold our tongues in sullen silence. If the safety of the State required such a law, I am sure, my countrymen would gladly vote in favour of it. But I ask, was there ever a time in which the question of the safety of the State was more narrowly and anxiously considered than in the dark days of the Indian Mutiny? In those dark days, when the country was in flames, when the British Empire was tottering to its foundations, when the contagion of rebellion was spreading like wild-fire over an American prairie: in those dark, stern and awful days. Lord Canning and his Council thought nothing of disseminating the poison, but boldly came forward when it became necessaty to prosecute certain vernacular editors who had been guilty of writing seditious libels. In 1857, the editor of *Durbin* the editor of *Samachar Sudhabarsan*, the editor of *Sullan-ul-Akhbar* were prosecuted by Lord Canning for sedition. In those dark days of the mutiny, when the political system was most prone to succumb to the deadening effects of this poison, it had vitality enough to resist its baneful influences. And now we are told in times of comparative peace, contentment and prosperity, and with a loyal and law-abiding people, that the gigantic fabric of the British Empire, this colossal, and imperial structure, resting upon the willing allegiance, the steadfast loyalty and the fervent devotion of two hundred and fifty millions of human beings, stands in danger of being wrecked and ruined by the miserable pratings of a few vernacular editors, who might take it into their heads to indite articles, not the most temperate or the most respectful towards the Government.

But there is another argument which, in the opinion of Government, makes it necessary that the poison should not be

allowed to disseminate. It is assumed that the readers of vernacular papers are ignorant and uncultivated men, upon whose minds the seditious criticisms of the vernacular papers would have a most fatal and prejudicial effect, and sap the foundations of their loyalty. A paternal Government must protect them, and hence the law. I beg most distinctly to affirm that the readers of vernacular papers are not thoughtless, ignorant and uncultivated men. They are for the most part, educated men. Primary education was introduced into our country only the other day and we have not yet reached that state of blessedness, devoutly to be wished for, when the Bengal ploughman may be seen ploughing with the one hand, and holding the *Sulava Samachar* in the other. The vast masses of our people still continue in the grovelling depths of profound ignorance. They read no newspaper, vernacular or otherwise. It is educated people who read them. The *Hindu Patriot* confirms this view of the matter, and so does the *Indian Mirror*; and *Shahachar*, whose mournful loss we deplored the other day, in that farewell letter of it which we all read with such melancholy interest, distinctly stated that all its readers were educated men and did not come from the uncultivated classes. But there is a higher authority yet who supports this view of the matter. Sir Richard Temple says as follows in his Administration Report for 1874-75 : "Generally speaking, it may be said that the Veraacular Press has little or no influence on the majority of the people, who are agriculturists and labourers. They do not see newspapers and are not influenced by them, either directly or indirectly."

The arguments, then, upon which this measure of legislation is based, have fallen through, and the measure stands before us, in all its naked deformity, unjustified and unaccounted for.

But I contend that the law is unnecessary, and that the vernacular papers are not disloyal. A grave charge has been brought against the Vernacular Press, viz., that it is disloyal. This charge is broadly made. It runs through the speeches of the Hon'ble Members of the Council. It has, therefore, become necessary that we should discuss this question at

length. I must crave the indulgence of this meeting to be allowed to confine my observations to the extracts from the Bengali papers because I have not yet had time to compare the Urdu extracts with their originals. It is not for one moment to be supposed, that I do not sympathize with the vernacular editors of Upper India in their sore distress and trial. My heart bleeds as much for them, aye, indeed much more profusely than it does for the editors of Bengal, for they are poor, helpess, and alone in their trial, with no influentially organised association, with no powerful representative body to help them in this awful crisis. But the great God who helps the distressed will help them too. The cause of justice is their cause ; the cause of truth is their cause, and that cause will in the end triumph.

Let me, gentlemen, begin with the remark that these extracts range over a period of twelve months, and are confined to the year 1877. There may be one or two extracts of December 1876, and one or two of January 1878, but, for all practical purposes, we may assume that the extracts are confined to the year 1877. The question at once occurs, what was the condition of the Bengali papers before 1877 ? Was their tone loyal or disloyal ? Let us examine facts. Let me begin with the year 1874-75, when Sir Richard Temple was the Lieutenant Governor of these provinces. Sir Richard Temple, in his Administration Report for 1874-75 remarks as follows with reference to the tone of the Bengali Press :

"I have accordingly paid due attention to this subject, and my general conclusion is decidedly favourable in respect to the loyalty and goodwill of the Bengali Press towards the British Crown and nation, and towards the British rule in the main."

Later on, he says : "The case on behalf of the British is put by the Bengali Press with a warmth and an impresiveness hardly ever surpassed, and seldom equalled by zealous advocates among ourselves."

In the following year, Sir Richard Temple sees no reason to change his opinion on the subject, In the Administration

Report for 1875-76, he says : "The Vernacular Press maintains the same general tone as characterised it last year, and the Lieutenant-Governor sees no reason to modify the expression of opinion which was placed on record in the Administration Report for 1874-75."

Let us now come to the time when Sir George Campbell was Lieutenant-Governor. Now, in considering the opinion of that distinguished authority, we must bear in mind that he was violently abused by the Bengali Press ; in short, he was the best abused man of his time. Now Sir George Campbell says, in his Administration Report for 1872-73 that the Bengali Press is not really bad at heart. Thus then for the two or three years preceding the year 1877, the tone of the Vernacular Press of Bengal was not only not hostile and seditious, but was absolutely loyal to the Government. Has it then all on a sudden become seditious ?

There is a break in the chain of continued development. To-day the Vernacular Press is loyal and respectful to the Government. Tomorrow's sun dawns upon it, and all of a sudden, down goes its character for loyalty, and it becomes seditious, disloyal, spreading the taint and pollution of treason throughout the length and breadth of the land, and it becomes necessary to produce a gagging Act. This simple fact, this break in the chain of continuity, makes us hesitate to believe in the correctness of this charge of sedition against the Vernacular Press, and, as we wade through the extracts, we find this suspicion all the more strongly confirmed. From the last Administration Report, we learn, that there are thirty-five vernacular papers in Bengal ; the so-called seditious extracts have been made from fiften papers. I say "so called" advisedly, because the extracts are not really seditious. Out of the fifteen papers from which extracts have been made, one, the *Samaj Darpan* has ceased to exist for the last six or seven months. The gentleman who edited this paper received a notice from the Commissioner of Police the other day, to enter into a bail bond for the good behaviour of his paper. Unfortunate editor ! Little did he know that the obloquy of having once

edited a vernacular paper would stick to him through life, and that months after he had quietly buried his journal in its grave, its spectral form would once again rise and haunt him like the ghastly phantom of another world. There are fourteen papers then from which thirty-two extracts have been made, excluding four from the *Samaj Darpan*. Now, I contend, that several of these translations are misleading. I shall only instance three. I shall begin with an extract from the *Sadharani* of the 4th of March. 1877, which speaks of the Fennua trial : "It neither bespeaks" says the extract, "a cultivated taste, nor is it agreeable, to have constantly to write against Government. But in view of the arbitrary acts which have become common in these days, we should be wanting in our duty if we passed them over without any protest. The people were hitherto proud of the justice administered in the High Court. In seeking to shield a rash, oppressive, and unprincipled European Civilian, Government has now brought that Court into contempt, and has struck a blow at the root of British justice. Government has thus worked its own ruin ; and if after this the people are found to express discontent, the Anglo-Indian editors will brand the Bengalis with such epithets as ungrateful, disloyal, scurrilous, and what not." The translator has done injustice to the editor by omitting a passage which occurs in the same article, and the effect of which is to mollify the sense of the whole. The passage translated runs as follows :

"But it will not do for us to remain quiet any longer : there is no justice in the country ; now for sometime we must create an agitation on this subject in the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland".

Could there be anything more loyal, anything showing greater confidence in the integrity and honesty of purpose of the British nation and the British Legislature than the extract which I have just quoted. Justice may not be obtained in this country, but England will do us justice, so says the extract.

The next quotation will be from the *Shoma Prakash* of the 26th of February 1877. I may here add that I quote extracts from those papers only which have the greatest influence and circulation: "The assertion so frequently made by our rulers that they never act contrary to law is seen to be utterly groundless, when we contemplate the illegal acts of Mr. Kirkwood, and the arbitrary treatment which Baboo Lal Chand experienced at his hands. We are at such moments led to question the use of the Legislative Councils, the maintenance of which costs so much to India, and the equally expensive offices of the Vicerory and the Lieutenant-Governor. For what is the use of them when the offices in the Mofussil are all in all? They are the Viceroy and the Lieutenant-Governor, they are the Legislative Councils; their orders are law, and their acts furnish the rules, and their will is Government. Natives are wrong in regarding indigo planters as oppressors. These oppressors cannot compare with Kirkwood and his conferers. If oppressions (are necessary to the promotion of self-interest. the planters pledge themselves to resort to this means. Kirkwood and his brother officials (who ought to be officials of the same type) do the same, though they are sworn to put a stop to oppression."

Here is also an important omission, for in the very same article there are lines which translated run thus: "Now we are eager to hear the opinion of the Governor-General on this subject. His sense of justice has been clearly shown by his impartial minute on the Fuller case."

Now I ask, could anything show greater confidence in the impartiality and sense of justice of the present Viceroy.

The third and the last extract will be from the *Shahachar*. I can scarcely conceal the feelings of indignation that rise in my bosom, when I come to speak of the manner in which the extract has been made up. The extract is not the translation of any connected paragraph or article, but is made up of lines apparently taken at random. The *Shahachar* of the 2nd July writes the following in the course of an editorial, headed the 'Strength and Duty of England':

"There are many points of resemblance noticeable between England and Carthage of the ancient times. In wealth, naval and commercial supremacy, and in military skill, both are alike. Carthage fell, and the causes which brought about her fall are in full operation in England at ihe present day. The fall of Carthage was due to her fighting with mercenary troops and the existence of fierce factions among the leaders of her people. Does not England present the same spectacle to-day? She is like Carthage, the home of liberty, and, like her, she is an eyesore to all despotic governments. The supremacy of England in naval warfare is, however, now a matter of question, while it is almost certain that on land she is no match for the army of any of the great Powers of Europe. The present is a critical time for her, possessed as she is of influence, but without adequate resources of war,"

Now there is a most important omission in connection with this extract. There occurs in this very article, a passage full of the most devoted loyalty and of good feeling to the English nation and the English Government, and which, curiously enough, does not appear in the translated extract. The passage runs as follows : "It is not because we are the subjects of England that we desire to see her great and powerful. Read the annals of the human race. No age, no country, has ever witnessed any system of administration or government like that of the British. The downfall of the British Empire will be the precursor of many evils to the human race."

Before I take leave of the *Shahachar*, I may point out to the omission of a passage full of loyalty which occurs in another article, which is in the same issue, from which the condemned extract has been made. The passage runs as follows : "We are the grateful subjects of Her Imperial Majesty. It is our incessant prayer that Her rule should be preserved intact."

It is upon extracts such as I have read to you that the Act is founded, and it is for you to consider whether an Act which rests upon extracts of this nature is justifiable or not. I may say that not one of the extracts made from the Bengali papers

is seditious. Let me read an extract from the *Bharat Sanskarak* of 3rd September 187? :

"The *Bharat Sanskarak* observes with regret, says the extract, Government has only two means, both imperfect and incorrect, of judging the tone of native newspapers. These are (1) the weekly report which is often a mistranslation of the views of native editors ; and (2) the representation made to Government by men like Kirkwood, which cannot but be of a hostile character. Under these circumstances it has become a matter of consideration with Native editors how to keep the Government informed of the true views maintained on public questions by the vernacular newspapers. The Native Press Association should now be up and doing."

Now I ask, could anything be more loyal, temperate and respectful to the Government than what is stated in the above extract ? The Advocate-General has taken the trouble of classifying the heads under which the several extracts may be placed. It would be interesting to know under which of those heads the extract I have quoted would come. The Vernacular Press is therefore not seditious. The Act, therefore, is entirely unjustifiable. It has been remarked by Sir Alexander Arbuthnot, in the course of his speech, that Sir Thomas Munro was against a free press. Sir Alexander quotes Munro's minute dated 1822, but he says that he does not rely upon it. It is as well that Sir Alexander does not rely upon this minute. Sir Thomas Munro is opposed to a free Press,—on what ground ? Because he thought that the writings of a Free Native Press would have a most prejudicial effect on the minds of the Indian soldiery. It is not even pretended that the articles of the Vernacular Press are helping to create is affection in the minds of the native soldiery. I, therefore, say that it is well that Sir Alexander does not rely on Sir Thomas Munro's minute. But Sir Alexander has likewise cited the authority of Metcalfe and Macaulay, in support of the new Gagging Act. I am bound to remark that the Honourable member has not done justice to Sir Charles Metcalfe. Sir Charles, no doubt, contemplated the possibility of circum-

satnces arising, which might make it necessary to impose restrictions upon the liberty of the Press. But he thought that temporary or local restraints would be sufficient to meet any case of emergency. Lord Canning and his Council understood Sir Charles Metcalfe's minute in this sense, as may be gathered from their Despatch to the Court of Directors on the subject of the Gagging Act of 1857. Metcalfe said, in reply to the address presented to him by the people of Calcutta :

"I entirely concur with you in the desire which you entertain that if, at any time, actual danger should render necessary, temporary or local restraints on the liberty of the Press, the precautions applied by the Legislature may be only commensurate to the real exigency, and that no restriction may be made permanent beyond those which are necessary to ensure responsibility ; and I trust that all legislation, with a view to protect the community against licentiousness, will be in the true spirit of liberty".

While speaking on this subject, I cannot help remarking upon the manner in which the Act is being worked When the Bill became law, everybody thought it would be kept suspended like the sword of Democles over the devoted heads of the vernacular editors. But, at last, these hopes have been blasted. Already several editors of vernacular papers have been called upon to furnish security. Such demand has been made from the *Bharat Mihir* of Mymensingh, from the *Dacca Prakash* and *Hindoo Hitaisini* of Dacca, from the *Sulava Samachar* and the *Shahachar* of this city. And I ask, what offence have these papers been guilty of since the passing of the Act ? We know of no offence which they have committed. Is the law then to have a retrospective effect ? This call for security has told with fatal effect upon one at least of these papers. The *Shahachar* has ceased to exist. And I have no doubt a similar fate will soon overtake many other vernacular papers. Gentlemen, there has been some irregularity in the practical working of the Act. Section 3 requires that it is the Magistrate who must take the initiative in cal ing upon editors to furnish security. But in the case of at least three papers, it is the Lieutenant-

Governor who has taken the initiative, and has called upon the Magistrate through the Commissioner of the Division, to require the editors to enter into their bailbonds.

It is melancholy to contrast the manner in which the Gagging Act of 1857 was enforced, with the manner in which the present Vernacular Press Act is being worked. The Gagging Act of 1857 was a much milder piece of legislation than the Press Act of 1878. Mild as it was, it was worked with far greater moderation and forbearance. Let me illustrate this by an instance. On the 23rd of June 1857, the *Friend of India* published an article, headed the Centenary of Plassey. The Governor-General was of the opinion that it contained objectionable remarks. A warning was sent to the editor. He took no notice of the warning. He published an article in the next issue of his paper, in much more violent lanuguage, in reckless defiance of the warning that had been sent. But even then the forbearing Governor-General, whose memory we all cherish with so much respect, did not withdraw his license, but on receiving an assurance from the proprietor of the *Friend of India*, that such objectionable matter would not be allowed to appear in its future issues, forgave the erring journalist, and allowed the license to continue. A similar act of forbearance was shown as regards a letter which appeared in the *Bangal Hurkara* of the 13th September 1857, and this forbearance was shown at a time when it was a matter of question—whether stern severity should not take the place of mercy and moderation.

It has been remarked that the fact of the English Press having supported the Act ought to silence all criticism. I yield to none in my appreciation of the character for moderation, wisdom, and fairness which so eminently distinguishes the Press of England. The English Press, however, has decided the question *ex parte*, has not heard both sides of the case, and has certainly not heard the case for the defence. The English Press has, likewise, countenanced the Act under a sense of imperious necessity. They are under the impression that the country is ripe for revolt, and that the 'seditious' writings of

the vernacular journals constitute a source of danger to the Empire. But yet we are not without hopes of being able to appeal with success to the generous instincts of the English people. Our hopes and our confidence have been strengthened by what has has already taken place in the House of Commons. Before a breath of complaint was heard here, before a word of protest was publicly raised in this country, those ardent advocates of human freedom and of liberty of speech, had already called in question, in the House of Commons, the wisdom, the policy and the justice of this most objectionable law.

The question is, indeed, not an Indian question. It is not whether a certain number of Indians should have the right of free speech. The question is broader, vaster, deeper, more far-reaching. The question is whether in any part of the British Dominions, whether in any part of the world, where floats the free flag of England—the flag which has "braved the battle and the breeze," the flag which has stood forth in all lands, in all climes as the beacon of human freedom and human progress—the question is whether in any part of the world acknowledging British rule, restrictions should be imposed upon the liberty of speech of any portion of Her Majesty's subjects. We claim this privilege not as a matter of favour. We are no longer the conquered subjects of England. We are the incorporated citizens of a Free Empire. Has not our Sovereign been graciously pleased to assume the title of Empress, and was not the Act of Assumption celebrated amid circumstances of pomp and splendour, which have left a deep and ineffacable impression upon the minds of the Indian races and peoples? Was that Act of Assumption, of sacred incorporation, a fact or a myth? I appeal to the princes, the chiefs, and the people of India, to the high officials who were present on that occasion to bear witness to the solemnity of that ceremony and the sanctity of the pledges that were then given.

We are British subjects, and are we to be deprived of an inalienable right of British subjects, in this summary and per-

functory manner ? The Act is against the instincts of Englishmen, is against the genius of the British Constitution. The history of England is the history of freedom. It is history of one long, continued, sustained effort to succour the distressed and to uphold the cause of oppressed nationalities. I cannot, for one moment, induce myself to believe that a nation so firmly wedded to the principles of justice and freedom, will sanction a measure which deprives a large portion of Her Majesty's subjects of an important privilege and an inestimable boon, which Englishmen prize above all things. It is England that has introduced into our midst the lamp of knowledge. Will she now put out that lamp with her own hand, and plunge us again into the depths of Cimmerian darkness ? Under English influence, India has waked to new life. Under English auspices, the pulse of life is beating fast within her. But the present Act has prostrated, paralysed and over-powered her.

Let us then appeal to the representatives of England, the custodians of her honour, the repositories of her name and fame, to repeal this objectionable law, to avert a great calamity from our country, and thus perform an act of duty which would redound to the glory of veneration, which we all feel or the fair fame of England and her spotless name.

SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR INDIA*

Mr. President, brother delegates, ladies and gentlemen—I have the honour to move what has been described by your President as *the* revolution of the Congress (hear, hear). It is a great honour done to me, for ever since the birth of the Congress—and I may add even before its birth, for my public life dates earlier than even the birth of the Congress—I have been a champion of self-government, (hear, hear and applause), and if I can in any way, in the evening of my life, contribute to the accomplishment of this great end, I shall descend to the grave with the consciousness that I have not

*Speech at the session of Congress held at Lucknow on 28-29 December, 1916 in defence of a resolution moved by himself.

lived and died in vain. I shall now ask Mr. J. Chaudhuri to read the resolution. (Mr. Chaudhri then read out the resolution.)

Brother delegates, ladies and gentlemen, you have heard the resolution. The resolution divides itself into two parts as most of the resolutions do. There is the preamble—rather a long preamble—and there is what may be called the operative part of the resolution. The preamble sets forth the grounds for the demand. I need not repeat these grounds. We demand that immediately a Royal proclamation be issued announcing that it is the aim and purpose of British policy to establish self-government in India and that after the termination of war, when the reconstruction, refashioning, of the Empire takes place, India be uplifted to a position of equal partnership in the imperial system. First, there is to be a proclamation ; then the proclamation is to be followed by our being uplifted to a position of equal partnership within the Empire. But in the meantime something has to be done. We urge that in the meanwhile a definite step should be taken towards the grant of self-government, and that step is to give effect to the scheme formulated by the joint conference of the Congress Committee and the Moslem League. That represents, in short, the sum and substance of this resolution.

Ladies and gentlemen, since we met last at Bombay we have made some progress—I will not say considerable progress, but an appreciable measure of progress, in the efforts which we hope in their fruition will culminate in the establishment of self government in India. The Bombay Congress gave us a mandate to formulate a scheme of self-government—call it Home Rule if you like ; (applause). I have not the slightest objection to the phrase, the only point is that in the name you must not overlook the thing itself—to frame a scheme in concert with the Moslem League. A joint conference has been held and we agreed to a scheme which represents the demand of united India on the subject (hear, hear). Ladies and gentlemen, I had the honour, the great

honour, one of the greatest ever done to me in my life, of presiding over the deliberations of that conference, and I will say this on behalf of the representatives of the Hindus and the Muslim League that throughout they exhibited a spirit of compromise, of sweet reasonableness which, to my mind, constitutes the most valuable qualification for self-government. After all what is a parliamentary government but government by discussion ; and compromise is the essence of it, and that spirit of compromise was conspicuous in our deliberations. The scheme is before you, and it is the crowning testimony to the growing unity of feeling between the Hindus and Mussalmans (hear, hear). The solidarity of the two communities has been growing. Mark what took place in 1899 when the Congress met here and what is the state of things to-day. When the Congress met here in 1899—I was one of the delegates present—the Mahomedan community were opposed to us with the exception of a few here and there. To-day the leaders of the Mahomedan community have joined the Congress. Three cheers for them. They received us with open arms and with a greater earnestness and cordiality than might have been expected. We were received by my respected and honoured friend, the Raja Saheb of Mahmudabad whose independence and keen solicitude for good understanding between the Hindus and Musalmans have won him in an unstinted measure the esteem, confidence and the regard of both the communities.

Brother delegates, one weapon in the armoury of the enemies of Indian advancement which they use in season and out of season, which they have often used with such tactfulness and skill, is the alleged cleavage between the Hindus and the Mahomedans, which they themselves have been so sedulous in creating. I have often spoken to these reactionary gentlemen, and one is present to my mind at this moment. I visited him in London, visited his office, but he shall be nameless for the present. I spoke to him about our demands. He is the editor of a great paper—I am afraid I am little taking you into the secrets—and what he said to me was 'what will the Mussalmans say ?' That has been the

uniform reply of these reactionaries to the demands of the Indian National Congress. Whether in the modification of the partition of Bengal, or the appointment of an Indian on the Viceroy's Executive Council or the expansion of the system of election, these reactionaries, who have opposed our interests, have always posed as the champions of Mahomedan welfare and well-being. Now, this weapon is ruthlessly taken away from their hands and they must seek the help which they are so sorely in need of in some other quarters.

They look with wistful eyes to the mass of our people, great body of our illiterate countrymen, and they pose as their champions and spokesmen. In their opinion—normally expressed in times when there is no excitement and controversy—in their opinion the masses are dumb, inarticulate and unconcerned with anything except their own interests, never caring to peep out of the circle of village life in which they live and have their being. But when it comes to be the question of self-government of India, the government of our country by the people of our country, then all of a sudden, by a strange magical transformation the masses, in the opinion of these people, become vocal and even claimant and they may exhibit a concern, even a measure of anxiety, at the prospect of a change which would transfer authority from a foreign bureaucracy to their own countrymen——the blood of their blood and the bone of their bone.

