

DUTIES OF ENGLAND TO INDIA.

NEVER was there a conquering nation which had more good to bestow on a conquered country, than England on India; never was more of honour and strength to be earned than by bestowing our good freely. Their exuberant soil and climate, their magnificent rivers, forests, plains, and mountains, joined with industry and docility in their swarming millions, and high intelligence in their superior races, have not sufficed to ensure to the Hindoos peace or material welfare, because they are debased by a corrupt religion and have neither political unity nor worthy political precedents. Precisely what they need, it is in our power to give them—first, modern science, European literature, and among their results a purified religion; next, commercial unity and easy intercourse; finally, political cohesion and stability. If under English rule their minds become enlightened, their industry productive, their national character elevated, and, in consequence of all this, their inclinations loyal, the material and moral advantage to ourselves will be incalculable. With such a possibility before us, how terrible is it to contemplate an opposite contingency—which is too probable, if we judge by mere experience—that the future is pregnant with blood and fire, wasteful fury and exhaustion; and that one hundred and eighty millions of human beings who might be blessed by us and a blessing to us, will hate us more and more every ten years, will make insurrection whenever they dare, and drive us into tyranny through our fears; until India is a drain on our strength, a weakness and a disgrace, with disaster ultimately the greater the longer we hold the country. It is wholesome to open our eyes to the terrible fact, that in the last thirty years the English rule has become far more hated than it was previously, the English officials far less conciliating (the native newspapers say less *competent* since the suppression of Fort William College); and this, while

in Europe all national freedom has become intenser, and in England generally the desire to establish and confirm the freedom of all our colonies and dependencies has in many ways strongly expressed itself. We have not room here to enter deeply into the causes of this fact, which are probably complex: it suffices to point at phenomena which are on the surface.

In 1833, when the charter of the East Indian Company was to be renewed, the Ministry of the day announced two principles contained in the new charter to be so vital, that if the Company refused them the Ministry would advise Parliament to discard the Company. Of these vital principles, one was that native Indian subjects of the King were to be admitted on equal terms with British-born subjects to every office of State, except to be Governor-General or Commander-in-Chief. The other provided that Europeans should have full right to hold landed property. Lord Macaulay has published the ample and careful speech in which he expounded the policy of Lord Grey's Government; nothing can be nobler in promise, more pointed in avowal, more exciting to the hopes of intelligent Indians. Proportionable must have been the disappointment of precisely that part of the Indian community which is our natural ally, when it found this provision of the charter to be a *dead letter*; and that natives were excluded alike from the 'covenanted' Civil Service, and from promotion in the army. Until lately it was possible for them to vent their reproaches on the Company, and to believe that the Crown would have been more faithful to its engagements. But it is evident that a deep distrust of the Crown also is now sinking into their minds. Sir Charles Wood has recently made an emphatic avowal, that the Government is *not* averse to appointing natives to the very highest places of the judicial bench; and how does the *Indian Mirror* comment on this?—

Such appointments (it says) will win the plenary confidence of our countrymen the justice of British rule. We are, however, sceptical as to the fulfilment of its measure in practice. Truly did Mr. Bullen remark in the House of Commons, that this power would be no more exercised, than that under the Act of 1829 to limit Roman Catholics to the English cabinet; or, we should say,—*perhaps no more than the solemn declarations of the Royal Proclamation of 1858 have been carried into effect!*

The italics and punctuation are reproduced from the Indian writer. The words of the Royal Proclamation to which he refers, are elsewhere alluded to as follows:—

It was expressly stated on a recent occasion, that 'All her Majesty's subjects, of whatever race or creed, should be freely and impartially admitted to offices in her Majesty's service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability, and integrity fully to discharge.' Our countrymen cannot help believing it to be a dead letter, inasmuch as they find an insuperable line of demarcation drawn between themselves and those of the dominant race in every department of government service. The registrars of offices are almost invariably Eurasians or Europeans; though they are often deemed as mere puppets in the hands of their experienced native assistants.

It has been observed, that the improved morality and more earnest religion of the last thirty or forty years in England has sensibly increased the chasm between the Indians and ourselves; and we fear there is truth in this. The very vices of our countrymen, when they openly kept black mistresses, put them into domestic relations with the natives, and gave them a more intimate knowledge of all sides of their character. English nabobs of this class had sometimes even an enthusiastic confidence in the personal attachment and devoted faithfulness of the natives; and whatever severity of judgment might be called out by their domestic licentiousness is sadly silenced when one contemplates the miseries, the enormities, the demoralizations innumerable, contingent on such a war as that of 1857-59. How much preaching of missionaries, how much public

education, how much beneficial and conciliatory government, will be needed to wipe out the long train of evils hence entailed? Alas! it would seem that any amount of polygamic enormities and pagan irreligion in foreign and despotic rulers appears a less evil to a conquered country, than their incapacity and their unconciliating demeanour. Surely our first duty and our first wisdom is, to determine that we *will* win the loyalty of the Hindoo millions, and have no more insurrections.

And here we beg to interpose a protest against two classes of talkers who, thinking themselves speculatively wise, do much practical mischief: indeed, we have met both forms of folly in one and the same man. The one class is most liberal in its proposals to lay down empire and sacrifice foolish ambitions. It tells us that India, if subject to Russia, would be worth far more to us in its commerce than now; that the country is not worth keeping, since we shall never reconcile the people to our rule; and it will always be to us a drain of men, a public anxiety, a periodical danger; while it exposes us to envy from all the Great Powers. It is therefore great nonsense (they say) to make a fuss about India, as if we were going to keep it: on the contrary, we ought to give it up to the people themselves, or to any civilized power that will take it. The other class of talkers has always the topic of *races* prominent, and supposes this to decide that the Executive of India must be at once despotic and foreign. Black races of men—those to whom hot climates are natural (we are told), are inevitably inferior to the European race. Where the black and white meet, one or other must be absolutely master. The two are intrinsically uncongenial; no compromise is possible: they will crush us if we do not completely keep them down. All history, all experience (these reasoners assure us), make this certain; and if we do not learn it by the past, we shall learn it too painfully in the future. To give politi-

cal rights to the Indians would be madness; to give them equal social rights would be good, if it could be done; but we know it cannot when the European is politically dominant. Full despotism must therefore on no account be relaxed, at least over the natives; nor must they share with us any high offices, executive or judicial. Whether non-official Englishmen are to have exceptional privileges, the race-mongers are not agreed.

