

nexion, and of the immense importance of India to Britain for Britain's own greatness and prosperity.

THE BENEFITS TO INDIA.

① The present advanced humanitarian civilisation of Britain could not but exercise its humane influence to abolish the customs of *sati* and infanticide, earning the everlasting blessings of the thousands who have been and will be saved thereby.

② — The introduction of English education, with its great, noble, elevating, and civilising literature and advanced science, will for ever remain a monument of good work done in India and a claim to gratitude upon the Indian people. This education has taught the highest political ideal of British citizenship and raised in the hearts of the educated Indians the hope and aspiration to be able to raise their countrymen to the same ideal citizenship. This hope and aspiration as their greatest good are at the bottom of all their present sincere and earnest loyalty, in spite of the disappointments, discouragements, and despotism of a century and half. I need not dwell upon several consequential social and civilising benefits. But the greatest and the most valued of all the benefits are the most solemn pledges of the Act of 1833, and the Queen's Proclamations of 1858, 1877, and 1887, which if "faithfully and conscientiously fulfilled" will be Britain's highest gain and glory and India's greatest blessing and benefit.

Britain may well claim credit for law and order, which, however, is as much necessary for the existence of British rule in India as for the good of the Indian people; for freedom of speech and press, and for other benefits flowing therefrom.

THE IMMENSE IMPORTANCE OF INDIA TO BRITAIN'S EMPIRE, TO ITS GREATNESS AND ITS PROSPERITY.

Lord Curzon, before he went out to India as Viceroy, laid great and repeated emphasis, two or three times, upon the fact of this importance of India to Britain. "India," he said, "was the pivot of our Empire. (Hear, hear.) If this Empire lost any other part of its dominion we could survive, but if we lost India, the sun of our Empire would be set" (*Times*, 3/12/1898).

Lord Roberts, after retiring for good from India, said to the London Chamber of Commerce:—

"I rejoice to learn that you recognise how indissolubly the prosperity of the United Kingdom is bound up with the retention of that vast Eastern Empire" (*Times*, 25/5/1893). He repeated "that the retention of our Eastern Empire is essential to the greatness and prosperity of the United Kingdom" (*Times*, 29/7/1893). And with still more emphasis he pointed out upon what essential condition such retention of the Indian Empire depended—not upon brute force; but "however," he said, "efficient and well-equipped the army of India may be, were it indeed absolute perfection, and were its numbers considerably more than they are at present, our greatest strength must ever rest on the firm base of a united and contented India."

I now come to the faults of the present un-British system of Government, which unfortunately "more than counter-balances the benefits."

DESTRUCTIVE AND DESPOTIC TO THE INDIANS.

The Court of Directors, among various expressions of the same character, said, in their letters of 17/5/1766 and others about the same time: "Every Englishman throughout the country . . . exercising his power to the oppression of the helpless Natives. . . . We have the strongest sense of the deplorable state . . . from the corruption and rapacity of our servants . . . by a scene of the most tyrannic and oppressive conduct that ever was known in any age or country!" Such unfortunately was the beginning of the connexion between Britain and India—based on greed and oppression. And to our great misfortune and destruction, the same has remained in subtle and ingenious forms and subterfuges up to the present day with ever increasing impoverishment. ✓

Later, as far back as 1787, Sir John Shore (subsequently Governor-General) prophesied the evils of the present system of the British Indian Government which is true to the present day.

He said in a deliberate Minute:—

"Whatever allowance we may make for the increased industry of the subjects of the State, owing to the enhanced demand for the produce of it (supposing the demand to be enhanced), there is reason to conclude that *the benefits are more*

than counterbalanced by evils inseparable from the system of a remote foreign dominion. . . ."¹

Commonsense will suggest this to any thoughtful mind. These evils have ever since gone on increasing, and more and more counterbalancing the increased produce of the country, making now the evil of the "bleeding" and impoverishing drain by the foreign dominion nearly or above £30,000,000 a year in a variety of subtle ways and shapes; while about the beginning of the last century the drain was declared to be £3,000,000 a year—and with private remittances, was supposed to be near £5,000,000—or one-sixth of what it is at present. If the profits of exports and freight and insurance, which are not accounted for in the official statistics, be considered, the present drain will be nearer forty than thirty millions; speaking roughly on the old basis of the value of gold at two shillings per rupee.

Mr. Montgomery Martin, after examining the records in the India House of a minute survey made in 1807-1814 of the condition of some provinces of Bengal and Behar, said in 1835 in his "Eastern India":—"It is impossible to avoid remarking two facts as peculiarly striking—first the richness of the country surveyed, and second, the poverty of its inhabitants. . . . The annual drain of £3,000,000 on British India has amounted in thirty years, at 12 per cent. (the usual Indian rate) compound interest to the enormous sum of £723,900,000 sterling. . . . So constant and accumulating a drain, even in England, would soon impoverish her. How severe then must be its effects on India when the wage of a labourer is from twopence to threepence a day." He also calculates the result of the drain of £5,000,000 a year. What then must be or can be the effect of the unceasing drain which has now grown to the enormous amount of some £30,000,000 a year, if not famines and plagues, destruction and impoverishment!