Gentlemen, will you be surprised to hear that this view is not only expressed by the Anglo-Indian press, the extremists in the Anglo-Indian press, but it has been seriously put forward by Lord Ronaldshay, the Governor-designate of Bengal (cries of 'shame') to whom the Secretary of State has given a certificate of character (laughter) in reply to the universal condemnation of the appointment by the people of Bengal—a certificate, based upon his views and his services which from the Indian stand-point constitute a distinct disqualification for that high and exalted office. Let that however pass. You and I are not the representatives of the masses, but foreign officials who imperfectly speak their

language and live in a position of detachment and isolation from them! To substitute, to seek to substitute, foreign officials in place of the natural leaders of the community who are their guardians and protectors of their interests is to reverse the order of nature—to set at defiance the degree of Providence written in every line of the open book of universal history. Gentlemen, the point is so clear that he has only to announce it in order that its absurdity may be seen. We are not the natural guardians of the masses! And the Bureaucracy is afraid that if self-government is conceded, the effect of it would be that their interests would not be looked after. Now let me ask—who are the people who advocated primary education in season and out of sesson, pressed the claims of sanitation, of abolition of the salt tax, the reform of the police, the separation of judicial and executive functions, all intended to benefit the masses? The responsibility of pursuing a policy of obstruction in regard to these matters must rest upon the shoulders of the Bureaucracy who aspire to be the guardians of the interests of the masses. That is one of the arguments brought forward against us, namely, that if self-government is conceded the interests of the masses will not be looked after; and I have demonstrated that we are the natural leaders of the masses, that we are the prosecutors of their interests and those interests will be safe, far more safe in, our hands than in the hands of a foreign Bureaucracy.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are on the eve of a great reconstruction. The world after the War will not be the same as it was before the War. England and India will participate in that reconstruction. The object of the great War is to vindicate the sanctity of treaty obligations, to protect the rights of minor nationalities, to uphold the sacredness of 'scraps and bits of paper.' In the same spirit, I think, we are entitled to hold the gracious messages contained in our charters, and our proclamations should be vindicated and upheld; for the moral law is not worked by latitudes and longitudes. What is true and good for Europe is true and good for Asia. The latest declaration on the subject of readjustment that we have had is the one made by Lord

Chelmsford to an American correspondent, that the War has stimulated the aspirations of India politically as well as industrially, that it would be his duty to give them a practical form and recognition—now mark the words—to guard them—I am quoting the exact words—to guard them against the cramping influences of undue conservatism, also against revolutionary tendencies. A noble message nobly delivered. If His Excellency can carry out this message he will go down to posterity as one of the great benefactors of the Indian people. But, brother delegates, there has been of late a tendency to err on the side of caution. A high authority supposed to be a power behind the thorne speaking in Simla in connection with a public meeting in which the question of post-War reforms was discussed said that the policy which Akbar followed was excessively bold and that if he had been more cautious and less imaginative possibly the Moghul Empire in India would not have ended. Prophency in regard to matters that might have been but have not been is a perfectly safe occupation. Might I not be permitted to indulge in the same pastime and say that if Akbar had not followed this bold and courageous policy the Moghul Empire would not have taken its root in the hearts of the people ? I am supported by the authority of the historian of Akbar. Mark what happened before the advent of the Moghuls. Dynasties after dynasties followed in rapid succession within the space of 300 years. Akbar grasped the situation and saw the weakness of the system followed by the preceding governments, and initiated a bold and courageous policy which enshrined him in the hearts of the people and laid broad and deep the foundations of the Moghul Empire. And so I am confident that if Akbar had followed any other policy which failed to attract the hearts of the people the fate which had overtaken the previous dynasties would have overtaken the Moghul dynasty.

Ladies and gentlemen, Lord Chelmsford has observed that it would be his duty to guard the country against revolutionary tendencies. I think His Excellency may rely with absolute confidence upon the support of the educated community in this country. We are no revolutionaries. Revolution is repugnant to

our instincts and to our nature. We are the friends of reform because it is the surest sufeguard against revolution. History proclaims the truth that reforms indefinitely postponed, tardily carried out or inadequate in their scope prepare the ground for revolutionary propaganda. God grant that this blunder may not be committed in India. We know it was committed in Ireland. We are anxious that the same mistake may not be repeated here.

Lord Chelmsford said to the deputation of the Indian Association—I was a member of that deputation—that reforms will not be rapid. Well, whether they be rapid or whether they be not rapid, let there be no reforms by driblets with a background of mistrust and suspicion. Whatever reform is conceded, let it be whole-hearted, let it be an index of generous trust reposed in the people, and above all let it be adequate to the aspirations of India. Any reform that fails to satisfy this test must give rise to disappointment, create discontent, frustrate the object of all reform which is to keep pace with the advancing public opinion. I hope and trust that it will be Lord Chelmsford's high privilege to grant us reforms which will in a manner satisfy the growing aspirations of the people and be consonant with the scheme which has been formulated and which is now before you.

Brother-delegates, there is a wide-spread feeling all over the Empire that after the War Self-Government would be conceded to India or that at any rate a definite step would be taken towards it. The difference of opinion between the Nationalists and our critics is this : we say we should have Self-Government at once all in the immediate future. They say we must pass through purgatory on our way. Mr. Lionel Curtis—never mind—he is a man who has written several books on the subject. He exercises considerable influence over English public opinion. He may be an opponent of Indian aspirations, but let me try to meet him on his own ground. It is best not to depise an opponent, not to dismiss him with the cry of shame but to meet him on his own ground, and show the hollowness of the position which he has assumed. That is what I propose to do.

In his book, the *Problem of the Commonwealth*, he said : "The task of preparing for freedom the races which cannot as yet govern themselves is the supreme duty of those who can : 'it is—this is the most important point—'it is the spiritual end for which the Commonwealth exists, and material order'—that is very important—'is nothing except as a means to this end'. The preparation of the races living within the jurisdiction of the British Empire for self-government is a spiritual end for which the Commonwealth exists—which is the sole justification of British rule in this country. Material order is the means to that. All administrative measures are subordinated to this spiritual end which overshadows every other purpose. So far so good ; we are all in agreement with Mr. Lionel Curtis.

But then when he comes to the question of self-government for India he cries out 'Not yet'. That is an old cry. He says : you cannot have self-government now. Why not ? Because you have not got electorates. To that my reply is : Had you any electorates worth the name before the Reform Bill of 1832 ? It is not notorious that there were those pocket boroughs which were openly bought and sold ? And yet no one questioned the competency of the English people for self-government. Had Japan electorates when the Mikado conferred parliamentary institutions upon that country ? Had the Fillippinos any electorates, suitable or unsuitable, when the American Republic resolved to concede national independence to the people of the Phillipines ? The growth and development of electorates is part of the growth and development of free institutions. They are inseparable and march together hand in hand. We are not fit for self-government. We are not fit ! When in the morning of the world—when Europe was sunk in barbarism, our ancestors had those village communities which formed the centres of local self-government now and which survived the viscissitudes of time and fortune. We are not fit for self-government ! Go back to the days of the Vedic Rishis. What do you find ? The king was an elected monarch—so says Mr. Pramatha Nath Banerjee in his book. And even in the Middle Ages the memories of an elected sovereign lingered in the institutions there. Go to Islam. What do you find ? Islamic society and

government are saturated with the principles of democracy. Kazi, what if he but an elected spiritual head of the Moslem world. There is no community in the world in which the spirit of equality is more active than in Islam and in Islamic India. And yet we are told that we are not fit for self-government ! When shall we be fit, may I ask ? When the Bureaucracy will think that we are fit ? And when will it be ? Doomsday !

There is yet another authority which may give us self-government. What is that ? The Parliament of England. But it takes a long time to move Parliament. Sir Henry Fowler said on one occasion that every member of the House of Commons is a member for India ; what is everybody's business is nobody's business. We found that to be true. Nobody cares for India. England and Englishmen are so deeply concerned in their own affairs, absorbed in their own administration, that they find it impossible to pay attention to India. Who then will determine the time when self-government is to be conceded to us ? You and I. For nations by themselves are made. (hear, hear) Enlist on your behalf all the sympathy you can of Englishmen and Englishwomen of the civilized world ; but bear in mind you and you alone are the final arbiters of the destinies of the Motherland. Cromwell on one occasion made a memorable remark of which I am reminded at the present moment. On the eve of the battle of Nesby when the thunder and storm passed, addressing his troops he said : 'Keep your powder dry and pray'. Pray, by all means, but keep your powder dry. Don't lose sight of the material resources which are necessary for success in this world. Spiritual agencies are a mighty factor but the material resources are not to be neglected. The salvation of India is to be wrought upon Indian soil, by Indian hands, by Indian brains and by Indian agency. Have by all means the sympathies of Englishmen all over the civilized would, but it is you who will determine the great final question for yourselves.

Ladies and gentlemen, I don't know whether I have already exhausted your patience. I have a few more remarks to make.

Why is it that we want self-government. We want self-government in the interests of the Empire to which we are so proud to belong. We want self-government in the interests of the administration and for the efficiency of the administration. We want self-government for self-protection. And, finally, we want self-government for the higher national ends, for the moral and spiritual elevation of our people. I say we want self-government in the interests of the Empire. Who knows what will happen twenty years hence ? Who knows what strife, what struggle, what difficulties there may be in the womb of future ? Who knows that another war, more sanguinary and more davastating than the one which is now desolating Europe may not again set in the world. It is not the duty of statesmanship to be forearmed, to take the necessary measures of preparation against a contingency of this kind ? Who had ever dreamt forty years back after the battle of Sedan that England and Germany would stand and fight with one another ? You talk of the man-power of Germany. Why ? We are as multitudinous as the stars on the heaven. Rely upon us and trust us and the man power, I say to the rulers of India, you hold in reserve in India is such that Germany will quail before that man-power. Marshman says in his History of British India that the grandson of those who fought against Babar became under Akbar governors of provinces, ministers of his councils, etc. Let that trust be reposed in us and then England may view with serenity the mightiest combination that may be formed. Self-government is the cement of the Empire. It has knit together the self-governing Colonies of the Empire, It has converted hostile Boers into loyal civizens shedding their blood for the purpose of suppressing a revolution of their countrymen against the Empire. If self-government is conceded to us the same results will follow in this ancient land.

We want self-government for the ends of administration, for the efficiency of the administration. Brother delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen, I want to look at a concrete fact and judge our rulers by the test of that. We have anarchism. What is it due to ? I have no hesitation in saying it from this platform, saying it publicly with all the weight of responsibility upon my

shoulders—I will say this, that anarchism in Bengal is the product of past misrule. It has its roots in the economic and industrial conditions. We suggested the remedy in the address that we presented to His Excellency the Viceroy. We are asked to co-operate, but His Excellency left untouched the root causes of anarchism. How has the Bureaucracy grappled with anarchism? Repression is their only remedy. One coercive measure after another has followed in rapid succession—the Seditious Meetings Act, the Press Act, the Defence of India Act—and God knows what other Acts may be in store for us. And what has been the result? Anarchism frowns upon the land and casts its darkening shadow over the horizon. Anarchism remains unchecked. The Bureaucracy has failed to grapple with it as the Bureaucracy was responsible for producing it. In the words of Edmund Burke, conciliation and not repression is the sovereign cure of all public distempers. Grant us self-government and I will guarantee that in six years' time anarchism will disappear from this land. I promise to redeem this pledge—I make a personal promise—not a question of giving money but a question of giving services which will render anarchism impossible and if in six years' time I may not be able to redeem my word, transport me to the Andamans, unless in the mean time I am not translated to that land where there are no Congress, no Conference, where subjects committees do not prolong their deliberations in the evening—that land from which no traveller ever returns.

Sir Henry Campbell Bannermann told us that good government is no substitute for self-government. I will say this that in fairly progressive communities self-government is the only guarantee of good government. Take the case of Japan. Take the case of Turkey or the case of China. The chaos, confusion and anarchy have all been dispelled by the breath of self-government. I make an exception as regards Persia. But Persia also would have been changed and her political framework would have been as solidly established as others but for the intervention of European Powers. Good government is no substitute for self-government, but self-government is necessary for good government; and we claim it for the purpose of good government.

If we had self-government what do you think we should do? Suppose I was he President of the Indian Republic—which shall never be—suppose I was, what do you think I should do? The first thing I should do would be to pass a law in favour of free and compulsory education. The next thing I would do would be the separation of judicial and executive functions. The third thing would be to improve the police. And how? By importing into the higher branches of the service a strong Indian element capable of looking after the inferior grades. Lastly, I would abolish the duty on salt. We have been pressing these things for years together but we could not get them. If we had self-government we would have an Arms Act upon the lines of the British Act. I would not repeal it, except in that form. And I would have volunteering and a national militia. Let the Government make these concessions and anarchism will disappear. A friend of mine, Mr. B.C. Chatterjee, yesterday said if volunteering were granted it would go far to check the growth of anarchism. Mr. Chatterjee, who is defending a number of anarchists, speaks with knowledge which I don't possess. He had again and again dinned this into the ears of the Government but the Government did not listen.

In the third place, we want self-government for the purpose of self-protection. You might ask—what do you mean by self-protection? At the present moment there is visible on the horizon a cloud which is no bigger than a man's hand, which, I am afraid unless timely protest is made, is destined to grow into larger proportions. What is that cloud? The prospect of a federal council of the Empire from which we are to be excluded and only Colonial representatives are to be present.

Ladies and Gentlemen, we must put our own house in order before that consummation takes place. We are face to face with a great danger, and that being so we want Home Rule or Self-Government, so that the present self-governing Colonies may have no control over our affairs.

We want self-government finally for the highest ends of a national system, for the moral elevation of our people. Political

inferiority involves moral degradation. It is galling to our self-respect. The mind and the conscience of a slave could never have produced a Patanjali, a Buddha or a Valmiki. We want self-government in order that we might wipe off from our breast the badge of political inferiority and lift our heads high among the nations of the earth and fulfil the great destinies that are in store for us under the blessings of Divine Providence.

We want self-government not only in our own interests but for the sake of humanity at large. In the morning of the world, on the banks of the Ganges and on the banks of the Jumna the Vedic Rishis sang those hymns which represent the first yawnings of infant humanity towards the Divine ideal. In the morning of the world, before the Eternal City had been built on the seven hills, we were the spiritual preceptors of mankind. Kashi had been built. Kashi was flourishing before Babylon. Our past takes us back to the dim twilight of history. In those days when the world was sunk into barbarism we were the guides and instructors of mankind. Has our mission been fulfilled now ? It has been frustrated but not fulfilled. It has to be fulfilled. It must be fulfilled so that Europe may be rescued from the gross materialism, from the degraded culture which at the present moment has heaped the battle-fields of Europe with hecatombs of the dead. It is our mission to become once again the spiritual guides of mankind. But we cannot fulfil that mission unless and until we ourselves are emancipated, we ourselves are free. That is the first indispensable equipment for the discharge of that great mission.

Ladies and Gentlemen, therefore it comes to this, that our campaign for self-government is not a political one. It is something higher, and nobler. It is a moral and spiritual mission in which the fate and destinies of humanity are involved.

Such are the ideals, the hopes and the aspirations that inspire us to-day. To-day is a red letter day in our history. To-day, the Hindus and Mahomedans and all ranks of the Naticnal party are united on this platform inspired by a common resolve and a common purpose.

May the memory of this day be embalmed in the recollections of posterity, of the most distant generations, by the inauguration of a new campaign for the attainment of self-government. It is no use our holding a session for three days and then going to sleep. We must resolve in our hearts and take a vow such as we did in connection with the Swadeshi Movement and enter into a solemn league and covenant before God and man that you will not abstain from these labours until we establish in this land the great and inestimable blessing of self-government.

Our cause is the noblest that ever adorned the heart of man, founded upon the highest considerations of justice. We have to overcome many difficulties in the way. We are in measurable distance of victory. The promised land is in sight. From the Sinai of Hope and Faith we behold its splendour. But whether we shall enter it or whether our entrance will be delayed or indefinitely postponed will depend upon us. You therefore equip yourselves for the great work that lies before you. Pursue the campaign with energy and devotion and selflessness, sinking all differences and all divergencies, uniting yourselves upon one common platform and God will consecrete your efforts with His blessings and lead you to the promised land which will be your heritage and the destined heritage of your children and your children's children.

8

SWAMI DAYANANDA SARASWATI

[Swami Dayananda Saraswati (1824-1883) occupies a place of his own in the nineteenth century renaissance movement in India. His call of 'Back to the Vedas' boldly signified that while other great pioneers of modern Indian awakening looked towards the West for inspiration, he looked towards the glorious past of India what he preferred to proudly call the Aryavrata (Land of the Aryans). And yet he desired selective borrowing from other religions and cultures of the world that would add to the knowledge of the Indian people. Known as a great Vedic scholar, a dialectician as well as a social reformer, he sang the 'glory of Swaraj' (self-rule) that imparted a political character to his crusade of social regeneration at a time when the British colonial rule had become well entrenched in the country. As an ardent champion of social reform, he worked for the unlift of socially down-trodden people through the institution of Arya Samaj that he founded in 1875. Thus struggle for social reconstruction also made him, in the words of Romain Rolland, 'an ardent prophet of a national organisation.' By espousing the cause of Hindi as the national language, he added a new dimension to the nature of our nascent nationalism. The ideas of Swami Dayanand and his Arya Samaj played an important part in sharpening the trend of vigorous nationalism in India.]

RAJA DHARMA

Or

THE SCIENCE OF GOVERNMENT*

The great *Manu* says to the *Rishis*,** "After discoursing on the duties of the four *Classes* and the four *Orders*, we shall now

*From Swami Dayanand's *Satyartha Prakash*, Ch. VI.

**The *Rishis* or sages who went to *Manu* to beg him to discourse upon the duties of man, etc., for their benefit.

describe *Raja Dharma* or the duties and qualifications, etc., of Rulers, in other words, we shall discuss as to who is fit to be a king, how is to be selected, and how he can attain the *highest bliss*—salvation. Let a *Kshatriya* whose knowledge, culture and piety are as perfect as those of a *Brahman*, govern the country with perfect justice", in the following way :

Manu VII, 1, 2.

(God teaches), "Let there be for the benefit of the rulers and the ruled three Assemblies—1. Religious, 2. Legislative, 3. Educational. Let each discuss and decide subjects that concern it, and adorn all men with knowledge, culture, righteousness, independence, and wealth, and thereby make them happy."

Rig Veda III, 38, 6.

Let the three Assemblies, Military Councils, and the Army harmoniously work together to carry on the government of a country."

Atharva Veda, XV, 2, 9, 2.

"A king should address the Assembly thus :—Let the leader of the Assembly abide by the just laws passed by the Assembly, and let other members do the same."

Atharva Veda, XIX, 7, 55, 6.

It means that no single individual should be invested with absolute power. The king, who is the president of the Assembly, and the Assembly itself should be inter-dependent on each other. Both should be controlled by the people, who in their turn should be governed by the Assembly.

If this system be not followed and the king be independent of the people and have absolute power, "He would impoverish the people,—being despotic and hence arrogant—and oppress them, aye, even eat them up, just as a tiger or any other carnivorous animal pounces upon a robust animal and eats it up. A despotic ruler does not let any one else grow in power, robs the rich, usurps their property by unjust punishment, and accomplishes his selfish end. One man should, therefore, never be given despotic power."

Shatpatha Brahman XII, 2, 3, 7, 8.

"O men ! Let that man alone among you be made a king—the President of the Assembly—who is a very powerful conqueror of foes, is never beaten by them, has the capacity to become the paramount sovereign, is most enlightened, is worthy of being made a President, who possesses most noble qualities, accomplishments, character and disposition ; who is thoroughly worthy of the homage, trust and respect of all."

Atharva Veda, I, 6, 10, 98.

"O ye learned men ! Proclaim that man with one voice your king—the President and Head of the State—who is just, impartial, well-educated, cultured and friend of all. In this way alone shall ye attain universal sovereignty, be greater than all manage the affairs of the State, obtain political eminence, acquire wealth, and rid the world of its enemies."

Yajur Veda IX, 40.

God teaches in the *Veda*, "Rulers ! your implements of warfare, (such as, guns, rifles, bows, arrows, etc.) and war-materials (such as gunpower) be worthy of praise, strong and durable to repel and conquer your enemies. Let your army be a glorious one, so that you may always be victorious. But the aforesaid things shall not be attainable to the contemptible, the despicable, and the unjust." In other words, it is only as long as men remain honourable, just and virtuous that they are politically great. When they become wicked and unjust, they are absolutely ruined.

Rig Veda, I, 39, 1.

Let a *nation*, therefore. elect the *most learned* men, as members of the *Education Assembly*, the *most devout men*, as members of the Religious *Assembly*, and *men of the most praiseworthy character*, as members of the *Legislative Assembly* ; and let that great man in it, who possesses most excellent qualities, is highly accomplished, and bears most honourable character, be made the Head or President of the *Political Assembly*.

Let the three *Assemblies* harmoniously work together, and make good laws, and let all abide by those laws. Let them all be of one mind in affairs that promote the happiness of all. All men should subordinate themselves to the laws that are

calculated to promote general well-being ; they should be free in matters relating to individual well-being.

QUALIFICATIONS OF THE HEAD OF THE STATE

"He should be as powerful as *electricity* : as dear to his people's hearts as their very *breath*, able to read the inmost thoughts of others, and just in his dealings as a *judge*. He should enlighten people's minds by the spread of knowledge, justice, and righteousness, and dispel ignorance and injustice as the *Sun* illuminates the world. He should be like one who consumes wickedness like *fire*, keeps the wicked and the criminal under control like a *jailer*, gladdens the hearts of the good like the *moon* ; makes the country rich and prosperous, as a *treasurer* keeps his treasury full ; is powerful and majestic like the *sun*, keep the people in fear and awe ; and on whom no one in the whole world dares to look with a stern eye. He alone is then fit to be the Head of the State who is like *fire*, *air*, the *sun*, the *moon*, a *judge*, a *treasurer*, a *gaoler* in keeping the wicked under control, and like *electricity* in power."

Manu, VII, 4, 6, 7.

THE TRUE KING

"The *Law* alone is the real king, the dispenser of justice, the disciplinarian. The *Law* is considered as the surety for the four *Classes* and *Orders* to discharge properly their respective duties. The *Law* alone is the trure Governor that maintains order among the people. The *Law* alone is their Protector. The *Law* keeps awake whilst all the people are fast asleep. The *wise*, therefore, look upon the *Law* alone as *Dharma* or *Right*. When rightly administered the *Law* makes all men happy but when administered wrongly, *i.e.*, without due regard to the requirement of justice, it ruins the king. All the four *Classes* would become corrupt, all order would come to an end, there would be nothing but chaos and corruption if the *Law* were not properly enforced. Where the *Law*—which is likened onto a fear-inspiring man, black in colour and with red eyes—striking fear into the hearts of the people and pre-

Manu VII, 17, 19, 24, 28, 30, 31.

venting them from committing crimes, rules supreme, there the people never go astray, and consequently live in happiness if it be administered by a just and learned man. He alone is considered a fit person to administer the *Law* by the wise, who invariably speaks the truth, is thoughtful, highly intellectual and very clever in the attainment of virtue, wealth and righteous desires. The *Law* rightly administered by the king greatly promotes the practice of virtue, acquisition of wealth and secures the attainment of the heart felt desires of his people. But the same *Law* destroys the king who is sensual, indolent, crafty, malevolent, mean and low-minded.

Great is the power and majesty of the *Law*. It cannot be administered by a man who is ignorant and unjust. It surely brings the downfall of the king who deviates from the path of rectitude.

The *Law* can never be justly administered by a man who is destitute of learning and culture, has no wise and good men to assist him, and is sunk in sensualism. He alone is fit to administer the *Law*—which is another name for justice—who is wise, pure in heart, of truthful character, associates with the good, conducts himself according to the law and is assisted by the truly good and great men in the discharge of his duties.