We do not notice these theorists as though we imagined it possible that their doctrines could be received by any English statesman whatsoever, but because they tend to chill and damp exertion, to give an excuse for idleness, cowardice, dangerous delay, and violation of the public faith; when every public man would gladly put off to the morrow and to his successors the duties which are incumbent immediately. To those commercial economists who talk about peacefully laying aside our Indian Empire, it suffices to reply, that the thing is for a long time to come palpably *impossible*. The pride of England is as much a fact as the idolatry of Hindooism; and to subdue that pride by economical preachings is likely to be as long a task as to convert the Hindoos to Christianity. For aught that we can surely know, to have been expelled from India in 1857, might have been for our welfare; but that is not a practical question. The only *peaceful* mode of retiring from our imperial cares, is that which has been exhibited by us in Canada. It presupposes that the people gradually get more and more power, until, like a son who comes of age, the parental control is discontinued. We have to take at present the first steps of this course. We cannot take the last steps first, nor can we abruptly and recklessly resign our post. By violently conquering so many Indian dynasties — last, and not least, Oude and Delhi—we have incurred vast responsibilities. Even if England herself were willing, she has no right to throw back India into chaos; but is bound manfully to

encounter the difficult problem, how to train and govern it wisely, and make her rule a blessing.

To the preachers of race-diversity, we reply, that those diversities reveal themselves plentifully and strongly in Europe as well as in the tropics. We have indeed but recently escaped from the dogma that used to be dinned into our ears, that 'none but *Teutons* are capable of managing representative government.' This, we believe, was the form in which the doctrine was imported from Germany; but there were those among us who, observing that despotism had invaded Germany as well as the rest of the Continent, proposed to modify the axiom into 'none but *Britons*, &c.' We know that some were struck with wonder when the discovery broke on them that the Hungarians with Tartar eyebrows (that 'Scythian people,' as the Germans call them) have managed their powerful municipal institutions for eight hundred years, and that under the greatest difficulties, as ably and successfully as any nation in historical record. Still more lately, it has been a wonderful revelation to race-mongers, that the people of Northern Italy are suited for political institutions. It is hard to understand how any one who has even the most superficial acquaintance with history, should be ignorant that the Spaniards and the Bohemians had excellent free institutions, and conducted them most successfully for centuries, until they were overpowered by the craft, perfidy, and widely-extended possessions of the House of Austria. Happily, in the last ten years inductive speculators have enlarged the dogma. It is now conceded, that not 'Teutons,' much less 'Britons' only, were intended by the Lord of all Power for liberty, but all *European* races, at least while natives of *temperate* climates. The Irish were, till recently, a grave difficulty in the way of thus enlarging the proposition. We must all remember that a great writer and philosopher dared to pen the despairing sentences, that Ireland needed to be 'regimented'

under field taskmasters, and treated as a slave country; and that it would be a mercy to them and us, if the whole land could lie for twenty-four hours under the waves of the Atlantic. Fifteen years—half a generation—has changed everything. No one any longer despairs that disloyal, insurrectionary, Papal Ireland will in another generation not only be as loyal to the English crown as Wales is, but will be as manifestly fit for freedom as Sussex or Lancashire. That the diversity of temperament and race will disappear, we do not say, nor do we wish it. As individuals differ, so do races, so do counties of the same nation; and very stupid would it be to desire monotony. But our differences are those of man and man, not of man and beast. At the same time there remain in Europe Neapolitans and Sicilians, there remain Russians and Greeks, not yet very successful (or at least not of late) in managing free institutions. Who that has opened a book concerning India, is ignorant that its races differ internally as much as those which are foremost and backwardest in Europe? In ancient Europe, foremost surely in intelligence was the Greek nation; yet how great the difference between Athenian and Spartan, Bœotian and Rhodian, Corinthian and Thessalian! If any political result ought to be gleaned by us from early collegiate studies, it surely ought to be this, that within the bosom of the very noblest human race, the greatest diversities of national character are propagated by their institutions; so that under bad institutions the race itself may seem, *prima facie*, unworthy of liberty. Even the great Aristotle, author of that noble axiom, *Man is a political animal*, imagined that none but Greeks were fit for liberty, and that 'barbarians' were made by nature to be slaves. We now know, that for the degradation of national character which slavery has induced, there is only one remedy, and that is, *freedom*—as soon as it can be got and kept; but it will not be kept if given prematurely. Free-

dom (that is, subjection to equal law, while the law itself is subject to deliberate revision), freedom is the only reasonable and normal state of nations. This is the goal to which we must drive, whatever the weakness or peculiarity of the races over which we hold temporary despotism. As a foolish child needs more careful restrictions than one who is prudent, so does a subject race when weak and foolish; in order that we may rear it into self-control, and thus aid it to fulfil its part in the grand scheme of Providence. We should regard a father to be unwise, who grumbled that his child had a mind of its own, and did something more than reproduce his peculiarities and his limited virtues. What else but unwise is a ruling race, which reviles Hindoos for having a different national character from the English? The weaknesses of that character are among the data of our problem, and may make it more difficult, but certainly do not excuse us from the task which we have voluntarily assumed—to rule India; which means, *to defend it from itself in infancy, and train it into manhood*. Again we say, how long this infancy must last is not the question. It will be longer according as this or that race is essentially weaker; but in none can it be perpetual, except through the fault of the ruler. For the longer men are well governed, the better do they understand what good government is; and a race as intelligent as the Bengalese or the Parsees is not likely to learn less quickly than Irishmen or Austrians.

Perhaps our readers may think we dwell too much on this topic; but for several reasons it seems to be urgently needed. No men have so fatal a power to paralyse effort for Indian good government, as those who return from India with the airs of a traveller—

The travell'd fool your mouth will stop :
'I've seen ; and sure I ought to know.'

They imagine that by merely seeing what is, they are competent to dogmatize as to what *can be*. Upon

an absurdly narrow basis they have erected an abnormal and untenable theory, and do not know that they are theorizers. *Other* men are theorizers; *they* alone have practical knowledge! Were not the English people characteristically weak in faith as to all general principles, they would never submit to the dominion which these travelled people (non-official or official) assume, to the great calamity of the empire.