Mill's "History of India" (Vol. VI, p. 671; "India Reform Tract" II, p. 3) says: "It is an exhausting drain upon the resources of the country, the issue of which is replaced by no reflex; it is an extraction of the life blood from the veins of national industry which no subsequent introduction of nourishment is furnished to restore."

Sir George Wingate has said (1859): "Taxes spent in the

¹ The italics are all mine, except when stated otherwise.

country from which they are raised are totally different in their effect from taxes raised in one country and spent in another. In the former case the taxes collected from the population . . . are again returned to the industrious classes. . . . But the case is wholly different when the taxes are not spent in the country from which they are raised. They constitute an absolute loss and extinction of the whole amount withdrawn from the taxed country might as well be thrown into the sea. . . . Such is the nature of the tribute we have so long exacted from India. From this explanation some faint conception may be formed of the cruel, crushing effect of the tribute upon India. The Indian tribute, whether weighed in the scales of justice or viewed in the light of our own interest, will be found to be at variance with humanity, with common sense, and with the received maxims of economic science" ("A Few Words on Our Financial Relation with India." London: Richardson Bros., 1859).

Lord Salisbury, as Secretary of State for India, in a Minute (26/4/1875) said—[C. 3086—1—(1884, p. 144)]:—

"The injury is exaggerated in the case of India, where so much of the revenue is exported without a direct equivalent. As *India must be bled* the lancet should be directed to the parts where the blood is congested or at least sufficient, not to those" (the agricultural people) "*which are already feeble from the want of it.*"

This was said twenty-six years ago, and those who were considered as having sufficient blood are also being brought lower and lower. The "want of blood" among the agricultural population is getting so complete that famines and plagues like the present are fast bleeding the masses to death.

Lord Lawrence, Lord Cromer, Sir Auckland Colvin, Sir David Barbour, and others have declared the *extreme poverty* of India.

But the drain is not all. All the wars by which the British Indian Empire is built up have not only been fought mainly with Indian blood, but every farthing of expenditure (with insignificant exceptions) incurred in all wars and proceedings within and beyond the frontiers of India by which the Empire has been built up and maintained up to the

present day has been exacted from the Indian people. Britain has spent nothing.

There is the great injustice that every expenditure incurred even for British interest is charged to India. Under the recommendation of the late "Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure and Apportionment" the British Government has done a very small justice in refunding about £250,000 a year. Even for such trifle of justice we are thankful, and hope that this may lead to further justice. But it is necessary for us to have the help of the recognition and voice of the British public to ensure this.

The utter exhaustion and destruction from all these causes is terrific, and cannot but produce the present famines, plagues, etc. What would Britain's condition be under a similar fate? Let her ask herself that question. The Anglo-Indians always shirk that question, never face it. Their selfishness makes them blind and deaf to it.

DESPOTISM.

I need only say that the people of India have not the slightest voice in the expenditure of the revenue, and therefore in the good government of the country. The powers of the Government being absolutely arbitrary and despotic, and the Government being alien and bleeding, the effect is very exhausting and destructive indeed.

Sir William Hunter has truly said :—

"I cannot believe that a people numbering one-sixth of the whole inhabitants of the globe, and whose aspirations have been nourished from their earliest youth on the strong food of English liberty, can be permanently denied a voice in the government of their country. I do not believe that races . . . into whom we have instilled the maxim of 'no taxation without representation' as a fundamental right of a people, can be permanently excluded from a share in the management of their finances."

UN-BRITISH AND SUICIDAL TO BRITAIN.

A committee of five members of the Council of the Secretary of State for India have declared the British Government to be "exposed to the charge of keeping promise to the ear and breaking it to the hope" (Report, 20th January, 1860).

Lord Lytton, as Viceroy of India, in a Minute referred to in the despatch of the Government of India of 2nd May, 1878, said: "No sooner was the Act (1833) passed than the Government began to devise means for practically evading the fulfilment of it. . . . We have had to choose between prohibiting them and cheating them, and we have chosen the least straightforward course are all so many deliberate and transparent subterfuges for stultifying the Act and reducing it to a dead letter. . . . I do not hesitate to say that both the Government of England and of India appear to me up to the present moment unable to answer satisfactorily the charge of having taken every means in their power of breaking to the heart the words of promise they had uttered to the ear." (First Report of the Indian National Congress.)

The Duke of Argyll has said: "We have not fulfilled our duty or the promises and engagements which we have made." (*Hansard*, 11/3/1869.)

