made gradually, to selected areas first, and afterwards to others, but in all cases with perfect confidence, and in an ungrudging spirit. To enforce the principle wholesale in all places, and then to impose on it close and intolerable restrictions, was to court its failure. I would not be understood to imply that failure has followed; far from it! It is sufficient to say that the success of Lord Ripon's scheme was generously and fully acknowledged by Lord Elgin; but it has succeeded in spite of the conditions with which it was unwisely fettered. Freedom from official tutelage is essential to healthy and independent growth. This principle cannot be enunciated too often or too distinctly, and it is the more necessary to dwell upon it as, from the nature of the case, its application is very repugnant to the rising, ambitious, and energetic advisers of Government. To officials zealous for improvement it is trying to see important schemes, calculated to confer great benefit on a large community, postponed or marred from ignorance, or apathy, or indifference. But patience is necessary in the conduct of all public affairs, and those whose favourite projects are thwarted and opposed should remember that the establishment, development, and practical working of self-government is not only an end to be

pursued, but a great object of political education to be attained. It is better that even useful reforms should be postponed for a time, and ultimately carried out with the consent of local bodies, and in the form most acceptable to them, than that they should be enforced at once, with a disregard of the feelings of the local body. We should respect the independence of such bodies; we should retain sufficient control over them to see that they do not permanently, obstinately, or slothfully neglect their duty towards their fellow-citizens; but having planted this small tree of self-government, we ought not always to be pulling it up to look at its roots in order to see how far they have got down into the ground. It is hopeless to expect any real development of local self-government if local bodies are subjected to check and interference in matters of detail. The assistance and support of Government should be given—in Lord Ripon's words—"in the manner best calculated to preserve the Commissioners' freedom of action within the limits of their attributions, and not to weaken their sense of self-reliance." These are the principles of local self-government as they were enunciated by their sponsor in the Government of India, and we cannot too loudly join in the denunciation of a policy which not

only deviates from them, but is designed, if we may judge from its outward and visible manifestation in special cases, to crush every spontaneous formation as it arises, while at the same time professing to encourage local initiative.

The greatest of the administrative reforms which has been effected in India since Lord Ripon's time is the reconstitution of the Provincial Legislative Councils on a representative basis. No measure was ever more amply discussed or more urgently pressed upon the Government by the insistence of popular opinion. After seven years of preparation and consideration the law was passed, and a memorable step was taken, for which the educated Indian public will always be grateful as a concession to their just demands. It was not an adequate concession, but it was a great and decisive recognition of their claim to some independent representation in the councils of Government. In these eloquent words Mr Gladstone described the effect which had been produced on his mind by this measure for enlarging the liberties of the Indian people:—

I believe we are justified in looking forward not merely to a nominal but to a real living representation of the people of India. The great nation to which we belong has undoubtedly had to do most difficult

tasks in the government and in the foundation of the institutions of extraneous territories. But all the other parts of the British Empire have presented to us a simple problem in comparison with the great problem presented to us by India. Its magnitude, its peculiarity, is such that the task of Great Britain in this respect is far greater than that which any other country has attempted, and far greater than that which it has itself attempted beyond the sea in any of the dependencies of the Empire. I rejoice to think that a great and real advance has been made both before and especially since the direct transfer of the Indian Government to the immediate superintendence of the executive at home and to the authority of the Imperial legislature. The progress thus made has been effected by the constant application to the Government of India of the minds of able men acting under a strong sense of political responsibility. All these things induce us to look forward cheerfully to a great future for India, and to expect that a real success will attend the genuine application, even though it may be a limited one, of the elective principle to the government of that vast and almost immeasurable community. If this attempt be successful, it will be the accomplishment of a task to which it would be difficult to find a parallel in history.

This reform dates from 1892. I was a member of a Provincial Legislative Council for some years before the change was made and for some years afterwards, and am therefore in a favourable position to judge of its operation. Not only was the

constitution of the Councils changed, but their functions also were modified to some extent. The right of interpellation and of calling for papers was allowed, and the right of exercising some financial control was admitted. These privileges have not been abused. On the contrary, the provisions of the new law have operated to the general satisfaction of the public, and to the advantage of the Government. The Indian Councils Act has worked well; but it was not a perfect measure, and it labours under defects on the surface which no amount of tactfulness or happy give-and-take on the part of provincial governors or elected members could obviate. It is impossible to give adequate representation to a province containing more than seventy millions of inhabitants in a Council of only twenty members. But the number of councillors is limited under the present law to twenty. It is necessary, therefore, to enlarge the Councils. It is expedient also, in order to secure their stability and dignity, to provide a certain *ex-officio* qualification for membership. This *ex-officio* element should consist not of officials only, but also of noblemen whose position and status in the country entitle them to be recognised as legislators. We ought never to lose sight of the fact that India, in

spite of all its changes, is and always has been an aristocratic and conservative country, and that any attempt to democratise Indian institutions is calculated to result in failure. The Council should comprise the principal Indian dignitaries in the province; and as it is advisable to draw a precise line, it may be said that all Maharajah Bahadurs, Maharajahs, and Nawab Bahadurs, as well as all Indian gentlemen who have been honoured with the decoration of Knight Commander of the Star of India, or Knight Commander of the Indian Empire, should be *ex-officio* life members. Such recognition is due to their rank, to their stake in the country, to the respect in which they are held by the people, and to the influence they exercise. It is desirable on all grounds to encourage them to take an active part in the administration of public business. They take little or no part at present; but their inclusion in Council and their participation in legislation and the affairs of state would immensely strengthen the hands of Government. All who have thought on the subject have felt the wisdom of some such provision as this; and it has been suggested, considering the present limited number of councillors, that the noblemen of the province should be invited to elect a member from among