But, again, it is often forgotten what a reverberation in India results from words of broad contempt spoken and written in England. Not quite a quarter of a century back, the Irish people were incensed to a most dangerous point by the invective of a peer who intended to wound, not them, but his political rivals. A like exasperation is caused in India when, with a view to nullify the solemn proclamations of the Crown (which are in principle equivalent to a coronation-oath, or to a public treaty), Englishmen can get a hearing from the public for a general disparagement of all the races in India. Not the least dangerous part of this disparagement is its vagueness. What is said may be true, if interpreted in one extreme sense (in which perhaps alone the utterers will deliberately defend it), but is utterly false in the sense which it practically bears, and in which it is therefore understood in India. To say that the races of India are unfit for liberty, is true, if by liberty is meant democratic representation and Parliamentary Government; but quite false, if it is meant, that no races and classes among them produce *individuals* equal to and superior to the average of English office-holders and judges. And this is the practical point. No one, here or there, claims for India universal suffrage; nay, no one claims for them representative Parliaments, on however narrow a suffrage. No one, we believe, has yet moved for universal jury trial, or general municipal representation. In short, reform of the institutions is not that for which the outcry is made; but, the institutions re-

maining what they are, or nearly what they are, a claim is made to *share the Executive Government with us*. This is what was voluntarily and solemnly promised in the Charter of 1833, and as solemnly undertaken anew in the Proclamation of 1858. If it be proposed to summon a whole nation to the exercise of political functions, it is a valid objection to reply that the nation collectively is incompetent. But when it is only proposed to admit the picked men of their most cultivated classes into high office, then to inveigh against the weaknesses of *the race collectively* as an objection, is a gratuitous and illogical insult, not the less stinging for having truth in it, however little that truth is to the purpose. The gentlemen who so coolly tell us on the authority of their own experience, that 'no good can come of the natives;' that we must 'rule them well, but not admit them to rule,' appear to know as much of cultivated Indians, as Governors Lin and Yeh knew of our educated classes by experience of drunken and riotous English sailors. Men whose Indian lives have been passed within four walls, surrounded by the mean and cringing part of the natives, advised in law by clever and ill-paid functionaries, who cannot live without extra fees, suppose that the experience gained in police courts or in revenue collecting justifies them in passing sentence of political death against races which were civilized when our fathers were barbarians. If we were now arguing in favour of the *principle* that natives ought to be admitted into the Executive, it would be proper to adduce the evidence (which exists in abundance) of the excellent native rulers whom India has produced in the past century, quite independent of English education; and we should infer, that, much more now, must the classes which have access to our literature and are familiar with it, contain many men highly competent. But the argument is not in this stage. The English Government and Crown are committed too deeply to recede from

the principle. They have explicitly pledged their faith; and the last time, in 1858, with the express object of winning allegiance, while many chiefs in Oude and Rohilkhand were still unreconciled. Even if Hindoos in high office proved not quite equal to Englishmen who might have been had, the evil would be a trifle in comparison with that of breaking faith with India. It cannot be pretended that our own ministers or judges at home are all and always men of so high morality or so great accomplishment as many others who are excluded, perhaps for party reasons. We can afford to concede in argument that the natives chosen for office by the Crown will be inferior men; for it would not necessarily follow that the appointments would be a great gain to the empire.

But in regard to judicial offices, all reasonable anticipation lies the other way. No duty is so difficult to a foreigner as that of administering justice, where he has to decide alike on fact and on law; and the greater the stress laid on Hindoo subtlety or perjury, the stronger the argument which doubts whether Englishmen are so well suited as native judges to discern what facts are true, when attested by Hindoo witnesses. The young Englishman is notoriously under the greatest difficulties, and by universal confession, the judicial bench has hitherto been the weakest side of our Indian administration. The advocates of the Company confessed it; and even let out the secret, that those who had been taken into the Covenanted Service and proved incompetent, were made judges, because they could not be dismissed. The unofficial English attested it in a most remarkable way; by invariably inserting in their ordinary contracts of trade a formal clause,* to the effect, that in the case of any quarrel arising, it was to be tried

in the Supreme (Queen's) Court, and not in those of the Company. Our police has been pronounced 'the bane and pest of society' by the Parliamentary Commissioners appointed to inquire into the practice of torture. Since the English magistrates, at least in Bengal, have been unable to restrain their own police from deeds the most atrocious, we have no right to boast of our own successes in maintaining justice, or to indulge any scrupulous fear that natives may be unsuccessful in high office.

Lord Macaulay, in his life of Lord Clive, reckons the faithfulness of the English Government to its promises, as among the chief reasons of its warlike successes. Side by side with this, it is melancholy to hear this invective of an accomplished native (attested by Mr. Malcolm Lewin, late Second Judge at Madras)—'The word of the English was formerly, as it were, engraved upon granite; now it is written in water. So long as it was politic to keep faith with the natives, *who* could be more observant of faith than you English? Now that you have the country at your feet, you have thrown off the mask.' The very same was the cardinal sin of Austria against Lombardy. In 1814, to win allegiance, she put forth promises, and the scheme of a free Constitution; but when once in power, violated every promise. Less perfidious yet equally fatal has been the policy of Russia in Poland since 1831. There the good intentions of the Imperial Government have never been carried into effect, because it did not appoint Poles, but only Russians, to execute them. Let us not deceive ourselves. Whether we look to the precedents of history, or to the intrinsic sentiments of human nature, we obtain the same positive reply, that strict faithfulness to our solemn engagements is the first and most vital condition of our winning the

* The Supreme Court (of the Queen, in Calcutta), recently amalgamated with the Sudder, or Chief Court of the Company, had a *permissive* jurisdiction. Merchants of Calcutta dealing with persons not within its local or ordinary jurisdiction, might, in matters of contract, bring them under it by agreement.

loyalty of India. Every fresh year of delay aggravates the difficulties in prospect.

In reviewing this position, we cannot but draw the conclusion, that those who utter invectives or jeremiads over the Indian *racés* deserve to be scouted with indignation; first, because, like cowards in a camp who predict to the soldiers defeat on the morrow, they do their worst to paralyse our exertions; next, because their words, re-echoing in India, produce national animosity and hatred; thirdly, because they are virtually urging the Crown to break its faith solemnly pledged to India. Our Government is in the position of a man who, in a fit of enthusiasm, has carried off by violence and married against her will a woman who is not perfect. For the husband to endure that bystanders shall taunt her with her failings, shall predict that he will never win her love, and assure him that it is useless or hurtful to keep his marriage vows, would be an omen that he is already despicably faithless.