Lord Salisbury, in reply to Lord Northbrook's pleading for the fulfilment of British solemn pledges, said it was all "political hypocrisy." (*Hansard*, 9/4/1883.)

SUICIDAL TO BRITAIN.

Sir John Malcolm says: "We are not warranted by the history of India, nor indeed by that of any other nation in the world, in reckoning upon the possibility of preserving an Empire of such a magnitude by a system which excludes, as ours does, the Natives from every station of high rank and honourable ambition. . . . If we do not use the knowledge which we impart it will be employed against us. . . . If these plans are not associated with the creation of duties that will employ the minds which we enlighten, we shall only prepare elements that will hasten the destruction of our Empire. The moral evil to us does not thus stand alone. It carries with it its Nemesis, the seeds of the destruction of the Empire itself." ✓

Mr. John Bright: "I say a Government like that has some fatal defect which at some not distant time must bring disaster and humiliation to the Government and to the people on whose behalf it rules." (Speech in the Manchester Town Hall, 11/12/1877.)

The Duke of Devonshire pointed out that "it is not wise to educate the people of India, to introduce among them your civilisation and your progress and your literature and at the" ✓

✓ same time to tell them they shall never have any chance of taking any part or share in the administration of the affairs of their country except by their getting rid in the first instance of their European rulers."—(*Hansard*, 23/8/1883.)

Lord Randolph Churchill, as Secretary of State for India, has said in a letter to the Treasury :—

"The position of India in relation to taxation and the sources of public revenue is very peculiar, not merely from the habits of the people and their strong aversion to change, which is more specially exhibited to new forms of taxation, but likewise from *the character of the Government which is in the hands of foreigners who hold all the principal administrative offices, and form so large a part of the army.* The impatience of the new taxation, which will have to be borne *wholly as a consequence of the foreign rule imposed on the country,* and virtually to meet additions to charges arising outside of the country, would constitute a *political danger*, the real magnitude of which it is to be feared is not at all appreciated by persons who have no knowledge of or concern in the Government of India, but which those responsible for that Government have long regarded as of *the most serious order.*"¹

Lord George Hamilton candidly admits :—"Our Government never will be popular in India." Again, "our Government never can be popular in India."—(*Times*, 16/6/1899.)

How can it be otherwise? If the present un-British and suicidal system of government continues, commonsense tells us that such a system "can never" and "will never" be popular. And if so such a deplorable system cannot but perish; as Lord Salisbury truly says, "Injustice will bring the highest on earth to ruin." Macaulay has said, "The heaviest of all yokes is the yoke of the stranger." And if the British rule remains, as it is at present, a heavy yoke of the stranger and the despot, instead of being a true British rule and a friendly partner, it is doomed to perish. Evil is not, and never will be, eternal.

TRUE BRITISH RULE.

True British rule will vastly benefit both Britain and India. My whole object in all my writings is to impress upon the British People, that instead of a disastrous explosion

¹ "Parliamentary Return" [C. 4868], 1886.

of the British Indian Empire, as must be the result of the present dishonourable un-British system of government, there is a great and glorious future for Britain and India to an extent unconceivable at present, if the British people will awaken to their duty, will be true to their British instincts of fair play and justice, and will insist upon the "faithful and conscientious fulfilment" of all their great and solemn promises and pledges.

Mr. John Bright has truly said: "The good of England must come through the channels of the good of India. There are but two modes of gaining anything by our connexion with India. The one is by plundering the people of India and the other by trading with them. I prefer to do it by trading with them. But in order that England may become rich by trading with India, India itself must become rich." Cannot British authorities see their way to such intelligent selfishness? Hitherto England has to some extent made herself rich by plundering India in diverse subtle and ingenious ways. But what I desire and maintain is that England can become far richer by dealing justly and honourably with India, and thereby England will not only be a blessing to India and itself, but will be a lesson and a blessing to mankind.

Macaulay, in his great speech of 1833, said: "I have no fears. The path of duty is plain before us; and it is also the path of wisdom, of national prosperity, of national honour. . . . To have found a great people sunk in the lowest depths of slavery and superstition, to have so ruled them as to have made them desirous and capable of all the privileges of citizens would indeed be a title to glory all our own. The sceptre may pass away from us. Unforeseen accidents may derange our most profound schemes of policy. Victory may be inconstant to our arms. But there are triumphs which are followed by no reverses. There is an empire exempt from all natural causes of decay. Those triumphs are the pacific triumphs of reason over barbarism; that empire is the imperishable empire of our arts and our morals, our literature and our laws."

Sir William Hunter, after referring to the good work done by the Company, said: "But the good work thus commenced has assumed such dimensions under the Queen's government of India that it can no longer be carried on, *or even supervised*,