VOL. 19

MISCELLANEOUS

Compiled by
Dharampal

Ashram Pratishtan, Sevagram - 442102
May 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. HISTORIANS OF INDIA, PAKISTAN AND CEYLON 3

2.REAL SELF GOVERNMENT FOR 14

3.RURAL LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN SWEDEN, ITALY AND INDIA 16

4. A STUDY OF PANCHAYAT IN MADRAS 17

5.THE ASIATIC MODE OF PRODUCTION, Science and Politics 18

6. LETTER AND EDITORIAL FROM THE "TIMES" 1878 22

7. A.SARADA RAJU: ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN THE MADRAS PRESIDENCY 1800-1850, U of M, 1941. 30

8. CHARLES WILLIAM BOUGHTON ROUSE: Dissertation Concerning the Landed Property of Bengal, 179 32

1. HISTORIANS OF INDIA, PAKISTAN AND CEYLON

Edited By C.H.Philips, Professor of Oriental History University of London, page 217-229, oup.1961
Professor of Oriental History, University of London, Director of the School of Oriental and African Studies.

In our lifetime the history of the peoples of Asia will be rewritten, certainly by Asian historians themselves striving to express their new outlook as they emerge from the era of European dominance. Already this is taking place in India and Pakistan, whose history as it stands at present is to a large degree the creation of European, especially British, writers, In the past decade Europeans, too, have been taking a fresh look at this history, and for the first time have begun to examine the foundations of European historical writing in Asia.

If any systematic attempt is to be made to recreate objectively the history of India and Pakistan, whether by British or other historians, it is essential to establish first the basis from which we all have to start. What have been the course and the character, the major trends, of historical writings on these countries? What is our heritage? British historical writing on India constitutes the core of the problem. What, therefore, have been the major assumptions, attitudes, and purposes of British historians and what schools of thought have been dominant? In point of fact these fields of inquiry are as yet almost unexplored[1].

The British, in their conquest of India, found a country unlike the Europe of their time but resembling in some respects their own idea of the Europe of the middle ages, or even of the ancient empires described by Herodotus. So they could not turn away from the question: Are we to try to modernize this ancient land or in some way to preserve its institutions and govern through them?

At the period in the late eighteenth century when the English East India Company's power was spreading into Bengal, the ancient literature of the Hindus and much of Indian Muslim literature were still relatively unknown, as were the laws and customs of the people, and the Company's officers were groping for information about their new and numerous subjects. Just as Warren Hastings, during his governor-generalship, began deliberately to experiment in different system of tax-gathering in order to discover who actually were the proprietors of land, so he began to encourage research into the laws, customs, and history of the people. He got a fellow Persian scholar, Nath Halhed, to translate the Gentoo Code, and with the arrival in Bengal in 1784 of William Jones (a Fellow of University College, Oxford, and a classical and Persian scholar), the stage was set for the discovery of the forgotten early history of India. Jones soon became interested in Sanskrit, a knowledge of which was just beginning to grow outside India, and he soon identified the early Indian ruler, Chandragupta, with the Sandrocottos of Greek historians. It was the beginning, in Jones's words, of a seach for Indian `historical writing unmixed with fable'. But Jones and his fellow-members of the Asiatic Society,

[1] This paper was written as a sample for the Conference. Much of it has been developed and modified by subsequent papers.

which he founded, sought in vain, for the fact was that the Hindus and the early Indian empires, unlike the Muslims and their Indian states, had left few directly historical or chronological works; so few that we are justified in concluding that it was a branch of literature, a form of activity for which the need was small and which therefore they did not hold in high regard. Jones and his colleagues, unaware, thus sought a history that was as flimsy as gosamer. However, through their study of Sanskrit grammer, drama, and poetry, through their acquaintance with Hindu law, through Hinduism, they formed an extremely high opinion of the quality of early Hindu civilization, confirming the expectations of Hastings that their work would `open a new and most extensive range for the human mind, beyond the present limited and beaten field of its operations". But these scholar-administrators - with Jones, Charles Wilkins, and Henry Colebrook the three most prominent - were few in number and understandably their work was slow in maturing.

Meanwhile, British India was being conquered and governed, and India had become one of the nuclear subjects of English politics. Civilians and soldiers poured into India. An English society grew up, aloof, fitting neatly into caste society. Meanwhile, Britain herself was changing. Evangelicalism and industrialization had their effects. The Brahmanized Englishman became an object of suspicion, the tolerant feelings of Warren Hastings for the Indian peoples, his desire to lay down a system for `reconciling the people of England to the nature of Hindustan,' were challenged by new views. The governor-general, Sir John Shore, and his friend Charles Grant, both of whom had long served in Bengal, represented the evangelical viewpoint, which had already been fully expressed, though not published, in Grant's **Observations on the state of society among the Asiatic subjects of Great Britain,** in which he urged the application of Christianity and of western education to change, in his view, `a hideous state of Indian society'. A group of Christian missionaries were busy getting into print with a similar indictment, and the battle to determine British purposes in India was fully joined in London.

It was at this stage, in 1806, that James Mill, the Utilitarian philosopher and writer, at the age of thirty-three, began to work in London on his **History of British India**. Twelve years later, in six substantial books, it was published. By deliberately attempting in the second and third books an estimate of the full significance of Hindu and Muslims government and civilization in India, it ranged far beyond its title, and the whole work constituted in fact the first comprehensive history of India. Its chief significance now is that it has exercised great influence on British writing and thinking on India, which has persisted down to our own day.

Surprisingly, little study has been made of Mill's History. Leslie Stephen, in his work **The Utilitarians**, dismissed it in a few lines; Halevy, in **The Growth of Philosophic Radicalism**, gave this side of Mill only cursory attention. Only recently has attention been drawn to the significance of Mill's work. This neglect is the more surprising because, at the time of its publication, the **History** made a great impression. On the strength of it the East India Company's directors appointed Mill to a senior post on their London staff. Ricardo praised it to the skies. Ten years or so later Macaulay could refer to the **History** in the House of Commons as on the whole the greatest historical work which has appeared in our languages since that of Gibbon", and afterwards in his

famous **Minute on Indian Education** paid it the compliment of using some of Mills material. Mill's son John Stuart, described it as `one of the most instructive histories ever written', and Hayman Wilson, Professor of Sanskrit at Oxford, perhaps the most severe critic of the detail of the History, yet finally judged it in 1844 as still `the most valuable work upon the subject which has yet been published.'

We are led to ask what provoked Mill, who had never been to India and had no acquaintance with its languages, into writing on its history. Why, when he had ostensibly set out to deal with British India, did he dwell in such detail on Hindu and Muslim civilization, and how did he come to make such a sweeping condemnation of their history? In a recent article in **The Cambridge Journal**, Mr.Duncan Forbes has argued that Mill wrote his **History** to propagate the doctrine of his friend and master, Jeremy Bentham; that it served his purpose to describe a despotically ruled Indian people dominated by caste, privilege, and religion, as then and always barbarous; that in the process he elaborated his own `scientific' sociology and with it fashioned a `scientific' instrument for the legislator in India. He concludes that Mill, who was beginning to write in the year 1806, at a time when a direct assault on Church and State in England was impossible, found a convenient way, in this attack on Hinduism, of undermining these institutions in England[2].