The complaint is often made (perhaps as a plea for dispensing with all principle) that our position in India is too novel, too anomalous, to receive any light from historical precedent; yet the similarity of British India to the Roman Empire is so strongly marked, that no deep research is needed to suggest the comparison. Remarkably enough, the contest for a share in the Executive has its close parallel in the early struggle of plebeians against patricians within the walls of Rome itself. Then, as in the modern case, the subject class, or race, had no confidence in the just administration of the law, unless an officer of its own body were admitted to share the Executive Government: and the history of that struggle is instructive to us, as suggesting what ought to be our own procedure. Namely, it was found for many years together, that though plebeians were solemnly proclaimed to be *eligible*, they were in practice never *elected*. At length the law was demanded and passed, that of the two consuls, *one at least*

should be a plebeian: thenceforward it was impossible to make the law a dead letter. The Executive was in fact, and not merely in theory, opened to the plebeians, the two orders were reconciled, and from this era is dated the prosperity and good government of Rome. Yet the Appii Claudii of those days were firmly convinced that nothing but calamity could come of it; just as the zealots of white skin now augur concerning the Indian community. If now we desire to keep faith with India, nothing is clearer than that we ought to imitate this most successful precedent. The Ministers who have to dispense patronage ought to be relieved of difficulties which are evidently too great for them. They should be *commanded*, and not merely *permitted*, to fill up a certain proportion of high Executive and Judicial posts by native Indians. If this were done, their good intentions could not, as now, be neutralized by the obstinate resistance of Indian office-holders. Those who now struggle successfully to falsify the word of the Crown, would be utterly foiled by an ordinance which dictated the number of posts which *must* be filled by natives. Thenceforward, that which it has so often been avowed ought to be done, would be really done; and the effect on Indian feeling would be magical. They would be convinced of our determination to enforce faithfulness on the governing officials. They would in ten years identify themselves with the British rule, and look to none but Constitutional means for further reform.

Had not the Government committed itself so positively to treat the Indians on terms of full equality with British-born subjects in the matter of appointments to office, another course might have been suggested by Roman precedent, which would have had great advantages of its own,—*viz.* to bestow an avowed 'British citizenship' on select persons, families, towns, and classes, admitting them to the same political rights in India, as the colonies possess. This would

at once have brought the jury system, free counties, free parishes, free municipalities, into every part of India; would have allowed a larger influx of English settlers than is to be expected while jury trial is confined within the 'Mah-ratta ditch' of Calcutta; and would have forestalled by two centuries the time of Indian Parliaments. It is no longer possible to do this under the same names and forms; yet perhaps it may still be done substantially. English Ministers have a recent precedent in the administration of Ceylon under the Crown; where the jury system was successfully introduced, while the officers of the Company were assuring us that the thing was impossible with the lying Hindoo race. Sir Alexander Johnson, the benevolent and enterprising Chief Justice by whose energy chiefly this result was achieved, began the change gradually, bestowing at first (if we rightly remember) tickets on respectable persons, which guaranteed their right to serve on a jury. But, with greater rapidity than had been supposed possible, the institution was extended to all, as far as the Supreme Court is concerned.

In 1811 it was enacted that every native tried before the Supreme Court for a criminal offence should be tried by a jury of his countrymen; and that the right of sitting on such juries should be extended to every native, whatever be his caste or religion. The beneficial effects of this measure have equalled the most sanguine expectations.*

If a general jury system has not been glaringly mischievous in Ceylon, where most degraded castes of men exist, all pretence is cut away from the fanatics of race for leniency that a *carefully limited* bestowal of the right of jury may be highly beneficial in every part of India. In Calcutta, the principle has long been admitted; for the juries in the Supreme (or Queen's) Court have been chiefly natives. Moreover, the British settlers have been well satisfied with their verdicts.

All English statesmen avow that

the institution of the jury, wherever it will work at all for the purposes of justice, is a political training to the people: this is a secondary result, yet one of high importance. But besides, it would greatly aid the introducing of English settlers in India. The second vital principle of the charter of 1833—viz, the right of Europeans to hold landed property in India—has been made of little avail by two difficulties; first, the arbitrary taxation; secondly, the absence of jury trial, except in the immediate vicinity of Calcutta. Lord Grey's Ministry rightly estimated the extreme importance of British settlers to the Empire and to India. How else can the industrial skill and capital of England open the sources of wealth in India? How else shall English sentiment—moral, political, religious—be diffused? How else shall there be a check on the evils which the unbalanced despotism of an Executive must necessarily engender? How else shall our Indian Minister at home himself know the real facts, if nothing is to be reported to him except through officials who dare not displease their immediate superiors? But while the Ministry of 1833 sincerely desired a large immigration from home, they ruined their own scheme by determining to *destroy* instead of to *impart* the political rights of British settlers. Mr. Macaulay in his great speech pointedly avows the necessity of stripping them of every peculiar privilege; and in 1836, when in India, he earned for himself their animosity by trying to effect the enactment of this favourite idea. We do not believe that he intended to foster despotism; but, in fact, he played the game, so common to despots, of pushing their own projects under colour of extreme radicalism. True Constitutional government deals with things as they really are. It no more affects to give equal political power to classes very unequal in intelligence or in constitutional stability, than to put minors on

* We quote from the *Penny Cyclopædia*; Ceylon. 1836.

