

Consort, when asked about the education of the Royal children is clear and distinct, that the system must

not admit of dividing lines in educational institutions which are not the natural result of brain-power, and all aristocracies are the better for a common struggle with those whose studies must be taken up in right earnest

and this was acted upon to the great benefit of the dynasty and the British Nation.

The best mode of impressing those who are born to wealth and power with the insistent responsibility of their station in life is to

educate them under conditions which would imperceptibly lead them to compare themselves with the sons of the middle classes as men, and to feel that their true worth must depend on their mental and moral attributes.

and not on the factitious accident of birth. They must be made

to realise that outside their home they are no better than ordinary men, and that it is their behaviour as such that alone can reflect lustre or shame on their birth or their fortunes.

What can be said of an education which would surround them from their very birth onwards "with the divinity that doth hedge a king." The fruits of such an education turn inevitably to wormwood and ashes in the mouth and spell ruin and misery to the subjects of such Princes as is but too well exemplified by history.

The next five years after the age of 16 above-mentioned, might be spent in the company of their social equals in special Chiefs' colleges for the study of such subjects, as—Politics, Economics, Jurisprudence, Constitutional History and Law, Industrial and Commercial Law, Public International Law,

Public Administration, Accountancy and Business Organisation—(this is very important),—Banking and Currency, finally, Sociology and Psychology ; Forestry, Agriculture, and Mining should also be included, as also Biographies—legal, political and military. After getting a sound grounding in the *elements* of all these subjects they should be taken out for a year's tour in India under competent guidance, studying the application, in daily life, of the subjects which they have been studying theoretically, these last 5 years. After the Indian tour there should follow a European tour through the smaller countries, Holland, Switzerland, Scotland, Ireland should have special attention, nor is America (both North and South) to be neglected, with a similar purpose in view, winding up with Japan, and other Asiatic countries like China. Then a year at the Head-Quarters of the Government of India learning the daily work of administration of every department. Then 2 years in their own States thoroughly learning the work of every department. Each Chief should have a sound colloquial command of at least 2 Indian vernaculars besides his own mother-tongue and either French or German besides English. Education in Arts cannot with impunity be neglected either. Sculpture, Architecture, Painting, Music, have all to be cultivated, for the artistic and emotional is no less important in the life of a person than logic chopping or the severely practical. No Hindu needs reminding that Arjuna who was one of the mightiest warriors of his age and had

inherited philosophical aptitude from his grand-father, the Holy Rishi Veda Vyasa and so was fit pupil for the lessons of the Gita, was also such an accomplished dancer and musician, having learnt the arts from the famous heavenly *hetaira* of his father's Court, Urvashi, that he could teach those arts to his future daughter-in-law, the beautiful but unfortunate Uttarâ.

Any arrangement which would sever in early life this connection with the traditions of the people over whom they will be called on to rule is wholly mischievous. *They should in no case be sent out of India before their twenty-second year.*

The benefits of an English education even in India would be too dearly bought if the Chief and his future Councillors were to grow up to manhood devoid of sympathy for the people of their country or bereft of their affection and confidence.

Lord Reay, the experienced and sympathetic Governor of Bombay, held to these principles and gave effect to them as far as lay in his power in his dealings with the Feudatory States who were under his charge. Wise Governor that he was, he insisted on the solid acquirements as against the frivolities of superficial foreign social graces, which only helped to plunge the Feudatories into ruinous expenditure besides alienating the sympathies of their subjects and their brother-rulers and colleagues of an older generation.

A great deal is being done by the Government of India for the education of the children of the Princes and their nobles, but so far the results obtained have

been very incommensurate to the money and energy spent upon the purpose when they have not been actually mischievous. The reasons are not far to seek. It has been education on *alien* lines.—English nurses, English governesses, English companions, English tutors, and finally English ideals. As M. Chailley truly remarks :—

The fact remains that hitherto the Chief's Colleges have not fulfilled the hopes to which they had given rise (p. 225). Whether it be that the minds of the pupils were not sufficiently developed, or their work not sufficiently arduous, or whether . . . the teaching staff was inferior, the results obtained satisfied neither the parents of the pupils, nor the Government of India. It was alleged that the pupils received no solid instruction and acquired no taste for reading beyond illustrated papers. (p. 223)

From 1902 onwards Lords Curzon, Minto and Hardinge have called together from time to time conferences of the Indian Rulers for tackling this grave problem, but so far the outside world sees little headway made in the proper direction. No doubt a solemn adjuration was addressed by Lord Curzon to the students in the Rajput Chief's College in 1900, that they were not to regard themselves as

a privileged body to whom God has given a *sanad* of perpetual idleness. Their States are not their private property ; the revenues are not meant to be swallowed up by their privy purses. Providence has destined them to be the working bees, and not the drones of the time. They exist for the good of their peoples, and not their peoples for them, and they ought to be models, examples and guides. (*Lord Curzon's Speeches* edited by Sir T. Raleigh p. 221.)

But alas, the advice, the warning, still remains largely unheeded. A sifting *public* enquiry as to how the Principals in charge of these Chiefs' Colleges have been and are discharging their duties towards their

wards, and whether they have been and are *sincerely* endeavouring to train their pupils along the lines of the ideals so grandiloquently laid down by Lord Curzon in public profession—would probably disclose a very remarkable State of affairs.

One wonders now how many of the 700 Chiefs have truly and honestly separated the *State revenue* and their *privy purse*, how many have become really qualified working bees, how many regard themselves as *servants* of their subjects and not their subjects as their *slaves* ; probably not even 5 per cent.

EDUCATION OF THE PRINCESSES.

No less important is the question of the training and education of the Princesses. Unless the girls of the ruling families and of those also with whom they intermarry are properly educated, it will continue to be a difficult problem—the supplying of the proper environment to the boys of the ruling families. The vital importance of the subject is so thoroughly clear that it needs no dwelling upon. But, unfortunately, it is a question of such extreme delicacy that the British Government has wisely kept very aloof from it. Will the newer race of Princes tackle it in right earnest ? Will not the part that the English women from the highest to the lowest are taking in this terrible European war open their eyes ? But for this splendid backing of their womenfolk, could England have hoped to win this war ? It is only high-souled and well-trained mothers that can produce heroes.

THE AGE FOR FULL POWERS.

All this training necessarily postulates that the age of majority, of investiture with full ruling powers, must be higher than it is in the case of ordinary mortals. The greater the responsibility, the longer the period of training and dependence is the well-known rule of Nature, and it may not be broken in the case of man, without bringing him to pain and trouble. The Government of India has therefore been wisely advised in advancing the age of majority of a Ruling Prince from 18 to 21 years but this is not enough. When it is remembered that the well-being, the prosperity, of millions of human beings—nay their very life and honour will have to be committed to his charge, it is but fair that the rules that apply to average humanity should not apply to him, but that a much higher standard should be exacted from him. Not till he has passed his 25th year, as it is expressively called in Hindustan, *gadah pachisi*, (the *pous asinorum* of the first 25 years of life) should he be entrusted with the lives and destinies of peoples. This of course does not mean that the installation ceremony is to be deferred to this age. The succession ceremony should take place as a matter of course on the demise of the previous Ruler.

INSTALLATION.

There is a good deal of feeling among the Indian Princes and Chiefs over the procedure adopted by the Government of India with regard to this subject. They hold that it is against their dignity and against their

rights as semi-Sovereign Princes that they should have to suffer the humiliation of being enthroned on their ancestral *gadi* by any ~~outside~~ power, be it as high as a Governor-General, or lower in the ~~order~~ ^{rank} as a provincial Head, or still lower, an agent of either. Their contention is, that they hold their States in their own rights, and their admission of British Protectorate over them, does not give the Government of India the right to treat them in the manner in which a Suzerain may treat his Feudal nobles who had received grants of Fiefs *from* the Over-Lord. This point ought to be conceded, and the Princes and Chiefs should be installed by the chosen representatives of the people whom they are to govern. This was the goodly ancient custom, and it is in the fitness of things that modern democratic sentiment (which on this point is in full consonance with ancient Hindu practice as well as Western) demands that the Ruler should be handed the insignia of his high office by those over whom he is to rule, and after he has been made to take the coronation oath of protecting the rights and liberties of the people in accordance with ancient traditional forms. On this point of installing their king by the *people*, the *Mahabharata* says :—

असंत्यक्तमनुष्यं च तं जनाः कुर्वन्ते नृपम् ।

(Him who is ever accessible and sympathetic, the *people* instal as their king.)

