

**THE
COLONIZATION OF INDIA
BY EUROPEANS**

**BY
MAJOR B. D. BASU, I.M.S, (Retd.)**

**PUBLISHED BY
R. CHATTERJEE, M.A.,
91, Upper Circular Road,
CALCUTTA.**

Price Rs 2



Printed by A. S. Markar, at the Prabasi Press,
91, Upper Circular Road, Calcutta

Imp 119505
13.01.11

PREFACE

Most of the publications on which the present work is based are not easily accessible to the reading public of the country. They have gone out of print and become scarce and rare. Hence extracts *in extenso* have been reproduced from them for ready reference. This work originally appeared in the shape of serial articles in the *Modern Review* from which they are reproduced with additions and alterations.

B D BASU.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

	PAGE
The genesis of the British idea of civilising India ...	1
The policy of the British in India being the effect of the blockade against English goods by Napoleon ..	3
How England grew rich at the expense of India ..	5
The behaviour and the temperament of the English made them unpopular in India ..	10
Why the East India Company prevented the English from settling in India ..	12
Natives of England jealous of the monopoly of the Company ..	17
The pleas put forth to supplant the rule of the Company ...	18
The views of Warren Hastings and Sir John Malcolm ..	20
And of Mr Charles Grant against influx of the British ...	21
The lust for gold of the Britishers outweighed every other consideration ...	24
Their desire was to crush Indian industries, to promote their trade and to settle in India ..	30

CHAPTER II.

The free influx of Englishmen into India ...	31
Under the pretext of civilising India Britishers wished to freely trade and live in the country ...	31
Many Anglo-Indians were against the free influx of the natives of England in India—their statements ..	32-43
How an European population in India was regarded as beneficial to England ...	44-46
Evils of European influx ...	49
Difficulties in getting justice against Europeans ..	51-52
The policy was to displace Indians by Britishers ..	56

CHAPTER III.

	PAGE
The settlement of Europeans in India	60
'Give them an inch and they will ask for an ell'	
—its applicability to the British	60
Metcalfe and Bentinck favour European settlement	
from political considerations	64
The views of Metcalfe and Bentinck disproved	
by several eminent Englishmen	65-70
Settlement of Europeans detrimental to India	76
Opinion of Mr. Elphinstone	78
The number of British Settlers in India	81
Practically Europeans were allowed to settle un-	
hindered inspite of the rules and regulations	
to the contrary	85
Misconduct of indigo planters unheeded	86
Military aspect of settlement of Europeans con-	
sidered	90
Settlement of Europeans encouraged	94
The removal of the license, its bad effects	95

CHAPTER IV.

The Parliamentary Committee in 1858 on the	
Colonization of India	97
III, effects of the Colonization	100
Marquis Cornwallis against it	101
Colonization advocated under mark of philan-	
thoropy	102
Shore, Metcalfe and Bentinck in favour of it	104-5
Colonization loudly demanded by the people of	
England	108
How India was regarded as the safety valve of	
the British people	110
The effect of the Mutiny on the idea of Coloniza-	
tion	114
The greatest obstacle to Colonization is mutual	
antipathy between the two races	117
Parliamentary Committee's report is against the	
Colonization	121
European tea planters were benefited at the expense	
of Indians	123
Railways made to help British capitalists	126
It was suggested that Englishmen should be	
appointed to all important posts	132

	PAGE
The in-efficiency of the covenanted English Civilians shown ...	136
The transfer of Government from Company to Crown favourable to Colonization, and ...	139
Settlement of the British in India ..	140

CHAPTER V.

The possibility of the Colonization of India by the Britishers ...	142
The obstacles to Colonization .	142
Real reasons for slow Colonization .	134
The disabilities of tropical Colonizations .	146
The advantages of Colonising Kashmir enumerated	147-8

ERRATA

Page	3	line	8	from bottom for 'had' read 'has
"	23	"	18	for 'may' read 'May'
"	91	"	4	Add 'says' after 'Mayne'
"	106	"	16	for 'there,' read 'their'
"	110	"	13	from bottom, omit 'of' between 'Educated' and 'masses'
"	112	"	12	'insouciance' to be in italics
"	"	"	17	for 'turient' read 'parturient'
"	"	"	19	for 'lasted' read 'lashed'
"	136	"	15	for 'Convenanted' read 'Covenanted'
"	143	"	13	from bottom for 'Mrs.' read 'Mr'

THE Colonization of India by Europeans

CHAPTER I

THE GENESIS OF THE BRITISH IDEA OF CIVILISING INDIA

With the opening of the nineteenth century, events were occurring in Europe which had no inconsiderable share in shaping the course of the history of both England and India. After the French Revolution, a man, who has left the indelible mark of genius on the pages of the history of not only France but of the whole of Europe, rose like a giant, and to crush him was the great object of the statesmen and people of England. The Corsican adventurer, Napoleon Bonaparte, was a terror to the English and like an incubus was disturbing the even tenor of their existence. He called the English a nation of shopkeepers, and as that nation destroyed his fleet, he took steps to destroy their commerce, on which their prosperity depended. He said he would conquer sea by land. He blockaded all the ports of the continent of Europe against the importation of British

goods and manufactures The economic effect of this blockade was very keenly felt by the English. England had lost America, and the other colonies which she still possessed were not in a sufficiently flourishing condition to increase the wealth of England by becoming her customers England planted her colonies with the object of enriching herself at their expense Adam Smith in his "Wealth of Nations" writes.—

"To found a great empire for the sole purpose of raising up a people of customers, may at first sight appear a project fit only for a nation of shopkeepers..... The maintenance of this monopoly has hitherto been the principal, or more properly perhaps the sole end and purpose of the dominion which Great Britain assumes over her colonies In the exclusive trade, it is supposed, consists the great advantage of provinces which have never yet afforded either revenue or military force for the support of the civil government or defence of the mother country The monopoly is the principal badge of their dependency, and it is the sole fruit which has hitherto been gathered from that dependency. Whatever expense Great Britain has laid out in maintaining this dependency, has really been laid out in order to support this monopoly."*

But because the colonies could not enrich England, she turned her attention to India. It is said that Earl Mornington (afterwards known as

* Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, Chapter, VII, Part III.)

Marquess Wellesley) on the eve of his departure from England to assume the appointment of the Governor-General of India, received instructions from the Prime Minister Pitt to found an empire in India to compensate for the loss of America. That perhaps accounts for all the unprovoked wars he waged against Indian princes and the torrents of blood he shed of the Indian people. Be that as it may, the empire which England was building in India, without spending a single farthing out of the pocket of any of her inhabitants, was the means of saving her from the perilous position in which she had been placed by Napoleon.

The ports of the continent had been blockaded against English goods and manufactures and so the English took advantage of their political power in India to flood this country with English goods. But India was already an industrial and manufacturing country. In order to create a market for British manufactures, Indian industries had to be crushed. England felt no hesitation in doing in India what she had already done a century previously in Ireland. An Irish historian had narrated :

"The gross impolicy as well as the gross injustice of the commercial disabilities by which almost every form of Irish industry was deliberately and selfishly crushed. The history of those laws is well worthy of the attention of all who would study the social condition of Ireland, and it has been written by Mr. Froude with consummate power. Until the time of Charles I, Ireland

was placed commercially on all points on a level with England, but Wentworth, imagining that the Irish woollen manufactures might undersell those of England, took some measures to discourage them. This proceeding appears to have been purely arbitrary, ... With Charles II, ... legislative prohibitions began Ireland was a great pasture country, and her chief source of wealth was the importation of her cattle into England. The English landowners complained of the rivalry and the importation of Irish cattle to England, as well as of salt, beef, bacon, butter and cheese, was absolutely prohibited. By her omission from the amended Navigation Act of 1663, Ireland was at the same time excluded from all direct trade with the British Colonies. Her two chief sources of wealth were thus utterly and wilfully annihilated. One chance, however, still remained. The Irish, when forbidden to export their cattle, turned their land into sheepwalks, and it soon appeared that, in spite of the poverty of the people and the low condition of civilization, a great and flourishing woollen trade was likely to arise. Ireland possessed the advantages of unlimited water-power, of cheap labour, and living, and, above all of the best wool in Europe. Many English and even foreign manufacturers went over, and in the first years that followed the revolution there was every probability of her becoming a considerable industrial nation. Once more the selfish policy of English manufacturers prevailed. The export of unmanufactured wool to foreign countries had been already forbidden. The legislature now interposed and forbade the export of Irish manufactured wool not only to England and the English dominions, but to every other country. The rising industry was thus completely annihilated... Whole districts were thrown into a condition of poverty verging upon starvation,....

The above lengthy extract from Lecky is meant to show the peculiar traits of the English character. The Irish are their neighbours and related to them by blood and religion. If they had no scruples to crush their industries and reduce them to poverty, what consideration could the English have for the natives of India, who were alien to them by religion, language, and above all, color ? So they set to work to destroy Indian industries and replace Indian manufactures by those of England and thus create a market in India for British goods. India suffered for the Napoleonic wars in Europe. England grew rich at the expense of India and was enabled to fight Napoleon with resources wrung out of India. The importance of India at this crisis to England has been fully appreciated by so competent a writer as Sir George Birdwood, who, in his introduction to the *First Letter Book of the East India Company*, 1600-1619, states that it was the Company's possession of India which enabled England, at the commencement of the nineteenth century, to successfully resist the machinations of Napoleon I, and he declares that

"the continued possession of India will be our chief stay in sustaining the manufacturing and mercantile preponderance in this country in the crushing commercial competition with which we have now everywhere to contend"

The natives of England never spent a single farthing for the acquisition of India. But then they resented the East India Company enjoying the close preserve of India. The English were thirsting to have a finger in the Company's Indian pie. Even "the darkest cloud has its silver lining." So the East India Company with all its faults had one redeeming feature which should not be overlooked.

The Company was an exclusive body, and it did not allow any Europeans except those who were connected with it to settle in India for any purpose whatever. It did not encourage the colonisation and settlement of India by Englishmen for reasons which will be presently mentioned. Nay, the Company even went the length of propagating a myth that not more than three generations of pure-blooded Europeans could live in India, and there is no evidence for the statement so often made that a colony of Englishmen in India not at any time intermarrying with natives would disappear within a couple of centuries. The Company did all that lay in its power to prevent Europeans travelling about freely in this country. Thus an order was passed by the Governor-General that after 1st March, 1788,

"No persons in the civil or military service of the Company shall be allowed to proceed from the Company's provinces beyond Buxar without the Governor-General's

pass, to be produced to the Commanding Officer of that post, unless such persons are under orders, which shall appear either in the gazette (or by an official signature), to proceed to stations beyond that place, or unless they should be returning to their stations after the expiration of leave of absence. The same orders respect Europeans in general, who are not in the service of the Company."