This argument, sound though it may be, by no means gives us a full explanation of why the **History** was written[3] Mills History is much wider in conception than this interpretation allows, as I think we can soon establish if we turn to Mill's own preface; of which his son, John Stuart, said: `It gives a picture, which may be entirely depended upon, of, the sentiments and expectation with which he wrote the **History**'. Mill tells us that in his study of British history he was surprised to find that "the knowledge requisite for attaining an adequate conception of that great Indian scene of British action was collected nowhere". This was certainly all the more surprising because, for twenty years past, India had been one of the most controversial subjects of English politics, and in that period nothing more dramatic had occurred in London, for example, than the impeachment of Hastings. The materials, in the form of parliamentary reports, lay readily to hand, as yet undigested.

Mill's motives in writing on India were complex, but uppermost was his desire to apply utilitarian doctrines in governing British India. As Halevy suggests, Bentham's reference to India in his **Treatise on the Influence of Time and Place in Legislation** had interested Mill, and in the ***History*** he states that he intended "to provide for British India, in the room of the abominable existing system, a good system of judicial procedure", but whereas Bentham was interested in finding out whether and how far his principles could be applied in India, Mill was bent on proving that they could be, and in the process designed a ladder or scale of civilization to simplify the legislator's task of prescribing for each society on each particular rung. `To ascertain', he said, `the

[2] `James Mill and India' October 1951

[3] For example, Mill's great predecessors, Hume, Robertson, and Gibbon had shown that History could make money. There is also evidence to suggest that Mill had his eye on a post at India House

true state of the Hindus in the scale of civilization....is to the people of Great Britain....an object of the highest practical importance.' But by what tests was this state to be judged? `Exactly in proportion as **Utility** is the object of every pursuit, may we regard a nation as civilized'.[4]

By this assessment, contemporary as well as ancient India, whether in science, religion, government, law or political economy, was barbarous. But Sir William Jones and his fellow Sanskritists had meanwhile been arguing that the early Hindus had reached a high degree of civilization. Mill denied this, partly because, he said, the term civilisation was by Jones, as by most men.....attached to no fixed and definite assemblage of ideas, partly because he had no difficulty in finding evidence to suit his purpose. While the scholars who agreed with Jones, like Colebrook and Wilkins and Prinsep, had been slow in producing results, other more superficial and often prejudiced interpreters, and not only missionaries and evangelicals, had been quick and prolific in publication.

Mill chose to rely, for example, on the evidence of Robert Orme, whose accounts of India were written early and not intended for publication; on Buchanan, who had tried and failed to learn Sanskrit and was prejudiced against Indians; on Tennant, a most superficial observer; and on Tytler, who was very young and had seen Indian society through the refractive medium of the criminal law courts. Once committed to this view that Indian society was barbarous, Mill was highly selective in his use of evidence. The testimony of Dubois the Missionary, of Tytler and others, is cited when hostile to the Hindus, ignored when it is favourable; and them massive evidence on the character of Indians, collected in the parliamentary investigation of 1813, on the whole favourable to them went unnoticed. In his Preface, Mill had gone to great pains and shown great ingenuity in defending himself against the criticism that he had never been to India and knew nothing of its languages - arguments now-a-days that will convince no one. If had visited the country he would probably have gained just that experience through which to distinguish clearly between reliable and unrealiable witnesses. As it was he could not judge that evidence which lay beyond his experience, and he commonly attached the greatest weight to the writers who are least entitled to confidence. In this manner he constructed a damning indictment of Indian society and then went on to prescribe on a revolutionary curve to be achieved through the application of government and law on utilitarian principles.

Mill's **History**, once published, held the field unchallenged for twenty-five years, being reprinted in 1820, 1826 and 1840. Then a modest competitor appeared, in Mount Stuart Elphinstone's ***History of Hindu and Muhammadan India***, taking a more favourable view of Indian society; but it covered only part of the subject, and was much less impressive, more cautious in approach and manner, much less exciting to read, and, in any event, soon afterwards, in 1848, Hayman Wilson, the leading Orientalist of the day, produced an other edition of Mill, with elaborate footnotes and an extension of the

[4] Mill in fact accepted the Rationalist's assumption that progress could be taken for granted, and also the Scottish Sociological school's arguments based on an assumed uniformity of human nature.

story from 1805 to 1834, that is, down to the day when the Company became wholly a political body. Mill was thus given a new lease of life, so that his **History** in effect over the whole middle range of the nineteenth century provided the main basis for British thought on the character of Indian civilisation and on the way to govern Indians. What then, was the place of Elphinstone and Hayman Wilson?

In this first phase of empire we have seen three schools of thought competing to control the attitude and policy of Britain towards India. First, those like Hastings and Jones, joined later by Elphinstone, Munro and Malcolm, who not only knew India and something of its languages and peoples, but also showed a romantic, sympathetic understanding of their problems, Indians, they agreed, would have to undergo change, but slowly, with deference to their own institutions and not on speculative principles Secondly, the evangelicals like Shore and Grant, both backed by and backing the missionaries. And thirdly, the rationalists represented by Mill, the last two groups finding much in common in their condemnation of Hinduism and, to a lesser extent, Mohammedanism. The evangelicals sought to change India mainly through education, the rationalists put their emphasis on government and law. The happiness, not the liberty, of Indians was the end in view. Mill had produced in his history a justification for the policy of the rationalists; Grant had written his **Observations**; now Elphinstone tried to redress the balance by writing and encouraging others to write histories worthy of the romantic school.

As administrator and scholar, Elphinstone gave his life to India. Sent out as a boy of sixteen, and naturally wild and gay, he had every inducement, like the notorious Willam Hickey, to become a rake. But, deliberately taking himself in hand, he sublimated this wildness infield sports, and consciously sought to become a scholar-administrator. The range of his reading, to judge by his diary alone, was vast; in the first months of 1805 - when he was twenty--six, and resident at Nagpur in the thick of the Maratha struggles- he mentions the **Iliad**, which he had just finished; the **Electra** of Sohocles; **Philoctetes**; he was fagging away at Greek, reading **Oedipus Tyrannus, Alcestis**, diverging to **Tyrtaeus** and some of the elegiac poets. Then he applied himself to a course of Greek History, beginning with Thucydides, Xenophon, and the orations of Demosthenes. There is mention casually of Cobbett, Petrarch, and Walter Scott's newly published **Lay of the Last Minstrel**, and novels innumerable.