The Coronation oath as exacted by the *Rishis* from Pritbu, whose father, King Vena, they had condemned

to death because of his manifold misdeeds ; as given in the *Mahabharata* runs thus :—

प्रतिज्ञां चाधिरोहन् मनसा गिरा ।

पालायिष्याम्यहं भोमं ब्रह्म इत्येव चासक्तः ॥

यश्चात्र धर्म इत्युक्तो दण्ढनीतिव्यपाश्रयः ।

तं अशंकः कश्चिद्यामि स्ववशो न कदाचन ॥

(I swear in thought, word, and deed to unceasingly foster and protect the good, and to punish the wicked : to act unhesitatingly according to the law, and never to behave, autocratically, despotically or wilfully.)

Unfortunately all this was not always acted up to. It was only when the hereditary hierarchy fell out with the hereditary bureaucracy, then only the people, the masses, came into their own ; then only could the Rights of Man, as against the Right of Might be successfully asserted.

NAZARS.

Another sore point is the rule that the Feudatories are to present *Nazars* to the Governor-General and the Provincial Heads. Now this presenting of *Nazars* is a relic of the barbarous days of military autocracies, and it subserves no useful purpose to keep up ceremonies fit only for those Dark Ages. But the evil is ubiquitous. The acceptance of *Nazars* is practised by every one who gets the chance throughout the whole of India, British and non-British. While the Native Chief feels his dignity hurt by having to present *Nazars* to some British official, he does not scruple to inflict the same humiliation himself on his own

people. In British India also *Nazars* have to be shown to the Provincial Heads in *Darbars*. Now the observance of all these antiquated formalities which have no living significance left, becomes ludicrous in British India. Still lower come the *Zemindars* in British and non-British India, whether holders of broad acres, or of a trifling patch of land, they all insist on exacting *nazars* from their tenants and their servants. All this ridiculous and exasperating system reminiscent of the dark days of Feudalism should be made a clean sweep of.

HONOURS.

Now, that the vital question of self-preservation is no more the concern of the Indian Princes as far as aggression from without or insurrection from within is concerned, but is that of the Sovereign power, it behoves the princes then to push on with all the vigour and earnestness they are capable of, the imperative duty of Progress and Reform in their States, and of welding the 'isolated' chiefships into a Federation of enlightened and civilised States.

This can be helped on by many methods—one of them—the most potent one—by proper education has been delineated above. Another is by the method of judicious bestowal of honours.

Of the two that would appeal most strongly would be the increase in the Salute. Two more grades of 23, and 25 might be formed and the bestowal of some higher designation than that of H. H. Many of these style themselves *Farzand-a-Englishia*, etc., which can only mean "Child of the English Royal Family."

Why not then utilise this and give to a select few the rank of the Princes of the Blood-Royal and style them H. R. H. ? How highly it will be valued and how much more it will help to bring them nearer the British throne, may be realised by seeing how tenaciously the Princes cling even now after the utter disappearance of the Mussalman Empire, to the windy, bombastic titles bestowed by the Great Moghal. Similarly, greater honours and more profusely, might be bestowed on the officials of the Indian States. In fact, they might be put on the same footing as the officers of the British Government with regard to questions of precedence and decoration.

One thing more. The power of bestowing titles on their own subjects exercised by the Princes of first rank should be put on a proper footing by those titles being recognised by the Government of India. But if this is to come about, a definite understanding will have to be arrived at, regulating the numbers and conditions of bestowal, of public notification, of office record, etc., etc., with the Government of India by the Princes desirous of such recognition. They might also be allowed to distribute a certain fixed number of British decorations and invest the recipients themselves in public *darbar*—as do the Provincial Governors.

Finally, the important questions, namely, that of the rank, and precedence, and the mode of address for the heir-apparents and of the brothers and sons of the Ruling Princes and Chiefs has so far never been settled. It is manifestly absurd that the heir

should be addressed as H. H.; it is decidedly derogatory to address him or his brothers as commoners. The official mode of address is a sore point in every Native Court. There was much sulking and quite justifiably when the R-sidency refused to address the heir-apparent of the premier Vassal State as *Shahazada*. Will the Princes themselves send up a united suggestion as to the proper forms to be observed when referring to the members of their families? No such confusion and uncertainty exists with regard to the social proprieties, that should be observed in dealings with the scions of the British Royal family or those of the British nobles, then why cannot this be settled for these also, to the comfort of every one concerned?

The other ticklish question is that of precedence. It is not possible in the 20th century to revert to the ceremonials observed a 100 years ago, where a Maharana of Udaipur could sit enthroned while the bare-footed British Agent was kneeling *dozanu* among his courtiers below; nor is it desirable that these Ruling Princes should suffer the indignity of having to go to receive the Residents at Railway Stations, or to allow them to sit side by side with them on their thrones,—as if both were the *joint-sovereigns* of the State—in public Darbars, or be invariably accompanied by them side by side in Imperial processions, and undergo the further humiliation of having the Resident presented *before* them. Tact and commonsense ought to find a *via media* between the two extremes. For one thing, every Ruling Prince should be accorded the

ceremonial due to a "semi-Sovereign" and so should have precedence of every British official below the Viceroy, in India; and in England they should, as naturally, be accorded precedence over the Foreign Ambassadors, and just after the Royal Family.

The Indian Princes, like the Indian people, are becoming self-conscious, and are no more inclined to give up tamely their rights and privileges than the latter are. While courtsey costs nothing, and is in fact the lubricant, of the social machine, want of it generates heat and conflagration. But while pleading for full social consideration for the Indian Feudatories, they too need reminding that their social behaviour towards Indians, who are not of their own exalted rank leaves very much to be desired. Most of them insist upon keeping up absurd, antiquated Court customs in this democratic century, in which insistence on the privileges of birth and of caste, look foolish and ridiculous, when not downright idiotic. When the veneer of shams and of mere gilt and tinsel is being so ruthlessly torn asunder, is it right, is it politic, for these Princes to behave in such stuck up fashion, as unfortunately—with a few bright exceptions—the great majority of these do? The pitiable part of it is that none of them dare behave in those discourteous ways towards an European, however lowly his social status may be. It is the observance of this racial distinction as galling as that of the Arm's Act, which still more lowers the Native Prince in the eyes of the people and makes it impossible for self-respecting Indians to

come into touch with them. Lest I might be thought writing at random, I will give concrete instances. The Maharaja of Travancore, while he will accord a proper seat and receive any and every European with due courtesy, will do nothing of the kind for an Indian, be he his own subject or British. His highest officers—Chief Minister, Chief Judge etc.,—must stand all the time they are in his presence, even though it be a business interview lasting for hours. On public occasions, when Europeans and Indians are both present, the former are allotted seats, but the latter must keep standing, so that it happens that Europeans in the Maharaja's service, have seats while their Indian superiors have to keep standing! This may be an extreme case, but the less extreme cases require no less a change of attitude. For instance the latest Minto-created ruling Chief, while he himself sits on a chair, expects everyone of his 'native' visitors to squat down on the floor at his feet, among his servants and flunkies, his high officials—Chief Secretary, Chief Judge etc., all squatting there. All this must be replaced by modernised social behaviour, where the differences of mere rank do not count to such an extent that one of a lower social rank will not be forced to observe such humiliating social etiquette which would be lowering to his dignity as a fellow-creature, as a man. 'Do unto others as you would be done by' is a very useful maxim to remember by the Princes, when they are demanding proper social treatment for themselves. Let them treat their own people as men, and not as

slaves; and *then only* will they themselves deserve to be treated as men by those who now treat them as if they were tame bears and themselves the keepers.

STATE BOUNDARIES.

Before going on to suggest the heads on which reform would be welcome, indeed urgently required, I would urge here the prime necessity of a well-defined boundary. Sir William Lee-Warner says:—"In the Bombay Presidency there is hardly a single district outside Sind in which one or more *enclaves* of foreign territory do not abound. Even in the case of a solid block, like the State of Hyderabad, the frontier is so irregular that British towns are surrounded by the jurisdiction of His Highness the Nizam, and his villages lie in the heart of British territory." (*Protected Princes of India*, p. 16.) Now, such a state of affairs is not very desirable, for it inevitably produces friction. It ought to be and can be rectified. The difficulties in its consummation are not insuperable. All the three methods possible (*a*) purchase, (*b*) lease, (*c*) exchange, could be employed by turns to secure clear, undisputed boundaries avoiding intermingling of different territorial jurisdictions.

STATE ARMIES.

Another thorny question which might as well be dealt with here is that of the armies of the Feudatories.