According to the regulation passed by the Governor-General in Council on the 1st, May, 1793,

"No British subjects (excepting King's Officers, serving under the Presidency of Fort William, the Civil Covenanted Servants of the Company, and their Military Officers) shall be permitted to reside at a greater distance from Calcutta than ten miles, unless they enter into a bond rendering themselves amenable to the court of Dewany Adawlut, within the jurisdiction of which they may reside, in all civil suits that may be instituted against them by natives or inhabitants of either of the provinces of Bengal, Behar or Orissa, coming within the descriptions of persons declared amenable to the Zillah and City Courts, for any sum of money or thing, the amount or value of which shall not exceed five hundred sicca rupees, and that this bond is to be executed in open court before the Judge of the Court within the jurisdiction of which such British subject may reside or take up his abode."

In letters, dated the 11th December, 1793, and the 28th May, 1794, the Court of Directors ordered that new covenants should be taken from every person in their service. They wrote —

"We direct that every person in our service be called upon immediately to execute the covenants proper to his station, and that on his refusing to do so, he be dismissed

and have notice to come home. We also direct that all other British subjects, residing under your presidency, whether with or without license, be forthwith called upon to execute the covenants proper to their stations, and that on neglect or refusal to execute they have notice to quit India, as we are determined not to permit any persons in future to reside in India, without our license and being under proper covenants, so that any irregularity of conduct may be more readily corrected. With regard to persons who reside under your presidency, and have not entered into covenants of any description, we have sent a number of covenants of the denomination of covenants of *free merchants, free mariners and of persons permatted to reside in India*, these are calculated to suit all persons, who are to reside under the Company's protection and you will take care that each person executes one of these descriptions in the mode already pointed out."

"Those known as "*free merchants*" were obliged to furnish two responsible persons in England to enter into security in the sum of £2,000."

The following were the instructions for the marine authorities for the landing of new comers in India:—

"The Commanders of all foreign vessels importing at Calcutta, are required to deliver into the Master Attendant's Office, on their arrival, the names of the commanders, officers, crews and passengers on board the said vessels, and that the Master Attendant is positively prohibited from furnishing any foreign vessels importing at Calcutta, with pilot until such list shall have been delivered to him."

The East India Company had to issue all these

orders, because they knew that they never conquered India by their sword, but held it by the sufferance of the people. Therefore, the Company took all precautions necessary not to wound the feelings of the natives of India in any way. It was on this ground that Christian Missionaries were not allowed to settle in territories then under the administration of the Company. Carey and others had to settle in Serampore, which was owned at that time by the Danes.

The East India Company knowing full well the temperament and moral nature of their compatriots and co-religionists made all those regulations which discouraged Englishmen coming out in large numbers to India. For had they at that time allowed Englishmen to come out and settle in India, they would not have succeeded in consolidating their power in this country. It is impossible for Englishmen to ingratiate themselves with natives of foreign countries. Mr Meredith Townsend in his 'Asia and Europe,' (p. 216) says that an Englishman is hated everywhere.

"It is very difficult, of course, for an Englishman, conscious of his own rectitude of purpose and benevolence of feeling, to believe that he will not be more liked when he is better known, but a good many facts seem to show that it is so. He is not seen and talked to anywhere by men of a different race so much as he is in Ireland, and he is not hated quite so much anywhere else. He is decidedly much more disliked in Egypt since he appeared

there in such numbers. He is more hated in the seacoast towns of India, where he is prominent, busy and constantly talked to, than he is in the interior where he is rarely seen, much more detested in the planter districts than in the districts where he is only a rare visitor. If there is contempt for him anywhere in India, it is in the great towns, not in the rural stations where he is so nearly invisible, and contempt is of all forms of race-hatred the most dangerous."

✓ In India, even in those days, when the English did not possess any political power, they behaved towards the natives of this country in a manner which did not enhance their reputation for honesty or fair dealing. The author of the *English in Western India*, Rev Philip Anderson, writes (p 32).—

"As the number of adventurers increased the reputation of the English was not improved. Too many committed deeds of violence and dishonesty. We can shew that even the Commanders of vessels belonging to the Company did not hesitate to perpetrate robberies on the high seas or on shore when they stood in no fear of retaliation. During a visit which some English ships paid to Dabhol the officers suddenly started up from a conference with the native chiefs, and attacked the town, having first secured some large guns in such a manner that they could not be turned against them. Their attempt failed, but after retreating to their ships they succeeded in making prizes of two native boats. Della Valle declares that it was customary for the English to commit such outrages.

"And although this last account may be suspected as

dictated by the prejudices of an Italian, we can see no reason to question Sir Thomas Herbert's veracity. Sailing along the coasts with several vessels under the command of an English Admiral, he descried, when off Mangalore, a heavily laden craft after which a Malabar pirate was skulking. The native merchant in his fright sought refuge with the Admiral, but, writes our author with confessed grief, his condition was little better than it would have been, if he had fallen into the pirate's hands. After a short consultation, his ship was adjudged a prize by the English officers 'For my part,' proceeds Herbert, 'I could not reach the offence, but this I could, that she had a cargo of cotton, opium, onions, and probably somewhat under the cotton of most value, which was her crime it seems. But how the prize was distributed concerns not me to inquire. I was a passenger, but no merchant, nor informer. The whole account would be incredible if not given on such good authority, but as it is, we must regard it as a blot upon the English character, and some justification of the Moghul officers when they afterwards brought charges of piracy against the Company's servants. Sixty of the native seamen, concluding from the churlish conduct of the English that mischief was intended, and that they would be sold as slaves to the people of Java, trusted rather to the mercy of the waves than of such Englishmen, and threw themselves into the sea, which seemed sport to some there,' writes Herbert, 'but not so to me, who had compassion,' some were picked up by canoes from the shore, and some by English boats; but the latter were so enraged with the treatment which they had received, that they again endeavoured to drown themselves. A terrible storm which followed was regarded by the narrator as a token of God's severe displeasure.

"Such were the English at their first appearance on

the western coast of India..... But doubtless at first the popular feeling was one of fear, afterwards of contempt. Hindus and Mussalmans considered the English a set of cow-eaters and fire-drinkers, vile brutes, fiercer than the mastiffs which they brought with them, who would fight like Eblis, cheat their own fathers and exchange with the same readiness a broadside of shot and thrusts of boarding pikes, or a bale of goods and a bag of rupees.

"As time wore on, the estimation in which the English had been held, declined These English were indeed regarded as men of an insignificant country, dissolute morals, and a degraded religion "

Little wonder, then, that the East India Company from motives of self-interest, and instinct of self-preservation, prevented the English from settling in India. The same considerations also prevented them from disseminating the spread of Christianity in this country. Christianity might be a religion of love, but it did not appear so to the natives of India. Sir Phillip Francis, a zealous Christian himself, for he was the son of a Christian minister and was brought up on the teachings of the Bible from his very cradle, thus spoke regarding the failure of Christianity in India:—

"Listen to the poor Brahmin, when the New Testament was explained to him. 'Your religion may be very good for *you* and *your* climate, and your lawgiver seems to have been a wise man, for he says, *judge of the tree by the fruits*. To us that fruit has been bitter, but you

must make a desert of India before you can plant the tree in our land.”*

The author of “The English in Western India” thus refers to the estimate which natives of India had formed of Christianity

“But according to Terry, the natives had formed a mean estimate of Christianity. It was not uncommon to hear them at Surat giving utterance to such remarks as:—‘Christian religion, devil religion, Christian much drunk, Christian much do wrong, much beat, much abuse others’ &c. Terry admitted that the natives themselves were very square, and exact to make good all their engagements, but if a dealer was offered much less for his articles than the price which he had named, he would be apt to say:—‘What! dost thou think me a Christian, that I would go about to deceive thee?’

“There was at least one European also who had no higher opinion than natives of Englishmen’s religion, as will appear from the following anecdote. When Terry was in Surat a certain Spaniard presented himself at the factory, and asked for employment. He gave out that he was by birth an Hidalgo, which as our author explains, ‘signifies in Spanish the son of some body,’.....

“This strange character gave his name as ‘the Knight of the Golden Rapier,’ and declared that having come with the Spanish Viceroy to Goa, he had, in defence of his spotless honor fought so many duels there, that he had been placed in confinement, and required by the priests to atone with penances for the indulgence of his sanguinary propensitiesSuch was the story of this

* ^o ^o Memoirs of Sir Phillip Francis, Vol. II, pp. 375-376. ^o

monk here, who added that he was now resolved 'not to live any longer amongst the Christians, but that he desired to live amongst the English,' 'But the English are Christians,' some one replied. 'Jesu Maria' exclaimed the amazed Spaniard, he had never before heard that such was the case" (p 32)

Under these circumstances it was only common sense which led the East India Company not to allow as matters of policy the free resort of Englishmen to India and of Christian Missionaries to preach Christianity to the "heathens" of this country

But, as said before, the blockade of the ports of the continent by Napoleon made Englishmen turn their attention to India


America was lost to England, and it seems that the natives of England were anxious to colonize India. But the exclusive character of the constitution of the East India Company was not favourable for the colonisation and settlement of the English in India. Adam Smith in his 'Wealth of Nations,' writes—

"Though the Europeans possess many considerable settlements both upon the coast of America and in the East Indies. they have not yet established in either of those countries such numerous and thriving colonies as those in the islands and continent of America. Africa, however, as well as several of the countries comprehended under the general name of the East Indies, are inhabited by barbarous nations. But those nations were by no

means so weak and defenceless as the miserable and helpless Americans and in proportion to the natural fertility of the countries which they inhabited, they were besides much more populous. The most barbarous nations either of Africa or of the East Indies were shepherds; even the Hottentots were so. But the natives of every part of America, except Mexico and Peru, were only hunters, and the difference is very great between the number of shepherds and that of hunters whom the same extent of equally fertile territory can maintain. *In Africa and the East Indies, therefore, it was more difficult to displace the natives, and to extend the European plantations over the greater part of the land of the original inhabitants. The genius of exclusive companies, besides, is unfavorable, to the growth of new colonies, and has probably been the principal cause of the little progress which they have made in the East Indies.* The Portuguese carried on the trade both to Africa and the East Indies without any exclusive companies, and their settlements at Congo, Angola, and Benguela on the coast of Africa, and at Goa in the East Indies, though much depressed by superstition and every sort of bad government, yet bear some faint resemblance to the colonies of America and are partly inhabited by Portuguese who have been established there for several generations. The Dutch settlements at the Cape of Good Hope and at Batavia are at present the most considerable colonies which the Europeans have established either in Africa or in the East Indies, and both these settlements are peculiarly fortunate in their situations.....