CHIEF OFFICES

"The four chief Offices—Commander-in-Chief of the forces, Head of the Civil Government, Minister of Justice, and the Supreme Head of all—the king —should be held only by those persons who are well versed in all the four *Vedas* and the *Shastras*, are conversant with all the sciences and philosophies, devout, and have perfect control over their desires, passions, and possess a noble character.

Manu, XII, 100, 110—111.

Let no man transgress that law which has been passed by an Assembly of ten men learned and wise, or at the very least of three such men. This Assembly must consist of members who are well-versed in th four *Vedas*, keen logicians, masters

of language, and men conversant with the science of religion, they must belong to the first three *Orders—Brahmacharya, Grihastha* and *Vanaprastha.*

Let no man trangress what has been decided by even an Assembly of three men who are scholars of the *Rig Veda*, the *Yajur Veda* and the *Sama Veda* respectively.

Even the decision of one *Sanyasi*, who is fully conversant with all the four *Vedas* and is superior to all the twice-born (*Dwijas*) should be considered of the highest authority. But let no man abide by the decision of myriads of ignorant men.

Even a meeting of thousands of men cannot be designated an *Assembly*, if they be destitute of such high virtues as self-control or truthful character, be ignorant of the *Vedas* and be men of no understanding like the *Shudras.*

Let no man abide by the law laid down by men who are altogether ignorant, and destitute of the knowledge of the *Veda*, for whosoever obeys the law propounded by ignorant fools falls into hundreds of kinds of sin and vice. Therefore, let not ignorant fools be ever made members of the aforesaid three Assemblies—Political, Educational and Religious. On the other hand let learned and devout persons only be elected to such high offices.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE DIFFERENT RELIGIONS PREVAILING IN ARYAVARTA (INDIA)*

Now we shall examine the religions of the *Aryas*, *i.e.*, the people who live in *Aryavarta* (India). This country is such that no other country in the whole world can come up to the level of its excellence. It is also called the Golden Land as it produces gold and precious stones. It was for this reason that in the beginning of the world the *Aryas* came to this country. We have already stated in the Chapter on *Casmogony* that the good and noble men are called *Aryas*, whilst those who are otherwise are called *Dasyus.* The natives of all other countries

*From Swami Dayanand's *Satyartha Prakash*, Ch. XI.

on the earth praise this very country, and believe that the philosopher's stone is to be found here. Though this story of the philosopher's stone is a myth, yet it is true that this country (*Aryavarta*) itself is verily a philosopher's stone whose very touch converts all base metals—poor foreigners—into gold—rich nabobs.

Since the beginning of the world till 5,000 years back, the *Aryas* were the sovereign rulers of the whole earth, in other words, there was only one paramount power whose suzerainty was acknowledged by the rulers of the earth. Till the time of the *Kauravas* and the *Pandavas* all other rulers of the earth and their subjects obeyed the law laid down by the rulers of this country, for it is said in the *Manu Smriti*, that was composed in the beginning of the world. "Let all other people of the earth—*Brahmans** *Kshatriyas*, *Vaishyas*, *Shudras*, *Dasyus* and *Malechhas*—learn arts and sciences suitable to them from the learned people born in this country."

Manu, 11, 20.

The perusal of the *Mahabharata* proves that the *Aryas* were the sovereign rulers of the earth till the coronation of Emperor *Yudhishtra* and the Great War of *Mahabharata*, for we read in that book that King *Bhagadatta* of China, *Babruvahan* of America, *Vidalakha*** of Europe, the Ruler of Greece, King *Shalya* of Persia and various other rulers came as ordered to take part in the Great War and in the coronation of Emperor *Yudhishtra*.

When the house of *Raghu* held paramount authority (in this country), even King *Ravana* of Ceylon acknowledged its suzerainty. Later when he revolted against its authority, Prince *Ram Chandra* having vanquished and dethroned him placed

Brahmans=Teachers—secular and spiritual.
Kshatriyas=Men of governing class, statesmen, soldiers, etc.
Vaishyas =Merchants, artisans and farmers.
Shudras =Men of the servant class.
Dasyus =Wicked people.
Malechhas=Barbarians.

**Called so on account of his cat-like eyes.

his younger brother *Vibhishana* on the throne instead. Since the time of *Swyambhava* to that of the *Pandavas*, the *Aryas* were the paramount power throughout the whole world. Thereafter, mutual dissensions among them compassed their destruction, for in this world, over which a just God presides, the rule of the proud, the unjust and the ignorant (such as the *Kauravas* were) cannot last very long. It is also a law of nature that the accumulation of wealth in a community out of all proportion to its needs and requirements brings in its train indolence, jealousy, mutual hatred, lustfulness, luxury and neglect of duty which put an end to all sound learning and education, whose place is usurped by evil customs, manners and practices like the use of meat and wine, child marriage, and licentiousness.

Besides, when people acquire perfection in the military science and the art of war, and the army becomes so formidable that no one in the whole world can stand it on a field of battle, pride and party spirit increase among them and they become unjust. Thereafter they lose all power either through mutual dissensions, or a strong man from among families of little importance rises to distinction and is powerful enough to subjugate them, just as Shivajee and Gobind Singh rose against Mohammedan rule and completely annihilated the *Muslim* power in India.

The fact that the *Aryas* were the sovereign rulers of the earth since the beginning of the world till the Great War called *Mahabharata*, is also proved on the authority of the *Maitreyopanishad* which says, "Why ! Besides these, there have been other Mighty Rulers who were the Sovereign Lords of the whole earth, such as *Sudyumna*, *Bhuridymna*, *Indradyuamna*, *Kuvalyashwa*, *Yanvanashwa Baddhyrashwa*, *Ashwapati*, *Shashavindu-Harishchandra*, *Ambrisha*, *Nanaktu*, *Saryati*, *Anarnya*, *Akshasena*, and also such like Emperors as *Mauruta* and *Bharat*."

Maitry Upnishad, 1,4.

The names of such Sovereign Rulers as *Swyambhava*,* etc., are clearly mentioned in the *Mahabharata*, the *Manu Smriti*

*What a pity that the descendants of these Aryas are being crushed under the wheel of the foreigner.

and other authoritative books. Only the prejudiced and the ignorant regard these statements as fallacious.

That which helps you to embrace truth, will also cause you to accept untruth. When all men are fallible, you being men cannot be otherwise. Consequently whatever you say or write cannot be altogether true, hence you cannot be entirely depended upon. This being the case, your beliefs deserve to be rejected like the food which is mixed with poison. No one can, therefore, accept your sacred book as authoritative. You are no more omniscient than others, hence occasionally you would, through error of judgment, be liable to reject a truth and accept an untruth. It, therefore, behoves us all, whose nature and knowledge are finite, to lean on the Word of the Infinite, Omniscient, Omnipotent, Supreme Spirit as we have stated in the 7th Chapter of this book which treats of the *Vedas* as revealed books. You should also believe the same otherwise the proverb "Lost on one side as well as on the other" will be applicable to you. When truth and nothing but truth is to be found in the *Vedas*, you do yourselves as well as others harm in hesitating to accept them (as the Supreme Authority in the ascertainment of truth). This is the reason that the people of this country (*Aryavarta*) do not look upon you as their own (flesh and blood). You have not been of any help in the advancement of your country as you beg from door to door, *i.e.*, have borrowed a few religious beliefs (truths) from the Muhammadans, and a few others from the Christians and soon. You think that by doing so you will be able to do good to yourselves as well as to others, but that you will never be able to do. Just as if the parents of a child were to take upon themselves to nurse all the children in the world, it will be impossible for them to succeed in it, on the contrary, they will lose even their own children (*i.e.*, their own children will die from want of care), the same is true of you. Now how can you test the truth or error of your beliefs or bring about the advancement of your country without accepting the *Vedas* and the *Shastras* as the supreme authority. You have no remedy for the disease this country is afflicted with. The Europeans do not care for you, whilst the natives of this country look upon you as followers of an alien

religion. Even now it is not too late for you to recognise your mistake and further the cause of your country with the help of the *Vedas* and other true *Shastras*. When you hold that all truths come from God, why don't you then, accept the truths embodied in the *Vedas* revealed to the sages by God ? Since you have neither read the *Vedas* nor have any desire to do so, how can you profit by the knowledge embodied in them ?

A STATEMENT OF MY BELIEFS

"I believe in a religion based on universal and all-embracing principles which have always been accepted as true by mankind, and will continue to command the allegiance of mankind, in the ages to come. Hence it is that the religion in question is called the *primeval eternal religion*, which means that it is above the hostility of all human creeds whatsoever. Whatever is believed in by those who are steeped in ignorance or have been led astray by sectaries is not worthy of being accepted by the wise. That faith alone is really true and worthy of acceptance which is followed by *Aptas i e*, those who are true in word, deed and thought promote public good and are impartial and learned ; but all that is discarded by such men must be considered as unworthy of belief and false.

My conception of God and all other objects in the universe is founded on the teachings of *Vedas* and other true *Shastras* and is in conformity with the beliefs of all the sages, from *Brahma* down to *Jaimini*. I offer a statement of these beliefs for the acceptance of all good men. That alone I hold to be acceptable which is worthy of being believed by all men in all ages. I do not entertain the least idea of founding a new religion or sect. My sole aim is to believe in truth and help others to believe in it, to reject falsehood and help others to do the same, Had I been biased, I would have championed any one of the religions plevailing in India. 'But I have not done so. On the contrary, I do not approve of what is objectionable and false in the institutions of this or any other country, nor do I reject what is good and in harmony with the dictates of true religion, nor have I any desire to do so, since a contrary conduct is wholly unworthy of man. He alone is

entitled to be called a man who possesses a thoughtful nature and feels for others in the same way as he does for his own self, does not fear the unjust however powerful but fears the truly virtuous, however weak. Moreover, he should always exert himself to his utmost to protect the righteous, and advance their good, and conduct himself worthily towards them even though they be extremely poor and weak and destitute of material resources. On the other hand, he should constantly strive to destroy, humble, and oppose the wicked sovereign rulers of the whole earth and men of great influence and power though they be. It other words, a man should, as far as it lies in his power, constantly endeavour to undermine the power of the unjust and to strengthen that of the just. He may have to bear any amount of terrible suffering, he may have even to quaff the bitter cup of death in the performance of this duty, which devolves on him on account of being a man, but he should not shirk it."

King *Bhartri Hari* and other wise men have composed verses on the subject which I subjoin with the hope that they will prove useful :—

(1) "The worldy-wise may praise one or censure him ;
Bhartri Hari. fortune may smilk on him or frown on him ;
death may overtake him immediately or he may live for ages, but a wise man does not swerve from the path of justice."

(2) "Let a man never renounce *Dharma* (righteousness)
Mahabharat. either through lust or through fear, or through greed or even to save his life, since *Dharma* is imperishable, while pleasure or pain is perishable, the soul is immortal, while the body is mortal."

(3) "There is only one true friend that accompanies one
Manu. even after death. All others desert one as soon as death has overtaken him."

(4) "It is truth that conquers, not error. It is the path of
Upanishad. rectitude alone that men of learning and piety have trodden, and it is by following this path that

the great sages of righteous desires have reached the highest citadel of truth—God."

(5) "Verily there is no virtue higher than *truth*; no sin blacker than falsehood. Verily there is no knowledge higher than *truth*; *let* a man, therefore, always follow *truth*." Upanishad

Let all men have the same kind of firm faith (in the power of *truth* and *justice*) as has been expressed by great souls (in the above verses).

Now I give below a brief summary of my belief. Their detailed exposition has been given in this book in its proper place.

1. He, Who is called *Brahma* or the most High; who is *Paramatma* or the Supreme Spirit, Who permeates the whole universe; Who is a true personification of Existence, Consciousness and Bliss; Whose nature, attributes and characteristics are Holy; Who is Omniscient, Formless, All-pervading, Unborn, Infinite, Almighty, Just and Merciful; Who is the author of the universe and sustains and dissolves it: Who awards all souls the fruits of their deeds in strict accordance with the requirements of absolute justice and is possessed of the like attributes, even *Him* I believe to be the Great God.

2. I hold that the four *Vedas*—the repository of Knowledge and Religious Truths—are the Words of God. They comprise what is known as the *Sanhita-Mantra* portion only. They are absolutely free from error, and are an authority unto themselves. In other words, they do not stand in need of any other book to uphold their authority. Just as the sun (or a lamp) by light, reveals its own nature as well as that of other objects of the universe, such as the earth—even so are the *Vedas*.

The commentaries on the four *Vedas*, *viz.*, the *Brahmanas*, the six *Angas*. the six *Upangas*, the four *Up-Vedas*, and the eleven hundred and twenty-seven *Shakhas*, which are expositions of the *Vedic* texts by *Brahma* and other great *Rishis*—I look upon as works of a *dependent* character. In other words,

they are held to be authoritative in so far as they conform to the *teachings of the Vedas*. Whatever passages in these works are opposed to the *Vedic* injunctions I reject them entirely.

3. The practice of equitable justice together with that of truthfulness in word, deed and thought and the like (virtues) —in a word, that which is in conformity with the Will of God, as embodied in the *Vedas*—even *that* I call *Dharma* (right). But the practice of that which is not free from partiality and injustice as well as that of untruthfulness in word, deed and thought,—in a word, that which is opposed to the Will of God, as embodied in the *Vedas*—even *that* I term *Adharma* (wrong).

4. The immortal, eternal *Principle* which is endowed with attraction and repulsion, feelings of pleasure and pain, and consciousness, and whose capacity for knowledge is *limited*— even that I believe to be the *soul*.

5. "*God* and the *soul* are two distinct entities by virtue of being different in nature and of being possessed of dissimilar attributes and characteristics. They are, however, inseparable one from the other, being related to each other as the *pervader* and the *pervaded* and have certain attributes in common. Just as a material object has always been and shall always be, distinct from the space in which it exists and as the two have never been, nor shall ever be *one and the same*, even so are *God* and the *soul* to each other. Their mutual relation is that of the *pervader* and the *pervaded*, of *father* and *son* and the like.

6. I hold three things to be beginningless, namely, *God*, the *soul*, and *prakriti*—the material cause of the universe. These are also known as the *eternal substrata*. Being eternal, their essential nature, their attributes and their characteristics are also eternal.

7. Substances, properties, and characteristics, which result from combination, cease to exist on the dissolution of that compound. But the power or force, by virtue of which one substance unites with another, or separates from it, is eternally inherent in that substance, and this power will compel it to seek

similar unions and disunions in the future *Unions* and *disunions*, *Creation* and *Dissolution* (of the world) [and *birth* and *death* of the soul] have *eternally* followed each other in succession.

8. That which results from the combination of different elementary substances in an intelligent manner and in the right proportion and order,—even *that*, in all its infinite variety, is called *Creation*.

9. The *purpose* of *Creation* is the essential and natural exercise of the creative energy of the Deity. A person once asked another "What is the use of the *eyes*?" "*To see with*, to be sure," was the reply. The same is the case here. God's creative energy can be exercised and the souls can reap the fruits of their deeds only when the world is *created*.

10. The world is *created*. Its Creator is the aforesaid God. The existence of design in the universe as well as the fact that the dead inert matter is incapable of moulding itself into different ordered forms, such as seeds, proves that it *must have* a Creator.

11. "The earthly bondage (of the soul) has a cause. This cause is *ignorance* which is the source of sin, as among other things it leads man to worship objects other than God, obscures his intellectual faculties, where of pain and suffering is the result. *Bondage* is termed so, because no one desires it but has to undergo it.

12. The emancipation of the soul from pain and suffering of every description and a subsequent career of freedom in the All-pervading God and His immense Creation for a fixed period of time and its resumption of earthly life after the expiration of that period constitute *Salvation*.

13. The *means* of salvation are the worship of God, in other words, the practice of *yoga*, the performance of righteous deeds, the acquisition of true knowledge by the practice of *Brahmacharya*, the society of the wise and the learned, love of true knowledge, purity of thought, a life of activity and so on.

14. The righteously acquired wealth alone constitutes *Artha*, while that which is acquired by foul means is called *Anarth*.

15. The enjoyment of legitimate desires with the help of honestly-acquired wealth constitutes *Kama*.

16. The *Class* and *Order* of an individual should be determined by his merits.

17. He alone deserves the title of a *king* who is endowed with excellent qualities and a noble disposition, and bears an exalted character, who follows the dictates of equitable justice, who loves and treats his subjects as a father does his own offspring and is ever engaged in promoting their happiness and furthering their advancement.

18. He alone deserves to be called a *subject* who is possessed of excellent qualities, a noble disposition and a good character, is free from partiality, follows the behests of justice, righteousness, and is ever engaged in furthering the happiness of his fellow-subjects as well as that of his sovereign, whom he regards in the light of a parent, and is ever loyal.

19. He who always thinks well (before he acts), is ever ready to embrace truth and reject falsehood, who puts down the unjust and helps the just, feels for others in the same way as he does for his own self—even *him* I call *just*.

20. *Devas* are those who are wise and learned : *asuras*, are those who are foolish and ignorant ; *rakshas* are those who are wicked and love sin ; and *pishachas* are those who are filthy in their habits.

21. *Devapuja* consists in showing honour to the wise and the learned, to one's father, mother and preceptor, to the itinerant preachers of truth, to a just ruler, to those who lead righteous lives, to women who are chaste and faithful to their husbands, to men who are devoted and loyal to their wives. The opposite of this is called *Adevapuja*. The worship of the above named persons I hold to be right, while the worship of the dead, inert objects I hold to be wrong.

22. *Education* (*Shiksha*) is that which helps one to acquire knowledge, culture, righteousness, self-control and the like virtues ; and eradicates ignorance and evil habits.

23. The *Puranas* are the *Brahmana* books, such as *Aitreya Brahmana* written by the great *Rishis* like *Brahma*. They are also called *Itihas*, *Kalpa*, *Gatha*, and *Narashani*. The *Bhagvat* and other books of that sort are *not* true (real) *Purans*.

24. *Tirtha* is that by means of which the 'ocean of misery' is crossed. It consists in the practice of truthfulnees in speech, in the acquisition of true knowledge, in cultivating the society of the wise and the good, in the practic of *yamas* and (other stages) of *yaga* in leading a life of activity, in the diffusion of knowledge and in the performance of the like good works. So-called sacred places on land and water are not *tirthas*.

25. *Activity* is superior to *Destiny*, since the former begets the latter, and also because if the activity is well directed, ends well ; but if it is wrongly directed, all goes wrong.

26. I hold that it is commendable for man to feel for others in the same way as he does for his own self, to sympathise with them in their sorrows and losses and to rejoice in their joys and gains ; and that it is reprehensible to do otherwise.

27. *Samskar* is that which contributes to the physical, mental and spiritual improvement of man. From *Conception* to *Cremation* there are sixteen *samskars* altogether. I hold that their due and proper observance is obligatory on all. Nothing should be done for the departed after the remains have been cremated.

28. I hold that the performance of *yajna* is most commendable. It consists in showing due respect to the wise and the learned, in the proper application of the principles of chemistry and of physical and mechanical science to the affairs of life, in the dissemination of knowledge and culture, in the performance of *Agnihotra* which, by contributing to the purification of air and water, rain and vegetables, directly promotes the well-being of all sentient creatures.

29. Gentlemen are called *Aryas*, while rogues are called *Dasyus*.

30. This country is called *Aryavarta* because it has been the abode of the *Aryas* from the very dawn of Creation. It is bounded on the north by the *Himalayas*, on the south by the *Vindhyachala* mountains, on the west by the *Attok* (*Indus*), and on the east by the *Brahmaputra*. The land included within these limits is *Aryavarta* and those that have been living in it from times immemorial are also called *Aryas*.

31. An *Acharya* is one who teaches the sciences of the *Vedas* as well as their *Angas* and *Upangas*, who helps (his pupils) to live righteous lives and keep aloof from bad habits and vices.

32. He alone is a *Shishya* (pupil) who has the capacity for acquiring knowledge and true culture, whose moral character is unimpeachable, who is eager to learn, and is devoted to his teacher.

33. By the term *Guru* is meant father or mother. It also applies to one through whose instrumentality one's mind is grounded in truth and weaned from falsehood

34. He is a *Prohita* who wishes well to his *Yajaman*, and always preaches truth to him.

35. An *Upadhyaya* (Profesor) is one who can teach certain portions of the *Vedas* or of the *Angas*.

36. *Shishtachar* consists in leading a virtuous life, in acquiring knowledge during the period of *Brahmacharya* in sifting truth from error by the help of (the eight kinds of) evidence, such as *direct cognition* and then embracing truth and rejecting error. He who practises *shishtachar* is called a *shishta* (gentleman).

37. I believe in the eight kinds of evidence such as *direct cognition*.

38. I call him alone an *Apt* who always speaks the truth, is just and upright and labours for the good of all.

39. There are *five* tests :—

(1) The nature, attributes and characteristics of God, and the teachings of the *Vedas*. (2) Eight kinds of

evidence such as *Direct Cognition.* (3) Laws of nature (4) The practice of *Aptas.* (5) The purity and conviction of one's own soul.

It behoves all men to sift truth from error with the help of these five tests and to embrace truth and reject error.

40. *Paropkar* (philanthropy) is that which helps to wean all men from their vices and alleviate their sufferings, promote the practice of virtue among them and increase their happiness.

41. The *Soul* is a free agent to do deeds, but is subservient to God for reaping the fruits thereof. Likewise, God is free to do His good works.

42. *Swarga* (Heaven) is the enjoyment of extreme happiness and the attainment of the means thereof.

43. *Narka* (Hell) is another name for undergoing extreme suffering and possession of the means thereof.

44. *Janma* (birth), which consists in the *soul's* assumption of the gross, visible body, viewed in relation to time is threefold, *viz., past, present* and *future.*

45. *Birth* is another name for the *union* of the *soul* with the body, and *death* is the dissolution of the link.

46. The acceptance of the hand, through mutual consent, of a person of the opposite sex in a public manner and in accordance with the laws (laid down by the *Vedas* and *Shastras*) is called *Marriage.*

47. *Niyoga* is the temporary union of a person with another of the opposite sex, both parties may belong to the same *Class* or the male may belong to a *Class* higher, for the raising of issue, when marriage has failed to fulfil its legitimate purpose. It is resorted to in *extreme cases*, either on the death of one's consort, or when protracted disease has destroyed reproductive power in the husband or in the wife.

48. *Stuti* (Glorification) consists in praising Divine attributes and powers or in hearing them being praised, with the

view to fix them in our mind and realize their meaning. Among other things it inspires us with love towards God.

49. *Prarthana* (Prayer) is praying to God, after one has done his utmost, for the gift of highest knowledge and similar (other blessings) which result from union with Him. It creates humility, etc., (in the mind of the devotee).

50. *Upasana* (Communion) consists in comforming ourselves, as far as possible, in purity and holiness to the Divine Spirit, and in reeling the presence of the Deity in our heart by the realization of His All-pervading nature through the practice of *Yoga* which enables one to have *direct cognition* of God. *Upasana* serves to extend the bounds of our knowledge.

51. *Sagun Stuti* consists in praising God as possessed of specific attributes which are inherent in Him; while *Nirgun Stuti* consists in praising God as devoid of attributes which are foreign to His nature.

Sagun Prarthana consists in praying to God for the attainment of virtuous qualities; while *Nirgun Prarthana* consists in imploring the Deity to rid us of all our faults.

Sagun Upasana consists in resigning oneself to God and His Will realizing Him as possessed of attributes that are in harmony with His nature; while *Nirgun Upasana* consists in resigning oneself to God and His Will realizing Him as devoid of attributes that are foreign to His nature.