a par with grown men. Irrational democrats claim absolute equality for everything in breeches above the age of twenty-one. Despots lay hold of this principle to break down sound Constitutionalism, by pretending that the classes which it establishes are aristocratic tyranny. Such exactly was Mr. Macaulay's argument. Privileges to the Englishman (he said) are not freedom, but tyranny: the Englishmen would be 'a new caste,' 'a new breed of Brahmins.' But the eloquent speaker was not an advocate for absolute democratic equality in England. Why did he not call those who are Parliamentary electors in England a tyrannical caste? Why not denounce a House of Lords? Surely India, as England, is complicated by vast diversities in its population: a complicated constitution in politics is therefore the only rational one. The first step towards any political organization, if men are not for ever to be as unconnected grains of sand, is to distinguish what classes, races, towns, districts, are competent for this or that political function. This is what every one seeks to do, who is striving towards a noble freedom: while every satellite of despotism tries to depress the entire community to a dead level, under pretence that all inequalities are tyranny of caste,—*except* the superiority of heaven-born office-holders! Mr. Macaulay's attempt, though foiled in 1836, was renewed several times; finally, in 1856-7, just when the great rebellion was impending, the stealthy effort to enforce it all but goaded the planters of Bengal into a little insurrection of their own. The summary jurisdiction of local magistrates, often very young ('boy judges,' as the planters call them), will not be endured by British settlers. Summary fines are bad enough, but summary imprisonment may cause the total ruin of a great mercantile fortune, or, in such a climate, may be a sentence of death. To the principle of the jury our authorities have given their full adhesion; though in the scheme of

1856 the juries of the Supreme Court were to be at most *nine* in number, at fewest *three*, *half of them to be natives* [what was half of three is not clear], and a verdict of *two-thirds* was to be necessary for a conviction. What effect has been produced on the rights of British settlers by the recent amalgamation of the Queen's and of the late Company's Supreme Courts, we need a lawyer to explain to us; but we fear it deprives British settlers of the right of habeas corpus. It cannot devolve upon us to go into any of these details: we merely point out, that if a good jury system is devised (whether of twelve or of three men,—or of six unanimous in matters of crime, and two-thirds of six in civil cases), it is an obvious wisdom to extend it to *select classes* over the whole of India, and presently to invest those classes with other rights also, especially the rights of county and municipal freedom. The importance of this is immense, and deserves to be dwelt upon.

If the question be put,—Of all the innovations introduced by the East Indian Company, which was the most pernicious? we think the reply must be—The total destruction of local treasuries over the breadth of the land. In comparison with this monster evil, all other delinquencies seem to fade away. Communities can endure infinite misgovernments in detail, with terrible suffering to individuals; they may struggle through them, as through wars, pestilences, and famines, and come out less numerous, but not less capable of prosperity. But to divert all their local moneys into the central treasury, and leave no funds for repair of roads, bridges, and tanks (to say nothing of executing new works), is to drain their life-blood, and press them all down into barbarism and permanent exhaustion, *except* the parts which happen to be petted by the government of the day. Various large towns in recent years have availed themselves of enactments to levy local rates for sanitary and municipal purposes: as Kurrachee, Surat, Lahore, Poonah.

these fully suffice to disprove the wild assertions which used to be made by Sir James Hogg, Mr. Langley, and others, that by reason of the indisposition of the natives to everything new, tolls cannot be levied for local improvement. The truth is palpable, that while the natives believe that a new tax is about to be paid into the treasury at Calcutta, they will rebel against it; but as soon as they find that it is *bond fide* devoted to their own wants, as in promoting drainage of lands, irrigation and traffic, they will pay as willingly as we. And India is something vastly greater than a collection of large towns: the country districts need local resources (such as we call those of counties and parishes), quite as urgently as do the towns. In so vast a deficiency (for the old roads of whole provinces have been overgrown with jungle, and lost, under the operation of our hideous transit-duties, the abolition of which has not restored the roads), not one, but many, agencies of restoration are needed. With a view to these the first step is, to excite the voluntary activity of every English local officer by soliciting suggestions; the second is, to give every facility to voluntary (limited-liability) companies to execute roads, works of irrigation, &c.; the third, perhaps might ere long be to invest all, who had the jury-right, with the full rights of local taxation by means of public councils. With regard to the first point, it is notorious that local British officers have been afraid to make suggestions to their superiors, as they knew that their advice would be unacceptable. To report (unasked) that a road or tank was needed, was to beg money of the Treasury, and was deemed very officious; and to desire that any portion of the money locally collected should be left as a thing of course to be spent locally by local discretion, would have sounded like treason to the ears of the Company. Hence the total apathy and servile passiveness of the entire

mass of office holders, the very men who ought to have been the stimulus of prosperity to India. The Crown of Great Britain can certainly afford not to be jealous of its collectors of taxes. As *leaders* of the natives into municipal and county action, they might be invaluable, if they knew that their activity would be praised and honoured: but under the Company such activity only exposed an officer to reproof, certain failure, and non-advancement. With regard to private companies for objects of great public utility, it may deserve to be considered whether, besides granting them facilities for claiming reasonable tolls or other charges, they should not be guaranteed against taxation until their clear dividend was six per cent. on their subscribed capital: for it is dread of arbitrary taxation which discourages such enterprise; and we have seen even in England how unmercifully railway companies are taxed.

Hitherto, whenever the jury question has been mooted, as far as we know, a difficulty has been felt, or alleged, on the question, who are to be esteemed 'respectable.' The planters' organs say, it must either be a pecuniary test, and then they will have none but zemandars, who are their prejudiced opponents, to try them; or they must make high caste the test; then they will have Brahmins as their judges, which they equally dislike. Brahmins and Sudras, they add, would not and could not* sit together on a jury. But all these difficulties will be manifestly fictitious if we conceive that the problem had been approached from what may be called the *Roman side*; viz., by the political question, On whom shall we bestow 'British citizenship?' The reply certainly would not be, On rich men; nor, On men of high (or of low) caste; nor, On princes generally; nor, On merchants generally; but, *On our friends; on those who are most like us; on those who will understand how to use their*

* So we interpret 'Only conceive their sitting cheek by jowl!' In Ceylon no insuperable difficulty has arisen from caste.

privileges. If this be made the clue, in guiding the bestowal of jury rights (which of course should include *habeas corpus*), there will be no practical difficulty whatever.

The Company was always afraid to look straight at the fact and avow it, that base or fanatical religion is the chief disqualification of native Indians for co-operation with us in good government. To gain among them a large party who should be our devoted friends was our obvious policy. We ought instantly to have adopted into full and practical citizenship all whose minds, position, and interests make them our natural friends and coadjutors. These are obviously, first, the native Jews and most of the Christians, especially Armenians, and Anglo-Indians, or the mixed race; secondly, the Parsees, whose religion is at bottom noble and pure, while their oppression under other dynasties makes them our firm partisans; thirdly, whatever Hindoo churches throw off the incubus of idolatry and break with the past, as the Brahma Somaj in Bengal, founded by Rammohun Roy; fourthly, individuals among the Mussulmans.