"The English and Dutch Companies, though they have established no considerable colonies, except the two above mentioned, have both made considerable conquests in the East Indies. But in the manner in which they

both govern their new subjects, the natural genius of an exclusive Company has shown itself most distinctly. In the Spice Islands the Dutch are said to burn all the spiceries which a fertile season produces beyond what they expect to dispose of in Europe with such a profit as they think sufficient.....By different acts of oppression they have reduced the population of several of the Moluccas nearly to the number which is sufficient to supply with fresh provisions and other necessities of life their own insignificant garrisons, and such of their ships as occasionally come there for a cargo of spices. Under the Government even of the Portuguese, however, those islands are said to have been tolerably well inhabited.

"The English Company have not yet had time to establish in Bengal so perfectly destructive a system. The plan of their government, however, has had exactly the same tendency. The servants of the Company have upon several occasions attempted to restrain the production of the particular articles of which they have thus usurped the monopoly, not only to the quantity which they themselves could purchase, but to that which they could expect to sell with such a profit as they might think sufficient. *In the course of a century or two the policy of the English company would in this manner have probably proved as completely destructive as that of the Dutch.*" 

The genius then of the East India Company was unfavourable to the colonization of India by the English. The natives of England had to pay more for the products, both natural and manufactured, of the East Indies because of the mono-

polies enjoyed by the Company. Adam Smith wrote :—

"Since the establishment of the English,—East India Company,—the other inhabitants of England, over and above being excluded from the trade, must have paid in the price of the East India goods which they have consumed, not only for all the extraordinary profits which the Company may have made upon those goods in consequence of their monopoly, but for all the extraordinary waste which the fraud and abuse, inseparable from the management of the affairs of so great a Company, must necessarily have occasioned. The absurdity of this second kind of monopoly, therefore, is much more manifest than that of the first."

The remedy, therefore, which suggested itself to the natives of England was to deprive the Company of its exclusive nature. They considered this measure as best calculated to pour into the lap of England the golden treasures of India. Why, Adam Smith wrote :—

"The trade to the East Indies, if it were altogether free, would probably absorb the greater part of this redundant capital. The East Indies offer a market both for the manufactures of Europe and for the gold and silver as well as for several other productions of America, greater and more extensive than both Europe and America put together."

By losing its exclusive nature, the Company would facilitate the settlement and colonisation of India by English adventurers.

All these advantages were dangling before the

eyes of the natives of England, and so they determined to deprive the Company of its exclusive character. But how to do it was the question.

★ They hit upon the novel idea that they wanted to civilize the people of India. The natives of India were according to them uncivilized barbarians and their coming in contact with the English would raise them in the scale of civilisation. They were heathens and so missionaries of the Christian persuasion were to be permitted to settle in India to lead them out of darkness. At the same time, Bishops and other ministers of the Christian faith were appointed and they were to be paid out of the revenues of India. ✎

But these were all very plausible arguments which were meant to cover their ulterior designs, the nature of which has been sufficiently indicated above.

Section 33 of Act 53 Geor III Cap. 155 passed on 21st July, 1813, ran as follows :—

"And whereas it is the duty of this country to promote the interest and happiness of the native inhabitants of the British dominions in India : and such measures ought to be adopted as may tend to the introduction among them of useful knowledge, and of religious and moral improvement ; and in furtherance of the above objects, sufficient facilities ought to be afforded by law to persons desirous of going to and remaining in India for the purpose of accomplishing those benevolent designs, so as the authority of the local governments

respecting the intercourse of Europeans with the interior of the country be preserved, and the principles of the British Government, on which the natives of India have hitherto relied for the free exercise of their religion be inviolably maintained : and whereas it is expedient to make provision for granting permission to persons desirous of going to and remaining in India for the above purposes, and also to persons desirous of going to and remaining there for other lawful purposes ; be it therefore enacted, that such person or persons shall be furnished by the said Court of Directors with a certificate or certificates signifying that such person or persons hath or have so proceeded with the cognizance and under the sanction of the said Court of Directors ;”

Before we mention the steps which were taken “to promote the interest and happiness of the native inhabitants of the British dominions in India,” it is necessary to advert to the evidence of the witnesses who were examined before the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the occasion of the renewal of the Charter of the East India Company in 1813. Almost all of those witnesses who knew anything of India were opposed to the increased resort of the English to India or of Christian Missionaries to preach the gospels to the heathens. Warren Hastings, the first Governor-General of India, Sir Thomas Munro, Sir John Malcolm, Sir John Shore (afterwards Lord Teignmouth), the *Christian* (the epithet is not ours) Director of the East Indian Company, Mr. Charles Grant, and several other well known Anglo-

Indians spoke in strong terms of the inadvisability of allowing the increased resort of Europeans to India. Warren Hastings

"Expressed it as his opinion, that if Europeans were admitted generally to go into the country, to mix with the inhabitants or form establishments amongst them, the consequence would certainly and inevitably be the ruin of the country, they would insult, plunder and oppress the natives, and no laws enacted from home could prevent them from committing acts of licentiousness of every kind with impunity. A general feeling of hostility to the government would be excited; and although the armed force might be of sufficient strength to suppress any overt acts of insurrection, yet the stability of the Empire must be endangered by universal discontent."*

Other Anglo-Indian witnesses bore testimony similar to the above. Sir John Malcolm, in his evidence with respect to the free admission of Europeans into India, said :—

"I think of all the powers which are vested in the Local Government, there is none more essential to its existence in full vigor and force, than that which enables them to restrain the local residence of every individual European to a particular part of the Empire. If British subjects were allowed to go in the manner described to India, the effects would be various, agreeably to the places to which they went. If to the Presidencies where British courts of law are established, there

* Mill and Wilson's History of British India, Vol. VII. p. 373.

would be no other danger, I conceive, resulting from them, but what might arise from their great numbers, and the changes in the condition of the society, and eventually and gradually of the government from that circumstance, but if they went to any ports where there was no established authority to control them, and if they proceeded into the interior of the country, there would no doubt be much mischief arising from those quarrels which must inevitably ensue with the natives, which mischief would vary from a hundred local causes connected with the character of the natives of the places to which they resorted."

Relative to Malcolm's examination, Sir James Mackintosh made the following entry in his diary --

"He (Malcolm) is to give strong testimony in favour of the Company's favourite argument, that a free trade will lead to an influx of Europeans, which will produce insult and oppression to the natives, and at last drive them into rebellion, which must terminate in our expulsion"

Mr Charles Grant in his pamphlet on the State of Society in Asia, wrote. —

"If the subjects of this country are permitted, at their pleasure, to visit those possessions as they may our American colonies, though professedly but for the purposes of traffic, great numbers of them will settle; for mercantile transactions must entail residence, because it will be impossible for a Government to say, that all such transactions shall be closed, and the parties be gone within a certain time, or to take cognizance in this manner of the conduct of every individual; and if such a measure

were at first attempted, it would not continue any time. All the lines of trade and manufactures would soon be overstocked, and then men would seek fasten themselves on the soil. Colonization would therefore very soon commence in India, especially in Bengal, those whom uncontrolled enterprizes in commerce would carry thither would see a rich soil apprehend great scope for exertions, and regard the natives as a subjected people, feeble, timid, and contemptible; all things would tempt them, and many both agents and seamen, would remain. But the increase of Europeans there would not be regulated by gradual progress of colonial industry. Multitudes of the needy and the idle, allured by the fame of that country, and eager to seize noble privileges, would flock thither at once. Britain would, in a short space, be thinned of inhabitants, and those eastern provinces filled with a new race of adventurers, many of them low and licentious. Being there, they must subsist, they would spread themselves throughout the country, would run into the inland trade, fix themselves wherever they could on the lands, domineer over the natives, harass, extrude, exasperate them, and at length provoke them to plots and insurrections, they would be bold and assuming towards our own Government there. In a certain degree we should have that lawless destructive scene acted over again, which the Spaniards exhibited when they first poured into America. It was thus that the Portuguese power in the East declined. The intolerable license of the roving adventurers of that nation rendered them odious to the natives, and armed the coasts and islands of India against them, so that weakened before they fell an easy prey to the Dutch. And thus too, we should ourselves be exposed, perhaps at no distant period, to"

the danger of general convulsion and revolt in those possessions, which prudently guarded and cultivated, may under the favour of Providence, to conciliate which should be our first care, be preserved for ages, to our great advantage, and the happiness of their native inhabitants.

"The question now therefore, with respect to these possessions is not, whether all British subjects shall have a right to trade thither in their own persons, but whether the natives shall be protected from being overrun and oppressed by foreigners."

But the fiat had gone forth that the Indian trade was to be thrown open to the merchants of England and, therefore, no attention was to be paid to the evidence of those who were competent to speak on the subject with authority. When the subject was discussed in the House of Commons on the 25th of May, 1813, the speakers who were opposed to the abolition of the monopoly of the trade privileges of the East India Company brought forward very weighty arguments against the proposed change.

Mr. Charles Grant, Senior, the reputed "Christian Director of the East India Company" and his son, Mr. Charles Grant, Junior, were opposed to the throwing open of the trade of India to the general merchants of England. The latter

"impressed upon the House the peril of disturbing a system of administration under which the people of India were prosperous and happy. for the sake of imaginary

commercial advantages which never could be realised. The good of the people of India was the real point at issue; and this could not be promoted by letting loose amongst them a host of desperate, needy adventurers, whose atrocious conduct in America and in Africa afforded sufficient indication of the evils they would inflict upon India. The Company had been charged with having excited wars in India, and furnished an exception to the general rule that peace and tranquility were the inseparable attendants of commerce, and by whom was this charge made? *By the advocates of the slave-trade, the people of Liverpool.*"*

But all these arguments were of no avail. The happiness and prosperity of millions of the inhabitants of India could not outweigh the lust for gold of the natives of England. The "heathens" of India were represented to be barbarians and, therefore, it was necessary to civilize them. But then those heathens did not stand in need of the luxurious articles of English manufacture and there was no market for them in India. India manufactured everything to meet the wants of her population. The evidence of no Britisher is more persuasive and eloquent on the subject than that of Sir Thomas Munro. In his memorandum on opening the trade with India to the out ports, 1st February 1813, he wrote :—

"Now as to the exports (from England to India)

* Mill and Wilson's History of British India, Vol. VII. p. 381.

it is not likely that they will ever, unless very slowly, be much extended, opposed by moral and physical obstacles, by religion, by civil institutions, by climate, and by the skill and ingenuity of the people of India.

"No nation will take from another what it can furnish cheaper and better itself. In India, almost every article which the inhabitants require is made cheaper and better than in Europe. Among these are all cotton and silk manufactures, leather, paper, domestic utensils of brass and iron, and implements of agriculture. Their coarse woollens, though bad, will always keep their ground, from their superior cheapness. Their finer camblets are warmer and more lasting than ours.

"Glass-ware is in little request, except with a very few principal natives, and, among them, is confined to mirrors and lamps, and it is only such natives as are much connected with Europeans, who purchase these articles. Their simple mode of living dictated both by caste and climate, renders all our furniture and ornaments for the decoration of the house and the table utterly unserviceable to the Hindoos;

"These simple habits are not peculiar to the Hindoos. The Mohammadan also, with a few exceptions among the higher classes, conforms to them.