themselves. Such a proposal is, however, not only inadequate, but it would be distasteful to their sentiment and lowering to their prestige. The difficulty cannot be met except by a proportionate increase of the numbers of the Council. The official *ex-officio* members should be limited to ten, and the nobility, though the number would vary in different provinces, would ordinarily contribute about twenty life-members. The political instincts of these noblemen would furnish the necessary counterpoise, if any is needed, to the large infusion of middle-class representation which every system of election must introduce. It would be left, as it is now, to the elected members to constitute what may be called the "opposition." The electoral bodies would continue to be the District Boards and Municipalities, the Presidency Corporations, the Chambers of Commerce and Trade, and the Universities. It is impossible to allow less than thirty members for the real representation of such bodies. The Council would then be supplemented by Government nominees, selected to represent official interests and other sections of the community—such as the European, Mahomedan, or Parsee—which might not otherwise be sufficiently provided for. This right of nomination is necessary for several

reasons: in order that the Government itself may be fully represented; in order that a fair representation of minorities may be secured; and (although in less degree) in order that individual members who are truly representative and worthy to serve on the Council, but who for some cause or other have not been elected, or it may be have not stood for election, may be appointed. I would fix the limit of Government nominees at fifteen, or one-half of the number of elected members. The whole Council would then consist of about seventy members. If this number appears large in comparison with the present number, it must be admitted that it is not large when compared with the size and population of the provinces, or with the constitution of representative chambers in other countries. There is a prejudice against a large Council on the ground that numbers will create confusion and hinder the despatch of work. But in this matter we have experience to guide us, and no objection to a large Council will be found to derive any support from the proceedings of the Presidency Corporations, or of the Senate of the Universities. I have always found in my own observation that the larger the meeting the greater is the common-sense of the assembly, the sounder is the decision arrived at, and

the more amenable the whole gathering is to the influence of authority. The varying and conflicting interests of those concerned, the respect for duly constituted authority which is inherent in Orientals, and their desire to stand well with Government, are considerations which effectually restrain them from identifying themselves as a body with any factious opposition. In an enlarged Council the Government would run no risk of defeat. It is only by the adoption of such a scheme that the Councils can be established on a really representative basis. Its adoption would not only afford satisfaction to the educated classes of the community, but it would gratify and conciliate the nobility and secure for the conservative and aristocratic elements of the country a share in the responsibilities of empire commensurate to their rank. Far from impairing the executive administration, it would prove to be a source of strength in all measures for the welfare of the people.

ENGLAND AND INDIA

IT should be a source of unfeigned satisfaction to persons interested in India when closer attention is given in England to Indian affairs. This closer attention exercises a valuable influence: our own moral sense is awakened by increased knowledge; more adequate knowledge of actual facts is accompanied by a livelier consciousness of deficiency and of increased responsibility. On the other hand, our Indian fellow-subjects are clear gainers from the stimulus which their rulers receive from the beneficial action of public opinion in Europe.

I am not disposed to overrate the value of such influence, and I am free to admit that the most active manifestations of English opinion have often been actuated by race animosity. But even in such cases English opinion is able to exercise a beneficial influence in comparison with Anglo-Indian opinion in India. It finds utterance in more temperate and decorous lan-

guage. No vulgar abuse of Indians,[1] such as sometimes sweeps over India, would be tolerated in any newspapers or public meetings in this country. Distance from the scene enables men to judge of events with less excitement and irritability. There is greater moderation, and the growth of opinion advances on irresistible lines in increasing sympathy with the Indian people and an increased sense of England's responsibility for India's welfare. Every year there is an addition to the number of authorities who avow doctrines which were formerly condemned as unpatriotic and unreasonable, and who in their appeal to a higher tribunal than national self-love are gradually leavening the tone of public opinion by their persistent enthusiasm, and profoundly modifying existing conceptions.

[1] In order that my readers may be able to form some idea of the language which Anglo-Indian journals have not been ashamed to use, I give below an extract from a newspaper which appeared at a time when the Ilbert Bill agitation may be supposed to have died out:—

"Baboo Lal Mohun Ghosh has decided to accept the invitation of the Deptford 400 to become the Liberal candidate for the representation of their new borough. It is not too much to say that this rabid, worthless mob of four hundred is more fit for the inside of a lunatic asylum than for catering for the political well-being of our native land. If a Bengalee Baboo can enter Parliament, it will soon become a favourite resort for Aryans. In an insensate, idiotic thirst for novelty, where will an English mob stop? Could a chimpanzee be trained to stand for a borough, doubtless he would be found to have an excellent chance with a

New India

Some of the best books about India have been written by men who have had no official concern with the country, who have perhaps never even visited it, and who derive all their knowledge of it from indirect sources. Such books will often contain more valuable reflections on the nature of our administration of India, on the constitution of our Empire, on the effects of our rule, and on the dangers (external and internal) which may befall it, and they offer also more valuable suggestions in regard to the future of India, than are usually to be found in similar books put forth by Indian officials of the widest experience. There is an advantage in being untrammelled by official antecedents. The opinions of those who have passed long years of service in India are unconsciously weighed down and narrowed by a bias derived from their whole life and environment. Many ad-

county constituency. And perhaps a chimpanzee would be a cleverer animal than this Ghosh Baboo, whose publicly uttered sentiments in Dacca obtained for him the distinguishing title of polecat. Thank Heaven! four hundred do not represent an English constituency, and the Baboo may find to his cost that at the last moment the English nationality has revived. In such a case his insolence and presumption in seeking a seat in Parliament would be fitly rewarded by an infuriate crowd of roughs!"