I have briefly explained my beliefs here, their detailed exposition is to be found in this very book in its proper place as well as in my other works such as "An Introduction to the Exposition of the *Vedas*."

In other words I believe what is worthy of belief in the eyes of all, such as veracity in speech; while I do not believe what is considered wrong by all, such as untruthfulness. I do not approve of the mutual wrangling of the sectaries, since they have by propagating their creeds, led the people astray and turned them each other's enemy. The sole aim of my life, which I have also endeavoured to achieve, is to help to put an end to

this mutual wrangling, preach universal truths, bring all men into the fold of one religion whereby they may cease to hate each other and, instead, may firmly love one another, live in peace and work for their common weal. May this doctrine, through the grace and help of God, and with the support of all truthful, honest and learned men who are devoted to the cause of humanity (*Aptas*) reach every nook and corner of this earth so that all may acquire righteousness, wealth, gratify legitimate desires and attain salvation and thereby elevate themselves and live in happiness. This alone is the chief object (of my life).

A Word to the Wise

["Mayest Thou (AOM) O God, Who art (*Mitra*), Friend of all, (*Varun*) Holiest of all, and (*Aryama*) Controller of the Universe, be merciful unto us. Mayest Thou (*Indra*) O God Almightly (*Vrihaspati*) Lord of the Universe, Support of all, endow us with knowledge and power. Mayest Thou (*Vishnu*) O Omnipresent and (*Kurukrama*) Omnipotent Being, shower They blessings all around us."] (*Rig Veda*)

Romain Rolland's Tribute

"Indian religious thought raised a purely Indian Samaj against Keshab's Brahmo Samaj and against all attempt at Westernization, even during his lifetime, and at its head was a personality of the highest order, Dayananda Saraswati (1824—1883).

This man with the nature of a lion is one of those, whom Europe is too apt to forget when she judges India, but whom she will probably be forced to remember to her cost ; for he was that rare combination, a thinker of action with a genius for leadership.

For fifteen years, this son of a rich Brahmin, despoiled of everything and subsisting on alms, wandered as a Sadhu clad in the saffron robe along the roads of India. At length about 1860 he found at Muttra an old Guru even more implacable than himself in his condemnation of all weakness and his hatred of superstition, a sannyasi blind from infancy and from the age of eleven quite alone in the world, a learned man, a

terrible man, Swami Virjananda Saraswati, Dayananda put himself under his 'discipline,' which in its old literal seventeenth century sense scarred his flesh as well as his spirit. Dayananda served this untamable and indomitable man for two and a half years as his pupil. It is, therefore, mere justice to remember that his subsequent course of action was simply the fulfilment of the will of the stern blind man. When they separated, Virjananda extracted from him the promise that he would consecrate his life to the annihilation of the heresies that had crept into the Puranic (old) faith to re-establish the ancient religious methods of the age before Buddha, and to disseminate the truth.

Dayananda immediately began to preach in northern India, but unlike the benign men of God who open all heaven before the eyes of their hearers, he was a hero of the *Iliad* or of the *Gita* with the athletic strength of a Hercules, who thundered against all forms of thought other than his own, the only true one. He was successful that in five years northern India was completely changed. During these five years, his life was attempted four or five times—sometimes by poison. Once a fanatic threw a cobra at his face in the name of Shiva, but he caught it and crushed it. It was impossible to get the better of him ; for he possessed an unrivalled knowledge of Sanskrit and the Vedas, while the burning vehemence of his words brought his adversaries to naught. They likened him to a flood. Never since Shankara had such a prophet of Vedism appeared. The orthodox Brahmins, completely overwhelmed, appealed from him to Benares, their Rome. Dayananda went there fearlessly, and undertook in November 1869, a Homeric contest. Before millions of assailants, all eager to bring him to his knees, he argued for hours together alone against three hundred pandits – the whole front line and the reserve of Hindu orthodoxy. He proved that the Vedant as practised was diametrically opposed to the primitive Vedas He claimed that he was going back to the true Word, the pure Law of two thousand years earlier. They had not the patience to hear him out. He was hooted down and excommunicated. A void was created round him, but the echo of such a combat in the style

of the *Mahabharata* spread throughout the country, so that his name became famous over the whole of India. Dayananda was not a man to come to an understanding with religious philosophers imbued with Western ideas. His national Indian theism, its steel faith forged from the pure metal of the Vedas alone, had nothing in common with theirs, tinged as it was with modern doubt, which denied the infallibility of the Vedas and the doctrine of transmigration. Its (Arya Samaj's) spontaneous and impassioned success in contrast to the slight reverberations of Keshab's Brahmo Samaj, shows the degree to which Dayananda's stern teachings corresponded to the thought of his country and to the first stirrings of Indian nationalism, to which he contributed.

The enthusiastic reception accorded to the thunderous champion of the Vedas, a Vedist belonging to a great race and penetrated with the sacred writings of ancient India and with her heroic spirit, is then easily explained. He alone hurled the defiance of India against her invaders. Dayananda declared war on Christianity and his heavy massive sword cleft is asunder with scant reference to the scope or exactitude of his blows.

Dayananda had no greater regard for the *Koran* and the Puranas, and trampled under-foot the body of Brahmin orthodoxy. He had no pity for any of his fellow countrymen, past or present, who had contributed in any way to the thousand-year decadence of India, at one time the mistress of the world. He was a ruthless critic of all who, according to him, had falsified or profaned the true Vedic religion. He was a Luther fighting against his own misled and misguided Church of Rome ; and his first care was to throw open the wells of the holy books, so that for the first time his people could come to them and drink for themselves. He wrote commentaries on the Vedas in the vernacular—it was in truth an epoch-making date for India when a Brahmin not only acknowledged that all human beings have the right to know the Vedas, whose study had been previously prohibited by orthodox Brahmins, but insisted that their study and propaganda was the duty of every Arya.

Dayananda transfused into the languid body of India his own formidable energy, his certainty, his lion's blood. His words rang with heroic power. He reminded the secular passivity of a people, too prone to bow to fate, that the soul is free and that action is the generator of destiny. He set the example of a complete clearance of all the encumbering growth of privilege and prejudice by a series of hatchet blows. With regard to questions of fact, he went further than the Brahmo Samaj, and even further than the Ramakrishna Mission venture of to-day.

His creation, the Arya Samaj, postulates in principle equal justice for all men and all nations, together with equality of the sexes. It repudiates a hereditary caste-system, and only recognises professions or guilds, suitable to the complementary aptitudes of men in society ; religion was to have no part in these divisions, but only the service of the state, which assesses the tasks to be performed. The State alone, if it considers it for the good of the community, can raise or degrade a man from one caste to another by way of reward or punishment. Dayananda wished every man to have the opportunity to acquire as much knowledge as would enable him to raise himself in the social scale as high as he was able. Above all, he would not tolerate the abominable injustice of the existence of untouchables, and nobody has been a more ardent champion of their outraged rights. They were admitted to the Arya Samaj on a basis of equality ; for the Aryas are not a caste. 'The Aryas are all men of superior principles ; and the Dasyus are they who lead a life of wickedness and sin.'

Dayananda was no less generous and no less bold in his crusade to improve the condition of women, a deplorable one in India. He revolted against the abuses from which they suffered, recalling that in the heroic age they occupied in the home and in society a position at least equal to men. They ought to have equal education, according to him, and supreme control in marriage over household matters including the finances. Dayananda in fact claimed equal rights in marriage for men and women and though he regarded marriage as indissoluble, he admitted the marriage of widows.

I have said enough about this rough Sanyasi with the soul of a leader ; to show how great an uplifter of the people he was—in fact the most vigorous force of the immediate and present action in India at the moment of the rebirth and reawakening of the national consciousness. He was one of the most ardent prophets of reconstruction and of national organization. I feel that it was he who kept the vigil.

Bipin Chandra Pal's Tribute

...The nature of scriptural authority in Hindu culture differed from the scriptural authority recognised by the other great world religions is this, namely, that while Christianity or Islam claimed more or less exclusive divine authority for their own books, the Vedas never put up any such claim. Modern Hinduism suffered in some sense from a great disability, as compared to Christianity and Islam, owing to the universal character of their scriptures, particularly of the Vedas. Dayananda Saraswati recognised this disadvantage and was evidently moved by the militant spirit of evangelical Christianity and Islamic missionary propaganda to create and foster a similar militancy in Hinduism itself. He was, therefore, moved to advance for the Vedas exactly the same kind of supernatural authority and exclusive revelation, which was claimed by the Christians for their Bible, and by the Muslims for their Quran. In this Dayananda Saraswati practically made a new departure from the line of ancient Hindu Fathers from Jaimini to Vyasa to Raja Ram Mohan ; and at the same time practically denied the very fundamentals of modern world-thought. But even by thus deviating from the ancient line of Hindu evolution he rendered an immense service to the new nationalist movement in India. He saw that both Christianity and Islam were making fatal inroads upon Hinduism. He realised that unless this process of conversion to Christianity and Islam of increasing numbers of Hindus could be stopped, India would cease in course of time to be the land of the Hindus, the main body of the people being divided into Moslems and Christians, Moslems in Upper India and Christians in the South. Christianity and Islam must, therefore, be fought with their own weapons, and Hinduism must find

this weapon in the Vedas, proclaimed as an exclusive revelation without which there is and can be no salvation for man, whatever may be his country. Christian and Islamic universalism is based upon the universality and infallibility of the Christian and Islamic scriptures. Whoever accepts the authority of the Bible and the doctrine of salvation through Christ proclaimed by the Bible becomes entitled to enter the Kingdom of Heaven absolutely regardless of his birth or parentage of his native country. It is so with Islam...We had nothing like it in ancient or mediaeval Hinduism. Hinduism believes in the universality of man's salvation. It believes in the universality of God's love and grace...And as Hinduism never conceived of a heaven to which Hindus alone would be entitled to enter or of a hell to which all non-Hindus would be condemned, it never set up the dogma of infallible scriptural authority familiar to credal systems like Christianity or Islam. Dayananda was, however, profoundly influenced by what might be called the credal universalism of Christianity and Islam to seek for the foundations of it in his own national religion. This was, it seems to me, the real psychology of the doctrine of Vedic infallibility set up by Dayananda Saraswati, upon which he wanted to build up the Hindu society and the Hindu nation inspired with a great mission among the peoples of the world...The *Satyarth Prakash*, which contains the teachings of Dayananda, clearly proves this interpretation of the psychology of the Arya Samaj. Whatever may be the philosophical value of these teachings, and however much these may be discordant with some of the bedrock doctrines and ideals of Hindu Universalism, it cannot be denied that the movement of Dayananda Saraswati, as organised in the Arya Samaj, has contributed more than the rational movement of the Raja's Brahmo Samaj to the development of a new national consciousness in the modern Hindu, particularly in the Punjab. It was no small thing for the Hindu suffering for centuries under what the psychologists now call the 'inferiority complex,' to be able to challenge aggressive Christianity and Islam by setting up this dogma of Vedic infallibility against their dogma of supernatural revelation ; while at the same time he was able to appeal to the social economy of the Vedic Hindu not only to remove the

numerous social disabilities under which the present day Hindu laboured, but also to claim a social order based upon the teachings of the Vedas which was from some points of view even superior to the advanced social idealism inspired by the dogma of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity of the French Illumination. India did not stand in need of going to Europe either for a purer religion or for a purer social order. This could be found in the ancient scriptures of the people themselves. This was really the beginning of that religious and social revival among the Hindus of India to which we owe so largely the birth of our present national consciousness.

A.L. Basham's Tribute

By the end of the 19th century, however, the situation had changed. A new generation began to realize that Hindu culture had much of permanent value and that the slavish imitation of the West could not solve India's problems. New organizations gave expression to this outlook. The Arya Samaj claimed to reform Hinduism by purging it of all later degenerate features and by a return to the Vedas, very liberally interpreted, and had considerable success."—*The Wonder That Was India* (1954), p. 482.

"Swami Dayananda Saraswati, the Theosophists Mme Blavatsky and Mrs. Annie Besant, and Swami Vivekananda, all with different emphasis encouraged the belief (which may in some respects be justified) that ancient India at her best reached a degree of spiritual and moral development far above that of the contemporary West ; and, from the time of Dayananda onwards, it was even believed in some quarters that ancient India had possessed scientific and technical knowledge little if at all inferior to that of nineteenth century Europe."—*Studies in Indian History and Culture*, (1964), p. 222.

The Arya Samaj, founded by Dayananda Saraswati in 1875, is more nationalist and is still an important force in Uttar Pradesh and the Punjab. The claim of its founder that all wisdom was to be found in the Vedas, was accompanied by an attack on the worship of idols, an insistence on monotheism and social equality and much educational activity.

NATIONALIST THOUGHT*

Swami Dayananda Saraswati is the untypical figure of Indian nationalism, and for that reason alone his contributions are worthy of serious study. The major figures of Indian nationalism, from Raja Ram Mohun Roy to Jawaharlal Nehru, had one thing in common : they were influenced to a more or less extent by western political thought. They were well versed in English literature and the intellectual culture of the West generally. This was true even of Mahatma Gandhi : the fact that he gave an authentically Indian character to his nationalism does not mean that he was not influenced by western political philosophy. But what is commonly true of the major figures of Indian nationalism is not true of Swami Dayananda. He derived his nationalist ideas by the originality of his own understanding of Indian culture, and without any direct influence of western thought.

According to modern thought a nation is a people that is conscious of its historical identity, its cultural uniqueness, its common language, its common territory, and its claim to self-rule. Swami Dayananda's conception of nationalism meets all these requirements, and the astonishing fact is that he had arrived at it by about 1875, a decade before even the Indian National Congress was founded.

The discovery that the Vedas, and the culture founded on the Vedas, were the roots of Indian identity was Dayananda's most important nationalist contribution. India has a golden age, the Vedic age, and the force of modern renewal had to come from the awareness of the golden age. He called knowledge of the Vedas the root knowledge of all Indians. "It is not possible to acquire branch knowledge without root knowledge *i.e.* the Vedas." According to this root knowledge, the major aspects of life were integrated into a co-ordinated whole : religion, ethics, science and politics were integral parts of an

*Excerpts from Anthony Parel : "The Nationalist Thought of Swami Dayananda Saraswati" in Ganga Ram Garg (ed.) : *World Perspectives on Swami Dayananda Saraswati*, pp. 226-32.

organic whole. The call for the return to the spirit of the Vedas was not meant to be a mere slogan, nor to be an invitation to an anachronistic step back into history; it was meant to be a summon to step forward towards national renewal on the basis of the basic culture. Through the interpretation of the spirit of the Vedas he politicized Hinduism in a subtle way and to a degree no other Indian thinker had done before or after him. This politicization, it must be emphasized, was primarily at the theoretical level; that is to say, he gave a coherent justification according to which Hindu culture, broadly understood, was to be the natural and the necessary basis of the nationalism of the Hindu people. He was not implying that the Hindu people were capable of *becoming* a nation; he was saying, on the contrary, that when Hinduism swept aside the accretions of corruption, it would *ipso facto* require a nationalist polity. Compared to this theoretical innovation, even the founding of the Arya Samaj, one would think, is historically less significant. This theoretical contribution to the rise of Indian nationalism constitutes a more universal legacy than even the reform of religion.

Sri Aurobindo understood this aspect of Dayananda's thought when he stated that the restoration of the Vedic spirit included the restoration of the idea of nationalist politics. "Swami Dayananda as a restorer of Vedicism included the theory of politics in his scope and revealed the intensely national character of Hindu religion and morality." It followed "that independence is the true and normal condition of a nation, and all lapse into subjection must be a sin and degeneration, temporary in its nature." Even British observers on the scene had grasped the nationalist theory implicit in the Swami's social thought. Dr. H.D. Griswold, writing in the January 1892 issue of the *Indian Evangelical Review*, had noted that the religious watchword 'Back to the Vedas,' was 'implicitly, if not explicitly,' combined with another watchword, 'India for Indians.' Combining the two, "we have the principle, both religious and political, that the religion of India as well as the sovereignty of India ought to belong to the Indian people."

Related to the notion that the Vedas were the sources of Indian national identity was the notion that India was the land

of the Aryans, and that Indians were Aryans. The adoption of the term Arya to refer to Indians was itself a highly significant nationalist act, since such terms as 'India' and 'Hindus' had a Persian and Greek etymology. That the Swami was serious about this nomenclature can be seen from the directive he issued to his followers to register themselves as 'Aryans' in the 1881 census. Writing to Daya Ram on 30 November 1880 he stipulated that "In the coming census the following details should be given like this—Religion, Vedic; nationality, Aryans.... The Swami also revived the ancient name Aryavarta and linked it to the territory of the Indian nation. "The Aryavarta is the name of the country lying between northern mountains called Himalaya and the southern mountains called Vindhya stretching right up to Rameswaram in the south. This Aryavarta was colonized by the devas or Aryas, *i.e.*, cultured, and was called Aryavarta because the Aryans...dwelt there."

Dayananda was the first major Indian thinker to realize that a nation needs a common language. He demonstrated the sincerity of his personal conviction by attempting to revive Sanskrit as the common language of India. He later abandoned the idea in favour of Hindi, which he adopted as his common national language. *Satyarth Prakash* is a nationalist work in a two-fold sense: in its contents and in its linguistic format. A born Gujarati, he adopted Hindi as his second mother tongue, and thereby set the pattern for the development of linguistic nationalism in a multi-lingual nation. He was able to transcend his natural feeling for Gujarati for the sake of a greater national cause, and to balance the emotional attachments for both in a practical and exemplary manner.

With respect to the theory of self-rule, an indispensable aspect of nationalism, Dayananda was far in advance of Indian nationalism of his day. He clearly saw that foreign rule, even when 'imbued with parental justice and mercy', could not be a substitute for self-rule. "Whatever may one do, the indigenous rule is always the best. Foreign government cannot be

perfectly beneficial even when it is free from religious bias, race prejudice, and imbued with parental justice and mercy. It is very hard to shake off linguistic differences, cultural angularities, and estrangement due to customs and manners.... It is, therefore, the duty of educated persons to pay due regard to the teachings of the Vedas, Vedic shastras and Vedic history."

This very brief survey of Dayananda's nationalism shows that he had arrived at a sound notion of modern nationalism by his own reflexions and that without the study of any western writer on the subject. "Regeneration of India is difficulty to achieve", he believed, "without having one language, one faith and one aim." If Indians were to emerge as a modern people, they had to do so as the inheritors and the continuators of their ancient religion (the Vedic religion), they must have one scripture (the Vedas), one language (Hindi), and one racial consciousness (being Aryan), and one territory (Aryavarta), and one supreme political authority.

If Dayananda arrived at a conception of modern nationallism without any direct influence from the West, it raises an interesting question about the nature of modern nationalism itself. European scholars, like Elie Kedourie, have generally held the view that nationalism was a nineteenth century European invention, "wholly" developed in Europe, and that nationalisms in Asia and Africa were a "reaction" against European domination. They suffer from artificiality. It is clear that judgements like this do not apply to Swami Dayananda. He is the most authentically Indian of all Indian nationalists.

There is one particular aspect of his nationalist thought which needs special notice, and that is his use of tradition to update tradition. One of the best examples of this is to be found in the sixth chapter of *Satyarth Prakash*, dealing with the theory of state. The Swami's chief source here is the *Laws of Manu*. A careful reading of his comments in the above mentioned chapter would indicate that he is selective and creative in his use of the sources. Tradition for him was not a

completed process, but a continuing process giving movement and direction to itself. Nineteenth century India needed a state based on consent, a kingship that was in harmony with the idea of the welfare of the people. Dayananda finds support for these needs in the traditional sources.

Manu attributes the origin of kingship to superhuman, quasi-divine sources. The king is above the subject, even above the law. But Dayananda ignores these ideas of monarchy, and instead underlines those ideas that support a consent-based view of the king. Mutual restraint should exist between king, assembly and people. Royal greed is more harmful to society than popular greed. The king must understand that greed is the most fundamental social evil, and the root of lust and anger. He must, therefore, be free from the 'ten evils' arising out of anger.

Manu was notorious for defending an unequal social order and a system of justice that defended social privileges. But it also contained ideas that favoured equality under custom and law. It is these latter types of ideas that Dayananda selects for comment. In his hands law and justice become the equalizing forces of society. Social distinctions were to be permitted only on the basis of temperament, ability and training. And punishment should be increased in direct proportion to the status and position of the criminal. On the question of meeting the material needs of modern society Dayananda's attitude towards the outside world was one of selective accommodation. Since the spirit of the Vedas required the harmony of material prosperity and cultural life, there was nothing de-nationalizing about developing modern means of achieving prosperity through the use of science and technology. He fully recognized that social and educational development was required by modern nationalism. In the nineteenth century, at the height of the prestige of the British empire, a prophet like Dayananda was able to negate its claims mentally and intellectually. His insight into the nature of his own tradition enabled him to do this.

PART II

BRITISH COLONIAL INTERPRETATIONS AND PRONOUNCEMENTS

Queen of the Seas ! Enlarge thyself,
Abundant as thou art of life and power,
Be thou the hive of nations,
And send thy swarms abroad !
Send them like Greece of old,
With arts and science to enrich,
The Uncultivated Earth.....

—**Robert Southey**

9

WESTERN IMPACT ON INDIAN AWAKEHING*

I

We have noted the controversy between the British apostle of radical western innovation, the conservative defenders of the *status quo*, and the advocates of the 'line-upon-line, here a little and there a little' policy. The dynamic of the first school, both in its rationalist and religious aspects, was justice, reason, and humanism, the motive of the second fear of popular upheaval, and of the third a mixture of the first two. All parties agreed in condemning the elements in traditional Hinduism which conflicted with western rationalist ideas and Christian values ; they differed in their own first principles and the line of approach. The extreme conservative preached non-interference because he believed in leaving other people alone to their own devices, not because he approved of them. His was the Brahmanical attitude in reverse. The advocates of innovation won the day on the whole because they floated on the flowing tide of western liberal opinion. The new ideas seeped in through members of Parliament and the cabinet, directors and the Company's servants in India, Mounstuart Elphinstone, for example, could not alone have changed policy and outlook in England, but he was himself a symptom of that changing outlook and policy. The innovators were restrained from pushing reform to the point of revolution by the caution

*From V.A. Smith : The *Oxford History of India*, Chapters 5 and 6.

enjoined on upstart imperialists in a great and as yet little-known dominion. Growing knowledge increased respect for the diversity and complexity of Indian life and so bred circumspection in seeking improvement.

The measures of the thirties were born of conviction and nurtured in hope. We must not forget that in England itself it was the age of the Great Reform Bill, when to liberals at least it seemed for a while that the 'world's great age began anew'. During the rest of the century this spirit was never quite extinguished, but the flame of progress flared and flickered, and at times burnt low. The westernizing movement was based on the double belief that it was good for India and that she would accept it as soon as she awoke to the light of the modern world. At first the omens in both directions were favourable. In the forties government's attention was diverted by wars but progress continued out of hearing of the guns. With Dalhousie the flame shot up though the undiscerning were too dazzled by the glare of his wars and annexations to take much notice.