"If we reason from the past to the future, we can have no well-founded expectation of any considerable extension of our exports. If it were as easy, as some suppose, to introduce the use of foreign articles, it would have been done long ago.

"From the most distant ages of antiquity, there was a constant intercourse between India and the countries on the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea, without the introduction of foreign manufactures among the Hindoos; and

since the discovery of the Cape of Good Hope, there has been an extensive trade with the Western nations of Europe, without any one of them having been more successful than the ancients in prevailing upon the Hindoos to change their customs so far as to use their commodities in preference to their own. Neither the Portuguese, the Dutch, the French, nor the English, have in this respect effected any considerable change. ...

" Besides the peculiar customs and institutions and climate of India, we must look to the superior skill of the Indian workmen. We cannot profitably export to them until our own fabrics excel theirs. When this is accomplished, no extraordinary skill will be required to extend the sale. The Indians will purchase, even though we should endeavour to prevent them, just as we in this country purchase the contraband stuffs of India.

" The grand obstacles to our exports are the inability of the Indians to purchase our commodities, and the cheapness and excellence of their own. It is obvious, therefore, that their demand for ours can only be enlarged either by a general improvement in the condition of the natives of India, or by a reduction in the price of European articles. In seeking, therefore, to extend our exports, cheapness is not the only requisite, the tastes of the natives must also be studied.... ..

On the whole, there is no ground to look for any considerable increase in the demand for our manufactures by the natives of India, unless by very slow steps, and at a very distant period,

Of course, Sir Thomas Munro was a paid servant of the Company and, therefore, to be true to the salt he ate, he advocated that the Company

should be allowed to possess their monopoly of trade. He wrote .

"The East India Company are attacked from all quarters, as if they alone, in this kingdom, possessed exclusive privileges. But monopoly pervades all our institutions. All corporations are inimical to the natural rights of British subjects. The corn laws favor the landed interest, at the expense of the public. The laws against the export of wool, and many others, are of the same nature, and likewise those by which West India commodities are protected and enhanced in price. It would be better for the community that the West India planter should be permitted to export his produce direct to all countries, and that the duties on East India sugar, etc., should be lowered."

As proved to demonstration, there was no market for European manufactures in India. But this was to be created for the benefit of the people of England. Under the circumstances mentioned above by Munro, there was no other way of effecting this than that of ruining Indian industries. How they did this will be evident from the following often quoted passage from Wilson's 'History of British India':

"The history of the trade of cotton cloths with India affords a singular exemplification of the inapplicability to all times and circumstances of that principle of free trade which advocates the unrestricted admission of a cheap article, in place of protecting by heavy duties a dearer one of home manufacture. *It is also a melancholy instance of the wrong done to India by the country on*

which she had become dependent. It was stated in evidence, that the cotton and silk goods of India up to this period could be sold for a profit in the British market, at a price from fifty to sixty per cent. lower than those fabricated in England. It consequently became necessary to protect the latter by duties of seventy and eighty per cent. on their value, or by positive prohibition. Had this not been the case, had not such prohibitory duties and decrees existed the mills of Paisley and Manchester would have been stopped in their outset and could scarcely have been again set in motion, even by the powers of steam. *They were created by the sacrifice of the Indian manufacture.* Had India been independent, she would have retaliated; would have imposed preventive duties upon British goods, and would thus have preserved her own productive industry from annihilation. This act of self-defence was not permitted her, she was at the mercy of the stranger. British goods were forced upon her without paying any duty; and the foreign manufacturer employed the arm of political injustice to keep down and ultimately strangle a competitor with whom he could not have contended on equal terms”*

In this connection, the speech of Mr. Tierney may also be referred to. The author who has been quoted above, in summarising his speech, says:—

“The singularity of the debate was a long and elaborate speech from Mr Tierney, who, in opposition to the sentiments of his colleagues, maintained that, looking to the distinguished character and generally concurring

* Vol. VII. p. 385.

tenor of the evidence adduced in favor of the Company, and the total absence of any evidence on the opposite part, the existing system ought not to be interfered with. In fact, there was a gross inconsistency in the resolution; a Court of Directors that could not be trusted with the commerce of India was to be confirmed in the government,—twenty-four execrable merchants were to make excellent political governors! But there was no charge against the Company.

... *Amongst all the arguments in favor of the benefits that were to accrue to the people of India from a free trade he had never heard it proposed to allow one manufacture of India to be freely imported into Great Britain.* It was true that they would allow cotton twist: but then, having found that they could weave by means of machinery cheaper than the Indians, they said to them 'Leave off weaving, supply us with the raw material,—and we will weave for you.' Now, *although this was a natural principle enough for merchants and manufacturers, it was rather too much to talk of the philanthropy of it, or to rank the supporters of it as in a peculiar degree the friends of India. If, instead of calling themselves the friends of that country, they should profess themselves its enemies, what more could they do than advise the endeavour to crush all Indian manufacture?* What would be said of the East India Company if they were to show as decided a preference to the manufactures of the natives of India under their protection as we did to the manufactures of England? *.....he would defy any man to point out anything like the good of India being the object of any of the resolutions*"*

But no reasons and no arguments were of any avail. Indian industries were deliberately crushed by England in order "to promote the interest and happiness of the native inhabitants of the British dominions in India" They were talking of civilizing the people of India by the establishment of an open trade. When Sir Thomas Munro was asked his opinion on the subject, he gave the following characteristic reply .—

"I do not understand what is meant by the civilization of the Hindus But if a good system of agriculture, unrivalled manufacturing skill, a capacity to produce whatever can contribute to convenience or luxury, schools established in every village for teaching reading, writing, and arithmetic, the general practice of hospitality and charity amongst each other; and above all, a treatment of the female sex full of confidence, respect and delicacy, are among the signs which denote a civilised people, then the Hindus are not inferior to the nations of Europe; and if civilisation is to become an article of trade between the two countries, I am convinced that this country (England) will gain by the import cargo"

But the Christian natives of England were bent upon civilizing the heathens of India by means of (1) free trade, (2) permitting free influx of the English into India, (3) allowing Christian Missions to preach the gospel to the heathens, and (4) imparting instruction in English.

CHAPTER II.

THE FREE INFLUX OF ENGLISHMEN INTO INDIA

Under the pretext of civilising India a one-sided free trade was imposed. One of the means the natives of England devised for improving their trade in India was the free influx of their co-religionists and compatriots into that country. Europeans were not freely allowed to sojourn or settle in the territories in India then under the jurisdiction of the East India Company. The Britishers wished to remove these restrictions so as to enable their kith and kin to go in large numbers to India. They believed that this would expand their commerce and increase the sale of English goods. They knew full well that the step which they proposed was not the one calculated to promote the happiness of the natives of India. Indeed, on this point almost all the witnesses examined before the Select Committees of both the houses were unanimous. We reproduce below the evidence of some of those who were competent to speak with authority on the subject.

Mr. Warren Hastings examined before the Lord's Committee said :—

"It is impossible that the English character should

coalesce with the natives in the same state of society. In the higher class of the British subjects this effect may not be deduced; but if Europeans are admitted generally to go into the country to mix with the inhabitants and to form establishments amongst them, the consequences must certainly and inevitably prove the ruin of the country, they will insult, plunder, and oppress the natives because they can do it with impunity, no laws that can be enacted from hence can at such a distance, and under the cover of so many circumstances as will occur in that country, prevent them from committing acts of licentiousness of every kind with impunity; the arrogance and boldness of their spirit will encourage them too far to do everything that their own interests may prompt them to. In India at a distance from the capital settlements, the name of an Englishman is his protection, and a sanction for many offences which he would not dare to commit at home. * * * There a tacit idea prevails universally in the minds of all British subjects not only in India, but I believe with a feebler or deeper impression even at home, the idea of common participation which every British subject possesses in the sovereignty of the Company — 'Since *we* became masters of the country,' '*our* native subjects,' and other phrases of a similar import constantly occur in our books, in our writings, as well as in the language of familiar conversation. These ideas in the lower orders of British subjects rise to the height of despotism, and are liable to all the excesses of despotism, whenever the prerogatives annexed to it can be asserted with impunity, with such a disparity, the aggrieved Indian loses his confidence; he is timid by nature, and not easily provoked to resistance where danger may be apprehended, but though this is a part of their individual character, cases

may be supposed in which the provocation of a general grievance may excite the whole people, or detached members of them, to all the ferocities of insurrection; thus, however is not very liable to happen, and I hope never will. Very great and almost insuperable will be the difficulties of obtaining redress should the native Indian be under a necessity of appealing for it to the courts of justice established in the country, these will always be at a great distance from the complainant, because he cannot afford the loss of a day's labour, which procures him his daily subsistence, in appealing to them. The same difficulties will occur in collecting witnesses, and procuring their attendance: and these combined will be more likely to prevent his complaining at all, than a too quick sense of injury to give occasion for his complaining without sufficient reason. * * * *

"If a free trade were authorised by law between this country and British India, and Englishmen were allowed to fix their residence in any part of our Indian possessions according to their pleasure, and without restraint, is it your opinion that any ill consequences from such permission would ensue to the tranquility and happiness of the natives of India under the Government of the Company? I answer confidently, that it would prove ruinous to the country, and very injurious to the peace of the inhabitants.

"Are you of opinion that ill consequences would follow from such permission to the stability of the British Empire in India? I am indeed. * * * *

"If there were any considerable increase in the intercourse of Englishmen with the natives of India, are you of opinion that it would have an ill effect upon the opinions of the natives of India relative to the character of Englishmen?—Most undoubtedly they would naturally

draw their opinion of the character of the country from the conduct of those with whom they were immediately conversant, and every act of injustice, for which they could receive no redress, would dwell upon their minds, with a strong prejudice against the Government itself, supposing it to permit them.

"Are you of opinion that such an idea so generated in the minds of the natives might eventually be prejudicial to the stability of the British Government in India?—A strong armed force may be sufficient, to suppress and keep down any spirit of revolt arising in the minds of the people. We must always keep up a strong standing, force in that country, but so much depends for the peace of the country and the stability of the Government upon the attachment of the people, that it would be very unsafe and impolitic to trust to that security only * *. In short, I do not believe that any nation upon earth is safe from the worst effects which may follow from a general discontent of its people."

