school, and he grappled with the rules of grammar and committed to memory stanzas embodying admirable moral sentiments, which sunk deep in his heart. His future course depended on the status of his family. If he was an artisan he became at once an apprentice under his parent or guardian, who observed him while he was at work. Doing all such minor services as might be entrusted to him, he learned the art as he grew day by day. That was the system of technical instruction. If he were to be apprenticed to a physician, he had to be, in the first instance, practically a labourer and an attendant, collecting and drying drugs, pounding them, and in fact learning the art and science, step by step, from the lowest intellectual grade. If he wanted to study higher literature, and was not trained by his own father, he was left under the care of a teacher. The distinction he earned in after life as artisan, carpenter, architect, goldsmith, physician, scholar, commentator, or author depended on his own aptitude and exertion. Thus the primary and the secondary course, the technical course and the higher scholastic course, were each different, and formed parts of an ideal system of instruction. Ideal, because, apart from combining all the merits that a system of instruction ought to possess, it was free from two overpowering vices of the modern system: firstly, the preponderance of examinations; and secondly, the conversion of the function of the teacher from that of a builder of character and complete manhood into that of a mere intellectual coach. In the indigenous system of instruction the primary teacher was in the first place the person who moulded the character of the boy; the teacher had entire jurisdiction over the boy for what

he did in school, at home, or abroad. The care of the boy was in fact entrusted to the teacher, and so much so that, if the boy proved troublesome in any respect, the teacher had only to be summoned and to call out the name of the boy to ensure instant obedience. The teacher realised his duty outside the school as much as inside it, and the parents of the boy recognised the teacher's jurisdiction as co-extensive with the physical and mental activity of the boy and with his moral inclinations as well. The teacher studied the boy, his ways and his aptitudes, and his pronouncement was received by the parents with all the confidence and deference that an expert's opinion commands to-day from a business firm. The boy, in fact, grew under the eye of his teacher. Similarly, when he worked as an apprentice artisan or when he was studying the higher branches of any science, literature, or art, he was moulded in character and judgment by his teacher, with whom he often lived and to whom he often rendered personal services. If any object must be dear to a mother, it is her son, and to an Indian mother her son is all her treasure on earth, the very apple of her eye, one with whose welfare her very heart-strings are bound up, and her affection transcends all those dictates of philosophy to which she is usually amenable. If a mother in India could frankly, and with the utmost earnestness of spirit, say to a teacher that she had borne a son to be moulded or marred in character and culture by him, that he ceased to be her child from the time the teacher took possession of him—and nothing was more common in India than the expression of such a sentiment—then one can easily comprehend how the teacher in former times

became in India *a part and parcel of the family, and how not simply the tuition of the boy, but the boy himself, was entrusted to his care.* On the other hand, in the present system of education one need hardly notice how thoroughly the teacher has been disestablished from his function as a builder of character, and relegated to the position of an instructor within the school, with no concern whatever in the moral and emotional development of the pupil. The teacher would resent the idea that there is anything remiss on his part in not having a care for the boy outside the school, while the boy himself is now prepared to turn round on the teacher and ask him what he means by calling him to book for what took place outside the pale of the school. The change from status to contract which has taken place in every other department since the establishment of the British Government, has operated nowhere with more disastrous consequences than in the relation between pupil and master.

The other evil is the examination evil. Not the acquisition of knowledge, but the passing of an examination, has become the end and aim of the teacher as well as the pupil, and the strain has become severe, unproductive, and deleterious. The University itself is a mere examining board, a condition which has vitiated the entire system of education. The colleges prepare the student for examination by the University, the high schools prepare the students for colleges, the secondary schools for the high schools, and the primary schools for the secondary schools. They are all engaged in the one task of manufacturing passed candidates! The entire edifice of the system

of education is founded upon examination; the student studies to pass. and the teacher teaches him to pass an examination; and we have the spectacle of hundreds of teachers of all ranks engaged in perfecting a system of hot-house growth, oppressive and artificial, blunting the intellect, enfeebling the mind, and in the end prostrating the man. One can conceive what a huge process of mental demoralisation and moral degradation is involved, when the resources of the State and the available energy of all educational institutions in the country are devoted to such a purpose. If anything is calculated to convert a growing, developing, and expanding mind into a mere mechanism adapted for a process of selection and rejection and retention of facts, it is a system of education in which examination is the be-all and end-all of a student's career. Instead of assimilation, there is mere loading; instead of mental development, there is a process of what is bound ultimately to prove mental enervation; instead of culture becoming the end, passing a test becomes the end; and finally, instead of a man whose mind has been fortified by the acquisition of valuable and well-assimilated knowledge, whose actions are the outcome of healthy emotions, rational convictions, and well-balanced judgment, we have a sorry specimen of a passed candidate. Indian student life culminates in producing a vast majority of failed candidates, and a small minority of passed candidates; and the few exceptions superior to either class occur in spite of our system. The teacher does not influence the judgment, train the emotions, and build the character of the student, but undertakes to coach him for a test; and the

whole-hearted aim of the student himself is in exceptional cases to get a pass as high as he can; it does not matter how low in most others. The strain imposed on him is tremendous, as the strain of all unnatural processes is bound to be. Is it not a feat of intellectual acrobatics to pass off the appearance of knowledge for knowledge itself, and to be capable of doing this simultaneously with regard to a number of subjects, at the risk of being pronounced a failure in all, if he should fail in any one of them? What can be calculated to make a mechanism of a mind more efficiently than this? If in this annual process of selection and rejection of candidates a large number must be permanently thrown out, what an amount of intellectual wreckage does the growing and accumulating percentage of failures evidence! Apart from all other considerations, is it a healthy feature that thousands of young men should be permitted to go through life as educational failures? The present system is so deplorably constituted that most of those who pass successfully become too soon in life victims of the strain they have gone through, in many cases leaving their parents impoverished; and most of those who do not get through successfully believe that a stamp of failure has been put on them from which there is no escape so long as educational qualification counts for anything. Such is the system of the present, yielding the minimum of benefit and the maximum of evil. Certainly the horizon of knowledge has been expanded, new subjects have been added to the curriculum of study, equality of opportunity has been created, a standard of merit has been instituted, and the latest advances in the domain of experimental science are embodied

in the syllabus of instruction. All these are no doubt great benefits, but they could have been secured at much less cost and to far better advantage. If only British Ministers had recognised the merits of the prevalent system of instruction before they so ruthlessly displaced it, a great deal of what was good in it would have been preserved. Did they remember that monuments and palaces, hill-forts and citadels, had been built long before the existence of an engineering college? Did they remember that so vast was the advance made in the study of astronomy and in the methods of astronomical calculation that, without any of the aids of a modern observatory, planetary movements and even meteorological events had been foretold with marvellous accuracy? Did they remember that the properties of drugs and minerals had been so thoroughly mastered, and the preparation of salts so perfected, as to excite the wonder of modern scientists—and that all this had been achieved without the aid of a modern laboratory? In what branches of skilled workmanship was the Indian without eminent aptitude? What is becoming of all this knowledge, of all the skill and all the capacity which then was in existence in such abundance? Already we have become such strangers to our own inheritance that the monumental works of the past in every branch of science and art seem to us as though they were the achievements of a nation we know not, whose descendants we seem not to be! For such a result the British Government is not a little answerable. Vandalism is the only word we can apply to the destructive work they have accomplished in constructing new systems.

Those who, for instance, swept off the indigenous system of primary education, hardly knowing what they were about, are still experimenting with the early boyhood of Indians. They were guilty of two capital errors of judgment: first, in believing that the British method, from the infant standard of instruction upwards, could be transplanted to India; and second, in the name of efficiency in bringing even primary education under a centralised control. In fact, the notion has taken possession of them that primary school teachers should be trained in the latest methods of German pedagogy for teaching infants. The Indian system, on the other hand, would have produced admirable results if only the Government had offered financial support and entertained some respect for what had stood the test of time and would have been in a flourishing state to-day but for the blighting zeal of a centralising bureaucracy. A well-shaded *choultry* with an open space round it, a plentiful supply of sand for the children to trace the alphabet in, would be enough equipment, and benches and chairs might altogether disappear in all primary schools. India is a poor country, but until yesterday, with all its poverty, it loved learning with such exclusive passion that material comfort had little fascination for its people. The result of British administration, however, has been to raise the cost of everything that it has touched, and even primary and secondary education has become prohibitively costly, and no one can now think of education except as a rich man's privilege. Picture-books, kindergarten toys, model gardens, and excursions for object lessons may all be in the fitness of things in European countries, but in India,

where the poverty of the people is overwhelming, the ancient method of instruction is the best and most substantially suited for the country. Further, the genius of the Indian people has been entirely different from that of European nations. To multiply wants, to make a man endlessly dependent on external aid, to make three steps of one—such has been the trend of European civilisation. That is the spirit of industrialism; text-books, picture-books, atlases, nay, even note-books are produced in a spirit of competition in the West; but it will be a sad plight for Indian primary education to be made an objective of this spirit of industrialism. The shortest and cheapest route to learning, however thorny and rugged it may be, not a royal road with an avenue of trees, is the one that the Indian has been taught to prefer. Moreover, the Indian principle has been to teach first what is to last through life, and to make it a part of a man's individuality. Moral aphorisms and mathematical tables, following invocation to the All-Ruling Power, were amongst the earliest acquisitions of the Indian schoolboy. Now his first introduction is to the picture of a striped zebra which he comes to glorify in his childish fancy as an object of consequence in his school-going, and his first acquaintance with letters is bound up with associations with the palm-tree, the spider, and the crab. These he sees with his own eyes as they are, but when he sees them in his books as well, he believes that he is taught in the school to know them more intimately. He grows up with no seeds of moral dictates, religious humility, trust, and faith sown in his mind at this morning hour of his education. He is practically led to begin his moral and mental

development without any deeper foundation than the feeble excitement caused by the sight of picture maps and clay models. This is all very well for a nation that has its faith embedded in a robust materialism and believes in curing, by a spirit of magnificent social service, moral and social evils whose growth has been left unhindered and unhampered. For a people whose problem of life has never been identical with an acquisition of the comforts of the world or limited by the balance they may have in the bank or in the cash-box, and with whom prevention rather than cure of evils, social and moral, has claimed prime consideration, the dawn of school life has always been associated with moral and religious notions rendered charming to the senses of the adolescent by a vivid manner of portrayal. The ideal schoolboy of the Hindus is one who insisted upon beginning his practice of the alphabet with the name of the God of his own choice, which method the imperious and self-glorifying king, his father, would not brook. He obtained relief from the parental tyranny by the deliverance of Providence, whose omnipresence he asserted, while the haughty father in supreme disdain denied it again, kicking a pillar and asking the boy whether his God, if omnipresent, was in that pillar. Thus denied and reviled, the God manifested himself, according to Hindu Puranic lore, as leonine man, justified the faith of the child, and rescued him from the tyranny of one who was at once his father and king, a religious tyrant and an infidel. Just as the Hindu boy began his alphabet by venerating the name of God, so also an author as profound as Sushrutha, one of the greatest Indian writers on anatomy and medicine, whose

works will come as a surprise to Western scholars of the present day, or a grammarian like Panini, the perfection of whose work is marvellous, would not begin his works without an invocation. Thus the Hindu conception of life and the Hindu aim of existence are fundamentally different from those of European nations. They were imparted to awakening childhood by associating secular knowledge with reverence to the Supreme Being, and later on in the career of the student by making the finite knowledge of man a narrow pathway from which to see glimpses of the domain of the unchanging and the eternal. Mundane existence in their view has been but a gift and an occasion for realising ulterior truths, by acting upon which the Hindu strove and even now strives to obtain final bliss. Whatever may befall the schoolboy as he grows up, whatever doubts may assail him, however scornful of undemonstrable sentiments and beliefs he may grow to be, the time when he begins to go to school is the time for him to learn reverence and to imbibe in his earliest sayings and repetitions the dictates of good conduct. Our British rulers are not, of course, opposed to any of these things, but the scheme of primary education which they have devised is such that there is absolutely no scope for the national system to prevail. They should be convinced sooner rather than later of the fact that they cannot make India a part of Europe, and that the best thing they can do is to help India along its own line of development, and not to try to transform it, a process which can only end by mutilating it. The education of children is almost like the cultivation of the soil, which is bound up with the