The accomplished Indian gentleman to whom the above remarks refer was President of the Indian National Congress held at Madras in 1903.

mirable books about India have, indeed, been written by Anglo-Indians, officials and non-officials; but the tendency of officials is to exalt unduly the excellence of the work on which they have been themselves engaged, and err on the side of excessive self-laudation. It results from this unfortunate but natural tendency, that it is necessary to make a wide allowance for the optimistic character of most Anglo-Indian writers; and the higher the official rank of the authority, the more sure is he to be an apologist, or perhaps biographer, of his own administration, and the more needful it is to discount his conclusions. The exceptions of such men as Lobb, Osborn, and Geddes, who died before they could accomplish their work, or of many living officers who, in their retirement, devote their unflagging energies to the true interests of India, do not affect the general truth of my statement. The fact remains that it is not in the volumes annually published by Anglo-Indian administrators that we may look for any glimmer of insight into that utter derangement of economic and social conditions which our conquest has wrought, and which is the chief cause of the pauperisation of the people. Nor is it likely that in these volumes we shall find any percep-

tion of the deteriorating effect wrought upon both conquerors and conquered by the anomalous relations existing between them. These are elements of cardinal importance in considering whether, on the whole, our presence in India has been for good or for evil; and yet their very existence is commonly ignored in the writings of official apologists. The pessimist writers who have the courage and ability to express their opinions, discharge, therefore, a useful function, which will continue to be necessary so long as officials like Mr Justice Stephen and Sir John Strachey continue to maintain that our Indian Government is the most beneficent, most perfect, and most unalterable that can be imagined. Unfortunately their work is for the most part critical only; it may wither and destroy, but it does not replace. The real need of India is reconstruction; and it is the special value of such utterances as those of Osborn, Caird, and Blunt—and particularly of Dr Congreve's pamphlet on India, and the treatise on India in the "English Citizen" series,[1] both written by gentlemen who have no personal knowledge of India—that being composed without prejudice, and with an adequate appreciation of the facts of

[1] *Colonies and Dependencies*, Part I., "India," by J. S. Cotton (Macmillan, 1883).

the case, they lead directly to the formation of administrative principles on which a reconstructive policy can be based.

I would mention the names of Messrs Hyndman and William Digby with respect, though I cannot agree with all their conclusions. Mr Digby has rendered a valuable service by drawing the attention of the British public to India's poverty. Sir James Caird's book is full of useful and practical suggestions. *Ideas about India*, which were reprinted by Mr Wilfred Scawen Blunt from the *Fortnightly Review*, are conspicuous illustrations of keen insight into the real relations between England and India. The outburst of indignation they excited among Anglo-Indians is an instructive contrast to the impression they created among the Indian community, which was briefly one of mingled surprise and gratification that an Englishman who had only travelled in India for a few months should be able so thoroughly to understand and represent their feelings. Our obligations are due to the late Sir William Hunter, whose unquenchable optimism impairs but does not destroy the value of his vivid interpretations of India to the English reader. Mr Romesh Dutt, with great erudition and exemplary industry, has devoted himself to the

elucidation of elaborate studies on the economic and historic aspects of Indian life. Mr Dadabhai Naoroji, Sir William Wedderburn, the late Messrs Fawcett and Bradlaugh, and the late Mr Caine, whose premature death all India mourns, have devoted their great influence, both in and out of Parliament, to the interests of India in this country. I may cite greater names who have wrought still more in the formation of public opinion in England on India. Edmund Burke will always be pre-eminent for his profound sympathy with the people of India and for the extraordinary knowledge of the country he acquired. The eloquence of his utterances has made them household words among us, and ensures their influence for all time. The writings and speeches of Macaulay have rendered inestimable service by popularising and establishing on a broad basis the application of liberal principles in practical administration and policy. The noblest and most eloquent of modern statesmen also, Mr Gladstone and Mr Bright, have stirred the heart of Englishmen, and deservedly earned the gratitude of the people of India by recalling England to a sense of her duties to her great dependency.

The essential importance of English opinion in regard to India will be best appreciated if we

measure what the effect of such opinion has been in regard to Irish reform. Internal agitation in Ireland has always been useless; it was only when Irish agitation was supplemented by a powerful phalanx of opinion in England that any concessions were allowed to the sister island. And so it is in the case of India. There is, I am persuaded, no reason to justify the fears of those who look on the peaceful solution of the Indian problem as a mere speculative contingency altogether outside the sphere of practical politics. But we know that internal pressure is powerless; it leads to repression only, the ultimate outcome of which must be a national outbreak. The experiment of a "firm and resolute government" in Ireland has been tried in vain, and the adoption of a similar policy in India is inevitably destined to fail. The remedy for both countries is the same. The opportunity of a peaceful solution rests in both cases with the English people, who alone have it in their hands to effect a material modification in the attitude of Government through the pressure of public opinion from the mother country.

The powerlessness of any action which may originate in India itself is illustrated by the history of Lord Ripon's administration. It is

impossible that I can mention Lord Ripon's name in terms of too high praise. From the moment he landed in India to the day he left it he laboured for the native population. His tenure of office will always be a memorable one. He will be known in history as the author of a progressive and enlightened policy, as a statesman of wide and sincere sympathy with the people of the country, above all others "the Friend of India"; and it will be the proudest honour of his successors if their names are handed down to posterity with that of Ripon. Yet he was able to accomplish little. It is true that the political revolution now taking place in India is largely attributable to his exertions—although by the irony of fate it is far more largely attributable to the blind fanaticism of those who opposed him—but the actual results of his administration as shown upon the statute-book are not very great. I recognise the difficulties by which he was surrounded, and it may be that he was encompassed by other difficulties of which I have no knowledge. He was harassed and hampered in an inconceivable degree by the bigotry and race feeling of his own fellow-countrymen. He was paralysed from want of support, and neither he nor any man in his position single-handed could have overcome

the dead wall of opposition by which he was confronted.