He sustained this manner of life until, in 1827, at the age of forty eight, he chose to retire from the Bombay governorship. He refused all honours and all further employment, whether the governor generalship of India, the under-secretaryship of the Board of Control, or an important mission to Canada. He was still bent on becoming the complete scholar, and took up his Greek again. All along Elphinstone has been deeply interested in History. Thucydides was his bedside companion. He had inspired others of his own way of thinking to write history. In 1816, given the time he would have started on a history of the Maratha peoples of western India; instead he stimulated his assistant at Poona, Captain Grant Duff, into doing it, handing over to him the Peshwa's state papers and correspondence, and in 1825 Grant Duffs two-volume work ***A History of the Mahrattas*** appeared. It is a straightforward, sympathetic account, invaluable in that it is based on material that has long since disappeared; a classic account though never, in

fact, much read. The first publisher he went to told him he would publish if the title were altered, `I said,"It is the history of the Mahrattas and only of the Mahrattas". '

`Who knows anything about the Mahrattas?' `That's the reason the book has been written-no one does.'

`Well,and who cares to know? If you call it ***The Downfall of the Moguls and the Rise of the English*** or something of that kind, it may do, but ***A history of the Mahrattas*** - that will never sell'.

So Grant Duff took his manuscript to another publisher and had it published at his own expense. Also among Elphinstone's disciples were William Erskine, one of his Bombay officials, who completed a translation of the ***Memoirs of Babur,*** the first Mogul Emperor, and Captain James Tod, who between 1812 and 1823 collected into three rich volumes *The Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, this being the first serious attempt to investigate the beliefs of the Indian peasantry, trying to do for them what the Sanskritist was doing for the Brahmins. Walter Scott particularly expressed delight in Tod's Rajasthan, and in the early writing of Elphinstone and of his colleague, John Malcolm, appreciating perhaps not only `the shepherd state' of the societies they described but also their interpretation of them.

All along, Elphinstone had been uneasy about Mill's *History of India*, uneasy because it was in his view masterly, yet misguided, setting out to revolutionise India on abstract principles, the converse of his own empirical methods in attempting to reorganize the defeated Maratha peoples. With characteristic under-emphasis, after reading it when it first appeared, he said: `The ingenious, original, and elaborate work of Mr. Mill left some room for doubt and discussion'. Moreover and here he really begins to knock the props away - `the excellence of histories derived from European researchers alone does not entirely set aside the utility of similar enquiries conducted under the guidance of impressions received in India; which, as they arise from a separate source, may sometimes lead to different conclusions.' In retirement he became increasingly critical of Mill - `the offensive thing...is the cynical, sarcastic tone', he was uncandid `in the native part' (that is, the Hindu and Mohammedan part); `as the disciple of a school of philosophy advancing new opinions, Mill was obliged to resort to argument to establish his principles and destroy those offered to him.'

Elphinstone had sent for and eagerly read Bentham's writings but he had concluded that human experience was too vast and rich to be comprehended by Benthamism. He once told Malcolm, his friend and successor in Bombay: `You will not know what difficulty is until you come...to reconcile Maratha custom with Jeremy Bentham.'[5] But Elphinstone was above all a modest man; he had seen the need to combat Mill and did not feel equal to it, or to the subject. To his friend, William Erskine, he confided that `to write India's early and medieval history would require great knowledge, and a very philosophical and reflecting mind. If suitably executed it would be a most important work. The subject of India, he said, might be unimportant to European readers and `it

[5] I am indebted for this apt quotation to Dr.K.A.Ballhatchet.

must therefore, be made up by connecting it with the general history of the species: and this requires a thorough knowledge of the principles of human action. The style also must be condensed and animated, and the reflections striking and profound.'

Encouraged by Erskine and others, and driven by a sense of duty, he forced himself to begin in June 1834, concentrating on the Hindu and Mohammedan histories. But in 1836 he again lost confidence and put the manuscript away- `The whole seems common place and what...might easily be produced by any ordinary workman'. But, prodded again by his friends, he went back to it and in 1841 this part of the book was published. He then turned to the British conquest, which, he said had already been `well digested by Mill' and therefore needed only `an agreeable form, which requires imagination and eloquence'. But he had already confessed that in the matter of style he did not feel equal even to Mill, and in truth he found writing difficult.

At this point he happended to read in **The Edinburgh Review** Macaulay's essay on Clive, which took the form of a review of Malcolm's **Life of Clive**. Macaulay begins by wondering why English readers are not interested in the conquest of India. `This subject, is, to most readers,' he says,`not only insipid, but positively distasteful. Perhaps the fault lies partly with the historians.' And now that he himself had been to India, we note that he has modified his view of Mill- Mr. Mill's book, though it has undoubtedly great and rare merit, it is not sufficiently animated and picturesque to attract those who read for amusement.' In his essays on Clive and Hastings, Macaulay had therefore deliberately set out to make good this deficiency. For Elphinstone this was the end; he already felt inferior to Mill, and now unable to compete with Macaulay's fireworks. *His History of British Power in the East*, which had got as far as Hastings' Governor Generalship, was therefore put aside, never to be finished.

On British India, then he had failed to replace, Mill, and this failure was signalized by the appearance of Hayman Wilson's edition of Mill. Although Wilson, who was a Sanskritist, differed radically from Mill's interpretation of Hindu civilisation (and indeed exposed it), he yet chose to do this in the form of foot notes, leaving Mill's text as it stood. It is incredible that he should not have chosen to write a new history altogether, but possibly his training as a Sanskritist, which had accustomed him to the method of interpreting a text in this way, had something to do with his choice. On British problems in governing India, then, Mill and Wilson remained the standard work; and new editions appeared in 1848 and again at the time of the Mutiny and on the assumption of Indian government by the Crown.

On the Hindu and Mohammedan parts Elphinstone was a competitor but not, I think, a powerful competitor. It is true that his account was informed by personal observation and based on chronicles provided by his friend, Erskine, and that in the year of its publication it came into use at Haileybury College, where the East Indian Civil Service cadets were trained. But Elphinstone was too diffident, too cautious; his criticism of Mill was implied, never open, his attack always oblique. So, to Mill's sweeping judgements on the Hindus he offers:

...Our writers confound the distinctions of time and place;

`Ten different civilised nations are found within India they combine in one character the Maratha and the Bengali...Those who have known the Indians longest have always the best opinion of them....It is more to the point that all persons who have retired from India think better of the people they have left after comparing them with others even of the most justly admired nations. These considerations should make us distrust our own impressions, when unfavourable, but cannot blind us to the fact that the Hindus have in reality some great defects of character.'

This is typical of his matter and method. His work is so scrupulous that it lacks the intensity of spirit and the animation of personality which alone can transform historical composition into historical literature. He had set out to make as short a history as Mill, ` more full in facts and free from disputes and dissertations'[6]. He uses the adjective `romantic' to describe this schools of middle nineteenth-century British historians - most prominent among whom was Thomas Arnold. Elphinstone's work has close affinity with their work. They diverge basically from the Utilitarians in the nature of their conception of development in their psychological theory, and represent a revolt against Utilitarian thinking. As Mr.Forbes has shown, progress for them was not an unquestioned assumption.) But with Mill holding the field and saying what he had said, and in the way he had said it, the hour called for `disputes and dissertations'.