Modern British diplomacy throws a cloak over it and is not fond of publicly girding against this enormous rabble—more dangerous to its own masters and their subjects than to anybody else. Time was when

the British officials minced not their words, but frankly and openly deplored and denounced the existence of this army—every treaty bears witness to the uneasiness caused by it. Even now British India has to pay for a large British army and huge cantonments located in or near the territories of Indian Princes, which burden has to be borne by us as long as the Feudatories continue to maintain large ill-disciplined armies.

Now, what use are these to them? They simply eat up their substance and snatch the hard-won bread from the mouth of their subjects. These armies cannot be employed either for aggression or for repression, neither can they be properly armed and equipped, nor provided with Indian officers trained in the Military Schools of Europe. Why then continue this utterly useless and costly waste? Everybody knows that even the British-officered and inspected Imperial Service Troops have to be maintained on a lower level of efficiency than the British troops. By the abolition of these armies—a large amount of money would be liberated both in British and Feudatory India for developing the capacities of the people and the country. All this saving might well be spent *on education, which is in a deplorably backward condition in all the States except two or three, and on the development of the economic resources of the State, and the financing of trades and industries. An expenditure of twenty per cent. of the State Revenue on education would be none too much under the present circumstances.* They would besides be able to win some

especial privileges for themselves by such a step which under the circumstances would be far more useful than this sham of a show of sovereignty. For instance, the conditions of the Railways, Steam Navigation, Telegraph, Wireless and other such like concessions vary greatly from State to State—some being positively harsh—and they could all be made easier and more uniform.

Every one of them might well keep Imperial Service Troops as their share of contribution towards Imperial defence but only up to a limit of 3 per cent. of their income. In an interpellation in the Viceregal Council it came out that Alwar spent 14 p. c. of its income on the troops while the Nizam spent a bare 1 p. c. The burden on the poor revenue of Alwar is enormous in comparison to the rich one of Hyderabad. The squeezable capacity of the Ruler of the time should not be set up as the criterion of the contribution. For purposes of internal order a small body of well-disciplined Military Police would be amply sufficient—as an aid to the Civil Police.

The Native States may feel sore that while they are so rigidly “supervised and advised” in matters military even to the extent that they have to depend upon the sweet autocratic will of the British Resident for a rifle or a revolver for their own personal use, Afganistan is *helped* by a subsidy of 18 lakhs a year to arm not only its army, which, unlike that of the Indian States, may be as large as it chooses, but all its ferocious subjects even with arms of the latest pattern. The

native Afghan Officer is not capable of merely leading his men into action, but understands strategy, is a capable artillery officer (which no Indian whether in British-ruled or Native-ruled India—is), knows all about aeroplanes even, in short, thanks to his Turkish teachers, is as up-to-date as possible. Further all sorts of military factories have been permitted to be established there and the Government of India has given active help for establishing such works, while the feudatories have to submit an annual report even on the amount of gunpowder they possess ! They are prohibited from giving even simple infantry drill to their subjects at large. The Rajputana and Punjab Chiefs find it hard to forget that they ruled over Kabul as Governors in the days of the Moghal Emperors—and that it was as much a part of India as Sindh or Punjab to say nothing of those pre-Moslem days when it was as much Hindu as any other portion of India and ruled by Hindu and Buddhist Emperors. Even so late as 1885 when Lord Dufferin held a Durbar at Rawalpindi to receive *His Highness* the Amir of Afghanistan, and dragooned a number of Indian Rulers into being present at it to add *eclat* and magnificence to the function and show off the power of Great Britain, the late Ruler of Kashmir successfully resisted the pressure and declined to be a consenting party to his own humiliation. For at that Durbar the Viceroy and the Amir sat side by side enthroned on high, while the Indian *His Highnesses* had to take lower seats. Maharaja

Ranabir Singh whose armies had often chastised the Afghan as had before him those of the "Lion of Punjab," Maharaja Ranjit Singh, his father's Surzerain, and the name of whose commander-in-chief, Hari Singh Nalua, was such a terror to these strong-limbed and lawless people, that their wives used to frighten their howling children into quietude with Nalua's name, would not brook being given a lower place than the Afghan Chief. Such sturdy assertion of independence would bring condign and swift punishment now, and the Princes have to attune themselves to their present environment. Lest this be regarded as mere rhetorical exaggeration, one has only to remember the unhappy cry at the glorious Coronation of the Emperor in Delhi against the Maharaja of Baroda. How every Anglo-Foreign paper bursting with race-hauteur and race-hatred gave tongue throughout the length and breadth of the land against the poor Gaekwar, the *bete noir* of the bureaucracy, who it seems had had the temerity to make certain suggestions for the better ceremonial treatment of the Ruling Princes but which unfortunately were displeasing to the powers that be. Nothing short of drawing, quartering and hanging the Maharaja would satisfy Anglo-India and for months after the event which nobody knew exactly what it was, its press kept resounding with anathemas against His Highness, who barely escaped with the skin of his teeth, a sadder and a wiser man. The Maharana of Udaipur too had to break his hereditary family oath, in the spirit, if he was saved the humiliation of having to break it in the letter

by the magnanimity of the Viceroy and his own timely surrender, and had to be present in Delhi. *His Highness* of Kabul has been raised to the dignity of *His Majesty* but let us hope that in the universal disappearance of every independent Islamic Kingdom before the march of the European powers, under the compulsion of their greedy traders ever on the look out for markets, under their own flags, his kingdom too, may not have reserved for it the fate of the "Kingdom of Oudh."

But the Sun of Kashmir has set, the sceptre fallen from the hands of that virile ruler into those of a weakling has suffered many an indignity, even to the extent of practical deposition. The powerful Governors of Kashmir and of Jammu who used to be addressed by the British Government as Excellencies, are now no better than the lowly *Tahsildars* of British Districts, ever genuflecting before the puissant Resident. While there is the Arms Act for His Highness's own subjects and other Indians, the foreigner enjoys the prestige and privileges of carrying arms freely ! Not only many valuable rights of semi-soverignty have been handed over to the Resident, but worse still even a large slice of border territory towards Afghanistan (Chitral) had to be made over to the British. It is an old, old tale. The weakness and incompetence of rulers makes interference unavoidable. So low have some of these Princes fallen, that shameful to relate, they themselves intrigue against their own Sirdars. For instance, one Rajputana Maharaja is reported on

his way back from England to have told the political officer who was bear-leading the party that some of his Sirdars had been surreptitiously purchasing rifles in England. Some few weak-kneed amongst these dropped their purchases in the Red Sea, for fear of a search of their baggage, as if they had been common thieves ; but others of true Kshattriya mettle, bearded their Ruler before his ' boss ' the Resident, and told the latter that the purchases had been made only after the Maharaja's permission had been obtained, to his confusion and discomfiture.

A brighter future, however, is dawning for the Indian Princes, the feeling of mistrust and suspicion is being replaced by one of trust and faith ; they too are getting educated on modern lines, (though alas ! very, very slowly) and it is to be hoped that in the interests of all concerned—the sovereign, the semi-sovereigns, and the 300 millions of the peoples of India—they may be, before long, permitted and trained to help in the higher task of bringing to birth a Federated Greater India under the guidance of Great Britain. For this great birth it is very necessary that the military career in all its highest branches should be thrown open to them, and in fact to every Indian, as freely as it is to every Britisher. Capacity and not color, should be the sole selecting guide.

EDUCATION.

The Government of India under the specious plea of want of funds will not make primary education compulsory and free, nor elementary and college edu-

cation more widespread and less costly. Some, alas, too few, of the Ruling Princes have risen to the occasion and are doing their best to educate their people. Baroda led the way. Indore has followed suit. The latest instances are those of the Begum of Bhopal and the Maharaja of Kolhapur, who have conferred the boon of compulsory and free primary education on their subjects. Mysore has taken the lead in establishing a University. More recently Hyderabad has started the *Usmania* University, with English *put in its right place*, as a second language, while all the subjects are to be taught in the language of the Court, namely Urdu; for not till the medium of education becomes our own mother tongue and not an alien tongue, can there be genuine education in this country. It is the primary duty of every Indian from the highest to the lowest to do his utmost for spreading the benefits of education in the country. If every Native Prince, Chief, Feudatory, Tributary, or Zamindar vowed that he would not rest till the peoples committed to his care were educated and prosperous, fifty years hence the whole aspect of the land would be far different from what it is to-day. But he must not slavishly copy the Anglo-Indian methods. The United States of America and Germany, the smaller European States—Switzerland, Holland, are the places to go to learn what education can do and has done, and *how to do it*. If Japan has done it, why not we? If the method has been so brilliantly successful for the Philippines—and that too within less

than twenty years—then why not for us? It is all a question of the *will to do*. Let every Native State establish post-graduate travelling scholarships, in as large numbers as it can, and send out every year, in their scores and in their hundreds its brightest intellects to roam the world in the search of knowledge.