I take this opportunity (before I allude further to Lord Ripon's policy) of linking the present with the past, and of invoking for his predecessors and successors their due tribute of acknowledgment. I do this advisedly, for I am able to bear testimony to the good which has been done; and I think there is too great a tendency among those who are impressed with the injustice of the English conquest to look with jaundiced eyes on all features of Indian administration. We may condemn the conquest (as animated by unworthy motives, for which no adequate justification has ever been brought forward), but we need not blind ourselves to the advantages which have followed from it. If it has been the case that, almost without exception, every Governor-General has extended the area of British territory, it is also the case that every Governor-General has taken his part in consolidating a peaceful administration over the territory so acquired. If the external policy of Government has been one of systematic aggression, it is also true that the internal policy has been one of continual progress. To Lord Cornwallis we owe the foundation of the present form of the civil administration, the purification of the Civil

Service, and the priceless boon of a permanent land settlement in Bengal. To Lord William Bentinck we owe the establishment of the principle that no natives of India are to be excluded by reason of their birth from any appointments under Government.[1] We owe to Lord William Bentinck, under the inspiration of Macaulay, the foundation of an educational system which has revolutionised India. To Lord Dalhousie we owe the initiation of a policy for developing the resources of the country which is now bearing fruit. The memory of Lord Canning will always be cherished by the Indian people for his justice, his firmness and courage at the time of a great crisis, and for his clemency. To Sir John Lawrence we owe the municipal-

[1] As long ago as 1833 it was provided by Act of Parliament "that no native of the said territories, nor any natural-born subject of her Majesty resident therein, shall, by reason only of his religion, place of birth, descent, colour, or any of them, be disabled from holding any place, office, or employment under the said Company." The same assurance was conveyed by the Queen's proclamation of 1858, when the Government of India was transferred from the Company to the Crown. And so it was observed by Lord Northbrook in the House of Lords, "Whether it was Lord Dalhousie with his imperial instincts, or Lord Canning with the responsibility laid upon him of dealing with the Mutiny, or Lord Lawrence with his great knowledge of the internal organisation of the country, or Lord Mayo, associated from childhood with the Conservative party.—all alike held that there should be no distinction of class or race, and that there should be one law for all classes of her Majesty's subjects."

isation of the large towns;[1] to Lord Mayo the decentralisation of the finances. To the humanity of Lord Northbrook we are indebted for the definite and practical assertion of the principle that it is the first duty of the administration during famine to preserve life. To Lords Dufferin and Lansdowne we owe the establishment of Legislative Councils upon a more or less popular basis. There is not one of the Governor-Generals of India whose name we may not associate with large and enlightened measures for the welfare, education, or political training of the people.

I venture, therefore, to think that the progress already made is a fit subject for commemoration. It is well to remember that a policy of consolidation has proceeded hand in hand with a career

[1] The following utterance of Sir John Lawrence, on 31st August 1864, distinctly foreshadows our present policy:—"Great public benefit is to be expected from the firm establishment of a system of municipal administration in India. Neither the central Government nor the local governments are capable of providing either the funds or the executive agency for making the improvements of various kinds in all the cities and towns of India which are demanded by the rapidly developing wealth of the country. The people of India are quite capable of administering their own affairs; the municipal feeling is deeply rooted in them. The village communities, each of which is a little republic, are the most abiding of Indian institutions. Holding the position we do in India, every view of duty and policy should induce us to leave as much as possible of the business of the country to be done by the people."

of conquest, that the establishment of order is always essential to any real progress, and that the united and continuous efforts of previous generations are the necessary introduction to all great measures of reform. If the war epoch has at last drawn to a close, if the conquest of India is complete, and our future proconsuls may sigh with Alexander that they have no more worlds to conquer, if all the energies of the Indian Government may now be devoted to the encouragement of national reconstruction—the vantage position we thus occupy is entirely due to the labours of our predecessors. It is they who have prepared the way for the pending changes which are about to affect every portion of the Empire. It is well to acknowledge that great progress has been already made in imparting civilisation, education, and order, and that the mechanism of one of the most remarkable movements ever known in the world has been set going by the hand of Government.

The policy of Lord Ripon was thus described by an acute but hostile critic in the House of Lords: "It is the policy of gradually transferring political power in India from European to native hands." "Does it not mean," asked Lord Lytton,[1] "nay, ought it not to be taken as mean-

[1] As reported in the *Times*, 10th April 1883.

ing, that we, the English Government in India, feel ourselves in a false position, from which we wish to extricate ourselves as quickly as possible? We must no doubt hold office for a certain time, in order to train up you natives to take our places; but this is our only object. As soon as it is accomplished (and the sooner the better), we shall retire, and leave India to be governed by whatever body her native representative assemblies may see fit to entrust with the task of government." This is Lord Lytton's language, not mine; it is a paraphrase uttered by a politician who had himself been Viceroy, with a full sense of responsibility and knowledge that his words were not likely to be forgotten. They are, indeed, but the echo of a sentiment which has made itself widely felt among the Anglo-Indian community in India. The organisation in Calcutta of a European and Anglo-Indian Defence Association, which comprises among its members nearly all the unofficial magnates in Bengal, which is largely supported by the active sympathy of officials, and which, according to the *Englishman* newspaper, "inaugurates a new era in the history of British India," is a phenomenon only to be understood in the light of Lord Lytton's gloss on Lord Ripon's policy. It is true that Lord Ripon himself was careful to

abstain from any such outspoken avowal, and that his friends and supporters were but too ready to offer the excuse that the proposals which excited so much bitter and violent opposition were really isolated in character and individually of small importance. It is true that the language of Lord Lytton was at once deprecated by Her Majesty's Ministers in that half-hearted manner in which the Liberal Government is too apt to protest against conclusions which must ensue from the conscientious application of its professed principles. It would therefore be incorrect to say that either the Liberal Ministry at home or Lord Ripon in India had consciously identified themselves with the policy which Lord Lytton enunciated on their behalf. On the contrary, it is probable that Lord Ripon was, in the first instance, as unconscious of the inevitable tendency of his own measures as he was admittedly unprepared for the tremendous opposition their introduction provoked. At the same time it would be unjust to deny to Lord Ripon the most ample credit for a great work. He was the instrument at whose hands a long and elaborate preparation at last received its due fulfilment. But he was a great deal more than a mere instrument. The policy which he espoused is indeed the logical development of