physical features and meteorological conditions of the tract of the country wherein the cultivable area lies. To utilise the Western system of instruction in the very earliest stages of childhood is not only to begin by giving a wholly wrong outlook, but to deprive the child of what it may fail in most cases to regain in later life. In spite of all these years of mistake, there is still time enough for the Government to retrace its steps and to release primary education in this country from the trammels of a Western outfit, from the tyranny of a foreign method, and from the essential unproductiveness of making early education a process of feeding the supposed fancies of the child, not according to the genius of his own race, but in keeping with that of another. Above all, the certain contingency of gradually but inevitably making primary education as costly as it is in the United Kingdom is to be dreaded as a curse in the disguise of a boon. To place it under the withering control of a centralised department with a radiating staff of Indian, Provincial, and upper subordinate and lower services, is to let in the scorching heat of a departmental divinity from one of the many solar systems of the Indian bureaucracy. To release primary education from the bondage of centralised control, and to free it from its Western habiliments, is to restore to the nation its own children. We do not want the Western quality and the Western standard of costliness, in the primary school at any rate. Let the Western method and manner begin from the secondary course, and to a fuller extent from the high school course, and have free play in the collegiate curriculum. Let the nation have the privilege and the responsibility, the right and the obligation, of

laying the foundations of education as the genius of the race demands and the means of the people will permit. Let no child be denied education because the Western trappings in which it is to be clothed are so costly that all the children cannot afford it. To an Indian it is the substance and not the manner of giving which is important; let England by all means have for herself the Western method of teaching the alphabet and the numbers, but let India be allowed its immemorial method so far as the system of inculcating early moral lessons and of strengthening the faculties of the mind is concerned. After this is accomplished, let the Director and his abundant and fast-increasing staff of Inspectors, Assistant-Inspectors, Sub-Assistants, Inspecting School Masters, and any others who may be in store for a service-ridden country like India, assume charge of the education of the boy. But in the first instance, at the softest, tenderest, and most impressionable period of existence, let the community itself perform the ceremony of initiating the child's education. The primary school is, in fact, a portion of the home; it is not even a neighbouring house, as is the secondary school, and not a place of migration, as is the college; in literal truth the beginning of a boy's education is a sacrament of Hindu life. It is an actual ceremony of initiation with appropriate hymns which to-day, through the all-pervading fascination of Western ideals, is being allowed by men of modern education to fall into disuse. This sacred custom has been wrenched from its ancient setting and cast aside to make room for Western methods totally unsuitable to Eastern conditions, and for which the people also have to pay. As if all this were not sufficient, the

expenditure on this score is made an obstacle in the way of free elementary education.

SECTION II

The Problem of the Three R's

The Bill introduced by Mr. Gokhale was thrown out by the Government of India with the most profuse expressions of sympathy and with the most gallant avowals of fidelity to the principle of compulsory free education. The member in charge of the portfolio of Education played a part which was sometimes pathetic, sometimes almost comic, by the nature of the opposition which he raised; while the attitude of the Government throughout was beyond all possibility of definite comprehension. All this was done because, while the Government was prepared to smother the Bill with the most affectionate embraces, protesting and swearing sympathy with the identical objects the mover had in view, it was unwilling for the time being to commit itself to a definite policy. It is this absence of a positive policy that seems to have driven the Member for Education into too affectionate an embrace of the whole Bill theoretically, only to pronounce later a *talet* after the Mahomedan fashion of divorce. It was, however, obvious that the attitude of the Government of India, for weighty and cogent reasons, could not be left where Sir Harcourt Butler left it. For, both in regard to what should have been said against the Bill and what should have been done for the Bill, the position of the Government of India was far from satisfactory. On the one hand, the Member for Education in portions of his

speech committed the Government of India too deeply in regard to the principle of compulsion, while on the other hand he was painfully reticent about the adoption of a progressive plan for the systematic spread of primary education, beyond a mere allotment of funds as might annually be found feasible. In dealing with the principles of compulsory education, there was apparently no limit to the good intentions of Government, while as regards a present programme there seems nothing open to it but to be altogether silent. "I should rejoice," declared Sir Harcourt Butler at the very beginning of a really excellent and well-delivered speech, "I should rejoice as much as they (Mr. Gokhale and his supporters) to see a condition of things in which elementary vernacular education is free and compulsory in India. The Government of India are deeply concerned to bring about such a condition of things." Concerning the Bill itself, Sir Harcourt expressed it as his opinion, "that it is a modest and unassuming measure, that it is full of safeguards, so full of safeguards that it seems to many likely to remain a dead letter." In these observations the Member for Education let out the official case against compulsion, an attitude which for an indefinite time to come must prevail with the Government of India, however much we may regret it. But he did not, after saying this, bring to bear in controverting the Bill that exact scrutiny which would expose the real objection to compulsory education in this country. After such an unreserved avowal as was contained in his statement that the Government of India is deeply concerned to bring about such a condition of things, the objection he raised against the Bill was: "As practical legislators

we are bound to ask what is the demand for the Bill." This is a very feeble difficulty indeed if we recollect that, without any demand by the people, compulsory measures both positive and negative in their character have been enacted by Government, such as compulsory vaccination, compulsory factory regulations, and the fixing of a compulsory age limit for matriculating. When Sir Harcourt fell upon the existence of caste as a stumbling-block in the way of compulsion, Mr. Gokhale retorted in his concluding speech that the Mahomedans had no caste, and yet they fared no better than the Hindus. Sir Harcourt admitted that in England compulsory provision of schools preceded compulsory education, but pleaded financial inability to undertake compulsory provision of schools in India. He wound up by saying that the proper method of compassing the end in view would be to amend the Municipal Law. Such a method of dealing with the problem amounts almost to a failure to grasp the essential issues raised by the Bill.

In the first place, compulsory education will remain outside the pale of practical undertakings in India for a very long time to come, not because the principle of compulsion is *per se* repugnant to the traditions of Indian Government or because of caste, or even on the score of expenditure. The paramount reason why India cannot think of compulsory education lies in the abysmal poverty of the people who will be affected by it, and to whom it will be nothing but an attempt to educate their children at the thick end of the police baton. It will be an ironical offer of education to those who hardly know what it is to have a full meal for days at a stretch, and whose normal physiological condition is one of perpetual

hunger. It will be a mean and melancholy gift of the three R's to boys for whom a tiny bit of rag a few inches in length and breadth is all the provision that can be made in the way of clothing by their parents. To fine them for not accepting it will be nothing but an odious and incomprehensible method of adding to the revenues of Government. Unless the State is prepared to feed and clothe as well as educate, it will be futile to think of compulsory education. The safeguard of which the Educational Member spoke in such generous terms, which consists in allowing compulsion on the recommendation of Local Boards, is no safeguard at all, since the nature of compulsion is the same from whatever quarter the initiative may proceed, and since the ultimate responsibility will be the Government's alone. Nor can free primary education be immediately introduced throughout the length and breadth of the country by a stroke of the pen. Apart from the impracticability and the expenditure of such a scheme, what will weigh against it as a practical undertaking is the apathy from which it will suffer on account of the complete lack of persuasion of local agencies. Schools will have to be opened and closed in a haphazard manner, and the benefit will hardly be proportionate to the enormous expenditure incurred. If compulsory provision of schools should mean sufficient provision as well, the position is not far different from free primary education.

To be convinced of these difficulties, however, does not mean an admission that Government can do better than merely allot funds as the years go by and as surpluses permit. The Government of India might recognise at the very threshold of this problem

that for all practical purposes there are two classes of illiteracy in India, preventable and unpreventable. In the case of the former, free education will be of avail only if local persuasion systematically goes hand in hand with it. In the case of the latter, its solution must await a gradual change for the better in the present abject conditions of the classes concerned. Until then free education will be of little or no attraction to them, while compulsion in their case will appear a tyrannical exercise of power, unless the Government is prepared to accept further responsibilities which have nowhere hitherto been assumed so extensively. The Government of India must accept the gradual removal of preventable illiteracy as a matter of imperial responsibility, and must commit itself to a definite plan of operations in combating it, utilising for the same a definite source of revenue, it must make the steady and systematic employment of persuasion by local bodies the pivot on which the entire scheme turns. Legislation on these lines will mean that if a Taluq Board or Municipal Corporation or a village Panchayet should be willing to introduce free primary education within its area, the Government of India will make an annual grant of a proportion of, say, 40 to 90 per cent of the total cost; the increase of grant within this limit will depend upon the increase of the school admissions and attendances, which will thereby guarantee local persuasion. Since such a scheme cannot be a substitute for the existing system of primary education, and the funds required will have to be an additional call on the resources of the Government, separate provision will have to be made. Apart from the suggestion which Mr Gokhale has already made in

this connection, there is one source of provision which seems well worthy of consideration. The permanently settled estate holders, not only in Bengal but throughout the country, are the only class who have practically escaped increased taxation since the beginning of British rule. It is not proposed that there should be anything in the nature of a revision of these permanent settlements, but it will be a perfectly justifiable course if a cess should be levied on their *peishcush* varying, let us say, from 1½ to 3½ per cent or more, as may be found necessary by the progress of expenditure on free primary education. Some of them may possibly be misled into considering it as a violation of their permanent settlement, but it is assuredly nothing of the kind. In undertaking free primary education, the Government undertakes a task that was never before attempted by any of its predecessors; and it is an undertaking that involves expenditure without an income in return. Omitting customs and excise, upon which the Government may have to draw in lieu of developments in so many directions, the taxation of incomes and lands other than permanently settled estates is fast reaching its limit. Under these circumstances, to look upon this class as exempt from all further taxation in perpetuity is to be inexplicably squeamish in the discharge of responsibilities to millions of others too long neglected. In fact, if the Government acts with a clear discernment of its needs and resources, and does not shirk the paramount duty of banishing illiteracy from so vast and populous a country by methods that will not prove penal or futile, a scheme such as this offers better prospects than a plunge into compulsion, while the policy of shelving

the entire question of primary education in India will have to be recognised as no longer practicable under the improving conditions of the country. Nor can it be maintained that the burden of free primary education in India is one that should be borne for the most part not by the Government but by the local bodies. India's case will long continue to be different, and there is no reason why a manifestly impossible course should be insisted upon unless to perpetuate a policy of inaction on a question of the utmost importance. To the doubt so often expressed as to whether it will be possible to give free elementary education in so vast and populous a country as India, there is but one answer, and that is to raise similar questions concerning other matters that have been successfully accomplished. Is it possible in India to survey every inch of land, to assess and collect the rent or revenue for every foot not only of cultivated but of cultivable area, owned by any subject of the Government, nay, to protect even the primeval forest resources of the country from the encroachment of men and cattle? If all this is possible, to place elementary education freely at the disposal of every child should be equally possible. Obviously the Government of India cannot justifiably delay much longer including amongst questions of imperial concern the imparting of free primary education, which will be regarded as the finest outcome of British order and organisation.