In Roman fashion, our high officers might have been invited to recommend persons and families to the Crown (*in beneficiis deferre ad aerarium*) for the gift of English citizenship, if it were worth having! We fear that this would now be scorned by high persons; still, as Sir Alexander Johnson (we have read) found that his ticket was prized by the Cingalese as a testimony to their probity, so might it be prized by great numbers of the Hindoos, if bestowed by an officer of some note. Whole towns or villages might perhaps, by special recommendation, thus receive jury-rights; and the experience thence obtained would be valuable. Besides all this, great stress might justly be laid on a good knowledge of the English language, which, in the present abundance of cheap newspapers, is sure to imply some knowledge of our political state. What if this accomplishment were made essential to a town councillor

or county councillor, and to constitute in itself a claim to jury rights! We do not presume to judge between the numerous possibilities here open; we principally desire to lay stress on two points—first, that nature and reason prescribe *SELECTION for special political privileges*; next, that those should be selected who have ostensible marks of *loyalty, intelligence, and agreement to our own code of MORALS.*

But how will this bear on Mohammedans? A majority of these, we fear, must be accounted disloyal, but that is no reason against their possessing high status as private citizens. Their polygamy is the point in which they come into conflict with our morality, and to require from individuals conformity to our own laws of marriage as a condition for admitting them into full political equality, appears to be reasonable and expedient. A Mohammedan who definitely renounces polygamy has triumphed over the weak point of his traditional religion; and since in every other respect the creed is noble and simple, there is nothing to hinder him, any more than the Jew or Parsee, from being our full equal in every social virtue. Nor is such a man likely to have fanatical hatred of English rule. But the topic leads us to the wider remark, that in suppressing widow burning and pilgrim immolation, and forbidding infanticide, we have not exhausted the moral good which it behoves us to effect by the direct action of the government. Whether depraving pictures and emblems are still exhibited to the eyes of the young in the temples and processions, we are not accurately informed; but when we have in London enactments so stringent as Lord Campbell's act, to save the eyes and mind of youth from pollution, surely to allow the same public defilements in India, because they are called 'religious,' would be a cowardly shrinking from duty. Nor only so; but in the case of premature marriage it is our duty to *protect children* from the monstrous folly of their parents. At the age of six many a Bengalee girl is given in marriage, and if her

ny bridegroom shortly dies she is
 id must remain a widow. When
 ere children become mothers,
 e race degenerates in size and
 nlength ; hence the puny forms of
 ngal. Moreover, female educa-
 on becomes impossible, if mater-
 and domestic cares are thrust
 on a tender girl prematurely. If
 father is not permitted publicly
 sell his daughter for prostitution,
 hy should he be permitted to
 ake away with her in marriage at
 age wholly unnatural, and to
 r very pernicious? But it suffices
 ere to point out the principle,
 ithout suggesting any special
 actment.

In general, to the opposers of
 rileged classes, whether in the
 use of despotism or of ochlocracy,
 e desire to insist that there is not
 ily much good, but there is no
 il, in such classes, where the
 or of entrance into them is open.
 hey are then as steps of a ladder.
 n aristocracy not fed by constant
 xcession from below, is little less
 ad than an aristocracy of race.
 'the British-born, and none but
 ey, were to have certain high
 riviliges in India (whether of
 fice or of jury trial), this would
 rserve Lord Macaulay's censure ;
 ough the remarkable thing is, that
 nlike to him) the same English
 ficials who are anxious to exclude
 n-official British settlers from
 e ordinary birthright of Britons,
 fact strive to monopolize all
 gh posts for their own white skin.
 is betrays that their animosity
 the planters is not from a desire
 at Hindoos may have equality,
 it from a dislike of the check to
 spotism which is given by the
 esence of independent Britons.
 it privileges, whether of office or
 social status, have nothing in
 em offensive, so soon as it is
 ctically manifested that all
 tives who can fulfil the necessary
 iditions, have access to the privi-
 e on equal terms with ourselves.
 or has a government like our
 n ever anything to lose by
 reme frankness and plain deal-
 . Everybody knows that an
 lian, however accomplished and
 rwise estimable, will not be

put into high office by us, if he is
 suspected to be an enemy of the
 British rule. In exacting an oath
 of office, we avow that we appoint
 none but *our own friends*. Why,
 then, should we be ashamed or
 afraid to say, that we admit none
 to political equality who do not
 measure social morals by our
 standard? If it is certain that no
 Indian minister would dare to
 recommend to her Majesty for
 Secretary of State a Mussulman
 who had three wives, how much
 better would it be to lay down
 explicitly that this, and this only,
 is the thing to which we object in
 a man of that religion. If this
 were said plainly, some of them
 might be found to abandon the
 unnatural and pernicious practice ;
 and then we could teach them that
 they are not excluded by black
 skin nor by reverence for their
 prophet. But now, while they
 believe themselves excluded, not
 by their vices or weaknesses, but
 by their blood, which they cannot
 change, or by our bigotry against
 their religion, we make them ene-
 mies of the British dynasty. The
 moral power of a foreign Govern-
 ment to extirpate those immoral-
 ities with which its own people
 has no sympathy, is immensely
 undervalued by us. This power is
 perhaps the only redeeming point
 of foreign conquest. We frighten
 ourselves by the idea of 'religious
 persecution,' while we are astonish-
 ingly brave to confiscate men's
 national rights. Religion is not
 the unchangeable thing which
 many pretend. Among the Sikhs
 Mohammedanism and Hindooism
 have marvellously coalesced, and
 Indian caste has vanished. 'Caste'
 in every country fundamentally
 means, the love of social distinction.
 This, no doubt, is innate to man-
 kind ; but its present form in India
 is rather new, and is not destined
 to abide long. One of our functions
 is to supplant that form by a better.