NUMBER OF FEUDATORIES.

The large number of Feudatories is due to the inclusion among them of numbers of chiefs owning only paltry patches of land, daily diminishing under the stress of the law of equal division, as, for instance, in Kathiawar, in the agencies of Rewa Kantha, Mahi Kantha, &c. Wherever there has been no primogeniture, no Feudatory rights should be recognised. In fact, it would pay to confer Feudatory rank and insignia on some of the Zemindars of British India with impartible states and incomes running into millions of rupees. Why need it be forgotten that many of these nominal Rajahs and Maharajahs were real ones in their day, exercising ruling functions. A certain definite standard of size, income and population ought to be fixed and only those States which conform to it ought to be recognised as Princes and the rest to be given the rank of premier Zemindars in their respective provinces. This is, of course, a very delicate matter, and will require as great *finesse* as that of Lord Curzon, who got the late Nizam to come to a permanent understanding with the British Government over the long open sore of Berar. The G. C. B. he got in exchange being interpreted by flippant wags to mean—Gave Curzon

Berars! But the situation has got to be faced with courage and with pertinacity, and of course with great sympathy. I would suggest that only those Feudatories be recognised as *Ruling* Princes and Chiefs whose revenues are not less than fifteen lakhs a year (£100,000); and territory not less than one thousand square miles. This would limit the numbers of the Feudatories, who really deserve to be ranked as such, to something like one-third of their present number.

FEDERATION SCHEME.

Now for the tentative scheme of Federation and the conditions by fulfilling which the Feudatories are to be admitted into it:—

1. Every Ruler, to grant a Constitution under the guarantee of the Government of India against its being withdrawn.

2. To appoint Legislative and Executive Councils with Ministerial responsibility.

3. To enact a *complete* body of Codified Laws; Civil, Commercial, Criminal, Labour,-Agrarian etc, etc. The British Acts, the Anglo-Indian, the British Colonial, the American, the Swiss, the German, the French, the Italian, should all be utilised in building up these codes, with the necessary modifications due to all that may be best in the indigenous, Hindu, Mussalman, and finally Customary Law.

The Indian States having a much freer hand than the Government of India, could be of immense help to the latter, if groups of States were to appoint Law

Commissions to compile digests of Customary Law which could be later codified into well-drafted Acts in the light of European experience.

It is not generally known though well worth knowing, that in Nepal it is a Penal offence to possess a copy of their nebulous regulations which are styled out of mere courtesy, Law. I wonder if there is a printing press or a newspaper in this rigidly "home-ruled" almost independant State. Such is the attitude of the only Native State where British influence is least—a relic of those barbarous mediæval days of India when none but a Brahmin may know the *Shastras*; a state of things not unknown to the aristocratic Roman Empire when a knowledge of the "Laws" was the heritage of the noble alone, and the *people* had to take it from the august hands of their masters, twisted and distorted to suit the patrician ends.

The publication of laws, full, clear and precise, has always been the outcome of the triumph of democracy.

With regard to law-making, it seems necessary to make one remark here. The Indian States must avoid enacting laws which emphasise racial cleavage, if they are not to lay up for themselves a store of bitterness and tribulations. The Travancore Arms Act of 1909, is a strong case in point. Similar is the import of the Kashmir Arms Regulations—the Foreigner shall not be required to take out a license—but not so the Native! The many Press Acts and Newspaper Regulations of diverse States are all equally bad and the whole lot of them have to be very carefully revised.

The making of laws is not half so important as the observance of them, and to secure this end no one, however highly placed, must be exempted from their operation: the king himself must not be above the law. Hear what Manu—whom nobody can accuse of an anti-patrician bias and according to whom a king is a divine being not an ordinary mortal—says on this point of the sovereignty of law, as against personal sovereignty. He says:—

The Rod of Justice, the Sceptre of the Law, is verily the king, the leader, the ruler, the seminal principle that vitalises the whole body politic. It is the living pledge that all the four types of men, in all the four stages of life shall do their Duty without fail. It governs all the peoples, it protects them; it alone keeps wakeful watch when all others sleep. It is Law (*Dharma*) itself. It destroys the king who deviates from the path of Duty and of Righteousness. (Ch. 7. Verses 17, 18, 27, 28.)

There is the famous instance of that powerful king, Venu having been done to death by holy Brahmins in the ancient days.

In short, autocracy, irresponsibilism, the personal will of the ruler, have all got to be abolished in favour of "limited monarchy," of the Reign of Law.

4. To inaugurate proper Courts of Justice.

5. Every ruler to take an oath, modelled on the British Coronation oath, publicly on his installation, to his people, pledging himself to do the utmost that lies in him to advance *their* interests.

The canker at the root of the Hindu Polity has been the centering of all the three functions of sovereignty, namely the Executive, the Judicial, and the Legislative, which are organically separate, and different, in the person of the monarch. There can be

no stability, no permanence, no continuity, in a State where Government hangs on a single life. It may be out off any moment by the assassin's dagger, by disease, by accident. And, after all, there is the fundamental psychological difficulty that there can never be a person, however Superman he be, who can properly combine within his single body such three diametrically opposed temperaments, as are necessary for the proper carrying out of the three functions. The inevitable result of such a centralisation of powers has been favouritism, dilatoriness, laxness, insufficient knowledge, in short inefficiency, and oppression. How, then, is the enormously longer and enormously more complete life of the State than that of an individual to be guarded from shocks which may weaken and even may kill it, and how is its health and strength to be promoted? By making its *Sutratman*, not a frail human creature, but a Constitution; with its fundamentally separate triple aspect of Brahma, Vishnu, Mahesha represented in the permanently independent activities of the Executive, the Judicial, and the Legislative and Fiscal authorities. Disturb their balance of power and you have *Pralaya*, destruction, chaos.

Even the oldest Hindu polity blundered here. While separating the Executive function, they mixed up the Judicial and the Legislative. It made still further trouble for itself, in the long run, by making the exercise of both these functions the monopoly of hereditary castes (the Kshatriya and the Brahmin) and so sinister vested right

divorced from duties, grew up with tropical luxuriance, and the *people* suffered.

The two weakest points in the administration of Native States are, their Financial and Judicial systems, while the Executive is their over-strong, mischief-making point which needs much curbing.

The judiciary higher and lower alike, has to be made as inflexible, as incorruptible, as independent, as jealous of outside interference, as it is in England.

Neither King, nor Minister, nor Parliament can exert the slightest influence over it, or modify, hasten or delay either its procedure or its judgments. (*The German Peril* by Frederic Harrison, p. 204.)

Alas! that this cannot always be said of even British India; for under certain circumstances instead of enforcing *justice*, the Courts enforce *policies*, as has been pertinantly remarked by Maitland about the doings of the notorious Star Chamber a few centuries back in England. (*vide* his *Constitutional History of England*).

The Legislature which will be representative of all varieties of class interests and industries in the State, has to be equally strong in the exercise of its functions. No amount of pressure should prevent its passing laws it deems necessary nor force it to pass laws that it deems hurtful; nor without its authority should there be levied any taxes, or State revenues distributed, nor should it be so accommodating as to vote all the monies that an Executive may want, against its own convictions of right and wrong. For "If the executive can control taxation, the result is tyranny." (*The German Peril*, p. 210).

EMPLOYMENT OF EUROPEANS.

The embargo laid on the Native States with regard to the employment of non-Indians without the special sanction of the foreign office should be abrogated. There is no danger now of their employing military adventurers to train their troops. Under the present conditions of service, every European servant of an Indian State regards himself more as a servant of the British Government than of the State employing him, and believes more in keeping the Resident in good humour than doing his duty. Naturally, there is a great aversion to employing foreign agency however skilled and helpful it might be, when there is always present the trouble of such an employee playing the master instead of the servant. With healthier conditions the relations are bound to be healthier also and lead to a greater utilisation of foreign ability and talent—till it can be safely and usefully replaced by a home-grown one.