A period of renaissance must therefore be inaugurated for primary education. The old indigenous methods should be rehabilitated, free from the stifling control of a centralised department. Village Panchayets, Taluq and Municipal Boards must have

complete control of primary education. Reading, writing, arithmetic, arithmetical tables, moral aphorisms, easy poetical compositions, elements of vernacular grammar, domestic hygiene, and brief outlines of Indian geography and history, all in the vernacular, should form the course of study in the whole primary course. These subjects may be spread over a period of six years. There should be no examination whatever during the first three years of the course, and the boy should grow up merely learning and developing his infant faculties of attention and acquisition. At the end of the fourth year there should be an examination merely to detect the deficiencies of each boy, so that the teacher may devote special attention to them, but not for purposes of promotion. The result of the final examination at the end of the last year of the course should be set forth in the certificate, without any classification of "pass" and "failure," simply for the purpose of giving an idea of the boy's proficiency. The result of these proposals will be to ensure a systematic spread of primary education with provision for its being made free, if local bodies are disposed to co-operate with the Imperial Government, and to rely upon a scheme of efficient persuasion. In the next place, the method and course of instruction in the primary schools must be such as will enable the boy to retain what he acquires practically for the whole of his lifetime. If parents of boys should be desirous of having them taught the rudiments of Sanskrit, Persian, and Arabic, provision may be made in the latter half of the primary course, so that no boy need grow up without an elementary knowledge of a classical language or of a sacred language,

which embodies the scriptural literature of his religion. By the time that a boy enters upon or completes his twelfth year he will have run through a profitable course of study in the vernacular, which will be an excellent foundation as well as a substantial acquisition, even if he cannot pursue his scholastic education any further. For such a course of study the State should be prepared to aid the local bodies to the extent of from 40 to 90 per cent of the total cost, and these schools may be separately designated by the name of Local Free Elementary Schools, to convey the notion that they are free and under local management. As these schools multiply in number, the existing primary schools which charge fees will gradually diminish and disappear, together with the method and course of instruction pursued therein.

Section III

After the Primary Course

It would be far better if at the very threshold of the stage of secondary education a distinction be made between boys who will ultimately take up a University or professional course and those who can only qualify themselves for a mechanical branch of study, and if a separate system be adopted for each. The latter may be known as training schools and the former as public schools. Every boy who comes with a primary school certificate should be eligible for admission to the training and public schools, subject to passing an examination in easy spelling, in English, and in arithmetic, six months after admission and suitable teaching. In the training school the

course will extend for a period of six years, and should comprise English, outlines of the geography of the world (more of a political and commercial nature than physical) in his own vernacular, arithmetic, sloyd (paper and wood), and elementary training in dyeing, weaving, carpentry, masonry construction, and foundry work. There should be at least one training school in every Taluq. To begin with, a model training school may be started in every district by the Provincial Government, under the direct management of the Department of Public Instruction. Appropriate vernacular text-books should be published to meet the curriculum of the training school. The sons of artisans should have special facilities for admission, and those who successfully pass out from the training school should be eligible for polytechnic or agri-horticultural institutions, where the medium of instruction in advanced portions of any particular branch of industry should be partly the vernacular and partly English; and similarly, if it be an agri-horticultural institution, both languages should be used in teaching elementary agriculture, sericulture, apiculture, methods of scientific manuring, grafting, and pruning. The course in both should not exceed four years, and each district should have at least one polytechnic and one agri-horticultural school, under the control of the Director of Public Instruction, the cost being entirely met from the provincial funds. Under the proposed system there will be no needless waste of intellectual labour, since at present most of those who are neither fit nor willing to qualify themselves for a University course are for want of suitable openings compelled to go through a secondary course of instruction mainly adapted for

University education. Hundreds of these, after a fruitless endeavour to get through such a system of secondary instruction, find themselves unable to turn their hands to any profitable occupation in life. Again, although according to the Indian system of technical education the son succeeds to the profession of the father and is trained by the father himself, still if he desire otherwise there are no facilities for a boy of one caste to learn the profession followed by men of another caste. Nor is there any facility for a boy to obtain training in more than one branch of manual work, so that, if on account of competition or lack of capital he cannot succeed in his hereditary profession, he may utilise his skill in some other. A boy who by reason of the position of his father has good prospects as a master carpenter, metal-worker, or weaver, will, after his primary education, prefer to receive his professional training under his father or guardian. But there are hundreds of children in each and every place who have not that opportunity in life, and whose utility as members of society will depend upon their ability successfully to adopt some profitable occupation, for which they have had some kind of systematic training. That these should be condemned to a system of instruction suited only to a literary course of study is a misuse of human material amounting almost to social guilt. To condemn a boy who could have made his life easy as a good carriage-builder or a reliable dyer to be harried through a course of study in the vexatious mysteries of $(a+b)^2$ or the vagaries of a hypotenuse, to load his memory with the names of all the capes and creeks and rivers and lakes in the known world, and ultimately to be incapable of getting on in

life except perhaps as a bill-collector or a post-peon, is deliberately to follow a woeful and wasteful system of public education.

In the case of a boy who enters a public school with a view to going up to the University, or to qualify himself as a licentiate in one of the professional colleges, the subjects taught and the method of instruction employed should be different. The method should be that adopted in convent schools, where the medium of instruction from the very first standard is English, and every subject is taught in simple English only. The entire course should be spread over a period of six years, during which there should be no more than two examinations. The first of these, held at the end of the third year, should be a school examination to keep back the hopelessly ignorant for a period of six months' further study; and the final examination at the end of the sixth year should be a public examination, conducted by a School Final Board appointed by the University for *particular groups of districts*. The scandal of a common matriculation or common school final for an entire province, and for thousands of candidates, should be given up in deference to mere intellectual decency. It is a process of thorough-going mental holocaust, emphasising the worst evils of the Chinese system of paper examination. It is nothing short of a process of competition between an examiner who has no manner of contact with the candidate, and is determined to turn him inside out, and an examinee who is driven to palm off on the examiner all that he has learnt by rote. It is a thoroughly vicious and vitiated system, and when we remember that thousands have to undergo such

a common test the strain on the boy can be well imagined. The best course would be to have a School Final Board for every district, but if that be considered too precipitate a step, Boards for particular groups of districts may well be formed. For instance, to take the Madras Presidency, six School Final Boards may be established to begin with. The Northern Circars may come under one group; the Ceded Districts with North Arcot under another; Salem, Trichinopoly, Coimbatore, and the Nilgiris under a third; Malabar and Canara under a fourth; Tinnevelly, Madura, Tanjore, and South Arcot under a fifth; and Madras and Chinglepet under a sixth group. The Board should consist of the headmasters of the leading public schools in the district, and should be presided over by the Principal of the leading college of the group. There should be oral examination in most of the subjects to supplement the written examination and to correct the evil of exclusive reliance on written test. There should be a Central School Final Board, composed of the Chairmen of these Boards, the Director of Public Instruction, the Vice-Chancellor of the University, who should be an actual educationist or of the same standing, and not a mere official entity, and two members of the Senate elected by the body from among active educationists. This Board should have entire charge of the curriculum and final examination and the grant of certificates. The inspection, recognition, and allotment of grants for these schools should be vested in the Director of Public Instruction, subject to such main regulations as may be framed therefor by the Central Board. If it be necessary to designate the official connection between the Director and the

Board by an official appellation, he may be called Ex-Officio Commissioner of the School Final Board. The subjects of study should be: (1) English, (2) a vernacular or classical language, (3) elementary mathematics, (4) elementary science, (5) English and Indian history and political geography; but the student should be required to obtain a compulsory minimum of one-third of the marks only in English, and 40 per cent of the total number of marks, provided that, if he should get below 20 per cent in any subject, such marks will be ignored.

The School Final should be considered mainly as preparatory to entering college, and should not be viewed as an examination of independent value in itself, apart from such qualification. At the end of the first two years of collegiate training the student should be eligible for a Previous Examination by the University itself in English, an optional language, and an optional subject. The optional subjects may be grouped under the main heads of: (1) mathematics, (2) natural science, (3) physical science, (4) history, (5) political economy and logic. A compulsory minimum of a third of the allotted marks in all three subjects, with 35 per cent of the whole, should be enough for securing a pass. If a candidate fails in the optional language, but passes in English and the optional subject, and gets not less than 50 per cent on the whole, including the marks in the optional language, provided these amount to not less than 20 per cent of the whole, he should be entitled to a pass. Those who get not less than one-third in every subject and not less than 60 per cent on the whole should be entitled to a pass with distinction. The Previous Examination, which will be the first University

examination, should mark a visible stage in collegiate education, and a student passing it should be entitled: (1) either to join a professional college for the *diploma of a licentiate* in engineering, medicine, law, forestry, agriculture, commerce and banking, veterinary science, and electrical and mechanical engineering; or (2) to undergo appropriate educational training for service under Government in the inferior grades of Police, Excise, Post, Telegraph, Forest, Survey, and Revenue services; or (3) to proceed for a degree in arts. In regard to the first of these three, the course of study should not exceed three years, and on passing it the student should be eligible, except with regard to law, to qualify himself for a degree in that branch if he chooses to do so. More of these professional colleges should be established in every province, as the present provision is exceedingly inadequate. As handsome fees are charged for training in these institutions, there is no reason why the Government should be so niggardly in sanctioning an adequate number of them. For instance, it is an educational scandal that there should be but a single engineering college for the whole of the Madras Presidency, and that admission should be by a competitive examination only. Schools like the Vellore Police School should be started for training applicants for service in the inferior grades of the other executive departments, so that no man need have to pass the necessary tests or get the necessary training *after* entering the service.

The course for a degree in arts should comprise English, and the optional subject and optional language taken in the Previous Examination; it should occupy no more than two years for a

pass and three years for honours. The position of the optional language should be the same as in the Previous Examination, that is, a failure to obtain a third of the marks allotted should not entail rejection, provided the student does not fail to get 50 per cent on the whole, including his marks in the second language, if not below 20 per cent. The only professional examinations for which a degree in arts should be necessary should be the degree examinations in law and in teaching. A candidate who passes the Previous Examination and the appropriate licentiate examination in law should be eligible to practise in the Moffussil Courts, but one who takes his law degree should be eligible for practising as a member of the High Court Bar, and only a Bachelor of Arts should be permitted to sit for the B.L. examination. For every other profession, the diploma of the licentiate should be necessary to qualify for a degree in that branch, and a degree in arts should be dispensed with. In all examinations, if a student gets 40 per cent of the marks in any subject he should be exempt from appearing in that subject again. The requirement that every student should pass in all subjects simultaneously at the risk of having to appear in all of them again, should he fail in one, is in fact a brutal requirement, and should be given up by all the Universities as being no more than a degradation of intellectual work to the rank of intellectual mortification. In many cases such a demand imposes on the candidate the labour of Sisyphus at its cruellest, and is the very apotheosis of the faculty of cram. It is a most irrational exaction, especially in the professional examinations of young men who

have to face the world as they leave the portals of the examination hall. Every examination should be held at least twice a year, as a full year is too long a period of waiting.