In his evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Commons, Mr. Warren Hastings said.—

"Twenty years ago when the present Charter was under consideration, I addressed a letter to the Chairman, or Chairmen for the time being of the Court of Directors upon this very subject; in which, so far as I can trust to my recollection, I strongly urged the necessity of providing against the irruption of British adventurers into India, and beyond the bounds of our settlements; arguing from it, that they would molest and oppress the people, and plunder the country; and I believed I expressed a wish that some provision should be made

against it in the Charter then depending. I have either lost or mislaid the letter so that I have no access to any copy of it : therefore I can only speak to its identity, and to the general import of it. I mention this to show that it is not a novel doctrine which I humbly deliver to this honourable House. My letter, I know, was seen, and I have a pleasure in thinking that it was approved, by the gentleman that then presided over the Board of Commissioners for the affairs of India, a man who certainly, if it could be said of any man, required no light from the judgement of another to aid his own ; and, therefore, it would be the height of arrogance in me to suppose that I had any share of merit in the event which followed. I have mentioned the fact only to show, how early my opinion was formed, and with what anxiety and earnestness I acted upon it. A clause was inserted by Mr Dundas, in the Act of Parliament, and in the Charter constituted from it, by which it was enacted, 'that no British subject not being a servant of the East India Company should be allowed to reside in India, except at the principal settlements, unless by a special license from the Company or the Governors of India.' This license I thought defeated the essential purpose of the prohibitory clause, but I waited till another occasion induced me again to address the Court of Directors through the similar official channel of the Chairman and deputy Chairman of that body ; which I did, in a letter dated the 12th of March 1802, strongly remonstrating against this exception to the general clause as liable to be productive of greater mischiefs from the few favoured Europeans who were allowed the benefit of it than if all men indiscriminatively were allowed to possess the same privilege. Again, on the 28th of April last, I a third time took up the same subject, and

addressed a letter upon it to the present Chairman of the Court of Directors, re-iterating my former objections, and the arguments connected with them, and proposing as a means of preventing the deprecated abuses, certain restrictions to which I have alluded in my answer to one of the first questions proposed to me. This letter contains all that I had written upon the same subject in my preceding letter of March 1802, in a quotation from it. This will, and the first letter which I have mentioned,— would (if I could produce it), strongly prove that such always was my opinion. This honourable House will have ample means of knowing, from more recent testimony than mine, whether the mischiefs which I apprehended have actually come to pass, and the records of the Court of Directors will afford a more authentic evidence still of their existence, if they have existed. I have the permission of the Court of Directors, in whose possession the last letter is, and I humbly refer this honorable House to it and if this shall appear to be clearly the case, the inferences that I drew, so long ago as twenty years past, of the connexion between the allowance of British adventurers in India, not in the service of the Company, with its influence on the peace of it, and the re-iteration of the same opinion through so long a series of time, are no longer argumentative; they are predictive, and in that sense are an irrefragable proof, that such consequences must inevitably follow such premises."

Mr. William Cowper told the Lords' Committee that:—

"Uninformed as the European must be of everything that it was important to him to know of the habits, the customs, the prejudices, the peculiarities, the laws, and the religion, both of the Mahomedan and Hindoo inhabi-

tants, he would ignorantly in a thousand ways be exposed to violate some and give offence in others; it cannot be supposed that some violences would not be committed by the European; this would tend to exasperate both the Hindoo and Mussalman population, and supposing that those adventurers were multiplied to the extent that the question I imagine intends, would lead to universal disorder, anarchy and confusion in the interior, infallibly as I should think."

Sir John Malcolm, as a witness before the Lords' Committee was examined as follows:—

"Is it your opinion that much less danger is likely to arise to the peace and happiness of the inhabitants of British India from intercourse with Englishmen, who, from their long residence in that country, are acquainted with their manners and prejudices, than with persons coming from this country unacquainted with any of their manners and prejudices, and therefore from ignorance likely to offend them?" No doubt. * * * *

"In case then any act of violence should be committed by any free trader or his agent, at the distance of several hundred miles from Calcutta, do you conceive it possible that the natives can have adequate justice against such trader or his agent? It would be attended with very great delay and inconvenience no doubt."

Lord Teignmouth in his evidence before the Lords' Committee, said —

"An unrestrained admission of Europeans into the country, * * * would certainly in my opinion be attended with very great inconvenience and embarrassment to the Government of the country, and

might probably be attended with mischievous and dangerous consequences.

"The admission of a number of Europeans into the interior of Bengal, of people unacquainted with the habits and customs of the natives of that country and many of them entertaining a contempt for them, would probably be attended with this inconvenience, that they would often violate the prejudices of the natives by their conduct, and excite a considerable degree of irritation in the natives by such conduct, but whether it would be attended with evil consequences to the peace of the country, generally speaking, I feel some hesitation in giving any positive opinion; there is another instance in which I think the unrestrained admission of Europeans * * would also be attended with bad consequences, that it would tend to lower the British character in the estimate of the natives, and that might be deemed a dangerous effect, when the great disproportion between the inhabitants of India and the number of Europeans is taken into consideration * * *

"Supposing that irritation which your Lordship has supposed would take place in the minds of the natives from unrestrained intercourse with Europeans, and supposing that degradation of European character in their opinion which your Lordship has alluded to, do you not think it might ultimately affect the stability of the British Empire in India?—A long course of irritation and an increasing sentiment of degradation, might lead to such an effect."

Major General Alexander Kyd's evidence before the Lords' Committee is so important that copious extracts from it are reproduced below.

"From the experience you have had on this subject

are you able to form a conjecture with respect to the probable effect of an unrestrained intercourse between British persons and the native inhabitants of India?— I think from my own observation it would be fraught with very dangerous consequences, * * *

"On what observed peculiarities in the character or usages of the natives do you find that opinion?—It is an unfortunate circumstance, but it is certainly true, that the character of the lower class of Europeans is, to hold in utter contempt and to despise the character of the natives; and on all occasions, where I have observed they have had the smallest authority, they never fail to treat them ill. There is another circumstance that is equally unfortunate, that almost all the lower classes of Europeans are addicted to spirituous liquors when they can get them. Spirituous liquors are to be got in every village or market in the country at a trifling price, and therefore, they naturally will indulge in them, and in their intemperance ill-treat the natives.

"Do you remember having seen instances in which this observation was verified?—In my own experience I had occasion, to employ a vast number of European overseers, which in general were taken from the military and were recommended to me as men of the best character, but in the end I found that it was impossible to delegate to them the smallest power, and I was obliged to leave off the employment of Europeans, from their habit of ill-treating the natives, and to take to native superintendents, in the works I was carrying on * * * *

"Supposing traders to go from this country with British crews, would any abuses happen with respect to the native vessels of which you have spoken, and of which the crews and captains and owners are exclusive-

ly natives?—Upon that subject I own I have some opinions that may probably appear strange; but I very much fear that several of those disappointed traders would most likely wish to make good their losses, and might be induced to commit depredations upon those defenceless vessels; and in consequence this free and open communication of ships of all descriptions might frequently lead to those depredations; I am almost certain it would do it.

“Do you find that opinion upon any historical fact?—We know there have been traders in former times, who even went the length of a regular system of piracy” *

“You have stated that in the public works carried on under your direction in India, you latterly preferred the employment of natives, as superintendents, to Europeans; what opinion has that enabled you to form respecting the capacity of the natives when so instructed and employed?—The capacity of the natives respecting carrying on all works of ingenuity, is beyond what people in general can conceive I have executed, with natives alone, buildings of all descriptions, made up furniture of every kind, in short directed them to cast cannon, there is nothing that I understood myself, but what I could get the native artificers to execute, and in a very superior manner, they are a very ingenious and a very intelligent people.”

Yet the natives of India were represented as savages, whom it was considered the duty of England to civilize.

Mr. Thomas Graham was examined before the Lords' Committee.

“Supposing a considerable and indiscriminate influx of Europeans, in consequence of an open trade from every

port in the United Kingdom to every port within the limits of the Company's Charter, what political or other consequences would you apprehend from such increased and indiscriminate influx?—I do not conceive that it would be practicable for the regulators of the government there to restrain them from those communications which might lead to commotion.

"Will you describe the kinds of communication which you apprehend might lead to such commotion?—The trespasses which they might commit upon their religious prejudices."

According to Sir Thomas Munro

"the general intercourse of Europeans with such a country (India) would certainly be productive of very bad consequences. * * I think that men recently arrived from Europe, without any knowledge of the language or manners of the people, would be too much accustomed to exercise acts of violence to their religious and civil feeling and prejudices, and by that means to excite discontent at, and occasion constant affrays and appeals to, the authorities established there"

Further on Sir Thomas Munro corrected himself by saying

"When I spoke of European merchants lately arrived from Europe committing acts of violence against the inhabitants and natives, I did not mean to confine my remarks entirely to merchants, I extend it to all Europeans, civil and military, Company's servants and King's when they first land, from their ignorance of the manners of the natives, from seeing them apparently so mild, they are apt to treat them with contempt, and to commit acts of outrage that they would not do in their

own country : they consider themselves in India as part of a nation of conquerors, and they are very apt to act as such in their own persons."

The questions which were put to Mr. William Young, and the answers which he gave to those questions in his evidence before the Lords' committee are reproduced below :—

"What do you conceive would be the effect of an unrestrained intercourse between the natives of that country and the natives of this?—I should think it would lead to very disagreeable consequences.

"Will you describe in what way you conceive those disagreeable consequences would arise?—I think that they would arise from their interference with the manners, customs, usages, and religious prejudices of the people." * * *

"Do you apprehend then, that an unlimited influx of Europeans into that country would produce consequences dangerous to the happiness of the natives and the stability of the British Government?—I think, that unless very great restrictions indeed were imposed upon them, it would."

Mr. John Stracey told the Lords' Committee

"I should certainly think if British subjects are allowed to go when and where they please, through the different provinces, the greatest injury would arise in every respect, and if they are to go in an unlimited manner, and to be under no restraint to the different courts established in the provinces, I think they would all of them, or at least most of them, be guilty of the greatest excesses and enormities"

Then he was asked :—

"Do you not believe that if such a state of circumstances were to take place as has been just supposed, it would create great disturbance in the native population against the English Government?—I certainly think it would.

"Are you of opinion that if such enormities were committed, they would materially tend to lower the character of the English in the eyes of the natives?—If they could not obtain redress, I should certainly think it would.

"Supposing it were practicable to establish provincial jurisdiction in that country, to which the English might be subject, are you of opinion that the frequent punishment of Englishmen by such jurisdiction would tend to degrade the character of the nation in the eyes of the natives?—I think it possibly may; but that is so general a question, the effect of it I cannot speak to. I am, of opinion that no Europeans should be allowed in the interior of the country, except British subjects, and those British subjects to go under a specific licence from the different Governments, as is the case at present."

It is unnecessary to give the opinion of other witnesses examined before the Select Committees of the two houses of Parliament. As said before they were all agreed that it was undesirable to allow a free influx of Europeans in India.