The Egyptian system of having 'Native' Ministers and 'Foreign' Advisers is alleged to work on the whole fairly well. The initiative and responsibility remaining with the Egyptian—while trained advice—critical and constructive, is at the elbow of every Minister (*vide* Cromer's *Egypt*). The Egyptian version of the state of affairs as it exists in *reality* is however very different. It has been voiced by Hall Caine in his very sympathetic treatment of the situation in Egypt, in his well-known novel, *The White Prophet*. It is shown there that the English Advisers are all-powerful, while the very-much-advised Egyptian Minis-

ters non-entities ; only there to register their decrees, and execute them as their own ! All such Advisers—Public Works, Judicial, Financial, etc., if it be thought advisable to have such, to have the privilege of attending ‘ Cabinet ’ meetings with powers of speech and discussion but not of vote. The employment of Americans and Europeans in such capacities would, perhaps, be more useful than of employing them in actual Executive or Secretarial work as at present. They are apt to kick against the feeling of subordination which all such work naturally implies in Feudatory States with Indian heads of departments. Of course, this feeling would gradually diminish and vanish under a different system of recruitment and subordination and with a much superior set of Indian official heads than is generally the case at present .

MINORITY ARRANGEMENTS

The system followed in India—especially during minorities—of appointing a Council of Regency with the Resident as President is wholly mischievous. It always becomes in practice irresponsible autocratic rule, sheltered behind a Council. Neither has joint-administration much to recommend it. It may work well, as it is said to have done in the case of Bhavnagar ; but in that instance it was due rather to an accident than to the policy. It is not easy to get hold of Europeans and Indians of the mental and moral quality of harmony which would make for smooth *joint* responsibility. without the former trying to domineer over the latter under the state of conditions as pre-

valent now in the Native States. In those States, however, in which through the liberality and wisdom of the Rulers, the people have been associated with the Government, and the eternally true principle of Government of the people, by the people, for the people, has been properly established, there will be no difficulties. There will be no break in the administration because of the death of the Chief; the impersonal Constitution never dies, it lives on for ever, meeting every emergency as it arises.

FINANCE.

The question of Finance is generally a thorny one on account of two special reasons.

The British Government brings pressure to bear upon the Feudatories for the abolition of Customs duties in the interests of foreign traders and manufacturers, and keeps generally a tight hold over their Budgets. *There is a steady tendency to absorb every Feudatory seaport and to encircle every frontier Feudatory with a strip of British red.* With ministerial responsibility and legislative control, complete financial autonomy must be allowed and proposals for levying a tariff for Revenue or even frankly protectionist purposes or the creation of monopolies should not be vetoed as they are at present, by the Government of India most illegally. The other difficulty comes from the Chiefs themselves who have been treating their States as if they were all crown lands or private domains—just like Zemindary property whose whole income is treated as private income.

The constitution should fix a separate Civil List which might vary between 3 to 6 per cent. in the *inverse* ratio of the State Revenues nor should the ruler be permitted *jagirs*, crown lands. Even where some arrangement for fixing a Civil List exists, it is on an enormously wasteful scale. To give one instance only. The Nizam has a Civil List of about 50 lakhs, besides *Jagirs* known as *Paigah* estates yielding over a crore which with better management, would yield half as much again, and with all this enormous sum in his rivvy purse—the late Nizam was heavily in debt! This is practically double that of the King-Emperor which is roughly £600,000 a year. Such fearful waste is nothing short of criminal and should be put a stop to, and the money thus saved to be utilised for State purposes—for Education, for Public Works, for industries and diverse other insistent calls.

It is a most culpable misuse of the surplus of Native State Revenues or of the private hoardings of the Chief that they should be invested in Government of India Promissary Notes or in any other Foreign securities, or deposited in Foreign Banks. A few years back the State of Travancore lost a huge sum of money through the notorious bankruptcy of the Madras firm of Arbuthnots. To begin with, it is very bad finance that the taxes should be so heavy as to allow of such surpluses, secondly it is still more reprehensible that the surpluses instead of being utilised for advancing the interests of its own subjects, in a hundred diverse ways, should be

invested in interest bearing securities, as if the State administration was a banking firm! What moral justification can the Foreign Department of the Government of India plead for taking away six crores to invest in Promissory Notes, the late ruler's savings and that too during the minority of the present ruler of Gwalior or for similar investments during the minority of other Feudatories? Such transactions have almost as bad a flavour in the mouth, as those of the older days, when, 'benevolences' were accepted from the Native States. (*vide* Sir Henry Lawrence's article on Oudh, reprinted in his *Essays*.)

AUDIT.

In most States reckless extravagance and unaccounted spending is constantly going on—especially in the Public Works Department—to say nothing about the expenditure incurred under the immediate orders of the Rulers. To give one instance only,—take the Kashmir Electric Power Scheme, where it seems, from an original estimate of sixteen lakhs the costs have gone up to near a crore and a half! When the difference is so vast between the actuals and the estimates, naturally the possibility of the high return shown in the original, will be in the inverse ratio of the outlay. During the last days of Sir Sheshadri Iyer's tenure of the Chief Ministership of Mysore or perhaps just after his resignation, a similar fate befell the revenues of the State over the renewal of the Gold Mining Lease and the Cauvery Electric Power Installation. Can any merely 'native' Minister under the

present condition of affairs hope to cope with this evil without getting an ignominious fall?

An audit department as a check on all unauthorised expenditure is necessary in the interests of the State itself. Nothing favours peculation and misappropriation of the public money so much as entrusting one and the same department with the power of collecting taxes, sanctioning or incurring expenditure and keeping accounts. Therefore, this function of keeping accounts and seeing that no department, however important, and no officer, however exalted, incurs the smallest expenditure that has not been previously sanctioned must be vested in a special department which shall have no hand or part in any branch of the work of administration. (*Letters &c.* p. 64).

Where European experts are generally employed, these, though technically subordinate to the Indian Ministers, are really independent of all serious control, for over and above the prestige of expert knowledge the race prestige effectually crows the Indian controlling heads—the fear of the Resident and the Foreign office acting as a wet blanket on the enthusiasm of an indiscreet ‘native’ Minister.

This department to be really effective and powerful, will have to be manned by experts, who must be allowed full independence by express enactment and with whose rulings not even the Ruler of the State should be able to interfere so as to deflect them from the right course.

It hardly needs pointing out that the Financial condition of the Indian States and their Rulers would have been far different from what they are to-day if such a powerful brake on the spending departments as also on the wasteful whims of the Chiefs themselves had existed.

To enter into greater details of the *internal* management of the States would only mean the repetition to a large extent of all that I have already said with regard to the administration of British India in my other Chapters of the book.

Such in rough, and with many crudities, is the outline suggested for fixing on an equitable and stable basis the mutual relations of the British Government and its Feudatories, the relations of the Feudatories and their own subordinate chiefs and subjects and finally, the relation that should subsist between the subjects of British-ruled and "Home-ruled India." For the future of United India lies even more in the hands of the Native States and their Rulers than it does in those of the British and British-ruled India. Through acting and reacting on each other, learning from each other's failures and shortcomings, profiting by each other's successful experiments, may they all work in unison with a single eye to the progressive development of the Motherland and its 300 millions of poverty-stricken, God-loving, and law-abiding inhabitants.

S U M M A R Y.

(1) The Ruling Chiefs to be separated into two broad classes; namely, (a) those who do really exercise the powers of a semi-sovereignty, and (b) those who are rulers only in name and possess either very few of the attributes of this semi-sovereignty even or exercise these through the agency of British officers whether paid by

the State or States concerned or even by the British Government.

(2) All these latter—and they will number some hundreds—to be removed from the category of Feudatories and put on their proper and real level as Zemindars, with plenty of show and pomp and dignity about them but all their *show* of power and administrative independence shorn in theory also, as it is in actual fact. All such ‘Chiefs’—a good many of whom do not even follow such an elementary self-preserving ordinance as that of primogeniture—owning only a bare few miles of India’s land or a few thousands of rupees as their State income and exercising some shadowy ‘civil’ powers might well be humored and ‘honored’ into giving up these rights and privileges which, while devoid of all substantiality, effectually keep the Chiefs out of the pale of the protecting English law and keep them and their States under the thumb of a Foreign Office owing an account of its actions to none.

(3) All these States to be divided into 5 groups according to their size, population, income and their general importance.

(4) A Council of Princes to be established, which is not to be a sham like the “Imperial Councillors” of that administrative failure Lord Lytton, but to be a reality.

(5) The Council to elect annually from among its own members, one President and four vice-Presidents. These not to be open to re-election without one break

of term. The Council to have a properly organised office, with paid Secretary, Assistant Secretaries, Registrar, clerks etc. The Viceroy's duties to be confined to delivering the opening and closing speeches every session. All the members of his Executive Council and the Foreign and the Political Secretaries to be *ex-officio* full members. Each of the 5 groups of the Feudatories to elect for a term of 5 years 20 Councillors, thus making a total of 100. No Councillor to seek re-election without a break of one term, except those of the first 2 groups because of their very small numbers.