The claims of the vernacular languages have been the subject of heated controversy in the Madras Presidency, where they have occupied for a long time a place of equal importance with the other subjects in the curricula of studies. In Western and Upper India there has been no such controversy, as a classical language has remained compulsory. In South India, where the vernaculars are of a Dravidian origin and not of a Sanskrit type, as they are in Northern and Western India, and where compulsory Sanskrit will seriously handicap the non-Brahmin classes, the vernacular had to take a place side by side with Sanskrit or any other classical language. Further, the South Indian vernaculars have all of them a noble literature, having been copiously enriched by master minds, whose attainments in the classical lore of the country were of a very high order, and whose mastery of the vernacular was equally profound. The main feature of all of them is that one can derive from a study of these literatures practically all the benefits and elevating and chastening influences of a course of study in the Classics. The question has been prominently discussed whether a student who receives University education should be allowed to forgo the benefit of a course of study in a classical tongue or in one of the Indian languages, when the latter are so richly endowed. The contention that in Sanskrit and the vernaculars there are no prose works of a modern European type, and that therefore they are of little consequence in present-day require-

ments, fails to apprehend the true merits of a study of classical literature. Dissertations and discussions, essays and criticisms, novels and biographies, are without doubt of great value for the information they contain, for forming the style of the student, for adding to the range of his expression, and for developing his powers of narration. A truly classical lore has other merits, which it will be unwise to ignore in a system of sound education. So far as the Indian classics, including the ancient works in the vernacular languages, are concerned, in addition to the unsurpassed merits which they have in common with *all classics*, there is the paramount consideration that they are the treasure-house of the antecedents, usages, and sentiments of the nation. They furnish the key to national character and disclose the national bent of mind as few other sources of information can. They form in fact the very inheritance of the race. To frame a system of education consigning such an invaluable storehouse of knowledge to practical oblivion is to ask the Indian student to begin and end his scholastic career as though he were born of a race of literary bankrupts, and of a land without a past. If we cannot ransack the treasures left to us in particular departments of knowledge, such as astronomy, medicine, philosophy, and architecture, it should at least be possible for every Indian student to know the outlines of the ancient literature of his country. Nor is that literature in any way poorly endowed, if judged by any standard of literary excellence. In depth of human pathos, in conflict of passions and ideals, in grandeur of human suffering, in devoted attachment to man, woman, or plighted word;

above all, in penetrating through the veil of destiny and appraising the value of human effort by the side of actual successes achieved and in unfolding the play of human ambitions; in fact, in armouring a man for the success or failure that awaits him in life, there is no literature which can greatly surpass the literature of India. To complain that we have no standard prose works included in such a literature is to be not critical, but foolish to a contemptible degree. By every means in our power we are bound to bring into existence in the vernaculars of the country works dealing with the latest advances in various departments of knowledge. That does not mean that we should act as though we were ashamed of the classics of our own country and blind to their excellences in a curriculum of studies. Even if we should have standard prose works they will have to occupy a place by themselves, and cannot approach in point of sublimity and beauty, in all that makes a literature classical, the ancient classics of India. An acquaintance with portions of works of such a type should be made an essential part of University education, so that no educated Indian may grow up in complete ignorance of the ancient classics of his country, and without having his mind drawn in his early career to what may possibly strike him as deserving his intellectual devotion. At the same time a certain amount of elasticity is necessary in the position assigned to a classical or Indian second language in the examination syllabus. It is most undesirable that the career of a student should be marred on account of his deficiency in it. The proposal made above as to the position of the second language secures this object, while guaran-

teeing that he will be taken through an Indian classical course. A mistaken conception has arisen in some quarters that the inclusion of a second language in the curriculum of University studies is advocated in the expectation that the vernaculars of the country will be improved. While nobody will contend that such a prospect is altogether unreal, still it is necessary to reiterate that it is more from the point of view of a classical course, with which may be interwoven the highest and the best in the past of the country, that the inclusion of an Indian language among the subjects of study is demanded. Indirectly it may not fail to benefit the vernaculars in stimulating the composition of vernacular prose works, but that is not the prime consideration underlying the recommendation.

SECTION IV

The Educational Service

It will be a manifestation of supreme lethargy to leave the destiny of higher education in India to the general run of "departmental educationists," who, coming to India soon after the completion of their college course in Great Britain, fall into a self-satisfied state of mind. Most of them manage to go through their "official" career with essentially the fund of knowledge they had on entering the Indian Educational Service, and are not required by circumstances to care for more. The vice of a bureaucratic form of government is that everything in its service tends to become a part of the governing bureaucracy. The Indian Educational Service has suffered considerably from this inherent taint of Indian govern-

ment. An "Educational Service" is formed, with pay, prospects, pension, and leave regulations, and consequently there is room in it only for those who can enter it before a stated age, with a certain minimum of qualification, and are lucky enough to obtain the patronage of the India Office. The "Educational Service" gets filled, therefore, in course of time, with a set of somnolent worthies, who solve the problem of life and all other problems when they receive their nominations, even as did their elder brothers of the Civil Service when they fell within the required number. Indian education becomes stagnant, and its standard lags far behind that of the United Kingdom, which initially is not considered by Germany and America sufficiently advanced in several branches of scientific study. The evil can be remedied only by requisitioning for a temporary period the services of talented men, if possible some of the great savants of the day, so that an invigorating breath may be imparted to the system of education, and the "Educational Service" may at least at intervals be quickened into intellectual life. If the appointment of professors of colleges lay with the Universities themselves, and were the Universities entirely composed of a self-governing body of eminent educationists, the evil would not be what it is now. If we could only imagine the state of affairs if the Home Secretary in England nominated and appointed all the professors and lecturers of all the Universities in the United Kingdom, or if the German Chancellor appointed all the professors of German Universities, we should be in a position to realise by comparison how completely the vice of officialism pervades the system of collegiate education

in India. So long as the University in India lies under a ban as regards the appointment of professors of colleges, collegiate education in India will be but a process of "discharging official duties" without the elevating influence of taking part in forming the intellectual calibre of the rising generation. A member of the Educational Service generally feels more like an official than like a teacher among boys or a fellow-teacher among teachers. There is, again, a difference which cannot be overcome between him and a member of the "Provincial" Service; and he cannot forget the idea of rank in his "own service" and the fact of proximity to the office of Director of Public Instruction—the controlling divinity of the "department," who has nothing to do with *collegiate* education. It is a notorious fact that European teachers in missionary institutions are more accessible to students and on terms of greater intimacy with their Indian colleagues than the members of the Indian Educational Service. But the worst effect of the official atmosphere in which the Educational Service moves and has its being, and of the division of the educational department into "Provincial" and "Indian" sections (the latter reserved for men of European birth, Indians being condemned to the inferior branch however eminent and exceptional their qualifications may be), lies in the feeling of early resentment implanted in the young aspiring Indian mind at the most telling period of life. The members of the Provincial Service cannot but regret, if not always audibly, that they have to reconcile themselves to a situation in which the qualification of birth outweighs not only want of attainments in

the individual, but possession of superior abilities in another who is not of the same racial stock. The quick-witted student who sees the latest recruit to the Indian Educational Service lagging, as it were, behind the required degree of proficiency, at times even having to strive to keep abreast of the most advanced section of the class, and at the same time sees the Indian professor who is absolute master of his subject condemnd permanently to a lower status and salary, feels little encouragement to show advancement in knowledge, conscious that birth may be penalised and attainments ignored in the dispensation of affairs under the British Government! Again, many a brilliant young man who would willingly have adopted education as a profession, having won laurels in the classical seats of learning in the West, has been forced to seek service in some other department or in the more liberal and hospitable service of a Native State. Such examples induce a bitterness of feeling in the earliest stage of intellectual life, and lead to an attitude of mental revolt against a policy which sanctions such gross inequalities and appears specially odious at a stage of mental development in which democratic ideas are in full swing. Young men read the lives of the Encyclopædists, the reasoned works of Mill, the passionate contributions of those master minds to the cause of Altruism, the highest religion in the plane of the known and the knowable, and when, with the inspiring sentiments distilled from these flowers of English literature coursing through their mental and moral being. they are brought face to face with the reality of the bar sinister in the very sanctuary dedicated to learning, they turn with a feeling of profound

disgust from the pretentious flourishes with which almost every British official or politician thinks it becoming to protest on every conceivable occasion his love of India and his regard for fair play. They are inevitably led to rate the political conscience of Englishmen as a peculiar possession which more often finds a reposeful place in bank books than elsewhere, and is so strikingly in contrast with their rôle in the vanguard of the forces of culture and civilisation. No teacher or University or college lecturer need take any part in politics, whether honourable or objectionable, to fill the young Indian student and the future citizen with feelings of dismay and distrust, so long as it remains a matter of system that mediocrity can on the score of birth supersede merit.

The inherent viciousness of the system is that the Educational Service has been constituted as "an opening" for men of British parentage. There must be an end of this. In the first place, the Director of Public Instruction should have no concern with collegiate appointments, and if it be too summary a measure to place them entirely under the control of the University, they should be controlled *by an eminent and active educationist* to be designated Director of Collegiate Education. He should not be of the Indian Educational Service, but a savant of any of the British, American, or European Universities, engaged for a period of from three to seven years. He should be in charge of the leading Government College of the Province, as Principal, should direct the course of collegiate instruction in the province, and should be the chief of the University lecturers. He should be authorised to engage the services of eminent

professors for temporary periods in the faculties of Engineering, Medicine, Forestry, Agriculture, Law, and Arts. These will be men of greater capacity who will set the pace for others in the service to follow, and will be in a position to keep the standard of collegiate instruction in India as far as possible on a par with that obtaining in Western countries. The higher pay that will have to be given to them need not be grudged, since there will be no obligation to pay them any pension. They may be engaged for any period from two years up to seven years, and as all colleges have a long recess, it will be easier to make provision for their stay in England for a sufficient period of recuperation from the effects of the Indian climate. The Director of Collegiate Instruction should visit the Moffussil Colleges and deliver model lectures, and authorise whatever may be necessary for their improvement. He may be given a personal assistant of his own choice from his own University.

The functions of the Director of Public Instruction should be limited to the schools; and his designation may be more appropriately altered into Director of *School* Instruction. A man on Rs. 2500 a month is far from necessary for the office, and one-half the pay is amply sufficient. Nor is it advisable that a professor of first-rate abilities should be condemned to desk work, occasionally looking into school returns and ordering the transfers and promotions of Sub-Assistant School Inspectors. The cause of education has at times sustained a very severe loss by the appointment of eminent professors as Directors. The only temptation to desert the more congenial work of teaching has always been the higher pay

and status now accorded to the place of Director of Public Instruction. The improving conditions of Indian education require that no professor of first-rate abilities should be any longer condemned to clerical drudgery and the supervision of High Schools conducted mainly by means of reports received through his subordinates. Further, the man who has to be in charge of collegiate education must be *an active educationist himself* and must mix with professors and lecturers as one of themselves, his chief work being cast amongst them and with them. He must be a man of acknowledged eminence in a European University, and should be the means whereby the services of competent professors could be secured for temporary periods. There must be a separate official in charge of school instruction, and the Director of Public Instruction should hold that post.

The regular service should be divided not into an Indian and a Provincial branch, but into a professorial and a tutorial branch, the former being recruited generally from among those who have passed with honours in any of the British or European Universities, no racial difference being made for purposes of such selection; the latter from among distinguished graduates of Indian Universities, provision being made for the promotion of men of exceptional eminence to the professorial branch, in which case their salary, status, and pension should not differ from those of the other members of that branch. The Director of Public Instruction should have charge of schools above the grade of primary schools, the management of the latter being gradually, yet completely, made over to local bodies. The secondary schools, the

polytechnic and agricultural institutions, and public schools alone should remain in his charge. It will be unnecessary for this purpose to have such a highly paid Inspectorial staff, and a substantial reduction may be made, since an efficient Indian staff can do justice to the work involved in the inspection of these schools, provided the Director gives more of his time to personal inspection. If necessary, he may have two deputies under him, but the staff of Inspectors may almost all be Indian.

SECTION V

Residential Universities

Along with these reforms the Government should recognise the need for the establishment of a teaching and residential University in every province. An Indian province is large enough and quite populous enough to warrant the existence of more than one University. The present policy of leaving the course of education to be entirely moulded by a single University, and that essentially of the type of an examining body, is deficient in more respects than one and calls for early rectification. The high-minded and benevolent policy of Lord Hardinge's Government, which has determined on the establishment of a second University at Dacca, in Bengal, as a teaching University, should be systematically applied to the educational needs of other provinces, among which those of the Madras Presidency stand first in importance. Unless a residential University is established in every province, the measure of independence legitimately due to a self-governing academical institution will not be apparent to the officials

who indite the communications in the name of the Government, and there will be no example of efficient management of educational institutions. In the case of both types of University, however, the Government ought to make up its mind to allow a much larger measure of independence than it has been disposed to do. The idea that, because of the financial aid which it gives, the Government is justified in imposing its pet predilections on the University is one that cannot but adversely affect the cause of higher education. It should be plain to the commonest understanding that so responsible a body, which includes men of the highest intellect in the province, could not be ruled merely with the rod of authority. No self-opinionated secretary, inflated with a notion of his overwhelming importance because he speaks in the name of Government, can by his inconsiderate and not strictly warranted criticism do more than wound the sense of self-respect of a University. It is certain to compromise the dignity of the Government beyond repair. It may be open to the Government to say the last word in an unedifying controversy with a body consisting of the most talented men of the province, but the privilege is often exercised in such a way as to carry the palm for perversity. It will therefore conduce to the prestige of the University as well as of the Government if the latter refuses to stoop to the undignified conduct of treating the former as though it were essentially a subordinate body, dependent on the goodwill of the Government and liable to be treated with censure or compliment as the predominant mood of the hour may suggest. In fact, before the Government commits itself to an expression

ot opinion, there should be a definite attempt to examine every aspect of the opinion presented from the point of view of the University, and with due regard for a body to whose hands the cause of culture and the intellectual progress of the province is committed. To be inconsiderate in dealing with such a body is not to assert the authority of Government but to betray it in a most thoughtless manner.