principles which all previous Viceroys—even Lord Lytton himself—had been ripening to maturity. But it was Lord Ripon who took action far more decided than any of his predecessors, who by his own personal enthusiasm infused life into the dry bones of the dull office machine, and by the vigour of his example stimulated the subordinate governments to give practical expression to his views. Already the benevolent despotism of an autocratic administration is merging into a system of free representation and municipal and local independence. The way is being gradually prepared for the emancipation of the Indian people. There has been no change in the power of Government, which is still as supreme as that of the Czar of Russia. The Government of India is still characterised by its absolutely despotic constitution. But it is in the spirit and disposition with which supreme power is now exercised that a change is visible. We have seen the complete reversal of an aggressive policy on the North-West Frontier. After having been for nearly fifty years under British rule, the province of Mysore was lately restored to its hereditary prince, and for the first time in the history of India the red line of British possessions has receded. The Guicowar of Baroda was restored

to his dominions. In spite of unprecedented provocation, the little State of Manipore was not annexed. A system of provincial representation has been introduced into the local legislatures. A comprehensive scheme of local self-government has been organised. An Indian judge has been appointed more than once to officiate as Chief Justice of the High Court. The "enforcement of civilisation irrespectively of the wishes or feelings of the people" under which legislation and taxes have been augmented until the imposition of a new fiscal duty becomes a question rather of policy than of finance; the "establishment of a scientific frontier" absorbing for military purposes all the proceeds of additional taxation which had been expressly levied as an insurance against future famine; the "inherent overwhelming turpitude of native character," that Anglo-Indian dogma so freely and unwarrantably postulated by subordinate officials and *littérateurs*—these are phrases which I am glad to think are discredited and past. At least they are no longer avowed as the basis of our Indian policy. We may observe among exceptional members of the official hierarchy manifestations of a wise and liberal attitude and of a wider grasp of the meaning of political events. The admirable independence and courage which were displayed by men like

the late Sir Henry Harrison and Mr Geddes inspire us with a confidence that others situated in their position may be emboldened to follow in their footsteps. Even among the highest authorities of Government there are those who are alive to changes unrecognised by most of those habituated to residence in the country.

The period of Lord Ripon and his immediate successors has been well described as the Golden Age of Indian reformers, when the aspirations of the people were encouraged, education and local self-government were fostered, and the foundations of Indian nationality were firmly laid. The natural trend of Anglo-Indian opinion has been to assert itself in a reactionary outburst against this development, disparaging the vantage-ground acquired in the past. In the Imperialism of Lord Curzon these reactionary tendencies have found a too willing mouthpiece. We are told that the weakness and limitations of the newly educated classes are now more clearly perceived, and that the complexities of the problems of Oriental politics are more distinctly realised. But it is not by indulgence in such vague generalities that the current of advance can be stemmed. Temporary spasms of reaction are inevitable. They pass away like footprints on the sand, and we

need not trouble ourselves too much with these vexatious aberrations from the path of progress. They will be quickly forgotten. In the meantime the old principles of administration, although they are discredited, cannot be formally destroyed until they are replaced; and for the Government to accomplish this is no easy task. It is not every Viceroy in India who is able to resist the pressure brought to bear on him by his own countrymen. It requires the assurance of a strong moral support from home, support not from the English Government only, but from the English people. It is a common complaint that the politics of India find no echo in the life and interests of Englishmen. Nothing short of a great famine or a great Durbar, a victory or a defeat, will attract attention to our vast dependency. The complaint is just, and it is perhaps inevitable that it should be so. But the spirit of indifferentism is hardly less dangerous than the spirit of the new Imperialism. England is a great nation with vast responsibilities, unique and unparalleled in their wide-reaching influence and operation. It is our privilege, the privilege of her people, to assist and determine action and to formulate policy. I do not deny that English opinion may be profitably exercised on particular sub-

jects, but it is of even greater importance that it should be directed to moulding general principles. I remember the words of Mr Gladstone when he spoke in the House of Commons[1] of the relations between Parliament and the Indian Government. He said: "It is not our business to advise what machinery the Indian Government should use. It is our business to give to those representing Her Majesty's Government in India ample information as to what we believe to be sound principles of government. It is also the duty and function of this House to comment upon any case in which we think the authorities in India have failed to give due effect to those principles; but in the discharge of their high administrative functions, or as to the choice of means, there is no doubt that that should be left in their hands." These words were wise. It is not by attempting to rule directly a country like India that we can do our duty to that distant territory. The details of administration must be left in the hands of those who possess a competent knowledge of Indian affairs, upon whom must always rest the personal responsibility of giving effect to a reconstructive policy without disturbance. For them there is good and noble

[1] Debate on the Indian Councils Bill, June 1892.

work remaining to be done. The difficulties accompanying the present epoch of excitement can only be successfully overcome by the cordial co-operation of Indian officials during the crisis. By the exercise of personal influence, which in virtue of their position is almost indescribably great, by the force of a strong example of tolerance, courtesy, and good-will, they have it in their power to do much to temper prestige and pride, and to establish a more kindly relationship with the people. For us, our duties lie in a different direction. Busied with the ordinary affairs of life, it is not possible for us to familiarise ourselves with the details of Indian administration. Our interests are nearer home. But our responsibilities remain. The white man's burden is on us. A policy of indifferentism is one of the greatest calamities that could befall India. Our duty is to make ourselves acquainted far more nearly than we do at present with the current events and history of India—so much, indeed, is easy—but, above all, on the basis of such acquaintance to form convictions on the general policy which should guide the Government, and to labour in the creation of a popular opinion which shall share those convictions and stimulate and strengthen the authorities in putting them into practice.

Those, at least, who think as I do need not hesitate to offer such aid as they can give. We have no cause for hesitation. We are already armed for the encounter, and, inspired by the belief we profess, have no difficulty in formulating the principles which we think should be followed. We accept the fundamental doctrine of modern social life, the subordination of politics to morals. We claim to test our political action by moral considerations, allowing that for the State as well as for individuals it is the question not of rights but of duties that must take precedence. These are the new principles we have to offer in substitution of the worn-out ideas which have provisionally been employed. This, therefore, is our policy of reconstruction. The policy of the future—which is based alike on the duty of England and on the need of India, on the devotion which is due from a strong nation to a weak and subject people—must be a policy of national self-sacrifice, voluntary restitution, and disinterested moderation.