(6) The Council to hold a Session every year after *Depavali* (sometimes in November) in Delhi for not more than a fortnight and not less than one week.

(7) To start with, the business of the Assembly to be social, consultative and advisory. The Administration Reports of each State to be produced before it and special attention called to any new or remarkable feature of the year's administration in any of the States. Answers to be provided to questions arising out of these; the speeches to be mostly confined to suggesting better or improved methods of dealing with progressive administration. It is time and experience that will show in what directions its work could be most profitably enlarged.

Lord Chelmsford deserves the thanks of all India for having inaugurated such a Council in the last days of October 1916; and it is to be fervently hoped that no reactionary counsels will prevail either making it an

impotent, mere show, affair, or suppressing it altogether. It is to be hoped that it will be given statutory recognition by an Act of Parliament, which will prevent its discontinuance, and that Secretariat influences would be so carefully provided against that they will not be able to make it a very showy but very empty shell as they have the wise action of Lord Morley in the case of the Legislative Councils, by enacting the thoroughly hampering and even mischievous Regulations against which the country has been ever since crying itself hoarse.

(8) The Viceroy not to be his own Foreign Minister.

(9) The Provincial Political Departments should be abolished, and every Feudatory State brought into direct relation with the Government of India. This would not only please the Ruling Chiefs and their subjects very much, for the sense of subjection is very much mitigated by a contemplation of the rank and high name of the person by whom power is exercised, but would also be of solid advantage in various ways. It would bring to bear on "Native State" administration high statesmanship instead of the mere petty administrative skill of the Provincial Political Agents. It would make for a more even-handed justice and uniform treatment of the States, which is not possible under many and divergent authorities, all equally autocratic.

(10) The Cadets of the Ruling Houses should be employed in large numbers, as honorary *attache* to

every political agency and in the Secretariat, and be given real hard work to do. It is obvious that this would give invaluable training to the future Rulers and Ministers of the States, who will naturally be taken from these. This will, besides, help to break down the fearful isolation of the Feudatories, for as *attaches* they will have made life-long friendships, already begun in their Rajkumar College days.

(11) No ruling Princes or members of their family to hold *Jagirs* (crownlands). A cash Civil list is the only proper arrangement.

(12) All Indian States in the interests of a Greater India to yield up their Currency and Postal rights. One Coinage, one Post, one system of Weights and Measures are essential.

(13) Each group of the Feudatories to elect four members from among the nearest relatives of the Rulers that may be available for the purpose, to represent the group of States sending them, to the Supreme Legislative Council.

(14) The dual control over the Political Agencies beyond India should be abolished. If the British Foreign Office thinks it necessary to keep these under its control then their expenses must come out of the British Exchequer; India should not be saddled with them. But if India must pay, then they should be under the sole control of the Indian Foreign Office.

CHAPTER IV.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS.

At the very outset it will be well to realise clearly that the present system of administration in India is the result not of *fission* but of *fusion*. It was the Regulating Act of 1773 that created the office of Governor-General—or rather made the Governor of Bengal, the Governor-General of India, while retaining his direct control over Bengal as its Governor—and made 'him the supreme controlling authority in India. This control was extended by Statute in 1784 and 1793, and was rendered absolute by the Charter Act of 1833, and the instructions issued thereon by the Court of Directors. As the three Presidencies grew and grew and their political relations with the sovereign 'Native States' about them became more and more complex and a constant source of danger and of anxiety, even to the extent of sometimes menacing the very continuance of the British occupation of the country, it became necessary to check the waywardness of the Presidency Administrations—each playing for its own hand, unmindful of results to the others—by unifying for *political* purposes, the different and conflicting administrations under a central authority. But the process once started, and its causes forgotten, it has gone on at an ever-accelerated pace

till every vestige of real independence—and even of nominal for the matter of that—has gone, and Madras and Bombay have been reduced to the level of the other subsequently created Provinces. The Presidency Mints have gone, the Presidency Armies have gone, the Presidency Services have become merged into Imperial or All-India Services, and so on. But circumstances have changed, and it is to be fervently hoped that the three Presidencies will regain most of their early independence and the newer Provinces will approximate to *those* in their autonomous powers and *not* drag them down to their own level of subordination. Further, the grip of the Government of India over the Provincial throats has not meant the relaxation of the Secretary of State's grip. So these labour under a double thralldom.

WAYS OF CONTROL.

It is not necessary to go into the ways in which the Secretary of State controls the action of the Provincial Governments ; here we are concerned chiefly with the control of the Government of India over them. The following excerpts from the Decentralisation Report will show the various ways in which the overlordship is asserted.

(1) By Financial rules and restrictions, including those laid down by Imperial departmental codes.

(2) By general or particular checks of a more purely administrative nature, which may (a) be laid down by law or by rules having the force of law, or (b) have grown ~~up~~ in practice.

(3) By preliminary scrutiny of proposed Provincial legislation, and sanction of Acts passed in the Provincial legislatures.

(4) By general resolutions on questions of policy, issued for the guidance of the Provincial Governments. These often arise upon the reports of Commissions or Committees appointed from time to time by the Supreme Government to investigate the working of departments with which the Provincial Governments are primarily concerned.

(5) By instructions to particular Local Governments in regard to matters which may have attracted the notice of the Government of India in connection with the departmental administration reports periodically submitted to it, or the "proceedings volumes" of a Local Government.

(6) By action taken upon matters brought to notice by the Imperial Inspectors-General.

(7) In connection with the large right of appeal possessed by persons dissatisfied with the actions or orders of a Provincial Government.

Summarising the general trend of *official* opinion on the above subjects, the Decentralisation Report (p. 26) says:—

The Provincial Governments, with the exception of Bombay, are content with the general lines of the present system, but all hold that there has been an excessive interference by the Government of India in matters of detail.

The Report makes detailed suggestions for minimising in future this *excessive interference* by the Government of India. But, it is to be feared, all those

detailed suggestions will prove merely temporary palliatives and the over-grown Imperial Secretariat, with the help of the Imperial Inspectors-General will, no sooner decentralisation has begun, find ways and means for tightening again their grip on the Provincial Governments.

The importance of the matter was so fully realised by the Commission that practically the whole of the bulky Report deals with the relations of the Central and the Local Governments. They realised that the state of affairs was far from what it ought to be. A few quotations would help to bring clearly to the reader's mind the attitude of the Commission to the question. They say that, even over *ordinary internal administration*

the Government of India exercise a general and constant control. They lay down lines of general policy, and test their application from the administrative reports and returns relating to the main departments under the Local Governments. (As already stated, the Local Governments also submit copies of all their printed proceedings to the Government of India.) They also employ expert officers to inspect and advise upon a number of departments which are *primarily* administered by the Local Governments, including Agriculture, Irrigation, Forests, Medical, Sanitation, Education, Excise, Salt, Printing and Stationery, and Archaeology. These officers are commonly known as Inspectors-General. (Italics mine.)

The above is a truly formidable list and even then it is not exhaustive !

The control of the Government of India is, moreover, not confined to the prescription of policy and to action taken upon reports and inspections. It assumes more specific forms. . . . The practical result is that no new departure in Provincial administration can be undertaken without their preliminary sanction, or in important matters, without that of the Secretary of State also. . . . The *essential* point to be borne in mind is thus that at present, even in matters *primarily* assigned to the Provincial Governments, these act as the *agents* of the Government of India, who exercise a *very full and constant* check over their proceedings. (p. 21).

Is it to be wondered at that the Government of Bombay strongly objects to this sort of absolute muzzling and manacling? See the very illuminating views of the Bombay Government on the subject (pp. 224-237 vol. VIII. Dec. Com. Report.) but which are too lengthy to be conveniently summarised here.

A few excerpts from the note of the Chief Commissioner of the N. W. F. P. which was created by Lord Curzon, in 1901, in the teeth of Panjab opposition, not only non-official but also official, printed in vol. IX of the Dec. Com. Report are no less outspoken—considering that it is an official document emanating from a Local Government *directly* subordinate to the Governor-General, and therefore bound to be more or less muzzled, unlike the Bombay Government, with its traditions of equality and of independence.

The Local Administration, while necessarily admitting that a considerable degree of centralisation is inevitable, and no one would wish it otherwise, go on to remark that :—

There is, however, at times a danger of this centralisation being carried to extremes, and of the Foreign Department of the Government of India attempting to administer the frontier too much in details and from a departmental point of view.