SECTION VI

Dictates of Self-Interest

Such are the directions in which the educational advancement of India lies so far as it can be advanced by the Government of the country. All of them call for a liberal expenditure of money as well as a moral and mental earnestness of purpose that can hardly be expected of men who have grown up in Anglo-Indian traditions. As for money, the country can provide it, if only those who have the control of its finances will make the best use of their opportunities. The reforming impulse can only proceed from outside the confines of the narrow governing guild. The "professional official" will have neither the inclination nor the high driving power, nor the tenacity of purpose, nor the spirit of self-abnegation necessary for initiating radical reforms in opposition to vested interests. The task must call forth the energy and devotion of men who will not be afraid to think and who will be courageous enough to act.

A few writers on Indian topics have doubted the wisdom of educating India, while some others have gone the length of tracing to the system of education on Western lines all the manifestations of a spirit of

incipient revolt against British rule. Such symptoms of hypochondria have their origin in an utter lack of appreciation of the conditions indispensable for the government of India by England and of the essential limitations of British rule. As a matter of mere self-help, it was unavoidable for England to educate India on Western lines. Of course it is impossible to educate all the millions of India on such lines; but a section, an infinitesimal section, of the population had to be so educated to make British government possible. When once the portals of knowledge are thrown open, those who enter cannot be commanded to benefit only to such an extent as will suit the purpose of those who gave them admission. Nor was the impossibility of imposing such an odious limitation absent from the minds of those who, after anxious deliberation and a full realisation of all the risks involved, cast the die deliberately, cast it so as to favour the admission of the natives of India to Western arts, sciences, and letters. The despatch of the Court of Directors accompanying the Charter Act of 1833, and the statesmanlike exposition of Lord Macaulay on the subject, furnish sufficient evidence. Again, does any man in his senses believe Great Britain could have been ruling the country for so many decades without so intellectual a people as that of India acquainting itself with Western literature, even had it been possible for England to govern without the assistance of Indians educated in the language and literature of the ruling country? The whole conception is from any point of view so ludicrous that it does not call for any serious refutation. Be it an evil or be it a benefit, or be it a mixture of both,

or whatever it may be, so long as England holds India education on Western lines will be a *sine qua non* of its rule. Casting one's shadow when walking in the light of day may be considered artistic or inartistic just as the hypercritical may be disposed, but, so long as we cannot prevent it, it is a perfectly futile theme of discussion. The only question is whether one should feel afraid to grow in stature, simply because of one's own shadow. Should England stamp her foot and fret and foam because the soil has proved so congenial for the seeds she was pleased to sow and could not help sowing? Who can deny that the harvest has been such as has done equal credit to the seed and the soil? Above all, there can be no controversy between the benefits of ignorance and the drawbacks of knowledge any more than between living in a state of light and in a state of darkness. True, the average Anglo-Indian official and the ill-informed British politician alike choose to view the question from the point of view of the way in which it may affect the prospects of British ascendancy. Even from such a standpoint any one can easily see that the dangers of education arise from the fact that knowledge is power, and that power is for ultimate good; but ignorance is no less a power, only it is a power for evil, at times passive, at times so active as to engulf in a moment the best work of a whole century and inaugurate an era of fierce antagonism and animosities. Between the two there is all the difference between the thorns found in a garden of roses and those to be found in an overgrown jungle. The fruition of British rule lies in steadfastly educating India on liberal lines and not in wavering between knowledge

and ignorance, or between knowledge of a restricted character and knowledge imparted by agencies abreast of the progress of the times. Harsh sentiments as to the educated classes have been expressed by men of shallow judgment among the British, but it is they who can value the best side of British rule, correct its excesses and defects, and in fine make British rule at once possible, progressive, and increasingly broad based. But for them no department of the Government could work for an hour, and but for them there would be no improvement in the administration. Above all, if they want an equal share with Europeans in the good things of their own country, they can aid Great Britain substantially in directions undreamt of by the Anglo-Indian bureaucrat, but which can be fairly well perceived by far-sighted British politicians. In ignorance there is no strength, and the ignorance of such a vast dependency as India will prove a greater obstacle and a greater danger than any that is to be feared from enlightenment. If ever duty and interest coalesce to engender the highest political wisdom, it will be in the compliance with the demand that England shall not waver in the faith with which she began what deserves to be called her mission in India and to which she gave a sworn allegiance at the very time when she felt the foundations of her rule sinking almost irretrievably beneath her feet. Let not the petty notion that as India receives more and more of Western education there will be less scope for employment for Britons suggest to England a faltering policy in regard to education. And let not the unreasonable fear that free primary education may become an easy route to the spread of disloyalty

be seriously entertained and allowed to interfere with a necessary and progressive policy. The forces of loyalty and of appreciation of British rule are truly too great to permit one of the most potent gifts of the British Government to be turned to so vile a purpose. These forces have not been given full freedom as yet, but if they are released from all trammels imposed on them by the deficiencies of British rule they will become formidable forces for good; and an educated populace will afford them scope for steady service. Let there be a systematic plan and programme for the efficient expansion of free primary education on lines that will prove neither oppressive nor wasteful of public funds, but will conserve the best features of the indigenous system rendered elastic and economical and suitable to local conditions. Let secondary education be framed on lines that will afford scope for useful industrial employment for the millions of the poor who are now heavily handicapped and on whom practically no benefit of British rule has descended except the rudimentary advantage of police and judicial protection. Let the standard of higher literary education and professional training be devised so as to approach that of the more advanced countries of the world, and last, though of no less importance, let the educational service be so designed as to secure the assistance of men of real eminence in Western learning, and not so as merely to offer an opening for those British youths disposed to solve the question of a career by obtaining the patronage of the India Office.

CHAPTER XIV

PARLIAMENTARY CONTROL

SECTION I

The Atrophy since 1858

ALTHOUGH the East India Company originally derived its authority for exclusive trade from a Royal Charter, Parliament did not remain unmindful of its right of control when the trade with the East began to prove profitable to the realm. Even when the East India Company was no more than a trading corporation in all its undertakings, Parliament asserted and assumed the right of regulating its trade by legislative provisions. The period when a Royal Charter sufficed to create monopolies and claimed "the prerogative royal, which we will not in that behalf have argued or brought in question," could not continue when, at the close of that century, Parliament became the predominant partner in the British Constitution. As the affairs of the East India Company led to territorial acquisitions as a matter of deliberate policy, Parliament also began to realise its responsibilities to the people who came under the rule of the Company Periodical Parliamentary inquiries into the administration of the Indian territories, and the constitution of the Board

of Control with extensive powers of interference, revision, and initiative, were the methods by which Parliament fulfilled its responsibility to the natives of India under the government of the East India Company. Besides these, special commissions were appointed to deal with particular subjects concerning the government of the Indian possessions; and, to consider the matter from the widest standpoint, it could not be said that there was any serious lack of Parliamentary interest in Indian affairs. This was not merely due to a feeling of wholesome jealousy, which doubtless animated individual members, but to the fact that Parliament as a body realised the justice it was bound to do to its superior rôle as the highest controlling authority of a trading corporation to which ruling powers had been delegated. Not only had it no other interest but to see that the people had justice and equity at the hands of their rulers, but this interest was in itself a sufficiently high motive to secure vigilance on the part of Parliament. However commendable a system of government by delegation of sovereign powers might have been from the point of view that animated John Stuart Mill in pressing for its continuance, it could not have lasted indefinitely even if the Mutiny had not occurred. Not only was it politically an inferior form of government, but it was incapable in its nature of being found compatible with such a state of advanced public opinion as we find to-day in India, which was bound to come into existence as a result of Western education, if of nothing else. In any case it could not but disappear and leave the affairs of India under the direct control of the British Constitution.* Although in many respects the transfer

of the country to the Crown has resulted in enduring benefits of a decided character, it has, nevertheless, as we shall show, actually meant less Parliamentary control over India. Where the responsibility for the administration of the country lay with such a body as the Company, it was not only necessary but easy for Parliament to exercise a vigilant and watchful scrutiny over the conduct of the Company's servants and the policy of its directors. The moral responsibility was more easily brought home, and its exercise was not beset with trying and inconvenient obligations. More than it has since ever been, India was then beyond the pale of party politics, for Parliament as a body could approach Indian questions with freedom from party bias and without obligations of party allegiance, and often with a sense that it had delegated its own duties to another body. After the transfer of the country to the Crown, India had necessarily to be assigned to a member of the Cabinet, which has automatically brought it within the orbit of party control, if not of party politics, and has subjected it to all the disadvantages of a party system of government with almost none of its advantages. The Minister who has charge of India has the support of the Cabinet, which has the support of the party in power and a substantial majority in the House of Commons. *India has, therefore, as a constitutional necessity remained a party question with every party, but it has been of no consequence whatever in party politics*, with all parties impartially, as a matter of silent and spontaneous understanding. Always liable to be influenced by party considerations, it has never influenced party considerations; always disposed of

by party fortunes, it has never affected party fortunes. Never since the time of Fox and Pitt has India ever become a turning-point in the party politics of England. It has been outside party politics, in fact, in the sense that it has excited little genuine interest in either party. The material and moral progress of the country, its economic needs and interests, the advancement of its people in their political status abroad and in their own country, have never found a place in the systematic programme of any British political party. In this sense all parties have eschewed Indian questions as being outside party politics. Nevertheless, as a matter of inherent necessity, India has remained a party item—to such an extent that it has become a gross trespass, if not an actual dereliction, involving serious consequences in times of election, for any member of the party in power to bring into discussion any decision of the Cabinet in regard to an Indian question. If the Opposition should ever be tempted to put India in the party programme, they are certain to lose caste for making a party question of India, which in the unwritten code of party warfare is indeed a most unbecoming Parliamentary vulgarity and a serious violation of party precedent and usage. As a result, Parliamentary control has not only given place to party control, but it has done so in favour of a system of party control in which no party has to own any party obligations to India. The fact that the United Kingdom has to be subject to party government is no relevant defence of such a result, because all the affairs of the United Kingdom are the concern of one party or another, and all of them are representative of particular sections of public opinion. In the case

of the Colonies, the question of Parliamentary control is a matter of no moment, because Colonial Home questions are beyond the purview of Parliament. Whereas, in the case of India, while Parliamentary control has been virtually disestablished, party control has come into existence without giving to India any share in the making of parties or marring of party fortunes, or the least vestige of self-government in her own affairs. Indian questions cannot be passed through the mill of British electioneering campaigns, and Parliament has composed itself to the view that India is outside its corporate consciousness, while at the same time the Opposition has neither uniformly and creditably played, nor has had the necessary motive power to play, the part of an efficient and disinterested critic and a competent check on the party in power in the matter of Indian administration. It is on account of this fact that Indian politics have been in that country often a cry in the wilderness, at times a cry of despair, at times a desperate resort to desperate remedies. That is why India has slowly and so late in the day partially succeeded in arousing the earnest attention of thoughtful British statesmen. If, notwithstanding all these facts, India has arrested Parliamentary attention and has been benefited by party traditions and principles in recent times, it has been partly due to the unhappy outbreak of an era of unrest and partly to the commanding personality and the innate radicalism of those who stood at the helm of affairs, at a time when the pressure of political agitation compelled a policy of high-minded liberalism and persuaded British statesmanship to some measure of justice to India. Even to-day,

in spite of a temporary break in the Parliamentary neglect of Indian affairs, should the existing order of things continue, Parliament cannot but relapse into its old attitude of unconcern towards India, leaving the entire responsibility to a single member of the Cabinet, who, more often than not, has represented in his own person a little coterie of bureaucrats of the India Office.