The Mutiny brought the whole question to the focus of public discussion. There were those who considered it proof that India was unchanging and incorrigible ; there were others, like the men of the Panjab school, who were inclined to agree but insisted that these measures should be continued nevertheless on broad grounds of moral duty and humanity. Reform, having become a burden instead of a pleasure, must be shouldered manfully as a duty. There were others who saw the Mutiny more clearly as an interlude or as a protest of conservatives hustled too sharply. But on the whole it was the second school which held the field of opinion, and it was this which set the tone for the next twenty years. The Panjab school were its great exponents and their popularity in England secured a wide acceptance of their views. Self-government must depend on self-reform ; self-reform was so slow that self-government could only come in a very distant future. The British were trustees in the position of long-leaseholders. The effect of this waning of the liberal western faith was seen

in a shift of emphasis in westernizing policy. In Bentinck's time the principal measures were moral and spiritual like the abolition of suttee and the new education policy. Later material projects like irrigation plans appeared. Dalhousie's measures were both moral and material, a fresh impetus to education and to western methods of administration on the one hand, and to public works of all kinds on the other. In the post-Mutiny period the emphasis was more definitely on material improvement. Educational and other moral measures were pursued, it is true, but there was much greater reluctance to interfere in any way with the Indian social structure. The promotion of material improvement both satisfied constructive impulses and allayed fears of another uprising and did something to salve the conscience of the moral reformer. This trend was further strengthened by the prospect of fresh sources of wealth occasioned by the development of railways with their power of tapping new resources.

In the eighties a fresh current of liberalism made itself felt in India, which in Britain was associated with the radicalism of Chamberlain and the later phase of Gladstone. Once more attention was turned to the mind of India. These people thought that they detected westward movements there whose existence their opponents doubted and the official class in India minimized. They wished to make a response in the direction of popular representation. From the late eighties the development of an Indian movement was not doubted in Britain; controversy henceforth turned on its extent and the speed of its growth. By no means all Liberals were convinced of the significance of this new movement before 1900 while leading Conservatives had moved away from the 'unchanging east' dogma by 1890.

We have already noted the beginning of the new education policy in 1835, which was perhaps the most far-reaching single measure in the whole nineteenth century. Without it there could have been no Indian nation as we know it today. The more austere aspects of the westernizing policy were removed by Lord Auckland in 1840, when he restored some govern-

ment patronage to Eastern learning without ceasing to make western learning the main content of official education. On the other hand, the new education was given a great stimulus by the rule that employment in government offices should go to those who had benefited from a course of the new education. English was now as necessary to the literary and secretarial class as Persian had previously been. A knowledge of English could secure entry into that class to those who did not belong to the literary castes. The next landmark was Sir Charles Wood's educational dispatch of 1854, which was eagerly implemented by Dalhousie. 'We are desirous', said the dispatch, 'of extending far more widely the means of acquiring general European knowledge.' The dispatch led to the foundation of the first three universities of Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras in 1857 on the London examining model, though not with London University standards. The grant-in-aid system was introduced, which enabled private colleges to be organized all over the country, by making grants for maintenance provided certain standards were maintained. Departments of public instruction were set up in place of the old amateur committees. This tended to officialize education and make it more stereotyped, but it was a necessary development if the large expansion hoped for was to be guided and controlled. These departments had more ample funds than previously, were able to lay down rules of procedure, and to appoint inspectors. Finally, an educational service was established to provide a cadre of teachers for the new schools and colleges.

As soon as the shock of the Mutiny was past, these measures produced a rapid expansion of higher education. Government schools and colleges were established at important points as model institutions ; the grant-in-aid system encouraged the founding of private institutions both to supplement government colleges in the larger centres and to take their place elsewhere. India was soon covered with a network of public and private colleges and schools. The aim was to popularize education and in this the government certainly succeeded. But this expansion brought its problems also. Attention was concentrated upon high schools and college and primary vernacular

education tended to lag behind, Between 1885 and 1886 the proportion of boys at school to undergraduates at college sank to 314 from 390 to 1. Girls' education still lagged behind owing to public apathy and orthodox opposition. In the interests of popularizing western education, standards were relaxed as soon as it was realized that a high standard would seriously restrict entry. In 1857,2 candidates obtained degrees out of 13 entrants and 111 were admitted out of 464 applicants. This standard was thought to be incompatible with the purpose of 'passing every student of ordinary ability who had fairly profited by the curriculum of school and college study which he had passed through'. The result was a lowering of standards, which, once started, was difficult to stop because there existed no easily available educational yardstick against which to measure Indian standards. The obvious one was that of London University, and once this was abandoned there was no other. There was much to be said for a standard lower than London for the sake of popularization. But no distinction was made between pass and honours candidates. The result was that instead of adding quantity to quality the new system substituted the one for the other. For real quality in western education it was necessary to go to Britain so that Indian education came to acquire a second-rate reputation. It served its purpose of spreading western knowledge widely but failed to produce, on its own merits, a new intellectual *elite*. Fortunately the course of educational history has shown that real talent will break through the worst of systems, and India proved no exception to this rule. Along with failed B.A.s and the barely passed appeared men of real distinction

The new educational service upon which the system now depended was not well managed by government. Its pay did not attract the best men and too often government did not know how to use them when it got them. The successes, like Edwin Arnold, were accidental rather than intentional, and the service was as a whole weighted down by officialdom in its direction and by mediocrity engaged for cheapness in its members. 'Everywhere departmental convenience was preferred, until very recent times, to educational interests ; and

the sort of man whom the departments really liked was one who was willing to be transferred from the teaching of history to the teaching of physics and from that to the inspection of schools'* In the main Indo-European scholars continued to come from the services rather than the educational class in the persons of men like Elliot, William Irvine, Vincent Smith, and Beveridge. A further defect was the lack of any moral content or personal contact in the new system. The universities were not what their name implied, but agencies for prescribing courses and conducting examinations whose headquarters many students never even saw. Nor was the defect remedied in most of the colleges themselves, except some missionary ones, because for financial reasons they tended to place reliance on formal class teaching to overcrowded classes. The mass lecture led to impersonal examination by a remote organization ; the award of a degree certified a modicum of knowledge which was often learned by rot. With such methods it is only surprising that so much came from so little.

Lord Ripon took the next step by appointing the Hunter Commission in 1882. This body surveyed the field of whole education and at least did service in pointing to defect to be remedied. The encouragement of primary and girls' education, of science and moral instruction, were all urged. The most practical result was the reorganization of the educational service which now consisted of three branches, the all India educational service, the provincial, and the subordinate services. The all-India service now attracted a better type of British graduate, while to the provincial service increasing numbers of Indians were appointed. It was hoped to foster primary education by confiding it to the care of the new municipal and district boards. But no great progress came from this well-intentioned move because, apart from the limitation of local resources, such a measure was like confiding the spread of the gospel to the unconverted. Efforts to introduce moral instruction were defeated by official objections and to encourage science by the general preference for literary studies. This, then,

*H.H. Dodwell, *Sketch of the History of India, 1858-1918*, p. 205.

was the general state of education at the end of the century. It was overweighted at the top at the expense of primary education ; that is, the old tradition that education was for the few was largely maintained. The higher education itself was undifferentiated in kind and had achieved popularity at the expense of quality. Nevertheless the educational service had been improved and some of the major problems were realized if not solved. A large impact had been made on the people throughout the country and a new class was fast rising which shared a common language and stock of western knowledge and ideas. The significance of this will be considered in the next chapter ; meanwhile we may note that the whole system was ripe for the reforming hand of a Curzon.

After the Mutiny there were few or no changes attempted in the structure of Indian society, and such as were enacted were by general consent.* The changes introduced were innovations which stood side by side with the traditional social structure, and whose influence upon it, if any, was indirect. In this class we may place the development of local government. In the villages self-government had survived in many areas, and, as we have seen, sedulous attempts were made to preserve the village communities, with varying degrees of success. But in these there was no trace of municipal self-government, the only signs of corporate life being in trade guilds and caste associations. They were often divisive rather than unifying in their effect. The early British settlements had local administrations, but there were in no sense representative of the tax or rate-payers. They were mayors and aldermen with judicial powers and much dignity, but they were nominated by the Company. The rapid growth of the presidency towns raised many administrative problems which prompted many expedients. It was in the seventies that the first municipal bodies with a real representative element were established. In 1872 half the Bombay corporation was elected by ratepayers ; in 1878 the Bombay model was adopted at Calcutta and Madras introduced the representative principle.

*See *The Cambridge History of India*, Vol. VI, p. 394.

These bodies, particularly that of Bombay, were the first real schools of British Indian statesmanship.

Elsewhere Dalhousie's Act of 1850 permitted the setting up of town committees empowered to levy indirect taxes, but few in fact were established. Lord Mayo enlarged their powers over education, sanitation, and local public works. But Lord Ripon is rightly regarded as the real founder of modern local self-government ; his measures were more comprehensive than previous ones and devised with the deliberate intention of introducing democratic practice. 'They are chiefly desirable as a measure of political and popular education', he wrote. He established a network of district and *tahsil* or *taluq* boards in the country and urban boards called municipal committees in the towns. From a half to two-thirds of the members were elected and powers were given to elect non-official chairmen. They were given powers over education, sanitation, public works, and health, and financial authority to levy octroi, terminal, property, and other duties. The fortunes of these bodies were chequered, but there is no doubt that to a large extent they fulfilled their educative purpose even when they fell short in administrative achievement.

Along with these measures must be noted the progress towards the Indianization of the services. The monopoly by the Company's civil service of all posts worth more than Rs. 500 a month established by Cornwallis was mitigated by degrees in the years that followed. Bentinck went farther by creating the posts of *Sadr Amins* and *Principal Sadr Amins*. At the same time the Charter Act of 1833 declared that no one should be debarred from holding any post by reason of race or religion. It even contemplated the substitution of competition for nomination to the covenanted service. But for twenty years more the directors retained their monopoly of appointments. The British in India were a 'commonwealth of magistrates' and 'the higher government officials formed a caste closer than had even the *mansabdars* of Akbar'. Change came but slowly. In 1853 the last Charter Act threw open the covenanted service to competitive examination. But since the

examinations were held in Britain, Indians had not only to make the voyage thither but also had to reside there for a long period. Only the wealthy could do this and they were few. Only the Muslims could come without religious difficulty and they were backward and poor. In these circumstances it was not till 1863 that the first Indian, Satyendra Nath Tagore, entered the service, and the stream remained a trickle until after the first World War. Lytton, who was frank as well as ill-advised, wrote of 'the acknowledged failure to fulfil fairly the promises given'. His remedy was the statutory civil service of 1879. Under this scheme one-sixth of the posts previously held by the civil service were to be filled by men nominated by the local governments. They were to be men of good family whom the subordinate service did not attract. By this means Lytton hoped to coax the old families into partnership with the British. It was far-sighted in its way, but it was the middle class rather than the aristocracy who were anxious to take up the burden of official life. Recruitment therefore languished. In 1887 the statutory service was abolished and replaced by a division of all civil servants into the imperial civil, the provincial, and the sub-ordinate services. The imperial service continued to be recruited by examination, nomination, and promotion in India. One-fifth of the posts reserved to the imperial service were now thrown open to members of the provincial services. At the same time it should be noted that there was during these years a large increase in the numbers of the superior services which also increased opportunities for Indians. Having said so much it remains to add that Lytton was right in his opinion of the position if not altogether happy in his method of dealing with it. Something had been done, but not enough. The failure of the home government to fulfil adequately its promises in the matter of official appointments was a proof, not of their insincerity or ill-will but of the strength of the corporate vested interest which several generations of British officials had built up in India since 1800. No votes were to be won by pressing on reforms of this nature while obstinate and skilful obstruction was certain. The matter was, therefore, shelved until the shock of the first World War.

There were two unofficial westernizing agencies which now demand attention. The first was the press. The first newspaper in India was the *Bengal Gazette*, edited by James Hicky, which appeared in 1780 and was suppressed by Warren Hastings two years later after a stormy and notorious career. From that time a succession of journals appeared and a running fight for freedom of speech was waged with government. This culminated in John Adam's regulation of 1823 requiring a printer to obtain a licence before he could publish a newspaper and his expulsion of the editor John Silk Buckingham for infringing Lord Hastings's regulations. In 1835 Metcalfe freed the press from all restrictions and thereby forfeited his chance of permanent appointment. There matters rested until Lytton's Vernacular Press Act of 1878 which imposed restrictions on the vernacular press only. This in its turn was repealed in 1882. Through these vicissitudes and from gossipy and irresponsible beginnings, the press came to exercise an important influence on Indian life. The English press was at first intended for British readers—the commonwealth of magistrates ; many of its articles were written by officers like Henry Lawrence or Edwardes under pseudonyms. This press constituted a forum of discussion of Indian policy where the merits or faults of a Napier or a Dalhousie were canvassed with unsparing frankness. In time it broadened its outlook. The *Friend of India*, conducted by Marshman of Serampore, struck a Christian and reforming note ; the Calcutta *Statesman* founded by Knight, the Bombay *Times of India*,* and others became responsible organs of opinion on current events and questions. As the English-knowing Indian public grew, these papers became an important factor in forming Indian opinion. They were the unofficial apostles of western influence and all the more effective for being unofficial. Further they stimulated the development of a genuine Indian press, at first in the local languages and then in English as well. Ram Mohan Roy with his Persian *Mirat-ul-Akhbar*** or Mirror of News and *Sambat*

*Founded in 1838 as the *Bombay Times*.

**The first was probably the *Bengal Samachar* of 1816, See S.K. De, *History of Bengali Literature*.

Kammudi (Moon of Intelligence) is rightly regarded as the founder of serious Indian journalism. After the Mutiny papers published in English like the Madras *Hindu* and the Allahabad *Leader* took their places beside their British brethren. They provided for the new westernized class a sort of continuation school as well as a window on the affairs of India as a whole and the world at large. With the coming of political controversy in the eighties they strengthened their hold on the new public and their secondary cultural influence increased in proportion. In a nascent society which had not yet acquired the habit of sustained reading, for which indeed books were not easily available before 1870, which could not afford to buy many of those that were, the newspaper performed an invaluable educative and cultural function.

The second great unofficial influence was that of Christian missions. Christian missionaries had worked in India from the time of St. Francis Xavier in the sixteenth century, and for a time the efforts of de Nobili and other Catholics met with great success in south India. But the effort died away in the eighteenth century* while Protestants were represented by a few Lutherans of whom Swartz was the most distinguished. The Company would not give missionaries licences to reside for fear of the effect of their preaching on the feelings of the people. In consequence the first British Protestants had either to live outside the Company's jurisdiction as the Baptist William Carey did at Serampore, or to serve as Company's chaplains like David Brown of Calcutta or Henry Martyn from Cambridge. In 1813 the ban on entry was raised and at the same time a bishopric created at Calcutta (later increased to three). The gracious Bishop Heber and the fiery Daniel Wilson gave distinction and vigour to the Christian cause in India and from this time the number of Christian bodies at work in India began to multiply, to be reinforced in time by many Americans and some Germans. From preaching the missionaries soon passed to teaching, helped by the new demand for English. A departure of the greatest importance was the Presbyterian

*See the Abbe Dubois's *Christianity in India*, 1818.

Alexander Duff's foundation in 1830 of the Scottish Churches College in Calcutta. The appeal was not only to the villager and to the man in the bazaar, but to the intellectual *elite* as well. From 1854 the grant-in-aid system and government policy encouraged a rapid growth in the number of Christian schools and colleges, of which the Madras Christian College was perhaps the foremost. A further departure was the engagement of missionaries in philanthropic activity in the form of hospitals and medical work, of famine relief, and later in rural 'uplift'. Another feature was the large number of women workers of all kinds who were the pioneers of the women's movement in India. We are not here concerned with the development of the Christian community, which by 1930 constituted two per cent, of the population, but with the impact of this Christian work on India as a whole. On the practical side it presented the Christian ethics in action and on the intellectual side it influenced by implication even more than by precept. Most missionaries presented the gospel in its western dress and they were therefore apostles of the West as well as of the pure spirit of Christ. By their manners and conduct, by their very existence, they were influences in favour of the western outlook. In these ways and in these respects Christian missionaries of all kinds exercised a profound influence, which can never be exactly measured, on the development of the new India. The influence was both positive and negative ; negative by criticism of the old and positive by embodying the new ethic in personal example and corporate practice.

Nowhere was the influence of the missionaries felt more than in relation to the women's movement. India had her own tradition of feminine culture and participation in public affairs. From Sita and Draupadi of the epics the tale ran through Rajput heroines to princesses like Rupmati of Malwa and Ahalya Bai of Indore. But by 1800 there was little trace of feminine culture or public life ; the less attractive aspects of the Hindu conception of the place of women in society were dominant. The new observers of Indian society therefore found little to praise in the condition of Indian women save

their resignation and patient acceptance of suffering, and much to criticize. The targets of disapproval, though not all brought forward at the same time, were suttee, infanticide, child marriage, the plight of Hindu widows, purdah or seclusion from public society, polygamy, and temple prostitution. The first two of these were, as has been explained, regarded as general moral evils, and as such were attacked by the government itself, the first by legislative enactment and the second by a mixture of pressure and persuasion. The rest came within the scope of local custom and as such escaped official action. It was the missionaries who supplied the positive foil to negative government action not only by criticism, but also by setting forth a conception of womanhood new to the India of the day and by providing living examples of its nature. They did this partly by their *zenana* activities which brought new ideas behind the purdah, but still more by their educational activities. In 1830 schools for girls were almost non-existent, except perhaps in the Punjab. The first schools were started in Calcutta in the twenties but were mainly for lower-class girls. The Bethune School in 1849 transferred activity to the girls of upper-class families. It was upheld by Dalhousie for five years from his private purse, eventually to become the first government women's college. There followed medical work for women, which in time became more attactive than education. 'Belief in doctors and hospitals is more widespread than the belief in teachers and schools.' The medical development was later than the educational; the first woman doctor in India was the American Clara Swain who arrived in 1874, and the second the Englishwoman Fanny Butler who came in 1880. Thereafter the landmarks were the launching of the Countess of Dufferin's Fund in 1885, the institution of the Woman's Medical Service in 1914, and the founding of the Lady Hardinge Medical College in New Delhi in 1916. Missionaries led the way in the opening of both women's colleges and hospitals. Half the latter before independence were missionary foundations.

In another way the missionary influence was powerful. What was preached to India at large was practised by the

growing Christian community. There the women's literacy rate was higher than in any other community and Christians predominated in the professions open to women. Thus example was added to precept.

These measures had a practical effect in giving women hope against the traditional monsters of ignorance, pain, and disease. They brought with them a new conception of woman as a personality and of her place in society. The effects of these measures appealed also to the masculine mind and worked both by revealing possibilities not considered before and stirring uneasy feelings at continued acquiescence in the *status quo* now shown to be as unnecessary as undesirable. In this way a reform movement *within* Indian society was born, which has gradually wrested the initiative from external agency and made the movement truly Indian. Many reformers appealed to the Hindu tradition for support, but it was contemporary foreign practice which inspired them.

We have seen how Ram Mohan Roy took up the fight against suttee and infanticide in both of which the government intervened on general moral grounds. Thereafter the *Brahmo Samaj* on reformist and the *Arya Samaj* on revivalist principles both found a religious sanction for the women's movement. The Brahmo Keshub Chander Sen advocated education, widow remarriage, and equality in the religious sphere. The Arya Dayananda championed female education on Vedic principles. The Ramkrishna mission with its missionary technique encouraged women as teachers and preachers. The eclecti. Theosophical movement was long led by two notable women.

By these means the women's movement became naturalized, as it were, within Indian society. Pandit Vidyasagar secured the first Act for raising the age of consent in 1860 and the legalization of widow remarriage, Pandita Ramabai (1858-1922), a learned Sanskritist as well as a Christian, opened her home for widows ; Professor Karve developed his Women's University at Poona and K. Natarajan carried on his work in Bombay. The new ideal woman was neither Sita or Mary, but rather

that of the humanist European tradition, a personality in her own right, a partner in the home and a cherisher of the family, an upholder of grace and culture in society, and an actor in public causes. It was accepted by the advanced classes of both communities who searched their scriptures for supporting texts rather than sought to mould their attitude on orthodox opinion.

It was inevitable that women should seek to express their new ideals in the political as well as other spheres and that their movement should link itself with the political embodiment of the new India, the National Congress. The All-India Women's Conference, founded in 1926, soon took on a political tinge, becoming an unofficial Congress auxiliary. But it remained true to its cause, securing the foundation of the Lady Irwin College in New Delhi. The political cause of women received an impetus from the Montford reforms which led to their enfranchisement on the same terms as men.* Though their voting power was small because of the property qualification, this marked the real beginning of their participation in public life. The Civil Disobedience Movement of 1930—31 gave a further fillip to the movement, for the enthusiasm it aroused led thousands of secluded ladies on to the streets as demonstration marchers, pickets of liquor shops, and so on. Some 2,000 suffered imprisonment for political reasons from 1930 to 1932. Urban Hindu society has never been quite the same since. At the same time a group of brilliant women gave both distinction to their cause and lustre to their sex. The most remarkable was perhaps Mrs. Sarojini Naidu with her combination of personality, wit, eloquence, and literary grace. Mrs. Lakshmi Pandit later attained world fame, while the Begam Shah Nawaz in the Panjab revived memories of Mughul princesses.

In the second half of the century the government left with increasing relief the moral side of improvement to unofficial agencies, while it concentrated on the material. It was the

*As a result of the Muddiman Committee Report in 1925.

great age of public works. Dalhousie, the creator of the public works department, was as enthusiastic for these as for annexation. Lawrence ran into deficits for their sake. He introduced the principle of borrowing for productive works which was first regularized and then extended by his successors. Foremost amongst these was the railways, which developed from 200 miles of track in 1857 to 40,000 by 1940. They have already been considered in the last chapter. They made welfare possible rather than being themselves welfare measures. Here mention may be made of two great designs of direct material benefit. The first of these is irrigation. Irrigation is an age-old art in India. The early British observers found many ruined tanks built by south Indian kings and many which were still in use.* Firuz Shah Tughluq built a canal to Hissar which Shahjahan repaired and extended to Delhi. Even the Sikhs built a few small ones. The first phase, inaugurated by Lord Hastings, was that of restoration. In 1820 water flowed into Delhi once more and the people turned out in gala dress to welcome it. The second was the design of large original works. These were first carried out where water was plentiful, and had the effect of making land where some cultivation was already possible more productive and secure against drought. The first great work of this kind in the north was the Ganges canal, described by Dalhousie in 1856 as 'unequalled in its class and character among the efforts of civilised nations'. In the south the Grand Anicut was built two miles long across the bed of the Cauvery in 1835-6. From 1892 canals were built to irrigate waste land in regions of little or no rainfall. The Punjab and Sind were the chief beneficiaries of this phase which, with its Punjab canals and canal colonies, made the Punjab the most prosperous province of India, and which culminated in the Sukkur barrage in Sind in the nineteen-twenties. The Sukkur barrage, even before its Pakistan extensions, was the largest of its kind in the world; the Godavari system extends over 2,500 miles and the Upper and Lower Ganges canals over 8,000 miles. In the Punjab the area

*It is estimated that there are 4,000 tanks or *erays* in Madras and as many in Mysore.

of irrigated land was double that of Egypt. In British India by 1940 32½ million acres or one-fifth of the cultivated area was irrigated land.

The other great welfare work was the development of famine policy. Famines have periodically visited all parts of India through the failure of rains. Little action beyond resignation to the will of nature was possible because of the lack of means of transport and the slowness of that which existed. Akbar attempted some relief but for the most part little was done. The same held good in the first great famine of British India, that of Bengal in 1769-70, which swept off a third to a half of the population. At first relief methods were spasmodic, *ad hoc*, and uncertain. Relief was attempted in the famine of 1837-8 in the upper Ganges and Jumna regions. In 1866 the Orissa famine was estimated to have carried off a quarter of the population through the failure of the Bengal authorities to act in time. The great famine of 1876-8 was attacked energetically but unsystematically. Out of this visitation, however, came Lytton's Commission of 1880 under Sir Richard Strachey, from which came the Famine Code of 1883. The code laid down procedure for detecting the symptoms of food shortage, for declaring first a state of scarcity and then of famine. The main principles were the use of railways and shipping to bring in grain from unaffected areas or from overseas, the regulation of relief and the provision of work of a productive kind for the able-bodied. These new rules were embodied in a series of provincial codes and improved as a result of the Macdonnell Commission's report in 1901 after the series of famines between 1896 and 1900. The Famine Code could not prevent famine, but succeeded in converting the terrible famines of food into more tolerable famines of work. The Famine Code used the new resources of science and planning to deaden the force of India's most terrible scourge.