But in the face of these testimonies the natives of England persisted in inducing the Indian authorities to permit their co-religionists and compatriots a free access without let or hindrance

to every part of India. They were told that this would not promote the happiness of the people of India. But what did they care for the happiness of the heathens of that country? They only cared for that which would put money into their own pockets. For, they believed that the measure which they proposed was the one calculated to prove beneficial to their commerce. Why, the larger the European population in India, the greater will be the consumption of European goods by them. Mr. Robert Morris was examined as a witness before the Lords' Committee. He said that there was no prospect of an extension of an export trade from England to India, unless there were a greater number of Europeans in that country to consume them. He was asked —

"Do you conceive there is much prospect of an extension of an export trade of the articles described?—Not under the present circumstances of the country, I mean unless there are a greater number of Europeans to consume them.

"Supposing it to be a fact, that the exports of European articles to India have, of late years, been considerably augmented, do you conceive that such augmentation has been owing to any increased consumption of European commodities amongst the natives of India?—I do not; or in a very small degree, probably some few articles, such as fine glassware for ornaments, for their houses, but of no others that I am acquainted with." *

The evidence of Mr William Fairlie was also

to the same purport. Being examined before the Lords' Committee —

"Do you know whether, during the last twenty years, there has not been an increased export of European articles and manufactures to India?—A very great one, I think, but chiefly, I should think, owing to the increased number of Europeans now in the service of the Company; the Company's Military and Civil Service have greatly increased, the King's regiments have greatly increased, and the number of Europeans is twenty or thirty to one, as compared to the time I went, thirty years ago."

× The presence of a large number of Europeans in India would *directly* lead to a greater consumption of European goods, and also *indirectly* lead to the same end by making the natives imitate European manners and thus become customers of European goods. It was also supposed that the intercourse of natives with Europeans would induce them to consume European goods. ×

× Mr David Vanderhayden, M. P. was examined before the Lords' Committee.

"Can you state whether, at the presidency of Calcutta, any growing conformity was discoverable, on the part of the natives, to European fashions or habits?—None to European habits, in some degree it may be with respect to fashions amongst the highest class of the people, I mean in the use of carriages or articles of furniture, such as looking glasses or glassware in a very moderate degree.

"Do you ascribe this slight progress of European fa-

shions among natives of distinction to their intercourse with Europeans or to any other cause?—*Of course it must have arisen from their intercourse with Europeans*

"Do you apprehend, that in the interior of the country, on the supposition that no great intercourse should be allowed to Europeans with natives, the consumption of European manufactures could be materially promoted?—I do not think that under any circumstances the consumption of European commodities in the interior is likely to be increased, for the reasons I have before stated."

✓ Yes, whatever demand there arose for European goods amongst natives was due to their intercourse with Europeans. And it was, therefore, considered necessary to permit Europeans to penetrate into the interior of India in order to promote the commerce in European goods.

Then again the free influx of a large number of Europeans into India brought into existence that class of hybrids known as half-castes or Eurasians, and thus leading to an increased consumption of European goods. Major General Alexander Kyd was examined before the Lords' Committee.

"Is it therefore likely, in your opinion, that under any circumstances or any system whatever, the manufactures of this country can obtain a very increased sale among the great mass of the Indian population?—In considering that question, I have been long of opinion, that it is not possible to increase the consumption of European articles to a much greater degree than it is at present among the

natives, but *it will go on progressively with our success in India, and with the increase of Europeans, and their children (half-caste), whose manners and habits are the same, and therefore use the same articles as their fathers.*"

In the course of their letter dated East India House, 27th February, 1818, Messrs. John Bebb and James Pattison wrote to the Right Hon'ble George Canning :

"The half-caste will increase in numbers more rapidly in proportion as facilities are extended to Europeans to settle in India." X

These were the considerations which led the natives of England, a nation of shop-keepers, to demand the free influx of Europeans to every part of India. Although some English natives would have been glad to see India converted into a colony, yet perhaps the thinking portion of them did not consider it good for them to see India colonised by their compatriots. Why? Because that might have diminished the export trade of England to India, instead of increasing it. Sir John Malcolm in his evidence before the Lords' Committee said —

"The facility of intercourse with India, from leading to the establishment in that country of a great number of European artisans and mechanics, will, I conceive, lead to a diminution of the exports of a great number of European articles. The manufacture of leather, lately established in Madras, has already not only furnished European accoutrements, but all species of articles down to ladies' gloves. Carriages and other conveyances are made by European artisans at Calcutta, all kinds of

furniture, all kinds of silver work, and in short, everything they can. The cheapness of the labour of natives, whom they teach to work under the superintendence of Europeans, in those arts, not only enables them to sell these articles cheaper, but is likely to be one means of introducing all such articles to more general use in the country, as they will become more within the compass of the means of the natives to purchase."

But India was not going to be made into a colony and the English people were taking steps to crush Indian industries rather than to encourage them and make India a thriving and prosperous country. So the fears of Sir John Malcolm were groundless. The Europeans who were to be allowed free access to India were to play the part of "birds of prey and passage" in India. They were meant to promote the interest of the English people and not of India. Thus Sir Thomas Munro was asked by the Select Committee of the House of Commons:—

"Are you not of opinion that if easier access to India were allowed to persons bred to the cotton trade, and more practised and skilled than general merchants in distinguishing the different kinds of cotton used in British manufactures, such would soon discover the situations most favourable for the growth of each sort of cotton, the best means of cultivating them, and of keeping the finer separate from the coarser cottons?"

In answer Sir Thomas Munro said:—

"I should have no doubt that if persons skilled^p in cotton were admitted into the interior of India, they

would probably find the means of improving the quality of the cotton."

The free influx of the Christian natives of England into India was meant for exploitation of India.

We have already reproduced above the statements of the several witnesses examined before the Committees of the two Houses who were almost unanimous in declaring that the free influx of Europeans would produce confusion, and disorder in India and the natives of that country would be oppressed and ill-treated by the white Christian adventurers and sojourners. The Right Honorable Lords, and the honourable members of the Lower House constituting the special Committees heard calmly the tale of sorrows that would befall the heathen natives by granting permission to their co-religionists and compatriots to freely resort to India. But what did they do? They perhaps did not believe in the proverb which says that "Prevention is better than cure." No, had they done so, they would have at once taken steps to make the regulations which existed at that time against the influx of Europeans into India more strict. No relaxation of those Regulations was desirable or advisable. Yet the free influx of Europeans into India, being a settled thing, it was proposed to make such regulations as would deter white sojourners in India from committing excesses

on its inhabitants. This looked something like inflicting a wound first and then applying some balm to relieve its pain and smarting

But no regulations could have prevented the ill-treatment of Indians by the white Christian adventurers. Lord Teigumouth in his evidence before the Lords' Committee, said :—

"I do not think any regulations of Government could, altogether prevent acts of injustice or oppression by Europeans in the interior, but that regulations might be so framed as to bring the offender to punishment in which case some of the evils would be mitigated."

But the discontent of natives engendered by ill-treatment at the hands of the white sojourners was not to be removed by any regulations. Sir Thomas Munro on being examined before the Lords' Committee was asked :—

"If any violences were committed by such persons upon the natives, would it not be extremely difficult for them to obtain any adequate redress ?

He said :—

"I should think that even the granting them adequate redress would not exactly remove the causes of discontent."

Similar was the testimony of several other witnesses.

But it was difficult, nay, almost impossible for any native to obtain redress when the offending party was a Christian white European.

No Christian white criminal was subject to the jurisdiction of any mofussil court in the interior. The British subjects were triable only in the Supreme Court of judicature established at the presidency. Mr. Thomas Cockburn, as a witness before the Lords' Committee was asked :—

"Are you aware that British subjects, for offences committed against the natives, are triable only in the Supreme Court of judicature established at the presidency?"

In reply, he said :—

"I am aware of that being the case, and I consider it one of the great grievances under which our Indian subjects labour. It is not only in respect to assaults or irregularities affecting their persons, but in respect to their property, a European, a British subject resident in the interior, licenced by the Government, by some construction of the law as it now stands, is considered even in regard to matters of property only amenable to the Supreme Courts; but as the act of going into the interior is one of his own seeking, and suffered by the licence of Government, he enters into a bond to allow himself to be prosecuted in the courts established under the regulations of Government to the extent of 500 rupees, while the European has the power to prosecute a native subject of Great Britain to any extent to which his dealings may extend; but if the native has larger demands upon the European than 500 rupees, he must proceed to the Supreme Court to prosecute him at the distance of sometimes hundreds, and in Bengal one*thousand miles, at an expense not only ruinous, but he must leave his family, his pursuits, and I

may say everything that is dear to him, and which he has been accustomed to, for the purpose of obtaining redress at the presidencies, while other Europeans not British subjects, are considered amenable to the country courts* * and this exception in favour of the British appears to me to give great reason for the natives to doubt the impartiality, if not the justice of the English Government. In criminal matters, a European, if informed against before a magistrate, is liable to be taken up by that magistrate, and witnesses are bound over to proceed to the Supreme Court whatever established, for the purpose of prosecution for the offence; of course, subject to the same inconveniences already described, except that in case of poverty, an allowance of two annas ($3\frac{3}{4}$ d) a day, I believe, is allowed to the witnesses to bear their expenses on such occasions. and in some particular cases, I believe, Government defray the expense of the prosecution."

Then he was asked —

Could British subjects be made generally amenable to those district courts without offence to their national feelings and prejudices."

He answered :—

"In cases of life and death, I do not think it possible either consistent with British laws or British feeling, that they should be amenable to the country courts; but in all other cases whatsoever, I cannot but think it would be just to the people of India, that those Europeans, who for their own advantage seek a residence among them, with the licence and protection of the Company, should be equally amenable to the country courts, I mean the circuit courts, where European judges preside, as the natives among whom they reside and whom it is the bounden duty, as is prescribed by the law, that the British

Government should protect in their religion, their usages, and even their prejudices."

He was further questioned :—

"Were British subjects made amenable to the jurisdiction of the country courts, however consonant the frequent exercise of that jurisdiction might be to the dictates of justice, would it be in fact agreeable to the natural feelings and prejudices of Englishmen?"

Mr. Cockburn truly observed :—

"As justice is the first principle in the heart of an Englishman, and as Englishmen place themselves in the situation described voluntarily, it is for themselves to consider whether they will do so, knowing that they will be amenable to trial by their countrymen, who preside in the courts to which I allude."

As the law stood in those days, the Christian white sojourners often considered it a good fun to take the life of a heathen black or brown native of this country. If they were in the interior of the country, by the committal of such a crime, they would at the expense of the State, be sent to the Presidency to take their trial before the Supreme Court. This gave them an opportunity to see the Presidency and thus relieve the monotonous life which they led in the mofussil often several hundreds of miles distant from the Presidency town. The author of *Fifteen Years in India* mentions an anecdote which is worth transcribing here, for it adorns a tale and points a moral.