The proposal that, as a remedy, India should be permitted to send representatives to Parliament, raises issues affecting the fundamental bases of the British Constitution in the consideration of which all the Colonies will have a decisive voice. The constitutional maxim, "No representation without taxation," may possibly be surmounted by a contribution to the British revenues from each part of the Empire for the Imperial Navy and Army; but, when all objections are overcome, the difficulty remains that India cannot consent to have any part of her affairs influenced in any manner whatever by an assembly in which the Colonies are a constituent factor, so long as Indians are denied equal rights by the Colonies. Be it the British Parliament or an Imperial Federal Council which is invested with statutory privileges and has an ascertained position in the political constitution of the British Empire, no such scheme can become possible until an Imperial citizenship is evolved in a fully tolerant spirit. If Indians are allowed to enter Parliament, only a few of sufficient means, patriotism, and ability can do so. These may secure seats in the Commons by their own effort or by the help of their countrymen, and of those Britons who have the larger interests of the Empire at heart, and can

now and then make a sacrifice on behalf of such interests. Such an arrangement can at no time be regarded as meeting even the bare needs and requirements of so vast a country to any satisfactory extent. The boast that every member of Parliament is a member for India as well is the silliest pretence to which expression has ever been given, and is in the nature of an insult to the common sense of the people of India in seeking to explain away the uniform indifference of an entire body with an average exception of less than half-a-dozen persons. There is no means by which we can compel Parliamentary attention to Indian affairs, notwithstanding the formation of Indian Parliamentary Committees. If the party system of government has been vitally defective in any respect without any apparent remedy, it has been so as regards the Indian Empire.

If, however, any further circumstance were yet required to complete Parliamentary apathy towards India and ensure Parliamentary indifference except under abnormal conditions, that circumstance has been supplied by the fact that the salary of the Secretary of State is excluded from British estimates, and an Anglo-Indian Council is devised to share with him the control of Indian affairs. It, as a consequence of the transfer to the Crown, Parliamentary control of India became, in the first instance, party control without any of its advantages, in the next instance this party control has become the exercise of final authority as a customary practice by a handful of retired bureaucrats in the name and on behalf of the Secretary of State. The atrophy of Parliamentary supervision under such a system has become complete, and a double wrong has been perpetrated,—

firstly, in depriving the country of sustained Parliamentary interest in its affairs, and secondly, in leaving its destiny even in regard to crucial developments in the hands of the choicest representatives of the superannuated section of the Indian Civil Service. Unless India is expected to reconcile herself to such a system of Parliamentary government and to be treated by each Secretary of State as may suit his spirit of indifference or idiosyncrasy, the present position calls for the most radical solution which the nature of the British Constitution will permit.

SECTION II

The Anomalous Autocrat

The British party system of government cannot be changed because India happens to be a British possession. It is also clear that India can only very rarely, if ever, become an influential factor in shaping the political programme of any party: nor can it be desirable that Indian affairs should become the subject of party warfare. Again it is plain that all hope of India's sending a sufficient number of representatives to Parliament is illusory, while any scheme of Federal Parliamentary representation including all parts of the Empire is a matter of remote and uncertain futurity. But if these circumstances cannot be helped, those others that have rendered Parliamentary disregard of Indian affairs systematically galling and discreditable may be so abrogated and modified as to make India feel convinced that a change has come over the Imperial attitude as far as present conditions may permit. In the first place, the system which excludes the salary of the Secretary

of State from British estimates is not only financially unjust and politically unfair to India and contributory to Parliamentary indifference, but perpetrates in more than one respect a constitutional anomaly. It is anomalous from the point of view of Parliamentary control of its own Executive, anomalous from the point of view of Indian executive control of its own finances, and a breach of one of England's cardinal constitutional maxims. If Parliamentary control of India is to be an exercise of a privilege, and that really a sovereign privilege which belongs to the one factor of the British Constitution which matters most, then it is indeed a sordid arrangement that the salaries of the Indian secretaries should be met out of the revenues of India. As has been pointed out so often, it is a melancholy exhibition of political meanness for England to say, while all other Parliamentary functionaries are maintained at the cost of the Imperial Exchequer, that India alone should be asked to meet the salaries of her own Secretary and Under-Secretary. If India is considered really fit for the portfolio of a Cabinet Minister, then as a British Cabinet Minister he should be paid out of the British revenues as all other Ministers are. The present arrangement, apart from conveying the clear impression that England grudges the salary of a couple of Parliamentary functionaries because they have the Indian portfolio, creates a most anomalous situation in British politics. Under the present system, since the people of India have no voice in their own expenditure, and since the Government of India has no voice in regard to the Secretary of State, and since his salary is placed outside the

British Budget, he is the one functionary in the British Empire who in every respect stands uncontrolled. He is the true autocrat of India because of his office in Downing Street, and he is the only Parliamentary autocrat because of his charge of India. Indians may well ask how long such an anomaly is to hold, an anomaly which detracts from the sovereign dignity of Parliament and places one of its own Executive outside its control so far as it can be done by his being paid out of another Exchequer. It reminds us, in fact, of the day when British kings were independent of Parliament and the people. The time is fast coming when India will claim to control, subject to certain conditions, every pice of her revenue, and it is not in the possibility of things that a British Cabinet Minister can then be placed in financial subordination to the Supreme Government of India. It is also a breach of that fundamental maxim of British sovereignty, "No taxation without representation," since India is now virtually taxed for the pay of British Parliamentary functionaries without the right of returning her own representatives to Parliament.

In order to effect the necessary change, it is essential that the Secretary of State, who has charge of India, should be converted from an anomalous autocrat, whose official salary is subject to control in neither country, into a regular Parliamentary official paid out of the British Exchequer, and therefore amenable to the fullest control of Parliament, and whose position as such will induce Parliamentary attention to the discharge of his duties. The moral result of the change will in itself be no small gain to India and England, and

the interest of Parliament in Indian affairs will undergo a refreshing and beneficent transformation. It is not merely as a question of financial justice to India, not merely as a necessary change for correcting an unprecedented anomaly in the position of a British Cabinet Minister, not merely to guarantee an effective control by Parliament and to keep alive its interest in India, not only as a step essential for raising the political status of India to its proper place in the British Empire, not merely from each and every one of these points of view that the change is essential; it is equally and indispensably necessary as a complement to any proposals that may be made for securing the autonomy of the Government of India. One of the invariable principles of Indian autonomy, from which no deviation could be permitted, ought to be that no person should be paid out of Indian revenues without being controlled by the Indian Government; and that no expenditure should be incurred out of those revenues without being subject to the control of the Finance Member of India. These postulates of Indian autonomy can become effectual only by removing first of all the salaries of Indian Parliamentary officials from the Indian to the British Budget. To state the same proposition in another way, the Secretary of State cannot draw his salary from the Indian Treasury and remain independent of the Indian Government, as its claims to autonomous powers come to be recognised; at the same time the Secretary having charge of India must become a regular Parliamentary official by receiving his salary from the British Treasury.

The "India Office" need not be an obstacle in the way of such a step, as it may be treated as an

office of record and information, and as an agency for the transaction of business pertaining to the Government of India in England. Its cost must fall on the Indian Exchequer; and, in time, it must become in all respects an Indian establishment in England, subject to the control of the Government of India and maintained out of the costs of India. The Secretaries who have charge of India must cease to be anomalous autocrats, and enter upon a career of full and unreserved responsibility to Parliament, and through Parliament to the people of England.

SECTION III

The Branch Bureaucracy

What has hitherto stood in the way of ensuring adequate Parliamentary attention to Indian affairs has been the existence of the India Council. It has often been observed, under circumstances of varying importance, that India should be governed primarily in India, subject to the control of Parliament, and not in Downing Street, subject to the control of the India Council. It is the absence of a sufficient measure of autonomy for India that has so long stood in the way of the recognition of this principle. With the initiation of reforms that will strengthen the power and widen the field of responsibility of the popular element in India, there will be no need for the continuance of a subsidiary bureaucracy in England standing between the Government of India and the authority of the Imperial Parliament. The Secretary of State, personally and individually, as representing the entire executive control of Parliament, will have to be the deciding authority between the

view of the Government of India and the ascertained opinion of the accredited representatives of the people. This responsibility of decision, in the very nature of things, ought to be an individual responsibility exercised only by the British Parliamentary official who represents it in his person, and exercises the authority of the British Constitution subject to the revisory control of Parliament. To seek to reform the India Council by conceding a selection of two or three of its members from a panel elected by the non-official members of the Indian Legislative Councils will be not only to give up reform in the right direction, but to introduce an innovation radically unsound in character, complicating the whole question in an amazingly inconsequential manner. Nothing but a fit of liberalism, which dare not be liberal in the right way but has no objection to stooping to amusing clap-trap, could have suggested reform on such lines. It only shows that the fundamental requirements of an efficient system of Parliamentary control for Indian administration have been scarcely understood, or that responsible British statesmen have had no objection to admitting novel claims of doubtful value, certain to dislocate existing relationships in a variety of ways. It is undesirable in the highest degree that the Secretary of State should be guided by the weight of opinion of men who have no further responsibility than that of counselling. They represent neither the people of India nor the people of England; as for the Government of India, it can directly represent itself. As a sober fact, they only secure, in a system of government by proxies, the continuance of the vested interests and of the domination of the class to which they belong. They

have been long the custodians of the purest spirit of bureaucracy, and have inoculated almost every Secretary of State with the bureaucratic virus. Under this arrangement the Civil Service not only rules in India, but rules from and for England also; it conserves its privileges and monopolies and perpetuates its prejudices not only in virtue of its powers in India, but also in virtue of the provision made for the practical dependence of the Secretary of State on the advice of its proudest products, who constitute his Council. A good deal of the slow march of Indian progress is believed to be due to the benumbing influence of the Council; and, whatever may be its pretensions to expert knowledge, it has been uniformly regarded in India and by well-informed friends of India in England as a veritable stone wall of bureaucratic prejudice against the progressive interests of the country. Indeed, so great has been its evil ascendancy, if only all the materials for a judgment could be available, that it will not be difficult to establish the contention that, in spite of what some of the Viceroys and Secretaries of State might have attempted to do to meet the demands of Indian progress, they have been impeded, hampered, and restrained by their Council. It has been a drag on the natural progressive spirit of British statesmanship, and a chilling influence on the warm and genial impulses of British statesmen who have held the Indian portfolio. At times even the rare appointment to the Council of one who was not of the official Anglo-Indian corps has been resented, if not by the Council itself, at least by the supporters of the bureaucracy. They regarded it as the introduction of an alien element into a charmed circle, reserved for

those who had set the pace for Viceroys and Governors in India, and were on that account deemed competent to hold the reins of the car in which a self-distrustful Secretary of State, duly deferent to those who knew what to him was not only an unknown factor, but a combination of uncertainty and danger, took his seat. A casteless stranger in a caste Panchayet in India could not have excited greater uneasiness than a non-official or an Indian member of Council unquestionably did before Lord Morley took his courage in both hands and, pronouncing the exorcism of liberal statesmanship, broke the spell of decades, and proved to the British and the Anglo-Indian world that the Indian Empire would not on that account collapse. The next step is to show that the British Empire in India will survive the abolition of this Council, which counselled but had not to bear the responsibility of the counsel, which was always prepared to offer a crutch if any Secretary of State preferred limping to walking, and impressed on every Secretary of State the danger of walking without a crutch in India. The difficulties in the position of the Secretary of State are also enhanced by the existence of the Council. He cannot, unless of extraordinary vigour of mind and of a thoroughly self-reliant nature, act in defiance of the Council, and when he acts conformably to it the responsibility before Parliament and the country is his and not that of the Council. The impression is always that it was open to him to override his Council and that he has failed to do so; and it requires unusual strength of character to ignore its claims to expert knowledge, especially as he has been asked to look upon India as a geographical expression.