POLITICAL RECONSTRUCTION

THERE are, I suppose, not many reflecting persons who will maintain that our occupation of India, as we hold it, can be of a permanent character. The emancipation of India has become inevitable ever since a system of English education was established and the principle of political equality accepted. The great upheaval which has revolutionised all departments of Indian thought, inspired the aspirations of diverse communities, and infused the sense of nationality throughout a vast and surging empire can only find its peaceful fulfilment in the wise and prescient recognition of changes imminent in the situation which the British Government itself has created. The Right Honourable Mountstuart Elphinstone wrote as long ago as 1850:—

I conceive that the administration of all the departments of a great country by a small number of foreign visitors, in a state of isolation produced by

a difference in religion, ideas, and manners, which cuts them off from all intimate communion with the people, can never be contemplated as a permanent state of things. I conceive also that the progress of education among the natives renders such a scheme impracticable, even if it were otherwise free from objection. It might, perhaps, have once been possible to have retained the natives in a subordinate condition (at the expense of national justice and honour) by studiously repressing their spirit and discouraging their progress in knowledge; but we are now doing our best to raise them in all mental qualities to a level with ourselves, and to instil into them the liberal opinions in government and policy which have long prevailed in this country, and it is vain to endeavour to rule them on principles only suited to a slavish and ignorant population.

These words are a lasting tribute to the sagacity of the old Anglo-Indian statesman who had lived for thirty years in India, who had ruled as Governor of Bombay for eight years, to whom the Governor-Generalship of India was twice offered, and who in honoured retirement in the evening of his life had lost none of his sympathetic interest in the country he had served so well. The experience of more than half a century since they were written merely confirms their truth.

India is indeed a tutelage unexampled in

history, and we have incurred liabilities on its account not lightly to be set aside. England should no more break from its past than should India break from the traditions of its history. An abrupt retreat would, as has been well said, be to act like a man who should kidnap a child, and then in a fit of repentance abandon him in a tiger jungle. The deplorable opposition which was kindled in India against Lord Ripon's measures is evidence of the difficult and delicate character of the work which lies before us. I do not say that the process of reconstruction can be effected otherwise than by slow and gradual means. Many years must elapse, generations may pass away, before we can expect the consummation of the policy I advocate. But it is a policy which we should always keep before our eyes, and to which all our efforts should converge. Sooner or later India must again take her own rank among the nations of the East, and our action should be devoted to facilitating her progress to freedom. Not in mere vague talk, but strenuously and of set purpose, it should be the principal object of our Indian Government to address itself to the peaceful reconstruction of native administrations in its own place.

The task is not so stupendous as at first

appears. The difficulty is not so much to organise internal administration as to provide for the existence of healthy relations between separate and independent states. But even in this respect the difficulties are exaggerated. It would ill become Englishmen who are actually engaged in a daily policy of dangerous repression to confess themselves incapable of political reconstruction.

The best solution of the problem is apparently to be found in the proposal to place India on a fraternal footing with the colonies of England. A constitutional relationship of this kind, as though England were the parent country and India its colony, would form a material guarantee for the peaceful attitude of the Native States. England will always have a stake in India sufficient to call forth interference if necessary, and in the event of a civil war in India the military interposition of England would be required in the interest of both countries. England herself, therefore, will continue to afford the principal guarantee of peace.

Autonomy and not assimilation is the key-note of England's true relations with her great colonies. It is the key-note also of India's destiny. The circumstances of Russia afford no parallel. In itself historically and geographi-

cally more of an Oriental than a Western power, Russia has without much effort or deliberate policy absorbed the border tribes on its eastern frontier, and all its extensions eastward have been conterminous with its own natural and ever-widening boundaries. In this way it has by a sure and almost unconscious process assimilated vast areas of Northern and Central Asia up to the confines of the Pacific. Assimilation has been complete, but there is no autonomy, for Russia has none to give. The relations of England with India are in striking contrast to those of Russia with Central Asia. We have not simply overstepped our borders, and our contact with the East is not the incorporation of neighbouring states. There can be no assimilation between Englishmen and the natives of India, separated from us by many thousand miles of land and sea. But in accordance with an august and liberal policy we have extended to India the inestimable boons of education, political equality, and representation. The dawn of the day has risen which Macaulay declared[1] in the House of Commons would be

[1] The eloquent and prophetic utterance of Lord Macaulay in the House of Commons in 1833 ought always to be ringing in our ears :—

"The destinies of our Indian Empire are covered with thick darkness. It is difficult to form any conjecture as to the fate

the proudest day in England's history. The full development of autonomy is still in a distant future, but the beginnings have been laid and the paths have been made straight. The claim for representation in the Government of Great Britain is frequently put forward in the advanced organs of Indian thought, and Indian candidates have often stood for Parliament. This need not excite our wonder when we consider how the glamour of a Parliamentary career dazzles men's eyes. But it would be more fitting and I am sure more gratifying to the ambition

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

and energies of these able and cultivated Indians if they were afforded a larger and more appropriate outlet in the administration of their own country. A certain measure of representation has already been accorded to the Indian people in the local legislatures. It is in its further development, in the increase of their power and influence in India itself, and not in representation in England, that we shall find the appropriate and natural prize and legitimate goal for Indian aspirations.