It is not only the English Govern-
 ment which has duties towards
 India ; we, the *people*, in a private
 capacity, have our duties also,
 which are not fulfilled by mission-

ary societies, at whatever height the efficacy of these may be rated. Before pointing out some of these duties, we would call the readers' attention to the stake which we now all manifestly have in India. The removal of the Company has thrown down a screen. Parliament now understands that our interests are bound up with those of India. What Ireland was to us for two hundred years, India is now; only that India is greater, and harder to reach. But it is now the weak point of our Empire, liable to become a fatal drain on our prosperity. If the finances of India be deranged, the stability of the Government is endangered; England is liable to be involved in difficult and expensive war in supporting it; *therefore* we cannot permit Indian finance to fail. This is to allow in fact, what is often denied in word, that the English treasury guarantees the solvency of the Indian treasury. Not only are those families who have members in India liable to calamity by their death or pecuniary losses, but all England will be doomed to vast sacrifices, and will be exposed to danger in many quarters, if ever the feud between us and India assume a form like to that which has animated Italy against Austria. This is what it must come to, if our insolent young men continue to call the Indians 'damned niggers,' if our military officers and colonists use the stick against them, and our Government falsify its pledges. The magnitude of India is such, that it is capable of dragging us down by its mere weight from our highest prosperity, and handing us over to moralizers as one more topic of marvel and pity, if we fail in the great task which we have undertaken. Its difficulty lies in the uncongeniality of the people in morals and in mind; thence rises the question, Can nothing be done by us to remove this obstacle?

An excellent beginning has been made by the Government colleges and schools, and the further these can be carried, the better. But the limit of financial supply is soon reached in Governmental action;

and the really important thing is, to stimulate the natives themselves to promote the education of their own people. This is already begun, at least from Bombay and from Calcutta; but they might be greatly encouraged and aided by the voluntary co-operation of the English nation. We would not undervalue the action of Missionary Societies; but it is evidently impossible for Indians to feel complimented or gratified by the existence of such societies, or to welcome them as co-operators in a good and common cause. But every native Indian who imbibes even a small taste of European science and literature, knows that we have sources of strength, refinement, and elevation, from which his people is debarred: and he understands, that in trying to impart the same to them, we are trying to raise them to our own level. A powerful voluntary society in England, which should take for its object, 'to promote the intellectual, moral, and social development of the natives of India,' would fall into natural and close alliance with the Parsee Institution in Bombay, and with the Brahmo Sumaj in Bengal. It would not only be welcomed with delight by intelligent Indians everywhere, but would gather up energies that now go to waste; would supply means, materials, and books, which might create new centres of exertion; and it might (especially if it received marked Government approval) stimulate well-meaning individuals in India who have more wealth than knowledge, to become large benefactors of their own countrymen. But our readers may need to learn something concerning the two institutions to which we have alluded, in Bombay and in Calcutta.

The Parsees in India had fallen into the state of religious routine and ignorance which is to be expected in those who revere an ancient religion, the sacred books of which are in a dead language, while oppression and surrounding idolatry unite to crush their intellect. From this state of superstition and apathy they have been awakened by the *secular* instruction

parted in the Elphinstone College. For a while it was imagined by the clerically disposed part of the English, that the Government education was a great failure, producing only of pedantry and conceit. The young men had gained knowledge which they did not know where and how to use. But in 1848, two Englishmen, the late Professor Patton and Mr. R. T. Reid, a barrister, suggested to them to form a literary society for reading essays and discussion, excluding controversies of religion or passing politics. In the first year forty-six students were enrolled; but within three months branches were organized for diffusing knowledge among the uneducated, by lectures and periodical publications in vernacular tongues, or by publication of pieces of refined poetry. Their essays elicit discussion, and are often printed, as are many tracts. The first essays early delivered on Teaching by Dadabhai Naoroji, now Professor of Gujarati in University College, London, and on Female Education (by Behramji Khurdji), gave a great and enthusiastic impetus to the Society. Schools were soon organized with the help of Professor Patton. Great liberty was elicited from four Parsee gentlemen. School books for girls were prepared, and so early as 1851, a Gujarati Hindoo school was actually opened. Down-up women, by visiting the school, became convinced of its value; and so rapid has been the progress, that Professor Dadabhai, in a lecture on Parsee Manners early delivered at Liverpool, avows, although the struggle is intense, and almost bitter, between the old Parsees, who cling to routine and ignorance, in the belief that it keeps them from English morality—and the new school, which would discard all that is traditional and revolting, and every practice borrowed from the Hindoos; still, in one point the triumph of the new school is complete. *It is now conceded by all, women ought to be educated*, and some mentally co-ordinate with their husbands. Hitherto there

has been naturally a want of female teachers. Nevertheless, Mr. Dadabhai is confident that in another generation the entire Parsee community will have outgrown its weaknesses, and, both in manners and in education, will be undistinguishable from cultivated European nations. The results brought about in so very few years by the stimulus and direction of only two Englishmen (who acted *with*, not *against* the native element), is most instructive and encouraging. It is interesting to read their acknowledgment of the service done them by 'Messrs. Chambers, Edinburgh, and Messrs. Parker, West Strand, London,' in supplying them with stereotype engravings useful in the school-books. The subjects of the essays publicly delivered, are even more multifarious than those at a Manchester or Leeds Athenæum. From them we pick out as examples: 'The Poets of India,' 'The Art of Electro-gilding,' 'The Disadvantages of Luxury,' 'Premature Marriage,' 'The Re-marriage of Hindoo Widows,' 'Gambling,' 'Use of Intoxicating Drugs,' 'Evil Consequences of Adultery and Licentiousness,' 'Female Ornaments.'

The Brahma Sumaj (which we believe means the Theistic or Monotheistic community) is of somewhat older date, as its founder, Rammohun Roy, is deceased more than a quarter of a century. But it has of late roused itself into new energy, and seems to be taking a step in advance of its founder. He left the question of caste among things *indifferent*, to be decided by the conscience of the individual; but from experience of its great mischievousness, the ardent minds of the present generation are assuming direct hostility to it. We read with much interest in the first number of the *Indian Mirror* (which is published by the energy and under the auspices of this community), that on July 26th last, the second daughter of Baboo Debender Nath Tagore (one of their leading men, we understand) was married without any of the idolatrous and superstitious rites of Hindooism, with such solemn religious

forms as Christians and Jews approve. The same gentleman is represented in the *Hurkaru* as an active and successful preacher. The writer (who assumes the tone of an opponent) says, that in opening a new school, Baboo Debender Nath Tagore 'delivered the preparatory lecture *with all the zeal and energy of an enthusiast*, and was heard with almost breathless attention.' We venture here to extract part of a private letter recently written to England by a member of their church, which describes the progress hitherto made. Whether the enthusiasm of the writer has over-painted, we have no means of deciding; but the *tone* of the letter will be of itself an astonishing phenomenon to those who have been accustomed to believe that dark races are abandoned by the Spirit of God. He writes:—