If he chooses to walk his own way, realising his responsibility conscientiously but taking no notice of the crystallised articles of political faith kept for his benefit in the India Office, then the cry goes forth that the Council has been reduced to impotency. At the same time no Secretary of State would dare to avow in open Parliament that the responsibility for his action and attitude lay with the Council. Such a farcical constitution of a body of advisers is a financial waste, an administrative irony, and a political barrier, which in its very conception is incapable of improvement and therefore deserves to be completely abolished. The fact that Lord Morley recently liberalised its constitution does not alter the weight of these crucial facts. Most of the members will continue to be Anglo-Indians, and all the members will be under their dominant influence. *The ascendancy of the bureaucracy will be all the greater with the introduction of any portfolio system*; the control of every Indian department in India will be liable to constant interference; if the member who has charge of a portfolio exercise authority in a manner that may controvert the view of the Government of India, provision will have to be made for reconsideration of the subject by the Secretary of State. Besides, if the decision of a member of Council should be called into question in Parliament, on whom is to lie the duty of undertaking its justification? The Secretary of State will be compelled to saddle himself with vicarious responsibility, and the Government of India will have to obey the delegated authority of the Secretary of State. The whole suggestion bristles with difficulties and bodes nothing but a policy of thorough retrogression in the future control of the Indian Government

in England. The only rational way of dealing with the subject is to leave the Secretary of State unfettered in his discretion and independence in dealing with his charge, and not burdened with any other concern in British politics relating to home affairs. Either in overruling or in concurring with the Government of India, either in initiating or in shelving reforms, the entire responsibility must be his and his alone, and he must make up his mind on the material that may be supplied to him by the Government of India and by public bodies. Then there will be a guarantee that Indian questions receive *the independent consideration of a British Minister of State*, who is a representative of the authority of Parliament, and therefore exercises the control vested in him by Parliament unfettered by the shackles of a body out of touch with British tendencies, out of touch with Indian opinion, and without any title to stand between the Government of India and the Secretary of State. So long as he is weighted down by his Council, no such guarantee can possibly be forthcoming, while in fact the conclusion is often tenable that his decision has been supplied by his Council. The India Office must become, when the Council ceases to exist, an office of record and an agency for the transaction of business on behalf of the Secretary of State and the Government of India, maintained out of Indian revenues. In order to facilitate the transition to such a condition, the Council of the Secretary of State should be first altered into the "Committee of the India Office," and its present strength must be reduced as vacancies occur to a maximum of five members with a President, who should be a man of position in British politics

but should have during his tenure of office no seat in either House of Parliament. To this Committee should be entrusted the conduct of the business of the India Office, except the patronage, which should fall within the official purview of the Secretary of State only to be exercised subject to fixed rules. The Committee should have the management of contracts on behalf of the Government of India, subject to such provisions as the Secretary of State may issue in consultation with the Government of India. The holding of reserve funds should be reduced to the necessary minimum so as to be consistent with the most likely requirements of the Secretary of State and the exigencies of the Indian Government, and should be handled as experience suggests and the interests of India permit. The Committee of the India Office should transact all other business, but should not be a Council of the Secretary of State; at its meetings neither the Secretary nor the Under-Secretary should be present. Its main function will be to supply and communicate information, and to give its opinion whenever required by the Secretary of State. By these changes, the India Office will be retained with the Council under the altered designation of the Committee of the India Office, and the Secretary of State will become the sole official responsible for Indian affairs in England, and will be in every sense a Parliamentary officer whose salary will be paid out of the British revenues, and who will therefore be fully controlled by the House of Commons. The next step, after this system has been worked with thorough efficiency, will be to do away with the power, now reserved to the Secretary of State, of consulting the Committee, and later on to place the India Office.

entirely under the control of the Government of India as its agency in England, replacing the Committee system of control by that of a single head who may be known by the name of the Director of the India Office. The main changes now advocated are, firstly, the placing of the salaries of the Secretaries on the British estimates, and altering the designation of the Council into the Committee of the India Office, making it optional for the Secretary of State to consult it whenever he likes to do so. The actual business will be transacted by the Committee under a President, subject to the general supervision of the Secretary of State. Later on, it will cease to be consulted and cease to exist as a Committee, and its members will become permanent officials under the control of a Director—when it will become in all respects the office representing the Government of India in England under the control of the Government of India.

It is in these directions that the solution of the problem of the Council of the Secretary of State lies, and not in making it a partly elected and partly nominated Council of portfolio members or a Council of talent and responsibility, which will mean that the Government of India will have to be subject to the control of the Council or of its individual members in the first place, of the Secretary of State in the second place, and of Parliament in the third place. If India requires any control in England it is *Parliamentary* control—*the control of a popular legislature which is accustomed to view questions of policy from a higher standpoint* and can counteract the baneful influences of a bureaucratic system of government which cannot be dispensed with for a long time—and

not the control of an additional barrier between Parliament and the people. It is the control, not of a handful of men who have gone back to England after having played the part of satraps here, and will therefore naturally uphold schemes and systems that can only thrive under satraps and are consistent with the maintenance of their autocracy, but the control of a larger body where conflicting opinions are certain to be heard, where in course of open debate the affairs of India will receive the attention due to a great empire. This will be a check on official vagaries in India and official indifference in England, and will go to convince more than a sixth of the human race that their destiny is amongst the treasured responsibilities of the British nation and awakens its concern as well as its fearless deliberation. It is this control that is necessary in England, and provision for practical administration should be made in India so that it may be governed by the introduction of such principles of autonomy as will tend to ascertain and give effect to non-official opinion there, under conditions that will guarantee the continuance of British supremacy. Unless the Secretary of State be released from the burden of a Council and appointed a British Cabinet Minister, drawing his salary from the British Exchequer and therefore liable to Parliament in the same way as other Cabinet members, he will not be face to face with the great responsibilities of his imperial office in his Council. A screen will continue to exist between him and his duties, while the non-provision of his salary from the British revenues will mark him out as an anomalous autocrat liable only by courtesy to the criticisms of Parliament. That anomalous position of his must

go, and the equally anomalous Council of his, which is at once a drag on his judgment and a convenient peg on which to hang his responsibility if he chooses to do so, must also find its way out of existence by a change in its designation, status, and function. Parliament itself will then feel its responsibility towards India sufficiently keenly to ensure that Indian questions will neither empty the House nor lull it to sleep. Then the assumption of the government of India by the Crown will be complete, and the transfer of the country to the Crown fully effected; but until then that assumption of direct responsibility will be more nominal than real.

It has been said with more cynicism than truth that, if India comes to be lost to the Crown, she will be on the floor of the House of Commons. No Indian, however, believes that the one institution which seems to him to embody the best of British traits and traditions will, as a result of anything that might take place in it, weaken the hold of England on India. In this respect the most candid discussions in Parliament are not one-tenth so mischievous as the rabid writings that mar a section of the British Press in India and England. India may be nearly lost in the columns of this section of the Press; but even that we may dismiss, considering it not even a warning, but a mere characterisation of the criticisms of a section of British and Anglo-Indian journals. A greater probability than either of these is that India may come to be lost if the free and fearless scrutiny of the British Parliament for the good of India fails her and her higher destinies continue to be placed in the keeping of proxies in India and in England whose interest lies in perpetuating their own power everywhere.

The British nation should recognise that the Civil Service is after all only a good servant, and to treat it as the master of the situation at home or in India will be to leave the people of India without that hope on which they have been subsisting all along. It will be impossible to place India under complete Parliamentary control and release her from the grip of the Civil Service unless the Council of the Secretary of State is abolished, and he becomes the sole deciding authority, fully subject only to the control of Parliament. Then, along with the other reforms, Indian autonomy will be so far complete as to guarantee that India shall not be lost on the floor of the House of Commons, or in the columns of the British or Anglo-Indian Press, or by being condemned to the rule of an official "caste" oligarchy in India as well as in England.

CHAPTER XV

RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

SECTION I

The Secret of British Rule

A PERIOD of three centuries and a decade separates the grant of a Charter by an English Queen to a body of London merchants, which conferred on them the monopoly of Eastern trade, and the Coronation Durbar of a British King at Delhi as the Emperor of India. For a century and a half of this period the British settlers followed trade as their sole occupation, their military enterprises being confined to the protection of their merchandise on sea and land, broken by exploits in the way of capture of foreign merchant vessels according to the trade morality of the age. During these one hundred and fifty years the East India Company had more to do with its rivals at home and abroad than with Indian princes and potentates. The development from trade to Empire may be said to have covered a period of eighty-two years, extending from the seizure of Arcot in 1751 to the abolition of the trading functions of the Company in 1833 by the Charter Act of that year. This process of conquest, if conquest it could be called, reveals the real political relationship between England and India :

and if properly apprehended by partisans of the school of perpetual benevolent despotism on the one hand, and by the extremist party of Indian Independence on the other, will lead to a substantial modification in the one-sided position of both. The common view of British-Indian history, that the East India Company came to India with a pair of scales, picked up a sword, and either stumbled upon an empire or by dint of intrigue took possession of it, is only a little more unhistorical than the other prevalent doctrine that British dominion in India is the result of conquest pure and simple, and entirely an acquisition of the sword. The events of Indian history between 1751 and 1818, between Arcot and Ashty, with the background of a century and a half of British trade, will, if dispassionately considered, amply demonstrate that India came into British possession neither as a windfall nor as the reward of persistent intrigue nor as the prize of unaided conquest. England's position in India is to a great extent that of the successful claimant on the spot at a time when Indian spoils became available to Western nations, but much more that of an accepted sovereign and paramount power for the good of the country. It is not difficult to be positive as to what would have been the result if, in April 1601, it had been proposed that in the place of a merchant fleet an invasion should be fitted out for the conquest of India. The proposal would not only have been ridiculed and dismissed as a most chimerical suggestion, would not only have been regarded as too dangerous an undertaking to merit serious consideration; even had it received the sanction of the State it would have provoked the

combined hostility of the strongest powers in India. As it was, Providence willed that what was to be of momentous consequence to the East and the West should take the line of least resistance. The future rulers of India came not as invaders but as *bona fide* and reputable traders, bringing credentials, and in fact profited the realm to which they came by an exchange of commerce. They maintained this character long enough and honourably enough, considering the inefficiency of Provincial Governments in those days. The ludicrous travesty that trade was but a mask, and fomentation of dynastic dissensions the chief instrument in a plan of conquest, is no more than a misreading of history, arising out of a total lack of insight into the play of forces which determine political destinies. Almost the very first British ambassador who came out to India a few years after the Company had carried on trade pointed out that traffic and war were incompatible, and enjoined on the Directors to "seek profit at sea and in quiet trade." This injunction was acted upon until the political conditions and the relationship existing between the rival European Companies in India became such as irresistibly to draw the British from trade to statecraft. By the time that Aurangzeb reimposed the Jazia and warred with the Rajputs and the Mahrattas on the one side, and the Shia Sultans of Bijapur and Golkonda on the other, the political state of the country had vastly changed from what it was when Jahangir ascended the throne of Akbar. Similarly, European nations gradually acquired a wider field for mutual reprisals in their respective spheres of trade, and this in its turn reacted on the character and outlook of the Companies them-

selves. Thus those who had the direction of the affairs of the East India Company at the commencement of the eighteenth century had to fall back upon naval and military supremacy to preserve themselves and their trade from sudden attacks of spoliation, and to strengthen their hands by availing themselves of all possible resources. Among these the most serviceable were of course defensive and offensive alliances with the ruling houses of the country. The Portuguese had already rehearsed on a small scale on the Malabar sea-board the effect which such alliances could have in the promotion of the interests of a European Company as against its rivals. But the theatre in which a trading Company might play an effective or extensive part in the succession to Indian kingdoms, from which was to come their opportunity, had not then been fitted up. It was not until the general disruption that commenced towards the close of the reign of Aurangzeb had well advanced that India began to present the scene which suggested to Dupleix what an alert European power could do in the temporary condition of the country. If the French were the first to perceive the opportunity and to advance towards it, they had soon to reconcile themselves to being outstripped in the race, and within a few years to abandon all dreams of territorial and commercial ambition in the East. Even if no Dupleix had come out to India, the rivalries of the ruling houses would have driven the British from an attitude of political neutrality and exclusive adherence to trade. The opportunity was not a creation of the French or of any other European Company; it was identical with the political conditions of the country, just as the equipment of a European

Company was not designed in those days in the first instance for the acquisition of territory, but only for securing trade, profit, and safety. The political condition was indigenous to the country, the naval and military outfit was indigenous to the state of commercial morality of the age. The inevitable result followed; what were not meant for each other nevertheless served each other in the unrevealed purpose of a higher providence. Lured by the gains of trade, each European Company was really sent to India for securing a higher object, and for contributing towards a greater destiny without even remotely dreaming it. Sir Thomas Roe, who had some insight into the signs of the times, misconstrued what he saw and read. He warned the Company not to scatter the merchandise, "for the time will come when all these kingdoms will be in combustion." He failed to see the possibility of a strong British control of India being forged during that conflagration. The process lasted for a period of sixty-six years, if we regard the Mahrattas as the last power to hold out against the supremacy of the British, and about ninety-eight years if we believe that the Sikhs were the last Confederacy to accept British authority; however that may be, with the passing of the Charter Act of 1833 the trading functions of the Company were terminated, and the march from trade to Empire had both theoretically and practically been accomplished.