But in 1857 the Mutiny occurred, accompanied by acute racial bitterness, and culminating in what was termed `the British reconquest of India'. These events tended to reinforce the lines of thought on Indian civilization drawn by Mill rather than those suggested by Elphinstone. Writing in 1844, Hayman Wilson had asserted that Mill's **History** was exercising a deep formative influence on British policy and practice in India. Wilson himself had served in Bengal for a quarter of a century, and after his return acted for many years as oral examiner of the Indian Civil Service cadets at Haileybury College, so we may give emphasis to his statement:

`In the effects which Mill's **History** is likely to exercise upon the connection between the people of England and the people of India.....its tendency is evil: it is calculated to destroy all sympathy between the ruler and the ruled; to preoccupy the minds of those who issue annually from Great Britain to monopolise the posts of honour and power in Hindustan, with an unfounded aversion towards those over whom they exercise that power. ...There is reason to fear that these consequences are not imaginary, and that a harsh and illiberal spirit has of late years prevailed in the conduct and councils of the rising service in India which owes its origin to impressions imbibed in early life from the *History* of Mr. Mill'.

Wilson may well have had in mind the ill effects of over-centralization under the Charter Act of 1833, the severity of land revenue policy under Holt Mackenzie, or under Pringle in the Bombay Deccan on principles laid down by Mill, or the land settlement of Bird and Thomason in the North West Provinces, described as 'a fearful experiment ... calculated so as to flatten the whole surface of society', which no doubt was partly

[6] Since writing the above I have seen Mr. Duncan Forbes' study of ***The Liberal Anglican Idea of History.***

responsible for the Mutiny. In 1844, too, the Government declared that candidates qualified by a knowledge of English would be given prefernce in the pubic service, and other measures removed the traditional protection given to Indian religious ceremonies. The Company's administration was becoming heavy-handed and its domestic policy forcible.

Mill's *History* was an established textbook at Haileybury College, where, from 1809 to 1855, the Company's Civil Service cadets were trained, and where a succession of eminent utilitarians or close sympathizers held senior teaching posts; Malthus, Empson, James Mackintosh, and later the celebrated Sir James Stephen. Holt Mackenzie, Pringle, and Thomason went to Haileybury, and also Henry Elliot, the very first `competition wallah', who did more than anyone else to perpetuate the Mill tradition in writing on Indian history. Elliot (who rose to be chief secretary in the government of India's Foreign Department) learnt Persian and devoted all his spare time to collecting the chronicles of the Indian Muslim annalists of the Muslim and Mughal empires of the eleventh to seventeenth centuries, which he duly catalogued and classified; with the help of John Dowson (formerly a tutor at Haileybury and later Professor of Hindustani at University College, London) and others, selections from these chronicles were translated and published between 1867 and 1877 in eight large volumes. Since then, the story of Muhammadan rule in India has been largely written from them: including Sir Wolseley Haig's important third and (in part) fourth volumes of *The Cambridge History of India*, published in 1928 and 1937, and still accepted as the standard British work. Elliot poured as great scorn on Muhammadan government in India as Mill had done on the Hindu; in the process pushing into the background the more sober, more sympathetic, and objective interpretation of Elphinstone.

Not that Elliot wrote a formal history, but if he had, I think we can tell from his preface and selection of material what line it would have taken.[7] He strikes a note which was to be caught by John Strachey in the field of administration, by Fitzjames Stephen in law and political thought, by Kipling in literature, by Sir John Seeley in history, and by Curzon in government. They were all agreed that the happiness of the governed which might be ensured by strong executive government; and the rule of law was more important than self-government their influence overbore Macaulay's and John Stuart Mill's attempts to liberalize the utilitarian views of James Mill and also Ripon's experiment in training Indians for self-government.

The British administration had moved into a phase of imperial dogmatism and complacency about its achievement in India. Sir William Wilson Hunter, one of the most famous of Indian civilians, who in the eighteen-eighties organized the great **Imperial Gazetteer of India**, including a volume on history, and followed it up with a **History of British India**, put this question to a friend; 'Can we ever conciliate India?' This was the vital question to which the ablest administrators deliberately answered `No' in the India of the Company. It remains the vital question to which we deliberately answer`Yes' in the India of the Queen. As a matter of fact, he concludes triumphantly:`The task of

[7] Dr.P.Hardy has drawn my attention to Elliot's most revealing preface to his ***History of India as told by its own historians***.

conciliation has been accomplished". This was in 1891, on the eve of the swaraj, or freedom movement. Others, less eminent, answered differently. There was Digby, whose study called *Prosperous British India* asserting that Britain was unfairly exploiting India, draining her of wealth, set off a controversy that is not yet closed.

There were, too, Octavian Hume, Wedderburn, and Cotton, who chose to put their emphasis rather on the British need to satisfy the new Indian middle class. With the growth of this class, preoccupied with politics, a new audience with a passionate and vested interest in Indian history had appeared; an audience which exaggerated India's ancient glories and present miseries, in demanding a more sympathetic interpretation of their own history. In an attempt to meet them, new editions of Elphinstone's work were brought out in 1905 and 1911, the preface stating that they were intended for Indian university students.

But by this time the researches of innumerable persons, members of the Asiatic societies, Sanskritists, Persian scholars, not least the contribution of the archaeologists and numismatists, had rendered Elphinstone's work hopelessly out of date, and had carried the range of Indian historical studies beyond the reach of any one man; but the evident need for text-book summaries persuaded Vincent Smith, whore retired from the Indian Civil Service in 1900 and was teaching Indian History at Dublin, to write, in 1904, the first general and authoritative history of early India in English, and seven years later to put together in one volume his own researches on early India with those of Elliot and Elphinstone and others on Muslim India, and those of Mill, Wilson, Hunter, and others on the British period.

It had, in fact, taken a century of British paramountcy to produce an adequate text-book on the history of India. Smith wrote at the close of the Curzon era and at the start of the transition to Indian self-government and his work forms an important bridge in our story. In his desire to write on the early and medieval history of India, and in his sympathetic treatment of Indian civilisation, he links up with Elphinstone; but some of his fundamental assumptions revealing differing views. When describing the disturbed condition of India in the seventh century, after the death of the emperor Harsha, he cannot help commenting that from this description the reader will gain a notion of what India always has been when released from the control of a superior authority, and what she would be again if the hands of the benevolent despotism, which now holds her in its iron grasp, should be withdrawn'. In his outline history, `which' he says, `was designed to preserve due proportion throughout', he can find no more suitable place at which to bring to an end a story of over 2,000 years than `the memorable visit of Their Imperial Majesties to India at the close of 1911.'

It was almost impossible to write in such a way as to satisfy both the Indian nationalists and the Indian Civil Service. Each side claimed that it, and it alone, represented the masses, and in this conflict, and in a genuine doubt on British ways and purposes in India, much of the zest, the frankness, and interest passes out of British historical writing on India. When, as in the nineteenth century, no one thought of any public but a British one, criticism was lively and positive judgement was passed without regard to political exigencies. In the twentieth century most of those who have written

have been haunted by the question: `will what I say in this difficult period of transition make for easier and quieter government?' This awareness of an eavesdropping Indian public has exercised a constant, silent censorship, seeming to make some writers like the late Professor Dodwell, for example, appear unsympathetic to Indian political aspirations, and others, like Edward Thompson, merely sentimental about them.