II

The benevolence of an alien government and administrative measures were not in themselves sufficient to create a new India ; without the breath of internal life to animate them they would form no more than the dry bones of regeneration. We

have therefore to consider the Indian reaction to the government and the measures which came to them from abroad. The first Indian reaction to the Europeans in India was one of curiosity and interest, which in the case of the Portuguese soon turned to hostility. But apart from the coastal regions where Portuguese power had to be reckoned with, curiosity remained the dominant attitude in Mughul times, whether it was Akbar questioning Jesuit missionaries or Jahangir exchanging drinks or pictures with a Hawkins or Sir Thomas Roe. Europeans were people to be used to advantage whether in commerce or war. When in the eighteenth century the Europeans developed military power their help was sought in local conflicts; when their power was seen to be a political menace the reaction was a military one. The rajas and nawabs sought European arms, European systems of discipline and military organization, and European auxiliaries in order to repel the threat from abroad. But they went no further, seeking to borrow just enough from the new alien culture to preserve themselves. The tale ran from Mir Kasim to Ranjit Singh, ending finally at Gujarat in 1849.

By 1820 India as a whole recognized that mere military skill would not exercise the unwelcome new spirit. Those closest to the British also realized that the western invasion was not to be confined to rulers and soldiers. New British were not to be old Mughuls writ large; by their administrative arrangements and their itch for improvements they were unsettling the old modes of life; while their boundless self-confidence in their civilization made them ready to seize opportunities for introducing it into the country. Only caution as to the consequences and some regard for tradition restrained their eagerness. The restoration of order was to be but the prelude to revolution. From the late eighteenth century when the *vakils* of the country powers had friendly converse with Warren Hastings and Ghulam Husain Khan reflected on the changing times, men were beginning to think out their attitude to this larger threat. The first reaction in both Hindu and Muslim circles was the conservative one. Political submission must not be followed by cultural *hari-kari*. Apart from the borrowing of such externals as European uniforms, furniture,

novelties, and wines the attitude was one of aloofness. Rather than share in the new world the old governing classes withdrew from it. Their refuge in British India was their estates and their memories, elsewhere the courts of the surviving princes. The religious conservatives, whether Brahmans or *maulvis*, took the same line ; they opposed innovation and withdrew as far as possible from contact with it. But complete withdrawal was impossible as the interfering measures of Bentinck were followed up by Auckland, Ellenborough, and Da'housie. A reservoir of emotional distaste was thus collected by such measures as western education, abolition of rent free tenures for religious purposes, the neglect of Persian, the introduction of the telegraph, stream power, and railways, and Christian activity. From these sources came the popular pressure which lay behind the Mutiny in which it found its outlet.

But there were others who were either more or lese far-sighted than the mass of lovers of the old ways. The smallest of the groups was prepared to surrender in the cultural battle as it had done in the political. It existed chiefly in Calcutta. There it was influenced by the rationalism prevalent among the British including the famous watchmaker David Hare and the young Anglo-Indian Derozio, and by the Christian persuasions of Alexander Duff. There was a short lived movement among young intellectuals to renounce Hinduism and all its works whose outward signs were Christian baptism and beef-eating clubs. As a movement this died away after 1840. The larger movement contained those who, though anxious to remain loyal to their cultural and religious past, realized that religion in its existing state could offer no antidote to the foreign influences. They thus sought to strengthen the old by purifying it, and they would purify by going back to the sources to their faith. They were the Protestant reformers of Hinduism and Islam.

The first of these movements was that of the *Brahmo Samaj* founded by Ram Mohan Roy in 1828. The aim of the group which gathered round Ram Mohan Roy was to meet criticisms of Hinduism by removing the accretions of ages. Ram

Mohan Roy went back to the Upanishads for his authority and there he found the principle of reason leading to a lofty intellectual theism. From this citedel he could denounce the evils of latter-day Hinduism such as idolatry and polygamy, suttee and female infanticide. He could also use against European critics their own weapon of reason, with such effect that one missionary became a Unitarian. 'Ram Mohan', says Dr. Farquhar, 'believed he was restoring Hindu worship to its pristine purity.' The *Samaj* was joined by Dwarkanath Tagore, whose son Devendranath became its head; it was developed and disrupted by the wayward genius Keshub Chander Sen, parallel societies were formed in Madras, Bombay, and Lahore. It has remained small but influential, tolerant, and intellectual but lacking in broad popular sympathy. It was the intellectual's rather than everyman's response to the western challenge.

The *Brahmo Samaj* remained a select society, in spite of the efforts of Keshub Chander Sen; the *Arya Samaj* was a cult on the old lines. Whereas Ram Mohan Roy went to the Upanishads for his inspiration, the founder of the *Arya Samaj*, Swami Dayananda,* relied on the four Vedas. Dayananda was born in 1824 in Gujarat, attained enlightenment by the orthodox process of austerity, and founded his society in 1875. He was devoted, emphatic, and militant. In his return to the primitive scriptures and his pugnacious attitude to Brahmanism he was a Luther to Ram Mohan Roy's Erasmus. He denounced idolatry, polygamy, and caste, preached a return to the simplicity of Vedic ritual and the austerity of Vedic manners, and maintained that all truth was to be found in the four Vedas. The movement proved to have moral vigour. It became an important influence in the Punjab and was active elsewhere. It was a curious mixture of old and new, of breadth and sectarianism. Within Hindu society it attacked Brahman privilege and was a strong reforming influence; without it opposed Islam with bitterness and Christian activity with

*Swami Dayananda died in 1883. Prominent members of the *Arya Samaj* were Lala Lajpat Rai, founder of the Servants of the People Society and Rai Sahib Harbilas Sarda, sponsor of the Sarda Act.

vigour. Its greatest obstacle was the contradiction between its modern outlook in such things as education and its 'fundamentalist' assumptions. For this reason many who were attracted by its anti-Brahmanism were repelled in turn by its anti-rationalism. The *Samaj* had most appeal in the north, where Brahman influence was not strong, but made little headway in the east and south. It helped to awaken without succeeding in uniting the new India.

A further response to the western challenge came from the followers of Ramkrishna Parahamsa. If Ram Mohan Roy was the mind, Dayananda the physical arm, Ramkrishna was the soul of the new India. Ramkrishna, who spent most of his life at a temple near Calcutta,* was a *bhakti* in the great tradition who sought to realize God by the *bhakti marga* or path of loving devotion. After twelve years of storm he attained peace and spent the rest of his life talking to admirers, disciples, seekers, and the curious. While his personal way was that of self-surrender, his theology was Vedantic. His disciples devoted themselves to the spread of his teaching and found a leader in Swami Vivekananda** and a talented follower in the Englishwoman Sister Nivedita.*** Vivekananda added social service and self-reliance to the traditional Hindu devotion and did much to rehabilitate Hinduism in the eyes of both Indians and the world by his tours and advocacy at the Chicago World Conference of Religions in 1893. His legacy was the Ramkrishna mission which was notable for good works and the view that all religions are at bottom the same. Ramkrishna and his disciples did much to restore Hinduism's confidence in itself and in its status in the world. But Ramkrishna has not proved a new Buddha any more than Dayananda. Perhaps the gulf between his ascetic devotion and the modern world was too great ; he did something to fill an emotional void in the soul of modern India, but his real answer to the

*At Dakshineshwar, four miles north of Calcutta. He lived from 1834 to 1886.

**Lived 1862-1902.

***Miss Margaret Noble. She died in 1911.

problems, practical and intellectual, of the new generation, was to withdraw from them. People were inspired and comforted by these men rather than converted by them. They were heralds of the new India rather than its *avatars*.

One more movement may be cited, that of theosophy. The Theosophical Society was founded in 1875 by Madame Blavatsky, a talented and colourful Russian lady. The society was at first a spiritualist one. It attained influence in India under the leadership of Mrs. Annie Besant with its head-quarters at Adyar near Madras. Spiritualism led to the *rishis* of the Himalayas as the repositories of spiritual truth. As a cult theosophy was eventually discredited by the controversies which surrounded it, and by the cult of the Messiah of Mrs. Besant's latter days. It was too vague to develop from a fashion or an influence to a sect or a religion. But its influence was nevertheless considerable ; its religious syncretism satisfied those who wanted reassurance in the Hindu religion in the face of modern criticism, while its pseudo-intellectualism attracted those who were repelled by the emotionalism of Ramkrishna. It praised Hinduism in western terms without demanding any particular action. For this reason it had much vogue among the wasternized classes during the early years of the century. Mrs. Besant became a figure in public affairs. With Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya she founded the Benares Hindu University and had her hour of political fame as the creator of the Home Rule League in 1915. But the movement was too shallow to take deep root and too lacking in a positive programme to carry the country with it for long. It was another milestone on the Indian path to nationhood.

In the Muslim community similar movements were stirring though they were a full generation behind those within Hindu society. The Muslims had lost temporal dominion and inner self-confidence at the same moment and for some time seemed too stunned to be able to recover. But the same pattern can be traced, though it took shape more slowly and at a later

date. There were the *Wahabis** of Patna and Moradabad with their call to the puritan simplicity of primitive Islam. There was the heterodox Ahmadiya movement** of Qadian in the Punjab with its affinities with Bahaism in Persia. And there was the syuthetic mind of Sayyid Ahmad Khan,*** who sought to reconcile the spirit of Islam with that of the modern West. In some ways his work was easier than that of Ram Mohan Roy because there was much more common ground between western and Islamic than between western and Hindu ideas. In other ways it was more difficult because Muslims were more hostile to the West than Hindus as their political supplanters, were less educated and so less open to new ideas, and were more deeply bound by tradition. Sayyid Ahmad Khan's great achievement was the foundation in 1875 of the Anglo-Arabic College at Aligarh, later to become the Aligarh Muslim University.

The cult which eventually united the new westernized classes was the un-Indian one of nationalism. The mind which made this possible was that of Ram Mohan Roy. For this reason he may be described as the greatest creative personality of nineteenth-century India. For he was much more than the founder of the *Brahmo Samaj* and an active public figure. During his seventeen years of public activity between 1813 and 1830 he laid down the main lines of advance for what was to become the Indian national movement. His attitude towards the West was neither that of surrender, withdrawal, or conflict. It was one of comprehension. The new world from the West was not to be a substitute but a supplement to the old. Synthesis, which is different to syncretism, was his remedy for the predicament of Hinduism. The instrument of synthesis was reason, the principle he found enshrined in the Upanishads. Once this was accepted the western challenge could be met face to face. Western loans would not involve eastern apostasy ; loyalty and reform could go hand in hand. On this

*The title came from resemblance to rather than identity with the Arabian movement of that name.

**Founded by Mirza Ghulam Ahmed (*c.* 1838-1908) about 1879.

***1815—98.

basis he accepted theism as an Upanishadic doctrine; he accepted individuality from the same source, and with it the whole liberal gospel of political rights. He held a dinner to celebrate the 1830 revolution in France. His treatment of suttee was characteristic. He condemned it on moral grounds, but at the same time supported his position by quotations from sacred texts while refuting those quoted by his opponents. A Hindu could accept the moral rationalism of the West because real Hinduism was both moral and rational. We are not here concerned with the ultimate validity of this contention as with its historical relevance; it provided the rising westernized class with just that bridge between their old and new mental worlds which they needed.

It is now time to turn to the fortunes of this class itself. The old middle class of India played a very subordinate part in the affairs of India. It was divided by distance, by language, by caste feeling, and by occupation. It had no common consciousness and was dependent everywhere on the intellectual aristocracy of the Brahmans and the landed aristocracy of *sardars* and *zamindars*. The merchant had little in common with the government official, or the doctor with the lawyer. Each profession or vocation was insulated from others by walls of custom and prejudice. No common consciousness was possible until this exclusiveness between upper and lower, between group and group was broken down. The first step in the process was taken by the British in their earlier years, by the removal or setting aside of the old upper classes. Their political encroachments culminated in the exclusion of higher Indian agency in government service by Cornwallis in 1793. The old rulers retired in proud poverty to muse on past glories and saw no reason for learning a foreign language which could lead to no honourable employment. The new land settlements tended also to eclipse the old landed gentry. Polygars disappeared in Madras, *zamindaris* changed hands in Bengal, *jagirs* were reduced and the holders of rent-free tenures found their rights called in question.* Those that survived could hope for no suitable government employment and their local

*Under Bentinck and specially by the Imam Commission of Bombay.

influence was steadily whittled away by the clipping of their legal and revenue powers. These people could not obtain suitable public employment and would not equip themselves for a place in the new order by taking up western education.

The way was thus cleared for the middle class. The cover, as it were, was taken off Indian society and with it the old limits to their aspirations. But at first development was one-sided and capricious. The first groups to benefit were the merchants and financiers at the seats of British power, the go-betweens of the new order. Many of the more successful purchased *zamindaris* as they lapsed after the Permanent Settlement of 1793. Merchants in general profited by the new security. There was a rush to learn English from these classes at the British ports, for what were in most cases freely admitted to be business reasons. But there was yet no solidarity with other sections of the class. *Bania* or *sowarkar* had no truck with *kayasth* or *khattri*, or hakim and *vaid* with *maulvi* and *pandit*. There were no common bonds, no spiritual links. It was these which the next batch of British measures in the thirties were to provide—the reforms of Bentinck and his successors. The official teaching of English was a utilitarian measure, and was welcomed as such even by the conservative Raja Radhakant Deb. But with it went western knowledge and science so that with the new language came knowledge of the new world. The transition from Persian to English as the language of government business and the higher courts greatly increased the use and so the demand for English. Presently came with Dalhousie the great expansion of schools and colleges under the grant-in-aid system (from 1854).

With this increased demand for English in subordinate posts went the rise of new professions which offered scope and status to men of ability. The new colleges and schools required teachers whose position in society was honourable. The new legal system required professional lawyers, who again were men of independence and position. The profession of western medicine was introduced with Bentinck's Calcutta Medical College. In the administration itself opportunities of service were widening with the opening of higher services to

Indian appointment and the increasing prestige of lesser offices like those of *tahsildar*. The advance of western techniques created further openings for the enterprising in the railways (from 1856), the public works departments, the engineering, forest, and other services. All these services were closed to those too proud to serve in subordinate positions but offered enlargement to those anxious to make their way. Thus the upper class continued to hold aloof and the middle class to expand and profit. Even Lytton's statutory civil service failed to attract the former, but its successor, the provincial service, was eagerly sought after by the latter. It was a grand administrative example of the meek inherting the earth.

Not only was the middle class stimulated and expanded by the new opportunities ; it was drawn together as never before. The new education gave it a common language and common stock of ideas and knowledge to be held side by side with its various sectional traditions. The new press continued their contact with the new mental world and enabled their own reactions to it to circulate. The new communications enabled Madras to talk to Delhi and Bombay to meet with Calcutta. Thus in the fifty years between the new education policy and the Ilbert Bill was born from the middle stratum of society a new integrated all-India class with varied background but a common foreground of knowledge, ideas, and values. Of course it was a minority of Indian society. But the important thing about it was that it was a dynamic minority. It had a sense of unity, of purpose, and of hope. It was the newborn soul of modern India. In time it was to infuse the whole of India with its spirit.

It was inevitable that this new class should aspire to a political expression of its views. The whole European liberal movement of the nineteenth century was keyed in political terms ; in thinking in these terms the new class was only practising the precepts it had received. It was also inevitable that there should be some friction between alien governors and native governed. The one was not likely to want to retire at exactly the same pace as the other wished to advance. The relevant questions were how much, for how long, and with

what results. We have seen that the British from the thirties envisaged eventual self-government, but that after the Mutiny their definition of 'eventual' became decidedly elastic. There was thus clearly a community of ultimate aims with an early difference in the matter of pace. But two other factors intervened. In the first place the British looked for the leaders of the new India in the wrong direction. The earlier administrators assumed that the leaders would come from the old governing class. Elphinstone's proposed Indianization of a Bombay district was to be carried out by this class, and so were Malcolm's similar suggestions ; Dalhousie looked to this class for an Indian appointment to his new Legislative Council ; Henry Lawrence staked his whole career on the regeneration of the Sikh *sardars* ; Canning drew on this class for the first Indian appointments to the new Legislative Council in 1862 ; and Lytton looked to them to man his satutory civil service. When it was clear that they were not forthcoming from this class in any number many British officials ceased to look any farther. When political gestures began to come from the new middle-class these men refused to regard them as valid. Can any good thing come out of Nazareth, was their attitude. Henceforth British opinion, both in India and England, was divided on the genuineness of the middle class national movement. Before 1914 the majority view minimized its importance ; it was only at the end of the nineteen-twenties, and largely as a result of the efforts of Lord Halifax, that a consensus of British opinion accepted the Indian national movement as the major political fact of Indian life. In the second place, as the country became settled, British officials tended to concern themselves less and less with politics and more and more with administration. The aim of efficiency in government tended to replace that of understanding the people. There was so much to do that there was less time to confer and consider. Speakers and leaders with little public experience, whose ideas of public affairs came from the liberal literature of Europe and Britain, seemed to them to be impractical dreamers. There was here a cash of temperament which in the circumstances was unavoidable.

The new class found its growth stimulated by the opposite ingredients of encouragement and opposition. On the positive side was the attitude of the more far-sighted governor-generals from Bentinck downwards, declarations like the Charter Act of 1833 and the Queen's Proclamation of 1858, the first steps in the Indianization of the legislature, the judiciary, and the services and the growing support of liberal opinion in England. The influence of Gladstone in this respect was most important. Another encouraging factor, in that it increased feelings of self-respect, was the new interest in Indian culture and letters in Europe, which, beginning with the work of Sir Williams Jones in the late eighteenth century, spread throughout Europe in the nineteenth. On the reverse side there was the impatience engendered by the tardiness and modesty of the Indianization process; there was the resentment aroused by the keen criticism of Indian institutions and the widespread assumption that they were barbarous rather than civilized*; there was, specially in western India, resentment at what was thought to be unfair commercial discrimination, and there was the bitterness aroused by the racial slights to which the lower ranks of Europeans were increasingly addicted.

The first centre of political action was the eloquent and volatile world of Calcutta. Discussions on ethics and social reforms easily passed on into politics. The first body which can be called political was the British Indian Association founded in the forties. It was a decorous body of landowners, concerned mainly with safeguarding its own interests, which expressed preferences rather than made demands. In 1876 the Indian Association was formed by Surendranath Bannerjea who had become a teacher after a brief career in the civil service. He joined organizing ability to eloquence, and soon found objects to absorb his energies. The lowering of the age of entrance to the civil service (thus further prejudicing Indian chances of entry) was the first of these and enabled him to found branch associations. Lytton's Press Act of 1878 provided another and still more popular issue.

*See J. Mill, *History of India*, Books II and III. Macaulay and indeed many Liberals were sinners in this respect.

Then came Ripon as the harbinger of Gladstonianism to India. If he had been a more forceful character he would not have prevented the formation of Congress but he might have strengthened those elements which wished to achieve their ideals in harmonious co-operation with the British. His first measures raised both the self-confidence and the prestige of the new nationalists. Then came the Ilbert Bill controversy, with its bitter expression of racial antagonism and suspicion, its flouting of authority and its well-organized agitation among the non-official European community of Bengal. This was the spur which finally drove the young nationalists to decided action, the reagent which precipitated the solution of the Indian Congress. The example of successful agitation, and the knowledge of such bodies as the Anti-Corn Law League and the Irish Land and National Leagues produced action on similar lines.

The first meeting of the Indian National Congress took place in Bombay in December, 1885. It was supported at the outset by a group of liberal-minded Englishmen, including A O. Hume, son of the radical Joseph Hume and a retired civil servant, Sir W. Weddeburn, Sir David Yule, and later Sir Henry Cotton. The first session comprised only seventy members, who had elected themselves by paying a small fee. They were mainly lawyers, journalists, and schoolmasters. The second session contained nearly 450 members chosen by public meetings and bodies. From that time there was no looking back. The Congress became an annual large-scale conference containing representatives from all communities and all provinces. The only group which noticeably held back was the Muslim under the advice of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan; democratic government, he said, would be government by Hindus. The Congress soon developed its organization of annual president, working committee, and full session, its procedure of presidential address, debates, and resolutions. It organized a network of local branches, it developed its own *ethos* or atmosphere. It soon became a party without ceasing to be a movement and around it grew up a circle of sympathizers more numerous than its actual membership. Outside the great cities membership was

still something of an adventure and mere attendance at its meeiings required an act of will.

The attitude of the government to this development was cautious but not unfriendly. Lord Dufferin recognized something of its significance and gave it a remote and olympian blessing. He used its rise as an occasion for pressing for an extension of the council system which led, after four years of discussion, to the Indian Councils Act of 1892. Though this by no means satisfied all, it had certain concrete results. The fact of election, disguised as recommendation for nomination, opened the door for the entry of Congressmen into these hitherto aristocratic purlieus. G.K. Gokhale entered the Central Legislative Council and soon became one its outstanding members. The enlargement of the Council's powers to include a discussion on the budget enabled questions of general policy as well as particular proposals to be discussed. Gokhale's annual budget speech at Calcutta became, with the Congress president's inaugural address, the twin political event of the new nationalist world.

Within Congress itself trends and strains soon developed. At the outset the prevailing influence was Gladstonian liberalism with some tincture of Italian idealism. This long remained the dominant school, but there was from the beginning another current which looked upon liberalism as a means rather than an end. Their end, like that of their colleagues, was self-government, but their concept of its form was more Indian than European, more traditional than democratic. From the beginning Bombay played an equal part with Calcutta in shaping the Congress destinies. The second president was the Parsi liberal Dadabhai Naoroji, who was also for some years a Liberal member of the British Parliament, and the third was a Bombay Muslim. It was in Bombay that the tension between the two views first became evident. It was embodied in the persons of two Chitpavan Brahmans of Poona, G.K. Goknale, the disciple of Justice Ranade, and Bal Gangadhar Tilak, the editor of the Marathi newspaper *Kesari*. Tilak looked backward to Sivaji and the glories of Maratha empire, while Gokhale looked forward to parliamentary rule based on liberal rationalism. The

difference of view was revealed in the Bombay cholera crisis of 1897 when Tilak encouraged orthodox resistance to measures of health precaution, praised Sivaji's violence on Afzal Khan as being above the moral law, and was imprisoned for incitement to disaffection. Thus began the division between moderates and extremists.

Thus by the end of the century, within fifteen years of its foundation, the members of the Congress had seized the initiative in internal Indian affairs. The class from which they sprang was described by Lord Dufferin in 1888 as a 'microscopic minority'. The statement was statistically correct ; what mattered this was that small and thinly spread group had become possessed of a creative idea, which was eventually to give them the leadership of the dormant masses and the drugged upper classes. The minority was creative and dynamic. It was a leaven which would leaven the whole lump. And the leaven was principally a western leaven.