That process of transition from commerce to dominion is unique in the history of conquests, and shows at a glance the foundations of British supremacy and the nature of the title by which England holds India. Had Clive marched from Plassey to Delhi,

planted the British flag on its ramparts, and annexed the whole Empire by a single step to the Imperial throne, the process of conquest would have been avowed, complete, and far less debilitating to the country. Far from embarking upon any such enterprise, the man who started the march from trade to territorial possession preferred to obtain at the first available opportunity the rank of a subordinate official of the Company, which in turn derived its authority from an Imperial Government then gasping for life Clive's policy has been described in the glowing pages of Macaulay as corresponding to that which the successful Mayors of the Palace adopted towards their puppet kings. The comparison may hold good to some extent in the case of the consummate Peshwas who ruled in the name of the effeminate monarchs of Satara; but Clive's seizure of the Dewany was not of that order. It was far from Clive's intention that he or any other servant of the Company should play the part of a Minister to the Mughal and carry on the affairs of State in the name of a decadent authority. He looked upon the Dewany as complete in itself and as a substantial possession of great value to the Company; but he by no means regarded it as a title to enable him to play the rôle of an Imperial Mayor of the Mughal Palace. It was not his plan to rule the Empire by ruling the Emperor, as it was assuredly that of the astute Mahrattas who grasped the prospect of acting the part of Imperial Wazir, or of standing out as the protector of the Emperor's person and authority. Nor did Clive's vision extend to a united British India supplanting the Mughal and completely overcoming all principalities and refractory confederacies.

To blast the prospect of the French in India, and thereby to add to the profits of trade, territory, and revenue as opportunity rendered it prudent, was all that in the best interests of the Company and his countrymen he thought desirable.

Between the acceptance of the Dewany in 1765 and the conclusion of the Mahratta wars in 1818, nothing is more remarkable than the fact that it was not a policy of conquest for which the agents of the Company in India contended. If Clive, who laid the foundations of territorial possession, contented himself with a Dewany from the palsied hands of an effete emperor, Wellesley, the master architect of the British Empire in India, strove acknowledgedly not for conquest but only for paramountcy. Nor can it be forgotten that in bringing about the establishment of that paramountcy there was not a single battle in which Indian troops did not largely outnumber and stand side by side with the British soldiery and fight for the triumph of a common cause. From the capture of Arcot by Clive to the suppression of the Mutiny by John Lawrence, there was not a single engagement in which the Indian sword was not raised alongside the British sword for the success of the cause for which the natives of India and the natives of England fought as allies. The transition from trade to Empire was therefore a process not of conquest, but of establishing paramountcy with the aid of the Indian sword, with the aid of the ruling houses of India, and in countless ways with the aid of the common people themselves. To speak of the British "conquest" of India is to be ignorant of the real drift of Indian history since the break-up of the Mughal Empire. To assert that

India should be held by the sword, meaning thereby that it should be governed without an effective voice in its own affairs, treated not as a country which co-operated with England in establishing British rule, but as though it were a land annexed to England by the unaided achievements of the British army, is to counsel in the plenitude of political folly and out of the fullness of historical ignorance. Indian history from Clive to Kitchener affords ample material both of a positive and a negative character for an impartial estimate of the theory of British conquest and of the danger of cherishing ideas born of such a theory. The Governor-General who, under the East India Company, acted in the belief that strength of arms alone would suffice for upholding British authority in India, brought on the extinction of the body whose executive agent he was. The policy of Dalhousie was the direct antithesis of the policy of Wellesley, being truly a policy of conquest by following the simple expedient of annexation whenever a suitable opportunity presented itself; he did not conceal that it was his aim to sweep out of existence "the princelings and kinglings of India." He saw, and no doubt rightly, that the East India Company was all-powerful, and he concluded therefrom that its agents in India could by a stroke of the pen obliterate ruling houses, some of which had enjoyed considerable political ascendancy at a time when the East India Company was not even a political power. He thought, no doubt, that he could contemptuously kick away the ladder by which the Company had risen to suzerainty; and for the time being he felt not only that he had done an honourable act, but that he was perfectly safe and

secure in doing it. If he showed thereby that he did not care to submit his action to the test of political justice, he also demonstrated amply that he was completely bereft of the vision of the statesman. In fact, his attitude throughout his Governor-Generalship was that of a man who did not care to consider whether what he did was right or wrong, so long as he could do it with impunity. To this moral obliquity was added in his case the folly of a man who did not know that he was preparing a mine beneath his seat of authority. He had the imprudence to assure his countrymen within fifteen months of the outbreak of the Mutiny that he was "leaving India in peace without and within," "having annexed in eight years four kingdoms," "besides various chieftainships and separate tracts," and added four millions sterling to the public income. His own organ, *The Friend of India*, precisely a year before the outbreak of the Mutiny, waxed eloquent on the policy of annexation in the following terms: "The policy of annexation may be considered secure. One by one its opponents are convinced, or confess by their silence that they are logically defunct. The dreamers who feared that the Empire will be weakened by the extension, and the Orientalists who believed native government better than civilised rule, are already for practical politics extinct." The real dreamers had too rude an awakening when they found the promise to "native governments" flaring in their faces: "We desire no extension of our present territorial possession"; "We shall respect the rights, dignity, and honour of native princes as our own." The fate of Lord Dalhousie's policy has demonstrated what a folly it would have been if Great Britain

had embarked upon a career of conquest at the time when Sir Thomas Roe clearly saw the prospect of a general disruption, or nearly a century and a half later when Clive outwitted the French and secured territorial possession, or later still when "the glorious little man" offered war and peace to the kingdoms of India for their own choice, and advanced British rule in India from mastery of scattered possessions, and from its position as one amongst other powers, to paramountcy and predominance. Forty years after the conclusion of the Mahratta wars, when Lord Dalhousie, as the occupant of the edifice built by Wellesley, acted, on the strength of his sword, as though paramountcy were equivalent to despotism and carried no moral responsibilities, his countrymen found that the foundations of Wellesley still held good and could not be disturbed without involving the ruin of the edifice. Those foundations they solemnly promised to respect as though they were the basis of their own authority in India. Almost exactly half a century later, when a Governor-General emulated Lord Dalhousie in the spirit of his statesmanship, and espoused the theory of British absolutism by word and deed, he forced India into a period of unrest the like of which had not been witnessed ever since it came under the Crown. It is not necessary to survey his regime, but to show how exactly like Dalhousie, whose faults and merits he seems to have shared, he failed to realise the immediate effect of his own policy, we shall only quote a single passage from his last Budget speech. In the peroration Lord Curzon said he looked back upon the past "with gratitude that the opportunity has been vouchsafed to my colleagues

and myself of giving so definite an impulse to all that makes for the growth of the prosperity of a people and the safety of an Empire." Projecting his vision into the immediate future, he declared: "The harvest is springing up; indeed, the green shoots are already high above the ground that will ten thousand times repay the exertion and obliterate every scar." The green shoots high above the ground concealed within them, as events have shown, anarchy and sedition, unprecedented in its annals ever since the assumption by the Crown of the direct control of the government of the country. These green shoots deceived his imagination just as "the peace without and within" deceived Lord Dalhousie's. When, however, the crisis came on both occasions, when Lord Dalhousie thought that he was leaving the country in peace, and Lord Curzon satisfied himself as to "the green shoots that will repay ten thousand times," it was simply because each in his day and sphere of control mistook the fundamental character of British rule in India, and felt assured that it was no more than an absolutism resting on the strength of the British sword, and in the keeping of a governing caste in India. In both cases British statesmanship, by the reforms that were introduced in India after the proconsulship of each, showed that it judged the conviction of each a political blunder. In spite of that adjudication, and of the reforms that followed it on each occasion, there is yet a disinclination on the part of British authorities to free themselves entirely from such political cobwebs as that "India was conquered by the sword," and "should be held by the sword" in the sense that it should be governed only on lines of benevolent despotism. If India were conquered

by the sword, it was by the British and the Indian sword alike; if it be held by the sword, it is again by both of them alike. British rule in India has been from the very beginning the concern, not of one party, but of two parties; its foundations lie deep down in the sacrifices of both nations, cemented by mutual faith and upheld by the best among them. To describe such a possession as resting on the sword is to be guilty not only of a historical perversion but to some extent of ingratitude, and to be completely blind to the moral basis of British rule. It is, in fact, to degrade its real character in a spirit of political fatuity and to deprive it of the most powerful support that a foreign dominion can ever hope to have. Historically the theory is faulty if not false; as a rendering of the moral aspect of British rule it is erroneous if not stupid; as a creed of statesmanship it is positively harmful if not malicious; even from the point of view of statecraft of a low order it is dangerous, as it implies that, if the people of India lost their country by the sword, there is neither anything morally wrong nor anything historically improbable in their recovering it by employing force. Those who expressly or by implication formulate such a theory after all these years of British rule, after so much Indian and British blood has been shed, and after so many decades of British and Indian co-operation, can only be blessed with a vision which can extend no further than the end of a quick-firing gun. That British statesmanship should be influenced to any extent by such an undercurrent can only be due to a malignant spirit which, if not overpowered, will bring to the dust the labours of centuries.

The secret (which has been described as a political

marvel) of a trading Company's obtaining possession of an Empire has lain, in fact, in the innermost appreciation of India that its political needs can be satisfied by England's paramountcy. It does not assuredly consist in a process of "hypnotism," as has been asserted in some quarters, but in a deep-rooted conviction which again and again has displayed itself, even in times of violent stress; it is the conviction that the future of India lies in making the British Government subserve all the purposes of a national rule, which has again and again evidenced itself in moments of despair and at times of trying excitement. So long as the better mind of India holds fast to this conviction, British rule may be certain of a firm anchor in spite of all the blunders of policy and errors of judgment on the part of those at the helm and those who ply the oars. As often as British agents in India, in the weakness of untrammelled power, have plunged the country in a whirlpool of disaffection, so often has this conviction prevailed with the thoughtful and judicious section of the community and acted as a strong embankment against the waves of discontent. It was this faith which led to the establishment of British sovereignty at the dawn of British-Indian history; it was the violence done to this faith which led the Government into troubled waters; it was again the same belief, to which the more self-restrained majority has always clung as a political creed, that along with other forces brought back the vessel of state into the haven of peace and goodwill; and on the restoration of normal conditions the efforts of British statesmen have always been to strengthen this conviction. To replace such a faith in the sustaining factor of