"One great defect in the judicial establishments in

India, however, is that the supreme criminal courts have such a vast extent of jurisdiction over Europeans, and the perpetrators of crimes have to be brought from such a distance for trial, before punishment can be inflicted, that the salutary effect of it in prevention is in a great measure lost. A short anecdote will illustrate this: His Majesty's 17th regiment of foot was for a long time stationed on the northern frontier, upwards of one thousand miles from Calcutta, and many of the soldiers began to despair of ever more seeing the presidency, from this feeling, seven of them entered into a conspiracy to murder a black man, under the impression that only one of them would be hanged for the crime, and that in the meantime they would all have a pleasant trip to Calcutta, accordingly, a musket was loaded, and lots were drawn, and they proceeded together a little way from the cantonment in search of their victim, who was ploughing his field, when he received a bullet through his heart, from the hand that had been armed for his protection. Five of the seven were executed in Calcutta for the murder, and it is probable, that if a criminal court, having jurisdiction over Europeans, had been near the spot where it was committed, six lives would have been saved to the community, and an enormity prevented which must necessarily have produced disgust and horror among the native population of the place." (Fifteen Years in India, pp. 99 and 100).

But the authorities did not do much to remove the grievances of the natives. All that they did, was contained in the section 105 of the Charter Act of 1813. This section empowered magistrates in the provinces to have jurisdiction in cases of assault and trespass committed by British subjects

on natives of India. As said before, this did not go far enough to deter British subjects from oppressing natives.

May it not be that it was the policy of the natives of England to allow a free influx of their countrymen into India so that they might insult, assault and oppress its inhabitants in order to provoke hostilities? The natives of Great Britain wanted to colonize India. But the East India Company stood in their way. It was not the interest of the Company to encourage the colonization of India by their countrymen. They propagated certain myths as to the unsuitability of India for purposes of colonization. India moreover was a populous country and its inhabitants an industrious people. Before the Select Committee of the House of Commons in his examination as a witness, Sir Thomas Munro was asked :—

“Do you think it possible that any considerable portion of Europeans can maintain themselves in India, so as to colonize that country?”

In reply he said.—

“The Europeans at present, by law, cannot become proprietors of land in India, they cannot be manufacturers, on account of the superior skill and economy of the natives; they are therefore excluded from almost every other means of subsisting themselves, except by trade; and I therefore conceive that their numbers never could augment so greatly as to make them what might be called a colony.”

Colonization means displacement. Unless the heathen natives were displaced, there could be no room for Christian Europeans to colonize India. This permission of the free influx of the Europeans was the introduction of the thin end of the wedge into Indian politics to accomplish their desired end. There was sure to be friction between Europeans and Indians. Of course, justice was very seldom to be meted out to the latter. Their rising against the Europeans in order to defend themselves from the ill-treatment of the latter would be the justification for Englishmen to crush them. This is not quite hypothetical. This was the tactics adopted by the white Christians in their dealings with the non-Christians all over the world. Scheming and designing as the English people are, there is no wonder if they looked upon the free influx of their compatriots as a means that would lead to the colonization of India. Surely, that would produce the desired effect of the displacement of natives and thus facilitate colonization.

We may look at this question of the free influx of Europeans into India from any point of view we like, but we cannot help coming to the conclusion that it was meant for the benefit of the natives of England, and was certainly not calculated to promote the happiness and comfort of the people of India.

In the letter from Messrs. John Bebb and James Pattison, on behalf of the East India Company, to the Right Hon. George Canning, dated 27th February, 1818, it is stated that the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committees of the two Houses of Parliament, preparatory to the renewal of the Company's Charter in 1813, clearly establish the following propositions:—

"That the natives of India, though, generally speaking, weak in body and timid in spirit, are very susceptible of resentment, and of peculiarly quick sensibility in all that regards their religion and women.

"That Europeans, particularly on their first arrival in India, are occasionally liable, from ignorance, to give involuntary offence to the natives.

"That Englishmen, especially those of the lower order, are addicted to excesses disgusting to the natives, and which frequently lead to acts of violence and outrage; and that, in general, they are prone to domineer over and oppress the natives from a sense of their own personal and national superiority.

"That the natives, if they have not the ready means of obtaining legal redress for the injuries which they sustain, will be disposed to take the law into their own hands. ✕

"That the natives, when aggrieved, will often be deterred from seeking legal redress by the distance of the courts, the expenses attendant upon prosecutions, the difficulty of procuring the attendance of witness, and the delays of judgment.

"That when legal redress is sought for injuries inflicted the affinity of the country, language, manners and dress

of the Judge with those of the person against whom the complaint is lodged, and possibly the social intercourse subsisting between them, will somewhat shake the confidence of the prosecutor in the justice of the sentence, when it does not exactly accord with his wishes and expectations.

"That the frequent punishment of Europeans, although it may give to the administration of justice an air of impartiality, will tend to degrade their character in the eyes of the natives, and greatly diminish the respect in which it has been hitherto held.

"That among the British residents in India there is a strong disposition to assert what they conceive to be their constitutional and indefeasible rights, a general leaning towards each other, and a common jealousy of the authority of Government

"That an unrestrained ingress of Englishmen into the interior of the country would be productive of the most baneful effects upon the comfort of the inhabitants and the peace of society, and would be fatally injurious to the British name and interests., '

"That the number of Europeans who gain admission into the interior, whether clandestinely or from misplaced indulgence on the part of the local Governments, will always be proportioned to the number who are permitted to proceed from England or elsewhere to India. .

"That notwithstanding the stipulation which has been introduced into most of the treaties subsisting between the Company and the principal native powers in India, by which the latter have agreed not to engage Europeans in their service without the consent of the Company's Government, it is very probable that inferior chieftains and jaghirdars, and even princes of mere note, may employ such persons without its coming to the knowledge

of the Company's residents, and very possible that Europeans may make their way into the native States in spite of all the restraints which can be devised. And lastly.

"That colonization, and even a large indiscriminate resort of British settlers to India, would by gradually lessening the deference and respect in which Europeans are held, tend to shake the opinion entertained by the natives of the superiority of our character, and might excite them to an effort for the subversion and utter extinction of our power."

CHAPTER III.

THE SETTLEMENT OF EUROPEANS IN INDIA.

"Give them an inch and they will ask for an ell," is a well known saying of the natives of England. They have always tried to act upon it. Ever after the renewal of the Charter of the East India Company, in 1813, in which the natives of England were granted the concession under certain conditions to freely come out to India, they commenced agitating to be further granted the privilege of colonizing India. Although it was mentioned by all the witnesses examined in 1813 before the Committees of both the Houses of Parliament, that the free resort of the British to India would cause oppression and unhappiness to the Indians, yet, in order "to promote the "happiness" of those dusky people, the British were granted, to a certain measure, the concession which they had been clamouring for. But the concession was not deemed sufficient for them. So they commenced agitating for the colonization of India. And unhappily for India, some of the highest Anglo-Indian authorities of those days, lent their support

to this agitation. Thus Sir Charles T. Metcalfe in Minute, dated 19th Feb., 1829, wrote:—

"Concurring cordially in the proposition for extending to Europeans, engaged in the cultivation of indigo, and in other speculations, the privileges already granted to coffee planters, I beg leave to submit my reasons for advocating that proceeding; as I am not quite satisfied with those stated in the Resolution of Government."

"I have long lamented that our countrymen in India are excluded from the possession of land, and other ordinary rights of peaceable subjects.

"I believe that the existence of these restrictions impedes the prosperity of our Indian Empire, and of course, that their removal would tend to promote it.

"I am also of opinion that their abolition is necessary for that progressive increase of revenue, without which our income cannot keep pace with the continually increasing expense of our establishments.

"I am further convinced that our possession of India must always be precarious, unless we take root by having an influential portion of the population attached to our Government by common interests and sympathies.

"Every measure, therefore, which is calculated to facilitate the settlement of our countrymen in India, and to remove the obstructions by which it is impeded, must, I conceive, conduce to the stability of our rule, and to the welfare of the people subject to our dominion.

"The proceeding now adopted being a step forward in what appears to me to be the right course, has my hearty concurrence."

Lord William Bentinck was also of the same opinion as expressed in his Minute, dated 30th May, 1829

"The sentiments expressed by Sir Charles Metcalfe have my entire concurrence; and when he adopted the recent Resolution to permit the occupancy of land by Europeans, it was by no means my intention to rest upon that measure as a final one, still less that the grounds assigned for its adoption should be regarded as embracing the general question of the policy to be observed in respect to British settlers. Believing the diffusion of European knowledge and morals among the people of India to be essential to their well being and convinced that the development of the natural resources of the country depends mainly on the introduction of European capital and skill, it has always been my wish and intention that the above question should be fully considered and discussed, and that the result of our inquiries and deliberations should be submitted at an early period to the authorities at home. But the resolution referred to did not seem to require that we should enter upon so wide a field; our immediate purpose was merely to enlarge the operation of certain rules already partially in force, and the effect of our determination will only be to permit that which is now done covertly, to be done openly. * *

"We need not, I imagine, use any laboured argument to prove that it would be infinitely advantageous for India to borrow largely in arts and knowledge from England. * * Nor will it, I conceive, be doubted that the diffusion of useful knowledge, and its application to the arts and business of life, must be comparatively tardy, unless we add to precept the example of Europeans, mingling familiarly with the natives in the course of their profession, and practically demonstrating by daily recurring evidence the nature and the value of the principles we desire to inculcate, and of the plans we seek to have

adopted. It seems to be almost equally plain, that independently of their influencing the native community in this way, various and important national advantages will result from there being a considerable body of our countrymen, and their descendants, settled in the country. To question it is to deny the superiority which has gained us the dominion of India: it is to doubt whether national character has any effect on national wealth, strength and good Government: it is to shut our eyes to all the perils and difficulties of our situation: it is to hold as nothing community of language, sentiment and interest, between the Government and the governed: it is to disregard the evidence afforded by every corner of the globe in which the British flag is hoisted: it is to tell our merchants and our manufacturers that the habits of a people go for nothing in creating a market, and that enterprise, skill and capital, and the credit which creates capital, are of no avail in the production of commodities.

"* * * * Is there anywhere the prospect of our obtaining, in a season of exigency, that co-operation which a community, not avowedly hostile, ought to afford to its rulers? Is it not rather true that we are the objects of dislike to the bulk of those classes who possess the influence, courage and vigour of character which would enable them to aid us?" Do our institutions contain the seeds of self-improvement? Has it not rather been found that our difficulties increase with length of possession?"

* * * * *

"The answers to those questions must, I apprehend, be such as to imply that the present condition of things is far from being that with which we could justifiably sit down, contented. They must equally, I am satisfied, if rendered in full sincerity and truth, evince that the required improvement can only be sought through the more

extensive settlement of European British subjects, and their free admission to the possession of landed property."