When it is remembered that the Frontier Districts were created into a province by the autocratic Viceroy Lord Curzon, to save these from the bane of this very *departmentalism*, by bringing them through the Foreign Office under his immediate control, it will be seen how well-grounded was the Panjab opposition to its creation. The note has many such sentences :—

In this and other matters the influence of the departments of the Government of India, owing to excessive caution *due to ignorance of local conditions*, is apt to be too rigid and uniform. (*Italics mine.*) The Local Government may be sure of its ground and able and willing to push forward in a particular line of policy, but the Government of India Departments are inclined to look with doubt or suspicion on a step forward being taken in our province unless all other provinces are ready to advance in the same direction. *Hence the pace in matters of administrative progress is usually that of the slowest province.* (*Italics mine.*) The tendency is strong in the Finance, and Public Works, and Railway Departments, especially in the latter, where revenue and departmental considerations are allowed to stand in the way of salutary reforms, when suggested from outside, and where the officials in their zeal for departmental interests are apt to overlook the interests of the public and the fact that they are *public servants*, not servants of a department. (*Italics in the original.*)

The note goes on to give a number of concrete instances of the misdoings of the Government of India in every department of administration, and remarks :—

The cases illustrate the powerlessness of Local Governments and the extent to which administrative improvements may be blocked by narrow departmental views.

It will thus be seen that all that I have said in the previous chapters about the necessity of comparative independence from the harassing control of the India Office over the Government of India applies with even greater force to the control of the Provincial Governments by the Supreme Government. For in this case with highly-organised Secretariats of immense power within such convenient striking distance, the opportunities tempting to incessant meddling become irresistible: while in the back-ground there is also the distant India Office to meddle and muddle. The late Sir John Strachey has some very true remarks in his *India* (p. 290 2nd ed.) on the serious limitations under

which the Head of a Local Government exercises his powers. He says :—

There is no branch of the administration in which he is not bound either by positive law, or by the Standing Orders of the Supreme Government, or by the system which has gradually grown up under his predecessor.

The above sentiment was due to his experience both as the Head of a Provincial Government, the United Provinces, and as one of the most powerful ministers of the Supreme Government. It will be perceived that the net in which the Local Administrations are enmeshed is both fine and strong, and from it there is no escape. This, while limiting efficiently the power for evil, limits still more their power for good. Under such a system all initiative is effectually killed out and the spur to ambition, to do one better, is blunted and one dead level of mediocrity and conservatism secured. The late Sir George Campbell (Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal) who perceived this all-absorbing tendency of the central power so long as seventy years ago and strenuously fought a losing battle against it, demanded in his *Modern India* (p. 173) an *Administrative Code* which would clearly lay down the different spheres of work of the Provincial and the Imperial Governments and prevent encroachment by the stronger on the preserves of the weaker, and put an end to squabbles by the avoidance of overlapping and the definition of the spheres of control.

The Decentralisation Report while fully conscious of the wholly untenable state of affairs jibs when squarely faced with the only possible remedy—

Provincial Autonomy—and in the right orthodox well-trained manner docilely goes off towards the easy well-worn track with the platitude :—

In India the Provincial Governments are, and *should remain*, subject to the general control of the Government of India in *all respects*, and their functions and powers should be variable by the *Central Government* or by the *Secretary of State* as circumstances require. (p. 24) (*Italics mine.*)

One expected a really statesmanlike, bold pronouncement from the Commission and not such a tame, inane mumbling. It was left to that great English statesman and diplomat, Lord Hardinge as Viceroy of India to point out with unfaltering fingers the true remedy—*Provincial Autonomy*—however unpalatable it might be to vested interests and to bureaucracy, in his famous Despatch of 25th August 1911.

But this autonomy would be a very dear purchase and a sad mistake, if it were only to result in the setting up of a number of Local autocracies in place of a distant Imperial one. *If it is to be fruitful of good instead of evil, it must be guided and controlled or stimulated into activity by enlightened Indian public opinion, able to make its voice effective through its control of the Executive and Legislative Councils.*

GOVERNORSHIPS.

The Decentralisation Commission has, however, luckily taken a long step in the direction of Provincial autonomy by advocating the raising of all the Provinces to Governorships, though they qualify it by saying :—

We recognise, however, that change in the existing system is not equally urgent in the case of all Provinces. (para. 446.)

The late General Sir George Chesney was, however, of a different opinion. He was for raising forthwith all of them to the higher dignity, and in his *Indian Polity* has outlined a definite scheme for ten Governorships, and has necessarily been led to advocate a readjustment of Provincial boundaries in connection with it.

The question of having Governors being settled, the question of their qualifications comes up at once. The Indian contention is that no European who has served his term in the country is fit for this high position, and so their demand is for a Governor who has a standing in the *public life* of Great Britain and has done good work in the House of Commons. The Decentralisation Report (p. 155) however tries to steer a middle course by saying :—

We do not think that a Governor need invariably be appointed from England. The Governorship of Bombay has occasionally been filled by a distinguished Indian Civilian, and men are from time to time found in that Service who could adequately fill such posts in other Provinces. It is, therefore, not desirable absolutely to close such appointments to the Indian Civil Service. The prospective loss to that service of some of the existing Lieutenant-Governorships would be made up, in considerable part, by the creation of new memberships of Council. (p. 155.)

When one remembers the *personnel* of the Commission, one understands at once the inevitable bias that led to the above statement. It was a psychological impossibility for the Commissioners—composed exclusively of I. C. S. men, even to its Secretaries—to arrive at a conclusion which would condemn their Service as incompetent for such work. Nor could

vested interests be forgotten, as the words "prospective loss, etc" prove unmistakably. But for these two ultra-potent disturbing factors, one may shrewdly suspect the Commission would have reported wholly in favour of Governors straight from 'Home.' A few selections will clearly bring out the internal conflict.

A Lieutenant-Governor drawn from the same service as his colleagues, and possibly junior to one or more of them, would not ordinarily command their deference in a degree sufficient to obviate friction. (p. 440.)

Could the feared friction be obviated by a mere juggling with names and calling the Indian Civilian Lieutenant-Governor, a Governor? One is afraid that an Indian Civilian, His Excellency, by the very fact of his more exalted position, will be forced to accentuate the social difference between himself and his Civilian colleagues more than would be the case if he were merely a His Honor and so of a lower grade of exaltation not much above his colleagues!

The introduction of a *fresh mind*, possessed by a Governor whose position and *antecedents* would command the deference and support of his colleagues. (p. 441, iii.)

The words italicised above by me show that the conditions wanted cannot be met with in the I. C. S. And so, while conscious of the supreme importance of importing Governors directly from 'Home,' they naturally made some reservations by saying that the Governor need not *invariably* be appointed from England, and that it was not desirable to *absolutely* close such appointments to the I. C. S.

I may briefly put some more of the arguments which tell against an I. C. S. man as Governor.

Too long and too intimate a connection with the daily routine of Indian administration is bound to dull the *freshness* of view of an Indian Civilian, and lead to a lack of initiative—a condition of affairs which will be helped considerably by the fact that he is sure to be an elderly man and will be unwilling to face hard work and trouble as a younger man from England would do. Besides, a statesman from England will resist the deadening pressure of Indian environment and will not succumb helplessly to pressure like an administrator from India. He will have his reputation to maintain, if not to create, *unlike* the Anglo-Indian, who has nothing to look forward to after his time of service is over. The latter may be equally conscientious, but the spur of ambition will be totally wanting. An Anglo-Indian Governor would be wedded by long habit to a *system* and would be as a rule largely influenced by vested interests which would warp his insight and his actions. Even Sir George Chesney while vigorously advocating the appointment of Anglo-Indian Governors cannot help recognising the advantages which would accrue from the selection of English politicians for Indian Governorships. He says:—

It brings Indian official life to that extent in touch with the English political world and creates a certain amount of interest in Indian affairs among persons who might otherwise be without it. Further the possession of personal experience is not always without disadvantage in one respect. It is scarcely possible that a man should be raised from the ranks of a Service in which his life has been passed without taking with him more or less of bias for

or against some of his old associates which may be displayed in the subsequent distribution of patronage. (page 95.)

The question of raising Bengal to a Governorship was pushed aside by the Executive Council of Lord Curzon in the interests of the Service, for while by splitting Bengal many more higher posts would be created, by keeping it one there was a danger of losing the Lieutenant-Governorship. So the argument for an Executive Council was strongly denounced in such terms :—

The two Councillors would be drawn from the same province as the Lieutenant-Governor and might be smarting under the sense of supersession themselves.