In the face of the bloated armaments of Europe it may seem useless to speculate about the reduction of the English army in India. But with a proper reorganisation of the native army it should be possible to effect a material diminution in the number of English troops required. There are only two ways of governing a conquered country; there is no safe standing-point between absolute suppression and absolute equality. The last is the goal to which we tend, and in military no less than civil reconstruction it is necessary to identify the interest of individuals with the State. The native army is, however, now organised on a mercenary basis. It is more and more replenished by rude and ignorant recruits from the borders of our frontier or beyond it, and the martial spirit of our own Indian

subjects is gradually dying out. "Tribes," writes Sir Richard Temple, "which fifty years ago were notoriously attached to arms are now comparatively unwarlike. With training and discipline the troops will still behave very well; but with the masses of them there is hardly now the predilection for the fight, the instinct of physical contention, that there used to be." The Mogul emperors adopted heartily and completely the policy of trust; Akbar's greatest generals and most devoted adherents were children of the very men his grandfather had conquered; the Rajput chivalry was the main bulwark of the Mogul throne. The British Government, on the contrary, has adopted a policy of suspicion; the non-commissioned officers of our native army are only old soldiers, promoted from the ranks, who in virtue of their longer services draw larger pay, and are permitted to sit down in the presence of an English subaltern. We can expect no assistance from such men, and we get none. The Russians can get from the territories they have absorbed in Central Asia an Alikhanoff or a Loris Melikoff. We can only produce men who rise to the rank of Naik, Havildar, or Resaldar, or to some other subordinate post, the name of which perplexes the English public. The first step towards the reorganisation of the native

army is to augment the power of the native officers, to afford some scope to their abilities and ambition, and to raise them to a level with ourselves. Lord Curzon has already moved in this direction. His commendable object is to attract into our armies the gentlemen and aristocracy of the country. This in itself will afford a powerful impetus towards the conversion of the native mercenary army into a national force. A further step is required. The decentralisation (if it may so be called) of the native army is the logical complement of Lord Curzon's policy. The establishment of provincial army corps, with an *esprit* and traditions of their own, recruited from the common people, and officered by the native gentry of the provinces in which they are to serve, would prove both a safeguard against internal disorder and a protection against attack from without. Just as the Rajputs and Mussulmans under the Moguls formed separate armies with their national chiefs, and inspired by rivalry distinguished themselves by feats of valour which are still remembered; so the provincial armies of the future, animated by a similar emulation, would display equal valour and hardihood in fighting for a common cause.

The native remedy—the permission to volunteer—is another proposal which tends in the same

direction of the gradual disbandment of mercenaries and English soldiers. The agitation in favour of volunteering has been set on foot and is sustained entirely by educated natives of the country. It is primarily the outcome of an honourable feeling that as they ask for a larger share in the administration, and to be allowed to exercise the privileges and rights of citizens, so they ought not to shrink from their national duties. But this feeling is also allied with others equally honourable. As the late Sir Henry Harrison, in the pamphlet I have already quoted, well says :[1]—

> The desire to be enrolled as volunteers arises (1) from a wish for political equality, a desire not to be regarded as helots, while other sections of the community are regarded as Spartans ; (2) from a conviction that those who claim their share in the prizes of administration must show their willingness to bear their share of the burdens of the citizenship ; (3) from a knowledge that the Bengalees and other Indian races are physically degenerate, and a desire to do something, however little, to make them less effeminate ; (4) from a pride in association with a noble empire like that over which Her Majesty presides, and a desire to share in its glories by being numbered among its defenders ; (5) from a conviction that a struggle may be imminent in India between the forces of retrogres-

[1] Ought Natives to be welcomed as Volunteers? p. 22.

sion led by Russia and those of progress led by England, and that their sympathies and their fortunes must unhesitatingly and unwaveringly be thrown in with the latter.

The enthusiasm which the educated natives evinced on this subject was very remarkable, and it was echoed by the native press with singular earnestness and unanimity. The Government repressed it with a cold refusal; but if persistence will bear any proportion to the determination expressed, it is a movement calculated to exercise a considerable influence in modifying the future constitution of our armies, and in keeping alive the military spirit of the country.

In civil administration the need of a similar policy is more evident and has made more way. The tendency towards decentralisation, though momentarily discouraged, is firmly established, and is eventually destined to resolve itself into a federated union such as prevails in the Federation of Australia and in the Canadian Dominion. Provincial representative government will gradually lead to the development and definition of the peculiar idiosyncrasy of each federated state. It is a noble and exalted duty that is reserved to our fellow-countrymen who are responsible for the destinies of India. It is theirs to guide and

facilitate the transition. The ideal of political reconstruction is a federation of states under the supremacy of England, with provincial national armies gradually replacing the standing army of Great Britain. The careful conservation of existing social institutions is the essential supplement of this reconstruction. The country recoils from such a social revolution as our Western civilisation has thrust upon it. It still needs the hierarchical leadership of caste. The tendency to reduce the power of the dominant classes and to destroy, if possible, all distinction between the different strata of society is much in vogue among headstrong administrators, who are too apt to transplant the radical associations of our democracy into a country altogether unsuited to their growth. But there is no more patrician *milieu* in the world than that which has for centuries flourished in India and still is vigorous, in spite of attacks upon it. Lord Lytton, at the time of the "Kaisar-i-Hind Durbar" at Delhi, appointed a few of the principal chiefs in India to be Councillors of the Empire, but the sound instinct which marked his action has not been revived, and these "pillars of state" have never been invited to take their part in Imperial deliberations. Lord Curzon, who is endowed with no small measure of Oriental insight, might

have been expected to appreciate the value of this association of the Government with the aristocracy of the Empire. But he has shown no sign. It is not, however, too late for him to attract to the nation's councils the great noblemen of India. This would be a great step in political reconstruction.

The sympathetic and systematic encouragement of the government of Native States is another natural link in the same direction. Some of these States—such as Mysore, Travancore, and Baroda—have shown that, in the hands of their enlightened chiefs, models of administration may be looked for under indigenous rule. The names of Sir Dinker Rao, Sir Madhava Rao, and Sir Salar Jung—not to mention other ministers of equal ability, although perhaps of less fame—are sufficient evidence of the aptitude and skill with which the affairs of large and important independent territories have been administered. What is required, in the absence of an emasculating foreign army, is an organisation of small States, each with a prince at its head, and a small body of patrician aristocracy interposing between him and the lower order of working men. For such an arrangement the country appears to be eminently adapted; the United States of India should be bound together by

means of some political organisation other than the colonial supremacy of England. The basis of internal order is to be found in the recognition of a patriciate accustomed by hereditary associations to control and lead.