The education here imparted is too mechanical. While it crams the mind with mere ideas and facts, it leaves the higher faculties and sentiments uncultivated. . . . It destroys faith in the absurdities of Hindooism, but does not impress upon the mind a positive idea of the true and good. . . . While tens of thousands are weltering in the mire of gross superstitions, the majority of those who do receive education, . . . far from setting examples of godliness in life, conduct themselves as doubters, mockers, or hypocrites. Amid so manifold evils Bengal has only one hope, even Brahmoism; that vital faith in the doctrines of love to God, and love to Man. We account it a display of God's loving kindness, that he has looked graciously on this wretched land, and vouchsafed to many the protection of that holy church. The salutary effects of the labours of our church are already manifest. It has kept many young men from falling into the vortex of scepticism, and the vices of intemperance, &c., prevalent here, and by establishing in their minds a steady religious principle, has enabled them to blend moral with mental improvement. It has helped the formation of many prayer societies, and encouraged the free investigation of theology in various quarters. It has established a Sunday-school for weekly lectures on doctrinal and practical Brahmoism, and a number of small friendly associations for the reformation of character, and the cultivation of

brotherly feelings. It has also, though to a small extent, through the simple agency of instructions by brother teachers and husband teachers, brought education to the females. With regard to social reformation, it has recently initiated a movement for the breaking up of all connexions, direct and indirect, on the part of its followers, with the hurtful social institutions of heathenism, such as caste, early [premature] marriage, &c.

It is not requisite to say that we *think*—for we *know*, that the Brahmo Somaj is panting for English sympathy. Exposed to a most unequal battle, as a handful of men against millions, with whom is the inertia of old custom and great power of social persecution, a very small indication of sympathy from England is to them very valuable. So small a body, which counts its numbers by hundreds only, must soon find its funds exhausted, as also its resources in books and in variety of cultivation. But where there is much zeal, a little aid in suggestion, in money, and in books, joined with the stimulus of sympathy, might add great impetus to their action. Hitherto the difficulty presented has been a want of natives active and zealous to instruct. Now the supply seems to have risen as it were of itself. The Missionary Societies do not know how to use and direct the energies of these men, but, we fear, treat them as enemies. Is not this a critical opportunity, which ought not to be let slip, for pouring the tide of instruction from Bombay and Calcutta over all parts of India? *Both classes are eminently loyal to England; both have a fundamentally religious spirit.* We are not called on to impart to them religious aid (as to which we might ourselves fall into controversy), but to supply means for the purely intellectual or (as it is called) secular movement. Many of us have feared evil results from intellectual teaching unaccompanied with religious sentiment; many, again, have feared that knowledge may only make the Hindoos our more dangerous enemies. What then is a happier coincidence, than to find

what could hardly have been opened) men at once loyal to us and religious, whose services will be urgently available as instructors? If the Government here and in India, and the Queen herself, would distinctly avow the earnest wish that a society should be formed in England by our nobility and wealthy classes or promoting the intellectual enlightenment of all classes in India—especially those who most need it, the females and the country people—this would assuredly give great impetus to a good work, and might be better to the Government in five years' time than an army of fifty thousand men.

Of the topics here presented to the reader, the majority, being new, need mature discussion. Only one has passed the stage of discussion, and needs to be immediately acted upon in order to save our good faith: the promise to admit native Indians into the Executive Government on equal terms. Above, we only touched on the higher offices, but the topic applies equally to the first act of admission. We have not fulfilled justly the pledge of 1853, in regard to the competitive examinations. To require Indians to come to *England* for the chance of being elected, is not to treat them on fair and equal terms. What would our youths think of the prospect of going to Calcutta in order to be examined, with a total uncertainty of being chosen? Evidently, as we ought to set aside a definite minimum per-centage of offices in every grade to be of necessity filled by natives, so ought we to enact that for primary admission the examinations for a certain minimum per-centage should be held in India, and only for the rest in London.

Nothing but the admission of black-skinned men into high offices will stop the infamous insults which our young men lavish on 'damned niggers.' At present the Queen and her Ministers are helpless to control these abominations, which, if not repressed, will assuredly convulse the Empire. Alas! it is not young men only who use freedom of aspersion.

The British planters have earned the animosity of the natives, less, we believe, by sharply enforcing their contracts (where at least they had advanced moneys, and their fortunes were at stake), than by the deliberate invectives against the native character in which their printed organs indulge. Nay, Sir Mordaunt Wells, as Judge in the Supreme Court, has thought, that in addressing the jury, it belongs to him, not only to comment on a case before him, but to assail the whole Indian race in terms most offensive. Nations forgive injury more easily than insult. The unbridled tongue (not to speak of kicks and blows with the stick) cause us to be hated in India. Will our rulers never open their eyes to the gravity of this matter, and to the absolute necessity of crushing it with a powerful hand? Let not the reader think us too urgent in closing this rather long article by a passage from the 'Notes on India,' by Mr. Russell of the *Times*, February, 1858:—

Is there not some warning given to our race by the catastrophe of Cawnpore? How are we to prevent its recurrence? I am deeply impressed with the difficulty of ruling India, as it is now governed, by force, exercised by a few who are obliged to employ natives as the instruments of coercion. That force is the base of our rule, I have no doubt; for I see nothing but force employed in our relations with the governed. The efforts to improve the condition of the people are made by bodies or individuals who have no connexion with the Government. The action of the Government in matters of improvement is only excited by considerations of revenue. Does it—as the great instructor of the people, the exponent of our superior morality and civilization—*does it observe treaties, show itself moderate and just, and regardless of gain? Are not our courts of law condemned by ourselves? Are they not admitted to be a curse and blight on the unhappy country?* In effect, the grave, unhappy doubt which settles on my mind is, whether India is the better for our rule, so far as regards the social condition of the great mass of the people. We have put down widow burning, we have sought to check infanticide: but I have travelled hundreds of miles through a country peopled with beggars, and covered with wigwam villages.