But for the greater part, this silent censorship has had the effect of reinforcing those trends in British historical writing on India were created by Mill and Elliot, in a word, to focus attention on what the British were doing in India, in government, law and administration and to ignore what was happening to Indian society, and nowhere is this more clearly to be seen than in the *Cambridge History of India*, the standard and by far the most solid work of British historical scholarship on India, five volumes of which were published between 1922 and 1937. This co-operative history bears the mark of the period in which it was written and the legacy of this dominant tradition of which I have been speaking.

The two volumes on the Mohamedan empires, edited and substantially written by Sir Wolseley Haig, are built on Elliot's researches, representing a chronicle of chronicles and a chronicle of emperors. Government and the army are prominently displayed, but society, whether Muslim or Hindu, is conspicuous by its absence. The general tone is cool and occasionally contemptuous. The two volumes on India under the British give overwhelming attention to problems political and diplomatic, and especially in the last volume, to questions of British central and district administration; no doubt valuable in themselves, but throwing the work as a whole sadly out of balance. The social and economic development of the country, and the evolution of the Indian peoples, is treated as secondary; and, for instance, Bankim Chandra Chatterji, the protagonist of Bengali Hindu nationalism, is not even mentioned. In these volumes the tradition of Elliot, Mill, and Fitzjames Stephen is manifest. But volume one, on ancient India, edited by Rapson the Sanskritist, stands apart. Unlike the other volumes, which were largely written by professional historians and members of the Indian Civil Service, it was written by Orientalists. Perhaps because of this, it evokes the spirit of William Jones and Elphinstone, describing sympathetically a whole civilization, equally as concerned with society as with government. Unlike the other volumes, it with stands the impact of the Act of Independence of 1947.

2.REAL SELF GOVERNMENT FOR

By W.A. Hirst
Sometime Principal, Gujerat College, Ahmedabad
India Office No. P/T. 3380 Watts & Co,. London, 1933 6d. (3374-3384) pp.31

Preface:

Brief account of this scheme for reviving the Indian Village Panchayats have been contributed by me to the `Empire Review' and the `Spectator' but nothing has been reproduced from these articles.

My object is to propose a system of rural self government for India in opposition to the hybrid scheme which is now before the public. All acknowledge that our present policy of abdication (if unhappily it should be carried into effect) will plunge India into bloodshed and anarchy.

Let us stand upon the ancient ways and give the village a chance.
October 6, 1933.

pp.14.

"We have the natural materials for building up a stable self-governing State, and we have perversely chosen to introduce an alien force which has ever acted as a dissolvent in the East, and always will do so.

....The plain fact is that all parliamentary constitution are malignant poisons in the East -a drug that doth work like madness in the brain.

pp.13.

Morley in Parliament: "If it could be said that what I propose would lead directly upto the establishment of a Parliamentary system in India, I, for one, would have nothing at all to do with it.

pp.15.

A third truth, disregarded but implicit in the two afore-stated, is that the village panchayats would give India local self government which would maintain instead of impairing its welfare.....It was an unhappy circumstance that, during the process of the consolidation of our rule more than a hundred years ago, Oriental institutions were regarded as by nature inferior to Western and the conscientious, energetic civilians, who laboured to repair the ravages of many decades of war and confusion, reported that the various practices and institutions which they found were an obstacle to progress, and they hastened to replace them by something better. In most cases, however excellent in themselves the new methods might have been, they were less suitable. But

there was then dominant the theory of the perfectibility of the human race by means of laws and institutions, the new broom of the reformer had fullsway.

pp.16. In some aspects this prepossession-the fruits of Bentham's triumph - was very unfavourable to the remaking of India; the belief that it was necessary to reform and abolish antiquarian rubbish.. Instead of Oxford and Cambridge, the Indian Universities were modelled on London, and this has hampered us from the first and is partly responsible for the creation of a hybrid and discontented clan - the class for which it is proposed to sacrifice the whole of India.....the worst of all though least noted, was the suppression of local self government. The panchayats were allowed to decay

p.17. Sir F.Lely struck the keynote in remarking to a witness *(D.Com):(Centralisation)* "In an attempt to get the people govern themselves, in passing over the village and beginning at the towns, have we not made a false step?". The witness was inclined to agree with him.

pp.22 "The best of the Mohammeddan, Mahratta and Karnatic rulers, the best of the Dravidian chiefs of the South, the feudatory sovereign or the territorial magnates of upper India, did all they could to uphold the strength and prestige of the autonomy of the village community and the authority of the village "panch". The worst of them refrained from interfering with it in any manner."
(The Future Government of India - K.Vyasa Rao pp.21.)

pp.24 Here, then, was, and to some extent still is, a valuable system of self government. But alas! the British administration has a black record in that respect. The officers found as they thought, and in Elphinstone's words, a system "not compatible with a very good form of government", and so determined to replace it with something better. Then the village headman was subordinated to the Taluk or Patel, or other minor official, and the various powers of the panchayat rapidly decayed.

pp.28. India has been the prey of theorists and megalomaniacs. Ignorant theorists come from the West and attempt to force upon the country various political institutions whose only effect is to disturb and disintegrate, Many of those who ought to have knowledge of India, who ought to be in touch with the people, have piled up Secretariats at Simla or Delhi, establishing castles of ignorance, where the denizens can never learn the manifold lessons which are necessary to the management of these hundred and fifty millions of people,...

3.RURAL LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN SWEDEN, ITALY AND INDIA

H.Zink A.Wahlstrand-F.Benevent -R.Bhaskaran T16880 International Political Science Association Stevens 1957.

Study with an idea to determine role in land reforms. good para by Bhaskaran on graft on page 130-1. Historical summing up on India page 19-24.

Pages 19-20: "In fact, the British administrators hold that the old Indian communities were constituted on a narrow basis of hereditary privilege or caste, closely restricted in the scope of their duties -collection of revenue and protection of life and property were their main functions-and were neither conscious instruments of political education nor important parts of the administrative system".

Under the British, collection of revenue and protection of life and property became the business of an organised and country wide bureaucracy which also undertook the responsibility for communication, public works, health and education. There was nothing left to local initiative or enterprise. The rural local communities languished; .....

Pages 22-23: "(after 1919) There was a great extension of democracy and a sincere desire to extend the services of the local bodies to the public as well as to turn over to local bodies much of there responsibility for major roads, education and pubic health. But the bitter political struggle which gripped the nation, the persistence of communalism and faction, the rise and dominance of party bosses in local bodies, the lack of experience and administrative incompetence among the officials employed by the local bodies, these factors prevented again the smoother progress of local government.