10

DEFENCE OF IMPERIALISM*

I

The question how we conquered India does not at all resemble the questions which I raised in the last course. Our colonists in the new world occupied, to be sure, a vast territory, but it was comparatively an empty territory. The difficulties they encountered arose not so much from the natives, as from the rivalry of other European nations. By what degrees and from what causes we gained the advantage over these rivals, I partly discussed. It was a question to which the answer was not at once obvious, but at the same time not extremely difficult to find. On the other hand it is at first sight extremely perplexing to understand how we could conquer India. Here the population was dense, and its civilisation, though descending along a different stream of tradition, was as real and ancient as our own. We have learnt from many instances in European history to think it almost impossible really to conquer an intelligent people wholly alien in language and religion from its invaders. The whole power of Spain could not in eighty years conquer the Dutch provinces with their petty population. The Swiss could not be conquered in old time, nor the Greeks the other day. Nay, at the very time when we made the first steps in the conquest of India, we showed ourselves wholly unable to reduce to obedience three millions of our own race in America, who had thrown off their allegiance to the English Crown. What a singular contrast is here ! Never did the English show so much languid incompetence as in the American War, so that it might

*From J.R. Seeley : *Expansion of England*, Lectures III and IV.

have seemed evident that their age of greatness was over, and that the decline of England had begun. But precisely at this time they were appearing as irresistible conquerors in India, and showing a superiority which led them to fancy themselves a nation of heroes. How is the contradiction to be explained ?

History is studied with so little seriousness, with so little desire or expectation of arriving at any solid result, that the contradiction passes almost unremarked, or at most gives occasion to a triumphant reflection that after all there was life in us yet. And indeed it may seem that, however difficult of explanation the fact may be, there can be no doubt of it. Over and over again in India, at Plassey, at Assaye, and on a hundred other battlefields, our troops have been victorious against great odds, so that here at least it seems that we may indulge our national self-complacency without restraint, and feel that at any rate in comparison with the Hindu races we really are terrible fellows !

But does this hypothesis really remove the difficulty ? Suppose that one Englishman is really equal as a soldier to ten or twenty Hindus, can we even then conceive the whole of India conquered by the English ? There were not more than twelve millions of Englishmen at the time when the conquest began it, and was made in a period when England had other wars on her hands. Clive's career falls partly in the Seven Years' War of Europe, and the great annexations of Lord Wellesley were made in the midst of our war with Napoleon. We are not a military state. We did not in those times profess to be able to put on foot at any moment a great expeditionary army. Accordingly in our European wars we usually confined ourselves to acting with our fleet, while for hostilities on land it was our practice to subsidise any ally we might have among the military states, at one time Austria, at another Prussia. How then in spite of all this weakness by land could we manage to conquer during this time the greater part of India, an enormous region of nearly a million square miles and inhabited by two hundred millions of people ! What a drain such a work must have made upon our military force, what a

drain upon upon our trensury ! And yet somehow the drain seems never to have been perceived. Our European wars involved us in a debt that we have never been able to pay. But our Indian wars have not swelled the National Debt. The exertions we had to make there seem to have left no trace behind them,

It seems then that there must be something wrong in the conception which is current, that a number of soldiers went over from England to India, and there by sheer superiority in valour and intelligence conquered the whole country. In the last great Mahratta war of 1818 we had, it appears, more than a hundred thousand men in the field. But what ! that was the time of mortal exhaustion that succeeded the great Napoleonic War. Is it possible that only three years after the battle of Waterloo we were at war again on a vast scale and had a much greater army in India than Lord Wellington had in Spain ! Again at the present moment the army kept in foot in India amounts to two hundred thousand men. What ! two hundred thousand English soldiers ! And yet we are not a military State !

You see of course what the fact is that I point at. This Indian army, we all know, does not consist of English soldiers, but mainly of native troops. Out of 200,000 only 65,000, or less than a third, are English. And even this proportion has only been established since the mutiny, after which catastrophe the English troops were increased and the native troops diminished in number. Thus I find that at the time of the mutiny there were 45,000 European troops to 235,000 native troops in India—that is, less than a fifth. In 1808 again I find only 25,000 Englishmen to 130,000 natives—that is, somewhat less than a fifth. The same proportion obtained in 1773 at the time of the Regulating Act, when British India first took shape. At that date the Company's army consisted of 9000 Europeans and 45,000 natives. Before that I find the proportion of Europeans even lower—about a seventh ; and if we go back to the very beginning we find that from the first the Indian army was rather a native than a European force. Thus Colonel

Chesney opens his historical view of it in these words : "The first establishment of the Company's Indian Army may be considered to date from the year 1748, when a small body of sepoys was raised at Madras after the example set by the French, for the defence of that settlement....At the same time a small European force was raised, formed of such sailors as could be spared from the ships on the coast and of men smuggled on board the Company's vessels in England by the crimps."

In the early battles of the Company by which its power was decisively established, at the siege of Arcot, at Plassey, at Buxar, there seem almost always to have been more sepoys than Europeans on the side of the Company. And let us observe further that we do not hear of the sepoys as fighting ill, or of the English as bearing the whole brunt of the conflict. No one who has remarked the childish eagerness with which historians indulge their national vanity, will be surprised to find that our English writers in describing these battles seem unable to discern the sepoys. Read Macaulay's Essay on Clive ; everywhere it is "the imperial people," "the mighty children of the sea," "none could resist Clive and his Englishmen." But if once it is admitted that the sepoys always outnumbered the English, and that they kept pace with the English in efficiency as soldiers, the whole theory which attributes our successes to an immeasurable natural superiority in valour falls to the ground. In those battles in which our troops were to the enemy as one to ten, it will appear that if we may say that one Englishman showed himself equal to ten natives, we may also say that one sepoy did the same. It follows that, though no doubt there was a difference, it was not so much a difference of race as a difference of discipline, of military science, and also no doubt in many cases a difference of leadership.

Observe that Mill's summary explanation of the conquest of India says nothing of any natural superiority on the part of the English. "The two important discoveries for conquering India were : 1st, the weakness of the native armies against European discipline ; 2ndly, the facility of imparting that

discipline to natives in the European service." He adds : "Both discoveries were made by the French."

And even if we should admit that the English fought better than the sepoys, and took more than their share in those achievements which both performed in common, it remains entirely incorrect to speak of the English nation as having conquered the nations of India. The nations of India have been conquered by an army of which on the average about a fifth part was English. But we not only exaggerate our own share in the achievement : we at the same time entirely misconceive and misdescribe the achievement itself. For from what race were the other four fifths of the army drawn ? From the natives of India themselves ! India can hardly be said to have been conquered at all by foreigners ; she has rather conquered herself. If we were justified, which we are not, in personifying India as we personify France or England, we could not describe her as overwhelmed by a foreign enemy ; we should rather have to say that she elected to put an end to anarchy by submitting to a single Government, even though that Government was in the hands of foreigners.

But that description would be as false and misleading as the other, or as any expression which presupposes India to have been a conscious political whole. The truth is that there was no India in the political, and scarcely in any other sense. The word was a geographical expression, and therefore India was easily conquered, just as Italy and Germany fell an easy prey to Napoleon, because there was no Italy and no Germany, and not even any strong Italian or German national feeling. Because there was no Germany, Napoleon was able to set one German state against another, so that in fighting with Austria or Prussia he had Bavaria and Wurttemberge for allies. As Napoleon saw that this means of conquest lay ready to his hand in Central Europe, so the Frenchman Dupleix early perceived that this road to empire in India lay open to any European state that might have factories there. He saw a condition of chronic war between one Indian state and another, and he perceived that by interfering in their quarrels the foreigner

might arrive to hold the balance between them. He acted upon this view, and accordingly the whole history of European Empire in India begins with the interference of the French in the war of succession in Hyderabad that broke out on the death of the great Nizam-ul Mulk (1748).

The fundamental fact *then is that India had no jealousy of the foreigner, because India had no sense whatever of national unit, because there was no India, and therefore. properly speaking, no foreign.* So far, as I have pointed out, parallel examples may be found in Europe. But we must imagine a much greater degree of political deadness in India than in German eighty years ago, if we would understand the fact now under consideration, the fact namely that the Euglish conquered India by means of a sepoy army. In Germany there was scarcely any German feeling, but there was a certain amount, though not a very great amount, of Prussian feeling, Austrian feeling, Bavarian feeling, Suabian feeling. Napoleon is able set to Bavaria against Austria or both against Prussia, but he does not attempt to set Bavaria or Austria or Prussia against itself. To speak more distinctly, he procures by treaties that the Elector of Bavaria shall furnish a contingent to the army which he leads against Austria ; but he does not, simply by offering pay, raise an army of Germans and then use them in the conquest of Germany. This would be the exact parallel to what has been witnessed in India. A parallel to the fact that India has been conquered by an army of which four-fifths were natives and only one-fifth English, would be found in Europe, if England had invaded France, and then by offering good pay had raised an army of Frenchmen large enough to conquer the country. The very idea seems monstrous. What ! you exclaim, an army of Frenchmen quietly undertake to make war upon France ! And yet, if you reflect, you will see that such a thing is abstractedly quite possible, and that it might have been witnessed if the past history of France had been different. We can imagine that a national feeling had never sprung up in France ; this we can easily imagine, because we know that the twelfth century is full of wars between a king who reigned at Paris and another who

reigned at Rouen. But let us imagine further that the different Governments established in different parts of France were mostly foreign Governments, that in fact the country had been conquered before and was still living under the yoke of foreign rulers. We can well understand that if in a country thus broken to the foreign yoke a disturbed state of affairs supervened, making mercenary war a lucrative profession, such a cnuntry might come to be full of professional soldiers equally ready to take service with any Government and against any Government, native or foreign.

Now the condition of India was such as this. The English did not introduce a foreign domination into it, for the foreign domiuation was there already. In fact we bring to the subject a fixed misconception. The homogeneous European community, a definite territory possessed by a definite race—in one word, the Nation-State,—though we assume it as if it were a matter of course, is in fact much more exceptional than we suppose, and yet it is upon the assumption of such a homogeneous community that all our ideas of patriotism and public virtue depend. *The idea of nationality seems in India to be thoroughly confused. The distinction of national and foreign seems to be lost.* Not only has a tide of Mussulman invasion covered the country ever since the eleventh century, but even if we go back to the earliest times we still find a mixture of races, a domination of race by race. That Aryan, Sanscrit-speaking race which, as the creators of Brahminism, have given to India whatever, unity it can be said to have, appear themselves as invaders, and as invaders who have not succeeded in swallowing up and absorbing the older nationalities. The older, not Indo-Germanic race, has in Europe almost disappeared, and at any rate has left not race in our European languages, but in India the older stratum is everywhere visible. The spoken languages there are not mere corruptions Sanscrit, but mixtures of Sanscrit with older languages wholly different, and in the south not Sanscrit at all. Brahminism too, which at first sight seems universal, turns out on examination to be a mere vague eclecticism, which has given a show of unity to superstitions wholly unlike and unrelated to each other. It follows

that in India the fundamental postulate cannot be granted, upon which the whole political ethics of the West depend. The homogeneous community does not exist there, out of which the State properly so called arises. Indeed to satisfy ourselves of this it is not necessary to travel so far back into the past. It is enough to notice that since the time of Mahmoud of Ghazni a steady stream of Mussulman invasion has poured into India. The majority of the Government of India were Mussulman long before the arrival of the Mogul in the sixteenth century. From this time therefore is most of the Indian States the tie of nationality was broken. Government ceased to rest upon right; the State lost its right to appeal to patriotism.

In such a state of affairs what is called the conquest of India by the English can be explained without supposing the natives of India to be below other races, just as it does not force us to regard the English as superior to other races. We regard it as the duty of a man to fight for his country against the foreigner. But what is a man's country? When we analyse the notion, we find it presupposes the man to have been bred up in a community which may be regarded as a great family, so that it is natural for him to think of the land itself as a mother. But if the community has not been at all of the nature of a family, but has been composed of two or three races hating each other, if not the country, but at most the village has been regarded as a home, then it is not the fault of the natives of it that they have no patriotism but village-patriotism. It is one thing to receive a foreign yoke for the first time, and quite a different thing to exchange one foreign yoke for another.

But, as I have pointed out, the surprising feature in the English conquest of India is not so much that it should have been made, as that it should have cost England no effort and no effort and no trouble. The English people have not paid taxes, the English Government has not opened loans, no conscription was ever introduced, nay, no drain of men was ever perceived, and no difficulty was ever felt in carrying on other

wars at the same time, because we were engaged in conquering a population equal to that of Europe. This seems at first sight incredible, but I have already given the explanation of it. As to the finance of all these wars, it falls under the general principle which applies to all wars of conquest. Conquest pays its own expenses. As Napoleon had never any financial difficulties, because he lived at the expense of those whom he vanquished in war, so the conquest of India was made, as a matter of course, at the expense of India. The only difficulty then is to understand how the army could be created. And this difficulty too disappears, when we observe that four-fifths of this army was always composed of native troops.

If we fix our attention upon this all-important fact we shall be led, if I mistake not, to perceive that the expression "conquest," as applied to the acquisition of sovereignty by the East India Company in India, is not merely loose but thoroughly misleading, and tempts us to class the event among events which it in no way resembles. I have indeed remarked more than once before that this expression, whenever it is used, requires far more definition than it commonly receives, and that it may bear several different meanings. But surely the word is only applicable at all when it refers to some action done to one state by another. There is war between two states ; the army of the one state invades the other and overturns the Government of it, or at least forces the Government to such humiliating terms that it is practically deprived of its independence ; this is conquest in the proper sense. Now when we say that England has conquered India, we ought to mean that something of this sort has happened between England and India. When Alexander the Great conquered the Persian Empire, there was war between the Macedonian state and the Persian, in which the latter was subjugated. When Caesar conquered Gaul, he acted in the name of the Roman Republic, holding an office conferred on him by the senate, and commanding the army of the Roman state. But nothing of this sort happened in India. The King of England did not declare war upon the Great Mogul or upon any Nawab or Rajah in India. The English state would perhaps

have had no concern from first to last in the conquest of India but for this circumstance, that it engaged five times in war with France after the French settlements in India had become considerable, and that these wars, being partly waged in India, were in a certain degree mixed up with the wars between the East India Company and the native Powers of India. If we wish clearly to understand the nature of the phenomenon, we ought to put this circumstance, which was accidental, on one side. We shall then see that nothing like what is strictly called a conquest took place, but that certain traders inhabiting certain seaport towns in India, were induced, almost forced, in the anarchy caused by the fall of the Mogul Empire, to give themselves a military character and employ troops, that by means of these troops they acquired territory and at last almost all the territory of India, and that these traders happened to be Englishmen, and to employ a certain, though not a large, propertion of English troops in their army.

Now this is not a foreign conquest, but rather an internal revolution. In any country when government breaks down and anarchy sets in, the general law is that a struggle follows between such organised powers as remain in the country, and that the most powerful of these sets up a Government. In France for instance after the fall of the House of Bourbon in 1792 a new Government was set up chiefly through the influence of the Municipality of Paris; this Government having fallen into discredit a few years later was superseded by a military Government wielded by Bonaparte. Now India about 1750 was in a condition of anarchy caused by a decay in the Mogul Empire, which had begun at the death of Aurangzeb in 1707. The imperial authority having everywhere lost its force over so vast a territory, the general law began to operate. Everywhere the minor organised powers began to make themselves supreme. These powers, after the fashion of India, were most commonly mercenary bands of soldiers, commanded either by some provincial governor of the falling Empire, or by some adventurer who seized an opportunity of rising to the command of them, or lastly by some local power which had existed before the establishment of the Mogul supremacy and had

never completely yielded to it. To give an example of each kind of power, the state of Hyderabad was founded by the satrap of the Great Mogul called the Nizam, the state of Mysore was founded by the Mussulman adventurer Hyder Ali, who rose from the ranks by mere military ability, the great Mahratta confederacy of chieftains headed by the Peishwa, a Brahminical not a Mussulman Power, represented the older India of the time before the Mogul. But all these powers alike subsisted by means of mercenary armies ; they lived in a state of chronic war and mutual plunder such as, I suppose, has hardly been witnessed in Europe except perhaps in the dissolution of the Carolingian Empire.

Such a state of affairs was peculiarly favourable to the rise of new powers. In other circumstances conquest presupposes what I may call a capital fund of power. No one can undertake it that does not already possess a recognised authority and an army. In those circumstances it was otherwise. Hyder Ali had nothing but his head and his right arm, and he became Sultan of Mysore. For mercenary armies were everywhere ; they were at the service of every one who could pay them or win an influence over them ; and any one who commanded a mercenary army was on a level with the greatest potentates of India, since in the dissolution of authority the only force left was military force.

Now among the different local powers in India, which in such peculiar circumstances might strike for empire with some chance of success, were certain merchants who had factories in the seaport towns. They were foreigners indeed, but, as I have pointed out, this could make no difference in India, where most Governments were foreign, where the Great Mogul himself was a foreigner. Much rhetoric has been spent on the miraculousness of the fortune of the East India Company. It is true that there had been no previous example of such a fortune, and that for this reason it would not have occurred to anyone to predict such a fortune. But it was not miraculous in the sense of being hard to account for or having no visible cause. For the East India Company had really some capital to

start with. It had a command of money, it had two or three fortresses, the command of the sea, and it had the advantage of being a corporation—that is, it was not liable to be killed in battle or to die of a fever. We are not much astonished when an individual rises from some private station into empire over a great territory, because this has happened often. And yet intrinsically it is much more astonishing. That the younger son of a poor nobleman in Corsica should control the greater part of Europe with despotic power, is intrinsically far more wonderful than that the East India Company should conquer India, for Bonaparte began without interest, without friends, without a penny in his pocket, and yet he not only gained his empire but lost it again in less than twenty years. In like manner the rise of Hyder Ali, or of Scindiah, or of Holkar, was more wonderful and demanded more of the special favour of fortune than the rise of the East India Company. You see that I wish you to place this event in a different class of events from that in which it is commonly placed. It is not the conquest of one state by another. It is not an event in which two states are concerned, at least directly ; it is not an event belonging to the foreign department, It is an internal revolution in Indian society, and is to be compared to one of those sudden usurpations or *coups d'etat*, by which a period of disturbance within a community is closed. Let us imagine for a moment that the merchants who rose to power had not been foreign at all,—the nature of the event is not thereby altered. We may suppose that a number of Parsee merchants in Bombay, tired of the anarchy which disturbed their trade, had subscribed together to establish fortresses and raise troops, and then that they had had the good fortune to employ able generals. In that case they too might have had their Plassey and their Buxar ; they too might have extorted from the Great Mogul the Dewannee or financial administration of a province, and so laid the foundations of an Empire, which might in time have extended over all India. In that case we should have had substantially the same event, but it would have appeared clearly in its true light. We should have recognised it as having the nature of an internal revolution, as being the effect of the natural struggle which every community makes to put down the anarchy which is tearing it to pieces.

In such an event as that there would have been nothing very miraculous, and yet the rise of the East India Company was much less miraculous. For the Company was closely connected with Europe, and could call in the military science and discipline of Europe, which was evidently superior to that of India. That same Frenchman Dupleix, who laid down so clearly the theory of the conquest of India, perceived that the native armies could not for a moment stand before European troops, but he perceived also that the native of India was quite capable of receiving European discipline and learning to fight with European efficiency. This then was the talisman which the Company possessed, and which enabled it not merely to hold its own among the Powers of India but to surpass them,—not some incommunicable physical or moral superiority, as we love to imagine—but a superior discipline and military system, which *could* be communicated to the natives of India.

Beyond this they had another great advantage. They did not, to be sure, represent the English State, but yet their connection with England was of infinite service to them. They had indeed to procure in the main for themselves the money and the men by which India was conquered. But as a chartered Company which had the monopoly of English trade in India and China, they were an object of interest to the English Government and to Parliament. It several times happened that the war by which they acquired Indian territory wore the appearance before the English public of a war between England and France, and was therefore heartily supported by the nation. This is a fact of fundamental importance, which has not often been sufficiently considered. The English conquest of India began not in some quarrel between the Company and a native Power. It began in an alarming attempt made by the French to get control over the Deccan, and so among other things to destroy the English settlements at Madras and Bombay, by interfering in the question of the Hyderabad succession. Our first military step in the East was to defend ourselves against the French attack. And from that time for nearly seventy years —that is, to the end of the war with Napoleon,—our wars in India never ceased to wear more or less the appearance of

defensive wars against France. The effect of this was that, though they were not waged in the name or at the expense of the State, yet they seemed to a certain extent national wars,—wars in which England was deeply concerned. To a considerable extent therefore the Company's troops were aided by Royal troops, and from 1785, when Lord Cornwallis went out as Governor-General, an English statesman of mark was sent out to preside over the political and military affairs. The attacks that were made upon the Company in Parliament, the vote of censure moved against Lord Clive, the impeachment brought against Hastings, the successive ministerial schemes for regulating the Company's affairs, one of which in 1783 convulsed the whole political world of England, all these interferences contributed to make our Indian wars seem national wars, and to identify the Company with the English nation. In this way the Company was practically backed by the credit and renown of a first-class European state, though at the same time that state contributed little to the wars by which the Company acquired territory.

The words "wonderful," "strange," are often applied to great historical events, and there is no event to which they have been applied more freely than to our conquest of India. But an event may be wonderful or strange without being necessarily at all difficult to account for. The conquest of India is very wonderful in the sense that nothing similar to it had ever happened before, and that therefore nothing similar could be expected by those who for the first century and a half administered the affairs of the Company in India. No doubt Job Charnock, or Josiah Child, or Governor Pitt of Madras (grandfather of the great Lord Chatham), or perhaps Major Lawrence, never dreamed that we should one day suppress the authority alike of the Peishwa of the Mahrattas and of the Great Mogul himself. But the event was not wonderful in the sense that it is difficult to discover adequate causes by which it could have been produced. If we begin by remarking that authority in India had fallen on the ground through the decay of the Mogul Empire, that it lay there waiting to be picked up by somebody, and that all over India in

that period adventurers of one kind or another were founding Empires, it is really not surprising that a mercantile corporation which had money to pay a mercenary force, should be able to compete with other adventurers, nor yet that it should outstrip all its competitors by bringing into the field English military science and generalship, especially when it was backed over and over again by the whole power and credit of England and directed by English statesmen.

The sum of what I have urged is that the conquest of India is not in the ordinary sense a conquest at all, because it was not the act of a state and was not accomplished by the army and the money of a state. I have pointed this out in order to remove the perplexity which must be caused by the statement that England conquered India—that is, a population as large as that of Europe and many thousand miles off,—and yet that England is not a military state, though this enormous conquest was achieved by England without any exhausting effort and without any expense. The explanation of this contradiction is that England did not in the strict sense conquer India, but that certain Englismen. who happened to reside in India at the time when the Mogul Empire fell, had a fortune like that of Hyder Ali or Runjeet Singh, and rose to supreme power there.

But yet of course in its practical result the event has proved to be a conquest of India by England. For now that the process is complete and the East India Company has been swept away, we see that Queen Victoria is Empress of India, and that a Secretary, who is a member of the English Cabinet and sits in the English Parliament, is responsible for the administration of India. England as a state did not make the acquisition, yet it has fallen to England. This is merely an exemplification of the general principle, which, as I pointed out above, has governed all the settlements of Europeans outside Europe since the time of Columbus. However far they roamed, however strange and wonderful was their success, they were never able at the outset to shake off their European citizenship. Cortez and Pizarro trampled under

their feet the Governments they found in America. With scarcely an effort they made themselves supreme wherever they came. But though they could set at naught in Mexico the authority of Montezuma, they could not resist or dream of resisting the authority of Charles V who was on the other side of the Atlantic. The consequence was that whatever conquests they made by their own unassisted audacity and effort were confiscated at once and as a matter of course by Spain. So with the English in India. After 1765 the East India Company held nominally a high office in the Empire of the Great Mogul. But it was asserted at once by the English Parliament that whatever territorial acquistions might be made by the Company were under the control of Parliament. The Great Mogul's name was scarcely mentioned in the discussion, and the question seems never to have been raised whether he would consent to the administration of his provinces of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa being thus conducted under the control of a foreign Government. The Company made part of two states at once. It was a Company under a Charter from the King of England ; it was a Dewan under the Great Mogul. But it swept away the Great Mogul, as Cortez swept away Montezuma ; on the other hand it submitted all its boundless acquisitions meekly to the control of England, and at last, when a century was completed from the battle of Plassey, it suffered itself to be abolished and surrendered India to the English Government.