The obvious and conclusive rejoinder to this would be and which Lord Curzon and his Council, for reasons of their own, persistently refused to see—*‘Change your system of Anglo-Indian Lieutenant-Governorship in favor of a Governor from England’*. The above-quoted opinion further distinctly and unequivocally shows that there will be no possibility of smooth working if an Indian Civilian is appointed a Governor. A man unconnected with the Service will have no prejudices for or against men or measures. The plea often put forward that the administration would be wrecked by an English politician as Governor, wanting in Indian experience, is much too interested an argument from the Civilian side to need serious notice. However, it may be pointed out that a Governor is not in the same plight as a Lieutenant-Governor or a Chief-Commissioner, who is always the “sole monarch” of all he

surveys ; he is given expert advice in the shape of a well-selected Executive Council. Bagehot in the Vith Chapter of *The English Constitution* has pointed out with convincing logic how the English system of administration, combining, as it does the carrying on of the daily routine of office by a set of *permanent officials*, possessing a precise knowledge of the action of the administrative machinery, controlled by *political chiefs* who bring as their own quota to the work, a large and wide experience gained amidst different surroundings, makes for efficiency with its quickening impulse on the permanent staff which, however capable and zealous, is by the very nature of its work incapable of taking a comprehensive and statesmanlike view of situations, immersed, as it is in the ruts and grooves which it has cut out by generations of steady application to the work of merely *carrying on* the administration. All this applies with far greater force to India.

The salary of the Governor in India is simply extravagant and so also are his sumptuary allowances. There is absolutely no reason why these should not be on the very same scale as in the Colonies namely £5,000 per annum. Their sumptuary allowances and household should also be reduced to the level of that of a Lieutenant-Governor if not that of a Chief-Commissioner. For instance, the Military Secretary, and the large number of A. D. Cs are useless and costly superfluities and should be done away with.

SALARY-PRINCIPLE.

I may as well state here, as anywhere else, what

I regard to be the principle that should govern the fixing of salaries for the various public offices. The Indian as a rule should never be given the same salary as the Britisher; even if he has entered the Services through the English door. He should be given a higher salary than his brother Indian recruited in India itself, but only that much more which would cover the extra expense of an education in foreign lands. The Britisher recruited in England should receive the same salary as the Indian recruited in India for the same work *but* he should be given a sufficiently tempting *expatriation allowance* over and above the salary which would allow of India getting the pick of the British market for every one of its departments. The question of invidiousness, of color-bar can never arise if this principle is rigidly acted up to. A uniform and not too high a scale of salary fixed for each post; an *expatriation allowance* for a *foreigner* recruited in England for it; and for an *Indian* recruited in England, say between two hundred to four hundred rupees over and above the fixed scale. The demands put forward before the Islington Public Services Commission by the Europeans were ludicrously extravagant, and they were imitated in this by the Indians who should certainly have been less covetous and open-eyed to the poverty of the country; the short-sighted Commission blissfully ignoring the frightful economic burden thus sought to be imposed upon the long-suffering, poverty-stricken taxpayer of India coolly advocated a good many of those demands! In this respect not England, but France

and the other European States should be our model, and above all Japan.

The *proportion* of the salaries of public servants in Japan is very well worthy of imitation in India. It is more 'humane' and takes much better account of human needs and necessities. In the first place it does not emphasise so acutely the difference between rich and poor, higher and lower, which is the cause of so much bitterness, jealousy, class-hatred and class-arrogance in the West, and finally is more in accord with the general poverty of this country.

PROVINCIAL BOUNDARIES.

Once the supreme importance of raising all the Provinces to the status of Governorships and of granting to them autonomy is conceded, there inevitably arises the question of Provincial boundaries. A re-arrangement of these—though not in the way which produced the stupendous muddle of the Partition of Bengal—is desired by all thoughtful Indians. Sir George Chesney as pointed out above would divide India into *ten* Provinces each under a Governor. Acute and serious differences arise, however, when concrete suggestions for boundary rectifications begin to be made. Lord Curzon was not very happy in his schemes of boundary rectifications. Bengal had to be reunited. His lopping off of Districts from Punjab to create the North-West-Frontier Province has been another lamentable failure and raised a storm of protest even from the Punjab Civil Service, some even going the length of resigning the service in protest. Mr. S. S. Thorburn in his *Th*

Punjab in Peace and War has most outspokenly, for an Indian Civilian, criticised the policy of creating a border Chief-Commissionership. It has to be remembered that all his service-life was spent in Punjab where he worked up every rung of the official ladder till he reached his final post, that of Financial Commissioner which ranks next to that of the Lieutenant-Governor only. He says :—

If the literature on frontier affairs for the last twenty years be examined it will be seen that the Subordinate Government, when consulted, almost invariably gave advice, which, if followed, would have saved India from the misdirection of energy and waste of resources which culminated in the troubles and humiliations of 1897. (p. 314.)

The comparative success of frontier management by the Local and Supreme Governments may be gauged by the facts that up to 1887 the aggregate cost of roundly twenty blockades, and frontier expeditions—exclusive of Ambela (1863) which was directed by the Government of India, was less than half of that incurred after 1892, and that the tribes are to-day as little amenable to our friendly offices as at any former period—1897 excepted—in our long connection with them. (p. 344.)

He goes on further to remark :—

The Peshawar Agent will often be an ambitious man 'in a hurry,' in which case he will push the forward policy and amongst future Viceroys, Aucklands, Lyttons, Lansdownes, and Elgins will be more frequent than Lawrences and Curzons, and then we shall have complications, coat-trailings, warlike movements, perhaps even wars, as was the case through the nineties, extravagance trans-Indus, and crippling retrenchments, or tax enhancements Cis-Indus. (p. 348.) Looking back for twenty-five years, remembering the causes of the Afghan War of 1878-80, the straining of our relations with the Amir 1890-93, the subsequent thrusting of 'friendly relations' and a protectorate upon the independent tribes beyond our frontier, the enforced delimitations of some of their hinterlands, the futile consequential wars of 1897-98, unprejudiced minds must recognise that the tax paying masses of India have received scant consideration, and that some of the heads of Governments and subordinate officers answerable for the blunders and wastage of the different periods, should have been discredited instead of being rewarded. So long as the Government of India is practically an irresponsible despotism, and the Indian public merely a powerless mass of uneducated and inarticulate

tax-payers, muddling, misrepresentation, and waste in the conduct of India's foreign affairs will not cease, and high-placed blunderers in authority will never be called to account. Until some force in India arises with the power, the will, and the ability necessary for securing a common-sense management of affairs, business-like prudence will not always be practised.

Present methods suit a bureaucracy : unless forced from the outside, reforms from inside are hopeless. Without the certainty that the truth will come out and be intelligently examined and judged, no Government will proclaim its mistakes or alter its ways. The fear of public opinion is the force which secures right mindedness in men in power in England, but in India there is no public opinion—at least published opinion except to some extent on domestic matters entering into the daily life of the people—*e.g.*, plague regulations—hence the Government of India in their foreign proceedings are irresponsible, and in pursuit of the chimeras of "high politics"—sometimes a mere moult for vaulting ambition—they plunge light-heartedly into adventures and wars which may benefit a few individually, but injure the people of India collectively. When things go wrong in India hardly a voice is raised against the wrong doers; officials may not speak, the press has little information, and if it had more, is timid, the line between treason and criticism being finely drawn, and as for the masses, their horizon is the evening meal and the next instalment of the revenue demand. Outside India nobody cares. John Bull is ultimately responsible, but as he does not pay the bills, and his immediate concerns engross him, he is not exacting, and accepts without scrutiny whatever statements the Government of India may lay before him. Take instances : Lord Lytton in 1877 forces a war against Afghanistan ; it costs twenty-five millions sterling ; India bleeds silently. Again, from 1890 onwards push and pinpricks upon India's North-West frontier plunge her into many wars ; the proceedings cost six or seven millions sterling ; once more India bleeds silently. To particularise, an agent trails his coat in Chitral, a war follows, India pays, and the agent is knighted and promoted, and there the matter ends. Again some of the Trans-Indus Pathan tribes, mistaking our intentions are frightened into fighting for their independence ; the Khyber Pass is abandoned, the events of August 23, 1897, take place, a serious war follows : once more India bleeds, this time happily, not quite silently. The Viceroy in Council calls the risings "fanatical outbreaks," no one objects until an official indiscreetly speaks the truth : eventually the blunderings are condoned, the blunderers rewarded, and the Secretary of State for India endorses—with hinted qualifications—the Viceregal fanaticism myth, and records in a Despatch to Lord Elgin his entire agreement "in regarding fanaticism as the principal motive," for the tribal risings, and on the part of Her Majesty's Government their high