....."Again democratic provincial governments were compelled by experience to supercede, dissolve or abolish local boards, diminish their function and tighten the inspection over them. The general political and economic condition of the country detoriorated after 1930. Local government could receive no attention in the final period of political struggle in the country, local bodies being under the control of political parties more intent on national freedom than local problems"

4. A STUDY OF PANCHAYAT IN MADRAS

- K.Jayaraman. (Spl. Pan. Officer, Govt. of Madras) I.S. Ag Ec, Bombay - 1947. pp.157 [V.2338-I.O.Number] (approved by Madras Government)

N. Gopalaswamy Ayyangar - (former Registrar-General) in Introduction "It (blame) should rather be traced to the narrow vision of already established Government departments and the mishandling of this vital village institution by means of those who have, for the last quarter of a century, been engaged in public affairs". "Village faction is no doubt there, but the surest method of eliminating it is to give villagers of different factions, based upon community, religion and personal spite, the opportunity of coming together for devising measures for the betterment of every individual in the village. The organisation for the provision of these opportunities has not either been there or as been tackled with an amount of suspicion and lack of confidence which it did not deserve.....Like all institutions of the kind, there will be continuous need for direction, guidance and supervision from above for these institutions not only to help in ordering their proper development but in the prompt weeding out of undesirable personalities and influences which militate against their success."

Chapter I -Village Assemblies in Ancient South India

pp.1-17 page 15. The decline of the village organisation seems to have begun during the Mussulmen invasion of the earlier part of the 14th century.... But the ancient community spirit does not seem to have disappeared altogether in spite of these changes, for even as late as the 18th century we hear of an instance of a village meeting to consider the case of desecrating a village temple "in which people of all castes - from the Brahmins to the Pariah - took part".

"At the beginning of the 19th century however, the village communities were getting disintegrated even in those parts of the country where they still retained their original form, and the various economic and administrative changes introduced by the British rule hastened the decay of these institutions. It was the inevitable result of the establishment of order by Government, internal tranquility and suppression of external aggression, and the growth of the means of communication that the relation of the village was broken and the villagers brought into more direct and intimate contact with the State."

5.THE ASIATIC MODE OF PRODUCTION, Science and Politics

Edited by Anne M. Bailey and Josep R.Llobera
(ROUTLEDGE & KEGAN PAUL, 1981 London, Boston and Henely)
pp 34-37, 44-5 Part I (eds) p 13-45

Marx's ethnological research and his correspondence on the Russian mir (47)

In the last years of his life Marx returned to his interest in precapitalist societies, this time devoting himself to a more concrete study of these societies rather than attempting to relate them to the categories of the capitalist mode of production. In reading Morgan and Kovalevsky he began to see communal systems as a set of variants. In his critical appraisal of Maine and Phear he returned to India as the laboratory for the study of the dissolution of communal forms.

In his critical notes on Maine, Marx reproaches Maine's critique of John Austin's theory of sovereignity. (48) Maine had failed to distinguish between government, society, and the state. The state, in all its forms, appears at a certain stage of social evolution, once there has been a process of individuation from the communal bonds of the group. These `individualities' or interests are themselves class interests: `hence this individuality is itself class, etc., individuality, and these interests all have, in the last analysis, economic conditions at the basis. On these bases the state is built and presupposes them' (Krader, 1972, P.329).

Thus the development of the state and the various forms it has taken cannot be understood as a sequence of juridical forms but must be related to the relations of production. In the development of the AMP, as seen in the Indian `laboratory', it is not the direct producer of the village community who is freed from the communal bonds, rather:

> The individuality that is torn free is that of the consumers of the surplus product, these are members of the ruling class, the sovereign, clients, his retainers, the countries, the wealthy in the rural life, and money-lenders, usurers, zamindars (Krader, 1975,p.224)

Despite Marx's opposition to Maine's general theory of the development of the state out of the patriarchal family, Marx found in Maine confirmation for his own view of the self-sustaining characteristics of village communities.

Marx criticized both Phear and Kovalevsky for the suggestion that feudal relations of production were to be found in India. Kovalevsky had based his argument on the existence of the ikta in India, land grants for military service rendered. Marx pointed out that such benefices were not uniquely feudal, but had existed in ancient Rome as well. Furthermore, the form of social labour in India could not be characterized as serfdom; in

India land could only be alienated through the consent of the village community; and finally, in contrast to Europe, the ruler or superior lord had no claim over the administration of justice on the domain of his vassal, whereas in India the sovereign had direct control over his tax-collecting / policing agents(Levitt, 1978).

In the midst of his ethonological research, Marx was called upon to relate his work on the village commune to the prospects of achieving socialism on the basis of pre-capitalist relations of production. In November 1877, he had written a letter to the editorial board of `Otechestvenniye Zapiski', contesting the idea that his theory of the development of the capitalist mode of production in Western Europe was `an historico-philosophic theory of the general path that every people is fated to tread' (Marx and Engels, 1965, p.313). From his own researches Marx felt that Russia since the mid-nineteenth century was tending towards becoming a capitalist nation.

In 1881, Marx was called upon to predict the fate of Russia. Was the complete development of capitalism in Russia a necessary stage to the ultimate creation of socialism or did the remaining institutions of the Russian commune provide a basis for socialism? In his reply to U. Zazulich, Marx affirms that such a possibility of the development of socialism existed, not just because of the survival of these pre-capitalist relations, but because their survival was contemporaneous with developed capitalism in Western Europe, by which Russia had not been enslaved as is the case in the East Indies. This path would entail eliminating the private property which had developed within the mir and incorporating the positive developments (technology) of capitalism. The Russian commune, in which arable land was privately owned and pastures, forests, etc. were held in common, is seen by Marx as the most recent form of the agricultural commune. Whereas in the more archaic forms the individual was bound through kinship to the commune, the more evolved mir was an association of individuals.

Marx's ethnological researches and his correspondence on the Russian commune today constitute evidence of Marx's interest in the development of non-Western societies per se, his critical appreciation of leading ethnologists of his day. These writings reaffirm his method expounded in the `Grundrisse', particularly his wariness of periodization focusing on a specific element abstracted from the totality.

Engel's `Anti-Duhring' (1878) and articles on Russia (1875, 1894)

Engle's `Herrn Eugen Duhrings Ummalzung der Wissenschaft' is a polemical work aimed at refuting Duhring's force theory of history, wherein major changes in the history of human society were attributed to warfare and conquest, Oriental societies, with a history of numerous conquests but relatively stable base, constituted a good counter-example to Duhring's theory. Engels noted that the age-old village communities of India had evolved from tribal communal property to the parcellation of land and (36) differences of wealth among the population; these changes had come about through intercourse with the outside: exchange had resulted in unequal distribution within the communities which in turn had led to the parcellation of land and the creation of small and large property holders. Such changes had not been effected

by the conquerors; and members of these village communities had had little contact. Economic processes rather than political events were at the basis of the change that had occurred within these communities.

In arguing specifically against the force theory of the development of the state, Engels postulated a two-stage development of the state; it first arose out of functions necessary to, and serving, the common interest (generally protection, and in the Orient the necessity or irrigation-works). Once in existence, the state developed into a repressive force serving the interests of the ruling class. For Engels, oriental despotism was the most primitive form of the state since it rested on the most elementary form of rent, rent in labour.

In Engels's `The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State' (1884), composed on the basis of Marx's notes on Morgan and Engels's own reading on communal institutions in Europe, oriental despotism is not considered.