II

I have considered the nature of the relation in which India stands to England, and have tried to explain how this relation could spring up without a miracle. We may now advance a step and form some opinion on the question whether that relation can endure without a miracle, as it was created without one, or whether we ought to regard the government of India by the English as a kind of political *tour de force*, a matter of astonishment while it lasts, but certain not to last very long. For the great difficulty which the student has to contend with in studying Indian affairs is the dazzling effect of events so strange, so remote, and on a scale so large, by which he is led to think

that ordinary causation is not to be expected in India, and that in that region all its miraculous. The rhetorical tone ordinarily adopted in history favours this illusion ; historians are fond of parading all the strange and marvellous features of the Indian Empire, as if it were less their business to account for what happens than to make it seem more unaccountable than before.

Thus we come to think of our ascendancy in India as an exception to all ordinary rules, a standing miracle in politics, only to be explained by the heroic qualities of the English race and their natural genius for government. So long as we take this view, it is of course impossible for us to form any opinion concerning the duration of it. What was a miracle at the beginning is likely to continue so to the end. If ordinary laws are suspended, who shall say how long the suspension is likely to last ? Now I have tried to look calmly at our Empire in its beginning. I have examined the conquest of India, and have found that it is indeed miraculous in the sense of being unlike our experience—the revolutions of Asiatic society would naturally be unlike those of Europe—but that it is not miracu ous in the sense of being unaccountable, or even difficult to account for. I now inquire whether our government of India is miraculous in this sense.

It must certainly appear so, if we assume that India is simply a conquered country and the English its conquerors. Who does not know the extreme difficulty of representing the disaffection of a conquered population ? Over and over again it has been found impossible, even where the superiority both in the number and efficiency of troops has been decidedly on the side of the conquerors. When the Spaniards failed in the Low Countries, they were the best soldiers and Spain by far the greatest state in Christendom. For the instinct of nationality or of separate religion more than supplies the place of valour or of discipline, being diffused through the whole population and not confined to the fighting part of it. Let us compare the parallel case of Italy. Italy corresponds in the map of Europe to India in that of Asia. It is a similar peninsula at

the south of the Continent, with a mighty mountain range above it, and below this a great river flowing from west to east. It is still more similar in the circumstance that for many centuries it was a prey to foreign invaders. No long time ago Italy was subject to the ascendancy and partly to the actual rule of Austria. Its inhabitants were less warlike, its armies much less efficient, than those of Austria, and Austria was close at hand. And yet, though fighting at so much disadvantage, Italy has made herself free. In the field she was generally defeated, but the feeling of nationality was so strong within and attracted so much sympathy without, that she has had her way, and the foreigner has left her to herself. Now in every point India is more advantageously situated with respect to England than Italy with respect to Austria. She has a population about eight times as great as that of England ; she is at the other side of the globe ; and then England does not profess to be a military state. Yet to all appearance she submits to the yoke ; we do not hear of rebellions. In conducting the government of India we meet with difficulties, but they are chiefly financial and economical. The particular difficulty which in Italy was too much for Austria we do not encounter ; we do not feel the difficulty of repressing the disaffection of a conquered nationality. Is not this miraculous ? Does it not seem as if all ordinary laws were suspended in this case, or as if we might assume that there are no bounds either to the submissiveness of the Hindu or to the genius for government of the English ?

What I urged above may partly prepare you for the answer which I make to this question. In the question it is assumed, first, that India constitutes a nationality ; secondly, that this nationality has been conquered by England. Now both these assumptions are wholly unfounded.

First the notion that India is a nationality rests upon that vulgar error which political science principally aims at eradicating. We in Europe, accustomed to see the map of Europe divided into countries each of which is assigned to a peculiar nationality, of which a special language is the badge, fall into

a profound misconception. We assume that wherever, inside or outside of Europe, there is a country which has a name, there must be a nationality answering to it. At the same time we take no pains to conceive clearly or define precisely what we call a nationality. We content ourselves with remarking that we in England should be most unwilling to be governed by the French, and that the French would be sorry to be governed by the Germans, and from these examples we draw the conclusion that the people of India must in like manner feel it a deep humiliation to be governed by the English. Such notions spring from mere idleness and inattention. It does not need proving, it is sufficient merely to state, that it is not every population which constitutes a nationality. The English and the French are not mere populations ; they are populations united in a very special way and by very special forces. Let us think of some of these uniting forces, and then ask whether they operate upon the populations of India.

The first is community of race, or rather the belief in a community of race. This, when it appears on a large scale, is identical with community of language. The English are those who speak English, the French those who speak French. Now do the inhabitants of India speak one language ? The answer is, No more, but rather less, than the inhabitants of Europe speak one language ! So much has been said by philologers about Sanscrit and its affinities with other languages, that it is necessary to remark that it is an obvious community of language, of which the test is intelligibility, and not some hidden affinity, that acts as a uniting force. Thus the Italians regarded the Austrians as foreigners because they could not understand German, without troubling themselves to consider that German as well as Italian is an Indo-European language. There is affinity among several of the languages of India, as among those of Europe. The Hindi languages may be compared with the Romance languages of Europe, as being descendants of the ancient language, but the mutual affinity of the Bengali, the Marathi, the Guzerati does not help to make those who speak them one nation. The Hindustani has sprung out of the Mussulman conquest, by a mixture of the Persian of the

invaders with the Hindi languages of the natives. But in the South we find a linguistic discrepancy in India greater than any which exists in Europe, for the great languages of the South, Tamil, Telugu, Canarese, are not Indo-European at all, and they are spoken populations far larger than those Finns and Magyars of Europe whose language is not Indo-European.

This fact is enough by itself to show that the name India ought not to be classed with such names as England or France, which correspond to nationalities, but rather with such as Europe, marking a group of nationalities which have chanced to obtain a common name owing to some physical separation. Like Europe it is a mere geographic expression, but even so, it has been much less uniformly used than the name Europe. Europe at any rate has been used in much the same sense since the time of Herodotus, but our present use of the word India is not perhaps very old. To us indeed it seems natural that the whole country which is marked off from Asia by the great barrier of the Himalaya and the Suleiman range should have a single name. But it has not always seemed so. The Greeks had but a very vague idea of this country. To them for a long time the word India was for practical purposes what it was etymologically, the province of the Indus. When they say that Alexander invaded India, they refer to the Punjab. At a later time they obtained some information about the valley of the Ganges, but little or none about the Deccan. Meanwhile in India itself it did not seem so natural as it seems to us to give one name to the whole region. For there is a very marked difference between the northern and southern parts of it. The great Aryan community which spoke Sanscrit and invented Brahminism spread itself chiefly from the Punjab along the great valley of the Ganges, but not at first far southward. Accordingly the name Hindostan properly belongs to this Northern region. In the South or peninsula we find other races and non-Aryan languages, though Brahminism has extended itself there too. Even the Mogul Empire in its best time did not much penetrate into this region.

It appears then that India is not a political name, but only a geographical expression like Europe or Africa. It does not mark the territory of a nation and a language, but the territory of many nations and many languages. Here is the fundamental difference between India and such countries as Italy, in which the principle of nationality has asserted itself. Both India and Italy were divided among a number of states, and so were weak in resistance to the foreigner. But Italy, though divided by organisation, was one by nationality. The same language pervaded it, and out of this language had sprung a great literature, which was the common possession of the whole peninsula. India, as I have pointed out, is no more united by language than Europe is.

But nationality is compounded of several elements, of which a sense of kindred is only one. The sense of a common interest and the habit of forming a single political whole constitute another element. This too has been very weak, though perhaps it has not been altogether wanting in India. The country might seem almost too large for it, but the barrier which separates India from the rest of the world is so much more effective than any barrier between one part of India than another, that in spite of all ethnical and local divisions some vague conception of India as at least a possible whole has existed from a very ancient time. In the shadowy traditionary history of the times before Mahmoud of Ghazni it is vaguely related of this king and that king that he was lord of all India ; the dominion of some historical princes in the first Mohammedan period, and finally the Mogul Empire, were approximately universal. But we must not exaggerate the greatness of the Mogul Empire, or imagine that it answers in India to the Roman Empire in Europe. Observe how short its duration was. We cannot put the very commencement of it earlier than 1524, the date of the capture of Lahore by Baber—that is, in Henry VIII's reign. When Vasco da Gama landed in India it had not begun to exist, and its marked and rapid decline begins in 1707—that is, in Queen Anne's reign. Between these dates there is less than two centuries. But next observe that the Mogul Empire cannot be properly said to have existed from the moment when Baber

entered India, but only from the moment when the Indian dominion of the Moguls became extensive. Now at the accession of Akber, which was in 1559, or the year after that of Queen Elizabeth, this Empire consisted simply of the Punjab and the country round Delhi and Agra. It was not till 1576 that Akber conquered Bengal, and he conquered Sind and Guzerat between 1591 and 1594. His empire was now extensive, but if we consider 1594 instead of 1524 as the date of the commencement of the Mogul Empire, we reduce its duration to little more than a century.

Next observe that even at this time it by no means includes all India. To imagine this is to confuse India with Hindostan. Akber's dominion in 1595 was limited by the Nerbudda, and he had not yet set foot in the Deccan. He was Emperor of Hindostan, but by no means of India. In his later years he invaded the Deccan, and from this time the Mogul pretensions began to extend to the Southern half of India. But it cannot be said that anything like a conquest of the Deccan was made before the great expedition of Aurungzeb in 1683. From this time we may, if we choose, speak of the Mogul Empire as including the Deccan, and therefore as uniting all India under one Government, though the subjection of the Deccan was Chiefly nominal, for the Mahratta Power was already rising fast. But thus the duration of the Empire is reduced to ta mere moment, for the Mogul Emperors purchased this extension of their dominion by the ruin of the Empire. Within twenty-four years decay had become visible and, as I take it directly in consequence of this ambitious expedition. The Empire had always wanted a sufficient nucleus, and its powers were exhausted by this unwise attempt to extend it.

On the whole then it may be said that India has never really been united so as to form one state except under the English. And they cannot be said to have accomplished the work until the Governor-Generalship of Lord Dalhousie thirty years ago, when the Punjab, Oude, and Nagpore were incorporated with the English dominions.

Another leading element of nationality is a common religion. This element is certainly not altogether wanting in India. The

Brahminical system does extend over the whole of India. Not of course that it is the only religion of India. There are not less than fifty millions of Mussulmans—that is, a far greater number than is to be found in the Turkish Empire. There is also a small number of Sikhs, who profess a religion which is a sort of fusion of Mohammedanism and Brahminism; there are a few Christians, and in Ceylon and Nepaul there are Buddhists. But Brahminism remains the creed of the enormous majority, and it has so much real vitality that it has more than once resisted formidable attacks. One of the most powerful of all proselytising creeds, Buddhism, sprang up in India itself; it spread far and wide; we have evidence that it flourished with vigour in India two centuries before Christ, and that it was still flourishing in the seventh century after Christ. Yet it has been conquered by Brahminism, and flourishes now almost in every part of Asia more than in the country which produced it. After this victory Brahminism had to resist the assault of another powerful aggressive religion, before which Zoroastrianism had already fallen, and even Christianity had in the East had to retreat some steps, Mohammedanism. Here again it held its own; Mussulman Governments overspread India, but they could not convert the people.

Now religion seems to me to be the strongest and most important of all the elements which go to constitute nationality; and this element exists in India. When it is said that India is to be compared rather to Europe than to France or England, we may remember that Europe, considered as Christendom, has had and still has a certain unity, which would show itself plainly and quickly enough if Europe were threatened, as more than once it was threatened in the Middle Ages, by a barbarian and heathen enemy. It may seem then that in Brahminism India has a germ, out of which sooner or later an Indian nationality might spring. And perhaps it is so; but yet we are to observe that in that case the nationality ought to have developed itself long since. For the Mussulman invasions, which have succeeded each other through so many centuries, have supplied precisely the pressure which was most likely to favour the development of the germ. Why did Brahminism

content itself with holding its own ogainst Islam, and not rouse and unite India against the invader ? It never did so. Brahmi inical Powers have risen in India. A chieftain named Sivaji arose in the middle of the seventeenth century, and possessing himself of one or two hill-forts in the highlands behind Bombay, founded the Mahratta Power. This was a truly Hindu organisation, and, as its power increased, it fell more and more under the control of the Brahmin caste. The decline of the Mogul Empire favoured its advance, so that in the middle of the eighteenth century the ramifications of the Mahratta confederacy covered almost the whole of India. It might appear that in this confederacy there lay the nucleus of an Indian nationality, that Brahminism was now about to do for the Hindus what has been done for so many other races by their religion. But nothing of the kind happened. Brahminism did not pass into patriotism. Perhaps its facile comprehensiveness, making it in reality not a religion but only a loose compromise between several religions, has enfeebled it as a uniting principle. At any rate it appears that in the Mahratta movement there never was anything elevated or patriotic, but that it continued from first to last to be an organisation of plunder.

There is then no Indian nationality, though there are some germs out of which we can conceive an Indian nationality developing itself. It is this fact, and not some enormous superiority on the part of the English race, that makes our Empire in India possible. If there could arise in India a nationality movement similar to that which we witnessed in Italy, the English Power could not even make the resistance that was made in Italy by Austria, but must succumb at once. For what means can England have, which is not even a military state, of resisting the rebellion of two hundred and fifty millions of subject ? Do you say, as we conquered them before, we could conquer them again ? But I explained that we did not conquer them. I showed you that of the army which won our victories four-fifths consisted of native troops. That we were able to hire these native troops for service in India, was due to the fact that the feeling of nationality had no existence there. Now if the feeling of a common nationality

began to exist there only feebly,—if, without inspiring any active desire to drive out the foreigner, it only created a notion that it was shameful to assist him in maintaining his dominion, —from that day almost our Empire would cease to exist ; for of the army by which it is garrisoned two-thirds consist of native soldiers, Imagine what an easy task the Italian patriots would have had before them, if the Austrian Government which they desired to expel had depended not upon Austrian but upon Italian soldiers ! Let us suppose—not even that the native army mutinied—but simply that a native army could not any longer be levied. In a moment the impossibility of holding India would become manifest to us ; for it is a condition of our Indian Empire that it should be held without any great effort. As it was acquired without much effort on the part of the English state, it must be retained in the same way. We are not prepared to bury millions upon millions or army upon army in defending our acquisition. The moment India began really to show herself what we so idly imagine her to be, a conquered nation, that moment we should recognise perforce the impossibility of retaining her.

And thus the mystic halo of marvel and miracle which has gathered round this Empire disappears before a fixed scrutiny. It disappears when we perceive that, though we are foreign rulers in India, we are not conquerors resting on superior force, when we recognise that it is a mere European prejudice to assume that since we do not rule *by* the will of the people of India, we must needs rule *against* their will. The love of independence presupposes political consciousness. Where this is wanting, a foreign Government will be regarded passively, and such a Government may continue for a long time and prosper without exerting any extraordinary skill. Such a passive feeling towards Government becomes inveterate in a country that has been frequently conquered. Governments most oppressive have often continued for centuries, and that though they had no means of resisting rebellion if it should arise, simply because it did not enter into the habits of the people to rebel, because they were accustomed to obedience. Read the history of the Russian Czars in the sixteenth century. Why did a great population submit to the furious caprices of

Ivan the Terrible? The answer is plain. They had been trampled under foot for two centuries by the Tartars, and during that period they had acquired the habit of passive submission.

Now ought we not to expect the population of India to be in a similar condition of feeling? Of liberty, of popular institutions, there exists scarcely a trace in the whole extent of Indian history or tradition. The Italians had the Roman Republic behind them, and it was by reading Livy to the people that Rienzi roused them to rebellion. No Indian demagogue could find anything similar to read to the people. And for seven hundred years when the English arrived, they had been governed not only by despots but by foreign despots. It would be marvellous indeed if in such a country the feeling could have sprung up that Government exists for and depends on the people, if a habit of criticising Government, of meditating its overthrow, or of organising opposition against it, could have sprung up. Nations have, as it were, very stiff joints. They do not easily learn a new kind of movement; they do what their fathers did, even when they fancy themselves most original. It has been pointed out that even the French Revolution strangely resembled some earlier chapters in the history of France. Certainly the Italian nationality-movement resembles earlier Italian movements that go back beyond the age of Dante. Now by this rule we should expect to find the Indian population silently submitting to whatever Government had the possession of power, even though it were foreign, as our Government is, and even though it were savagely oppressive, which we think our Government is not.

Our Government of India would be a miracle on two conditions. First, if the Hindus had been accustomed to be ruled only by their own countrymen, and were familiar with the idea of resisting authority. This is not the case of the Hindus, and accordingly they submit, as throughout history vast populations have been in the habit of submitting to Governments which they could easily overthrow, as the Chinese at the present day submit to a Tartar domination, as the

Hindus themselves submitted to the Mogul domination before the English came. Indeed this example of the Moguls is well adapted to show that our ascendancy over the Hindus is no proof of any supernatural statesmanship in us. For one cannot read the Mogul history without being struck with the Mogul very same fact which surprises us in the history of the English rule, viz. that the Moguls too conquered almost without apparent means. Baber, the founder of the Empire, did not come with a mighty nation at his back, or leaning on the organisation of some powerful state. He had inherited a small Tartar kingdom in Central Asia, but he had lost this by an invasion of Osbegs. He wandered for a while as a homeless adventurer, and then got possession of another small kingdom in Afghanistan. Nothing could be slighter than this first germ of empire. This Tartar adventurer ruling Afghans in Cabul founded an Empire which in about seventy years extended over half India, and in a hundred years more extended nominally at least over the whole. I do not say that the Mogul Empire was ever comparable for greatness or solidity to that which we have established, but like our own, even more than our own, it seems built up without hands. The Company had at least English money, English military science, and the immortality of a corporation. Baber and his successors had none of these resources. It is difficult to discover any causes which favoured the growth of their Empire. All we can say is that Central Asia swarmed with a wandering population much inclined to the vocation of mercenary soldiers, which passed very readily for pay and plunder into the service of the ruler of Cabul.

Secondly, our rule would be wonderful if the two hundred million Hindus had the habit of thinking all together like a single nation. If not, there is nothing wonderful in it. A mere mass of individuals, unconnected with each other by any common feelings or interests, is easily subjected, because they may be induced to act against each other. Now I have pointed out how weak and insufficient are the bonds which unite the Hindus. If you wish to see how this want of internal union has operated in favour of our rule, you have only to read the history of the great Mutiny. It may have occurred to you

when I said that a mutiny or even less than a mutiny on the part of our native troops would be instantly fatal to our Empire, that just such a mutiny actually happened in 1857, and yet that our Empire still flourishes. But you are to observe that I spoke of a mutiny caused by a nationality-movement spreading among the people and at last gaining the army. The mutiny of 1857 was not of this kind. It began in the army and was regarded passively by the people; it was provoked by definite military grievances, and not by any disaffection caused by the feeling of nationality against our Government as foreign. But now let us ask; in what way was this mutiny, when once it had broken out, put down? I am afraid the only opinion that has ever obtained in England has been that it was crushed by the prodigious heroism of the English and their infinite superiority to the Hindus. Let me read you the account which Colonel Chesney gives of the matter in his *Indian Polity*. After remarking that an intensely strong *esprit de corps* had sprung up in the Bengal Army—for observe that the Bombay and Madras armies were very slightly concerned in the mutiny—an *esprit de corps* which was purely military and actually opposed to the feeling of nationality, since it welded together the Hindu and the Mussulman elements (so that Colonel Chesney remarks: "In ill-discipline, bitterness of feeling against their masters, and confidence in their power to overthrow them, there was nothing to choose between Hindu or Mussulman"), he goes on to point out by what counter-movement this movement was met. "Fortunately the so-called Bengal Presidency was not garrisoned wholly by the regular army. Four battalions of Goorkhas, inhabitants of the Nepalese Himalaya, who had been kept aloof from the rest of the army, and had not imbibed the class-feeling which animated that body, with one exception stood loyal; the conspicuous gallantry and devotedness to the British cause displayed by one of these regiments especially won the admiration of their English comrades. Two extra regiments of the line, which had been recruited from the Punjab and its neighbourhood, also stood firm. But the great help came from the Punjab Irregular Force, as it was termed—a force, however, which was organised on quite as methodical and regular

a footing, was quite as well-drilled and vastly better disciplined, than the regular army. This force consisted of six regiments of infantry and five of cavalry, to which may be added four regiments of Sikh local infantry, usually stationed in the Punjab. These troops were directly under the orders of the Government of that province, and not subject to that centralised system of administration which had a share in undermining the discipline of the regular army. It was with these troops and the handful of Europeans quartered in the upper part of India that the rebellion was first met. Meanwhile the sympathies of the people of the Punjab were enlisted on behalf of their rulers. A lately-conquered people, whose accustomed occupation had been superseded by the disbandment of their army, they entertained no goodwill to the Hindustani garrisons which occupied their country, and welcomed with alacrity the appeal to arms made them to join in the overthrow of their hereditary enemies. Any number of men that could be required was forthcoming, and the levies thus raised were pushed down to the seat of war as fast as they could be equipped and drilled. And on the reorganisation of the Bengal army these Punjab levies have formed a large component part of it."

You see, the mutiny was in a great measure put down by turning the races of India against each other. So long as this can be done, and so long as the population have not formed the habit of cirticising their Government, whatever it be, and of rebelling against it, the government of India from England is possible, and there is nothing miraculous about it. But, as I said, if this state of things should alter, if by any process the population should be welded into a single nationality, if our relation to it should come to resemble even distantly the relation of Austria to Italy, then I do not say we ought to begin to fear for our dominion; I say we ought to cease at once to hope for it. I do not imagine that the danger we have to apprehend is that of a popular insurrection. In some of the alarmist literature, for instance, in Mr. Elliot's book entitled, *Concerning John's Indian Affairs*, I find harrowing pictures of the misery of the poor ryot, and then the

conclusion drawn as a matter of course that this misery must lead to an explosion of despair, by which we shall be expelled. Whether the descriptions are true this is not the place to inquire ; but granting the truth of them for argument's sake, I do not find in history that revolutions are caused in this way. I find great populations cowering in abject misery for centuries together, but they do not rise in rebellion ; no, if they cannot live they die. and if they can only just live, then they just live, their sensibilities dulled and their very wishes crushed out by want. A populatian that rebels is a population that is looking up, that has begun to hope and to feel its strength. But if such a rising took place, it would be put down by the native soldiery so long as they have not learned to feel themselves brothers to the Hindu and foreigners to the Englishman that commands them. But on the other hand if this feeling ever does spring up, if India does begin to breathe as a single national whole—and our own rule is perhaps doing more than ever was done by former Governments to make this possible—then no such explosion of despair, even if there were cause for it, would be needed. For in that case the feeling would soon gain the native army, and on the native army ultimately we depend. We could subdue the mutiny of 1857, formidable as it was, because it spread through only a part of the army, because the people did not actively sympathise with it, and because it was possible to find native Indian races who would fight on our side. But the moment a mutiny is but threatened which shall be no mere mutiny, but the expression of a universal feeling of nationality, at that moment all hope is at an end, as all desire ought to be at an end, of preserving our Empire. For we are really conquerors of India, and we cannot rule her as conquerors ; if we undertook to do so, it is not necessary to inquire whether we could succeed, for we should assuredly be ruined financially by the mere attempt.

INDEX