It was from political considerations that Metcalfe and Bentinck favored the settlement of Europeans in India. This is evident from their Minutes. But it would not have served their purpose to have given out their real reasons for permitting Europeans to settle in India. So they had to use the mask of philanthropy to cover their ulterior designs. It was said that the natives of India would be benefited by the settlement of Europeans and that capital would flow into India to fertilise it. But these advantages were myths pure and simple. Mr. David Hill, on being examined before the Parliamentary Committee on 30th March 1832, was asked:—

"367. You are aware that the idea is entertained by many persons, that the introduction of European settlers into India is not only practicable but would be advantageous; are you able to state to the Committee any general ideas upon that subject?"

In reply, Mr. Hill said:—

"The advantages to arise from the settlement of Europeans in India have been wonderfully exaggerated; I estimate them very low indeed. The process used to go by the name of Colonization; now, I believe, the principle recommendations of the scheme are considered to be the transfer of British capital, and skill and enterprise, for the purposes of drawing forth the resources of India. I have no conception that any British capital would ever find its

way to India: it never did when the temptation was much greater than it can now be expected to be, and the distance of our empire, the uncertain tenure by which we hold it, the alarms continually springing up as to events endangering its stability, will effectually prevent British capitalists from transferring their funds to India. In that case, there remain only the skill and enterprise of Englishmen. According to my conception, they will be very far behind the natives in most departments to which skill can be applied. There are physical difficulties in the way of their undertaking manual labour, which must exclude them from being agriculturists or mechanics in India: for I imagine that a farmer who never held the plough in his hand, and who was transferred to a country where the climate, and the system of agriculture and the products of the earth are all different from what he has been accustomed to, could never cope, in point of skill, with the natives of the country. I imagine that the ryots of India are much better husbandmen than European settlers would be. So it would be as to mechanics also. There remains only the object of stimulating and directing the exertions of the natives themselves, an object which falls very far short of the sanguine expectations of the advocates of the system of free resort of European settlers to India, and an object which, under the present system, seems to me to be attained to its full extent, or under the present system admits of being carried to any further extent which may be deemed necessary. Then there will arise objections to the system connected with the bad characters which would go: if none but good characters went, they would be doing harm to themselves, but would not do any harm to India. A man of good conduct and capacity could not injure India: but my

impression is, that as it would be a bad speculation to the settlers, many would forfeit the good character they took out with them, and many others would find their way to India who were bad subjects, difficult to govern and not capable of conferring any benefits on the country they visited."

The further questions on the subject and the answers which Mr. David Hill gave to them are reproduced below —

"369. At what period was there more facility or temptation for exporting British capital into the provinces of India than at this moment?—When the rate of profit was much higher than it now is, or is likely ever to be again, when with the greatest ease 20 per cent. might be made in the money market of India, where five or six now is a fair remuneration.

"370. Did not the system of the Company, by impeding Europeans from settling in India, oppose obstructions to the introduction of European capital into that country?—Probably the obstructions to the resort of Europeans may, in some measure, have tended to prevent British capital from being transferred there, but I should think, if the inducements had been sufficient, there were no obstructions that would have been effectual.

"371. Are there now Europeans in the presidencies who, if greater facilities were allowed, would engage in agricultural or manufacturing speculations in the interior of the country?—I am not aware that there are or that there is useful scope for a greater number. I think they would supplant better men in the persons of natives who are now employed in those pursuits.

"372. In point of fact, are there not many Europeans at the presidencies who are calling out for greater

facilities ?—There are a great many more Europeans in India now than can find useful employment.

"373. Are they not cut off from a great variety of the employments of the country? I think not: they are prevented from acquiring real landed property. * * * *

"376. When you say that in some cases Europeans, if allowed to go into the interior, might supplant the natives, how do you reconcile that statement with your former opinion, that the natives generally will be found to cope successfully with the Europeans in regard to the produce of the interior?—Still I conceive that through the patronage of their countrymen, connection by blood, or by friendship, or recommendation, they would be preferred to situations that might be more fitly occupied by natives * * There are higher situations which are at present filled by natives that might be transferred to Europeans, through 'favour shown to them by their countrymen.

"377. WHERE DOES THE CAPITAL EMPLOYED BY THE INDIGO PLANTERS COME FROM?—IT IS ACCUMULATED IN INDIA EXCLUSIVELY."

Besides Mr. David Hill, several other witnesses stated also that no capital would be brought out from England to India. Thus Mr. W. B. Bayley, in his examination before the Parliamentary Committee on the 16th April 1832, in answer to question No. 919, said:—

"My opinion that no capital will be brought from England into India arises from little or none having been brought hitherto, even at periods when interest has been at a much higher rate than it now is,"

Then he was asked —

"920. Do you think more capital would not go to India if the restriction on Europeans resorting to India was altogether taken away?—I do not think that capital would be sent from England, but I think that capital which would be otherwise remitted to England would probably remain in India."

"921 Do you not think that Europeans without capital, persons of broken fortunes and character, might be tempted to go out as adventurers?—That is a mischief to be apprehended. * *

Then in answer to a further question he said —

"Europeans might be guilty of violent, insulting and offensive conduct, which though not perhaps punishable by law, might be extremely irritating and distressing to the natives."

Captain T. Macan also in his examination on 22nd March, 1832, was asked :—

"1435. Would Europeans be likely to invest their capital in works of that sort?—I think there is much error upon the subject of European capital in India.

"1436. Under the existing law that restricts intercourse with India, is it probable, in your opinion, that any companies would be found to undertake such works?—I think Europeans who have *acquired capital in India*, might undertake such [public] works, with proper encouragement; but I scarcely can anticipate so much enterprise and risk as to take capital from England to invest in such speculations, *in truth, capital is, I believe, never taken out of England to India : it is made there and remitted home*"

It was a myth then that European settlers would bring any capital from England to India. Mr Rickards truly said in his Evidence before the Commons' Committee on East India affairs in 1830, that .—

"Any improvement which may have arisen in consequence of the introduction of British capital and enterprize into India, is nothing in comparison with what would be the case if the natives were sufficiently encouraged, and proper attention paid to their cultivation and improvement India requires capital to bring forth her resources, but *the best and fittest capital for this purpose would be one of native growth*, and such a capital would be created if our institutions did not obstruct it"*

He also said —

"In many branches of art also, their skill is unrivalled, several of their fabrics, such as muslins, shawls, embroidered silks, and pieces of workmanship in gold, silver and ivory, have never yet been equalled by British artists. In many other arts connected with the comforts and conveniences of life, the natives of India have in some made great progress, and in others attained perfection, without being in the smallest degree indebted to European patterns or examples"***

"The natives are much given to commercial and industrious pursuits, and exceedingly well qualified to succeed in them. They are sufficiently commercial to

* P. 308, Vol I. (Public) Appendix to Report from Select Committee on the affairs of the E. I. Coy. Published by order of the House of Commons, 1832.

answer the highest expectations that can be formed, or desired, in respect to trade between the two countries but our local institutions must be greatly altered before they can become wealthy or prosperous. if the condition of the natives, their habits, wants, rights, and interests were properly attended to, all the rest would follow."⁴

Regarding the native capital, Mr. Forbes also said :—

'The native capital is considerable, though it has not been increasing of late years, owing to overtaxation. The natives want encouragement to apply it.'[†]

According to General Lionel Smith :—

"The native merchants are not so prosperous as they were, *they were very rich*"[§]

The Government of India of that period did all it could to prevent the natives of the country from accumulating capital. The land was the principal source of revenue to the Government and so it was very heavily assessed. This is borne out by the evidence of the witnesses examined before the Commons' Committee on East India Affairs, in 1830. Thus M. Rickards said :—

"Without a suitable reform of the system of taxation, and a better administration of justice, the progress of prosperity among the natives cannot be great. Where the revenue is collected, as it is in India, on the prin-

* Loc. cit. p. 308.

† Loc. cit. p. 306.

§ Loc. cit. p. 308.

ciple of the government being entitled to one-half of the gross produce of the soil, and vast numbers of officers are employed in the realization of it, it is a moral impossibility for any people whatever to live or prosper so as to admit of a very extensive commercial intercourse."

According to Mr. Mill,

"Generally in India more than enough has been collected by the Government from the cultivators; * *"

Mr Bracken said :—

"The large proportion of the gross produce, which the government take from the land, interferes with the rate at which the cultivators of the soil can borrow money."

Mr Gordon said —

"The natives of the Coromandel Coast would not be benefited by free trade and settlement, if the same revenue system were enforced. In taking the land tax, as little as possible is left for the subsistence of the people. It is impossible to look for improvement in any way, unless there is a moderate assessment of the land."

Mr. Chaplin said —

"Almost the only thing to be done to improve the character and condition of the inferior classes, is to lower the assessment, and fix it for a long period. By taking a moderate rent, we shall contribute more to the prosperity of the people, and to the suppression of crime, than by the most perfect code of regulations; ***"

* Loc. cit. p. 306.

Had the suggestions of the above mentioned witnesses been acted upon there would have been no need of the so-called introduction of foreign capital into India. Permanent Settlement had been granted to Bengal and so, according to Mr. Mill,

"In Bengal there has been a considerable increase of capital and extension of cultivation "**

But to increase the prosperity or happiness of the natives of India, was not an object dear to the heart of the authorities. They wanted to increase the number of their own kith and kin in India and so they made use of the pretext that the European settlers would bring capital into this country.

In the Minute of Lord Bentinck, from which extracts have been given above, his lordship expressed his belief that "the diffusion of European knowledge and morals among the people of India" was "essential to their well being" It was one of his reasons for favoring the settlement of Europeans in this country. But what were the European morals which were held out before the natives to imitate? It was to substitute the luxurious and artificial existence of the Westerners for the plain and simple living of the Indians. It was to make drunkards of sober and abstemious Asiatics.

* *Ibid.*

Mr. Holt Mackenzie, in his evidence before the Commons' Committee, on the 23rd February 1832, said —

'I believe intercourse with Europeans leads to indulgence in the use of wine and spirits, which, though it may be lamented on the score of morals, must be beneficial to the revenue, their servants are generally better clothed, and the articles of clothing being subject to taxation, that would increase the revenue. * * * *

"Judging from Calcutta, there has been, I think a marked tendency among the natives to indulge in English luxuries; they have well-furnished houses, many wear watches, they are fond of carriages, and are understood to drink wines."

Yes, it gladdened the hearts of many a Christian Anglo-Indian, that the natives had taken to the drinking of wines. In his evidence before the Commons' Committee, on the 24th March 1832, Mr. Bracken said that

"Liquors,* in Calcutta are now consumed in large quantities by natives who can afford to purchase them."

In answer to another question, the same witness said :—

"I heard from a native shopkeeper in Calcutta, who is one of the largest retail shopkeepers, that his customers for wines, and brandy, and beer, were principally natives.

"1936. What should you say was the favorite wine among the natives?—Champagne.

"1937. Formerly they did not consume any wine? —Very little, I believe.