Whereas in `Anti-Duhring' Engels had focused on the historical civilized period, he now projected his analysis back to the pre-historic condition of man. His method is more chronological or historical, setting out a linear typology of forms, from simple to complex. The basis of the topology is a common end point, which is defined by a particular element, a strong centralized government. The state and its origins in Asia do not enter into Engels's evolutionary scheme which is centred on the development of the Mediterranean and Europe using Morgan's ideas on American Indians in his recreation of early developments.

Engels also entered the debate on the Russian commune. The Russian commune was a more evolved form of communal property than that found in India; within the commune there were already significant differences of wealth. From all indications it was leading towards complete dissolution into private property. Furthermore, the isolation of these communities and the narrowness of the members' outlook hardly provided the foundation for a transition to socialism:

> Such a complete isolation of the individual communities from one another, which creates throughout the country similar, but the very opposite of common, interests, is the natural basis for ***oriental despotism***, and from India to Russia this form of society, wherever it prevailed, has always produced it and always found its complement in it(Marx and Engels, 1969, p.394)

Whatever vestiges of communal labour that remained in Russia could provide a partial basis for the construction of socialism in Russia, but:

A victory of the West-European proletariat over the bourgeois: and the consequent substitution of a socially managed economy for capitalist production - there is the necessary precondition for the raising of the Russian Community to the same stage of development (ibid.,p.402)

---

47. `The Ethnological Notebooks', ed. L.Krader (1972), contain Marx's notes and comments on L.H.Morgan, `Ancient Society' (1877), Sir John Phear, `The Aryan Village in India and Ceylon' (1880), Sir Henry Maine, `Lectures on the Early History of Institutions'(1875) and Sir John Lubbock, `The Origin of Civilization' (1879). Marx's notes and comments on M.M.Kovalevsky, `Obscinnoe Zemlevladenie' (1879) (Communal possession of land) are found in L.Krader, 1975, pp.343-412. Marx's letter to the Editorial Board of `Otechesvenniye Zapiski (November 1877) was first published by the populists in 1886 (Marx and Engels, 1965, pp.311-13). Marx's letter to Vera Zasulich (8 March 1881) was first published by B.Nikolaevesky in 1924. The three drafts of the letter are reprinted in CERM (1970).

48. John Austin, `The province of Jurisprudence Determined' (1832).

6. LETTER AND EDITORIAL FROM THE "TIMES" 1878

1) From the Times, Friday, January 4, 1878: Letter dated December 31 from J.F.Stephen, 4, Paper-buildings, Temple. - 3 3/4 columns. (extracts, about half omitted)

2) From the Editorial of "The Times, Friday, January 4, 1878" (last para omitted).

1. From the Times, Friday, January 4, 1878: Letter dated December 31 from J.F.Stephen, 4, Paper-buildings, Temple.

...Mr. Bright's view is that our power is founded on "ambition, crime, and conquest," which I take it means that ambition and conquest are crimes. We are to regulate our policy with a view to our departure from the country, and to try to win the preises of our sons by "trying to make amends for the original crime" of our fathers. The temper which dictated these expressions is seen in a string of sneers at all that has been and is being done in India, and at the men who have done and are doing it. England "passed through a great humiliation" at the Mutiny. Mr. Bright had tried for years to show that the praises awarded to the East India Company were undeserved, and he was right, or "when the Mutiny came there was nobody to say anything for the Company and that famous old institution tumbled over at once, having not a friend or a single element of power left in it." The present rulers of the country, at home and abroad, are, to judge from his speech, deserving of little or no respect. The Council of the Secretary of State is "cumbrous and burdensome". When a Governor-General is sent out he knows nothing whatever about the country and begins to read Mill, in order to get some elementary notions about it. He is not much better off when he gets to India. "Half-a-dozen gentlemen in Calcutta, and who spend, I believe, half the year at Simla" (a remark which if it has any meaning at all, means, so idle and self-indulgent are they) are utterly incompetent to perform their task, which is to govern "one-sixth of the population of the globe." There never was anything in the world so monstrous." As for economy, every European in India is opposed to it, except the Governor-General; "they have all an interest in patronage, promotion, salaries, and ultimately pensions." The country is on the brink of bankruptcy. Those who direct the Government care nothing about any expenditure which has any other object than their own and their friends' advantage, or the military security. "Not one of these great personages" - ie., the principal official persons in England and India- "steps forward resolutely with intelligence and force, and courage" to put a stop to famines. I do not know that I should do Mr. Bright much injustice by putting the result of all this, and more the same sort, into a few words; "Indian civilians, - Our fathers were robbers and we are receivers. At one for their original crime as well as you can by bringing up the sons of the men whom our fathers plundered to replace you as soon as possible in the management of the property which our fathers stole."

It seems to me that Mr. Bright allows his philantropy at times to make him cruelly unjust. Moreover, his hatred of military power, his fanaticism in favour of popular institutions, incapacitate him from doing justice to the Indian Empire or to the men who administer it. If our presence in the country at all is a continuation of a crime; if the

systematic maintenance of that power by military force is essentially wicked, it seems to me that nothing remains except the utterance of a mournful protest against the whole system and a declaration that all reform of it is hopeless. The process of reform implies some common ground with the institution which is to be reformed. This seemed to be Mr.Bright's own view when he refused to take the responsibility of being Secretary of State for India. He had a right to take that view, but then he ought in consistency to keep silence on the subject. It is difficult to feel respect for the conduct of a public man who utters strong opinions on great subjects, and will not act on them when he can. This consideration would destroy the value of the views of the fairest-minded man who held Mr. Bright's opinions; but I cannot truly say that Mr. Bright's speech is that of a fair-minded opponent to a great institution. It appears to me to be the speech of one who heaps on what he hates reproaches which he assumes to be true without any sufficient evidence, and which are, in fact, utterly false.

Knowledge of Indian matters is not too common in England. Mr.Bright's speech implies that the class from which the Governor-General is usually appointed is specially ignorant, and his audience cheered and laughed at his account of the newly-appointed Viceroy reading Mill. How many of them had read Mill? How many of them could answer such questions as these - Into how many Provinces is India divided, and in which of them is Delhi included? What is the difference between a division and a district? What is the relation to each other of Hindustani, Hindi, and Urdu? What was the date and what the effect of the Treaty of Bassein? How many legislative bodies are there in India, how are they constituted, and what are their powers? What is the difference between the Indian Councils Act and the Act for the better Government of India? I should like to cross-examine a few of the noisiest of Mr.Bright's audience, or, indeed, Mr.Bright himself, upon some topics of the sort. I believe that if no one had been admitted to the meeting who could not point out on a map the positions of Jubbulpore, Agra and Allahabad, the result would have given some sort of test of the real value as distinguished from the accidental force of English public opinion on Indian subjects. An ignorant laugh, or cheer, however, is a venial offence. I cannot say as much of grave mis-statements recklessly made by men of the highest public standing; and I must say that Mr. Bright's speech gives me the impression that if he had accepted the office of Secretary of State, he might have done well to read Mill, or some other common book on the subject. As it is, I fear that he (the use his own expression about the Governor-General) "knows no more than the majority of his own class of society on the question." I have marked no less than 17 passages in his speech which show either great ignorance or great inaccuracy of expression, and I will quote six by way of specimens. I referred to some in my last letter.