Even the Mahomedan community is largely influenced by caste practices derived from its long contact with the Hindoo system. The Mahomedans as well as the Hindoos are thus well fitted for an aristocratic form of government. The difference between the Hindoo and Mahomedan religions would not at all stand in the way of the establishment of a similar form of government in both cases. The difference in religion is, however, one of the greatest practical difficulties in any scheme of reconstruction. I do not forget that the principal officers of state under the great Akbar were Hindoos; that the chief officers under Hyder Ali were also Hindoos; and that the ablest prime minister of Runjeet Singh, the man who kept his policy straight, was a Mahomedan. These instances give ground for hope that a principle of social unity between the chiefs and aristocracies of the Hindoo and Mahomedan classes may some day be established. At the same time it is impossible to be blind to the general character of the relations between

Hindoos and Mahomedans; to the jealousy which exists and manifests itself so frequently, even under British rule, in local outbursts of popular fanaticism; to the inherent antipathy with which every devout follower of Islam cannot but regard the idolatrous worship of Kali and Krishna. There are good reasons, therefore, for saying, as has been said, that the leaders of either community would find it insupportable to live under the domination of the other. Certainly I, for one, do not think that any amalgamation is probable, or that it would be possible to find from either community a common head with equal sympathies for both. The leaders of the people have, indeed, to a considerable extent already agreed to a separation, and in many parts of India the Mahomedan aristocracies are so distributed geographically that they will be able to avoid a collision with their Hindoo rivals. It appears desirable that the British Government should extend a helping hand to assist this natural tendency. The lower orders, fortunately, will remain unaffected by such a separation, and to the bulk of the people the difficulties of assimilation do not apply. The delta of Bengal, for instance, is peopled for the most part by quiet and inoffensive races, whether Mussulman or Hindoo,

between whom, from long association, a close affinity exists. The followers of Islam, who constitute an undoubted majority of the population, differ little in language, customs, or occupation from the older inhabitants of the country. In this division of the country the difficulty does not present itself; but in other parts of India it will generally be found that the Mahomedans are still, as they were under their own dynasty, the principal members of the community, and that they have established among themselves a religious and fanatical exclusiveness from the infidels with whom it is their lot to live. With these men and with the leaders of the Hindoo community, who are divided from them by unsympathising, not to say hostile, relations, the difficulties of assimilation are very great, and it is only in the distant future that we can venture to predict a time when fundamental differences shall subside under the impulse of a common faith and purpose.

The future of the European settlers and of the Eurasian community demands a similar but somewhat easier solution. The tendency of Eurasians to imitate the attitude of Europeans in regard to Indians is a source of growing disturbance, inasmuch as their claims to social

supremacy cannot be admitted by the more strictly called native community. These claims arise only from blood and language relations with British-born subjects, who, however, on their part hold the Eurasians at a distance in consequence of their relationship with the natives. Excluded on both sides, their condition is extremely anomalous, and if England were to abandon India it is probable that as a class they would sink to the level of the Mahomedan proletariat. But if England does not break off from India, as we know she will not, it seems that the welfare of the Eurasians as well as of Europeans can be best secured by the formation of separate little settlements at suitable localities, resembling the free cities of Germany or the city republics of Venice and Genoa. Such cities would then contain the European and Eurasian community who may choose to reside in the country. This is a state of things which is now, in fact, actually growing up. All the important civil and military stations in India comprise what is called a European quarter, and the municipal administration of such places is a source of endless misunderstanding between the native and Anglo-Indian populations. Complete separation, both by geographical limits and political institutions, is

apparently the only means of putting an end to irritation which in times of political trouble may easily become a source of serious danger. Their protection, if protection were necessary, will be afforded by the prestige and power of England. But it is not necessary. It has been acutely suggested by one of my Indian friends—a friend to whom I am indebted for other suggestions on this subject—that the alarm so often raised by Anglo-Indians on the ground of hostility from the natives means nothing more than a consciousness of their own hostile inclinations towards the natives. Indians may be irrational and uncompromisingly exclusive, but they are not aggressive. And the alarms of the Anglo-Indians, seemingly so innocent and so entirely on the defensive, are designed only to rouse the sympathies of Englishmen at home, so that they may send forth succour which the Anglo-Indians know very well will serve them also for purposes of aggression. Even if all military support from England were withdrawn, the withdrawal would not be injurious to Anglo-Indians, who, when conveniently located in separate places and with separate political constitutions, would be constrained in their own self-interest to adopt a more conciliatory demeanour towards the people of the country.

Turning now to the question of foreign invasion, on which I must say a few words, I think most persons will be found to agree that there need be no apprehension of such invasion from Asiatic Powers; if there be, it may be presumed that the various States and free cities would be strong enough to resist any attack. But it will be alleged that the real fear of foreign invasion is from European Powers, and probably from Russia. There are persons to whom Russia is a constant dread, a kind of demon of infinite capacity, possessed by a malignant and unceasing desire to wrest India from our hands. It is a curious phenomenon, this prejudice against Russia; but it is a prejudice, in my opinion, as baseless as it is hard to explain. The Russophobist labours under a strange hallucination. I, for my part, believe with Mr Bright "that Russia has no more idea of crossing the frontier of India into the Indian Empire than we have of crossing the frontier of India and invading the Asiatic possessions of Russia." With Lord Salisbury I would advise the victims of a baseless scare to buy large-sized maps, and learn how insuperable are the obstacles which Nature has placed between the land of the Czar and the Indian dominions of the British Crown. With Lord Beaconsfield "I