And now I wish to say a few words, if you will allow me, on the way in which I took at the immense problem to which Mr.Bright has turned our attention. The differences between us are far too deep to be discussed in your columns, but I should like to indicate their nature. If I thought that our power in India had originated in crime and was mainteined by brute force, it would have no interest for me. In that case I should turn my attention to other matters and leave a hopeless system to reach its natural end by its own road. I feel, however, that such a view is utterly false, and that We, the English nation, can hardly degrade ourselves more deeply than by repudiating the

achievements of our ancestors, apologizing for acts of which we ought to feel as proud as the inheritors of great names and splendid titles must feel of the deeds by which they were won, and evading like cowards and sluggards the arduous responsibilities which have devolved upon us. I say, let us acknowledge them with pride. Let us grapple with them like men. That will enable our sons to praise us for something more manly than reviling our fathers. Let them praise us, not for atoning for the misdeeds, but for following the examples of Clive and Hastings, and the two Wellesleys, and Dalhousie, and Canning, and Henry Lawrence and Havelock, and others whom I do not mention because they still live and because I have the honour to call some of them my friends. I deny that ambition and conquest are crimes; I say that ambition is the great incentive to every manly virtue, and that conquest is the process by which every great State in the world (the United States not excepted) has been built up. North America would be a hunting-ground for savages if the Puritans had not carried guns as well as Bibles, and the United States would be a memory of the past if the North, 13 years ago, had not conquered the South. I, for one, feel no shame when I think of that great competitive examination which lasted for just 100 years, and of which the first paper was set upon the field of Plassy, and the last (for the present) under the walls of Delhi and Lucknow.

Like Mr.Bright, I can speak of the East India Company as a "famous institution; " but, whether I thin of its history or of its end, I am conscious of no humiliation and I feel no disposition to sneer. It is true that 20 years ago that famous institution struck its colours. They had been displayed on many seas and on many fields of battle, and never more triumphantly than at the close of the Company's career. It is false that they were lowered under circumstances of humiliation, for the flag of England was hoisted in their place. It is false that "the Company tumbled over because it had no friend left," no life, no strength. It ceased to exist in the full pride of its strength, at the moment of its crowning triumph, by the hands, not of the mutineers who tried to throw it down, but of men who raised the Imperial Joint Stock Company to its proper place when they made it a permanent member of the Government of England. what difference is there between the institution over the fall of which Mr. Bright makes merry and the institution which has replaced it? Much the same sort of difference as there is between the Courts at Westminster as they were upto 1875 and the Supreme Court of Justice as it is now. Mr. Bright, no doubt, thought that he was pulling down a rotten institution. In fact, he was unconsciously building up an institution which had burst the mould in which it was cast. The corporation has gone, but the corporators remain. The same men continue to do the same things as of old in precisely the same spirit and under slightly different names. Any one who will study the series of Charter Acts passed in 1773, 1793, 1813, 1833, and 1861 was in substance only an administrative change in the direction of unity and simplicity, towards which every successive step manifestly tended. The Statue Book has not a syllable which indicates shame or repentance. It breathes throughout of Empire and Conquest. It was once possible to groan over the sins of the East India Company and to represent their history as something other than a part of the history of England. This is no longer possible. The Government of India is now, at all events, in form as well as in substance, a distinct, avowed part of the doings of the English nation. The institution is just as ambitious, just as much based upon conquest as it ever was; but if there is any crime in the matter, it is the crime of the nation at large and not that of a private company of merchants.

But was not the Mutiny a humiliation? Is it not humiliating for a Government to have to fight its own army? That depends on the further question, What did they fight about? To me the wonder is not that there was one mutiny, but that there was only one. What can be expected when an enormous conquest has to be made, protected, and guarded by an army of mercenaries? If we are too delicate-minded to be conquerors, let us give up our conquest and throw India back into interminable anarchy and bloodshed. If that seems at once cowardly and cruel, let us hold on to our conquest and accept and discharge its responsibilities; but we can no more be conquerors without the incidents of conquest (one of which is the possibility of insurrection and mutiny) then we can eat omelettes without breaking eggs.

But what, it will be said, is the prospect before us? Do your regard India simply as a Campus Martius in which Englishmen are to exercise the military virtues which are not called into activity at home? Are we to look forward to nothing but a series of aimless wars and a constant repression of popular disturbances, fighting still and still destroying ? If that is all, it may be a melancholy duty to stay where we are in order to keep off something worse; but is not such a state of things very nearly as bad as bad can be ? Can any humane person look with greater pride or exultation on the machinery by which such a system is maintained than would be afforded by the view of an ingenious gallows or a well-contrived apparatus for flogging garroters ? I should reply to such questions that I regard India and the task of the English in India in a very different light from this. The British Power in India is likely Vast bridge over which an enormous multitude of human beings are passing, and will (I trust) for ages to come continue to pass, from a dreary land in which brute violence in its roughest from had worked its will for centuries -a land of cruel wars, ghastly superstitions, wasting plague and famine - on their way to a country of which, not being a prophet, I will not try to dress a picture, but which is at least orderly, peaceful, and industrious, and which, for aught we can know to the contrary, may be the cradle of changes comparable to those which have formed the imperishable legacy to mankind of the Roman Empire. The bridge was not built without desperate struggles and costly sacrifices. A mere handful of our countrymen guard the entrance to it and keep order among the crowd. If it should fell, woe to those who guard it, woe to those who are on it, woe to those who would lose with it all hopes of access to a better land. Strike away either of its piers and it will fall, and what are they? One of its piers is military power; the other is justice, by which I mean a firm and constant determination on the part of the English to promote, impartially and by all lawful means, what they (the English) regard as the lasting good of the natives of India. Neither force nor justice will suffice by itself. Force without justice is the old scourge of India, Wielded by a stronger hand than of old. Justice without force is a week aspiration after an unattainable end. But so long as the masterful will, the stout heart, the active brain, the calm nerves, and the strong body which make up military force are directed to the object which make up military force are directed to the object which I have defined as constituting justice, I should have no fear, for even if we fail after doing our best we fail with honour, and if we succeed we shall have performed the greatest feat of strength, skill and courage in the whole history of the world. For my own part, I see no reason why we should fail. What remains to be done can hardly be more dangerous than what has been done already, though the

difficulties and dangers to be dealt with are more refined and less tangible. It was, perhaps, an easier matter to win the victories of 1846 and 1857 then to deal with the questions of our own day. Still we must recollect who we are and whose work we inherit. The men are still living, and in the full force of their life, who did that which neither our sons nor our grandsons will care to forget; and bearing in mind their exploits, I shall not despair of dealing successfully with the great questions as to the employment of Natives, the uncertainly and unsatisfactory character of the opium revenue, the extension of trade with due regard to the principles of political economy, and the prevention or mitigation of famine and pestilence without pauperising the population.

As I see nothing chimerical in the end, so I see nothing monstrous in the means by which it is to be attained. It is easy to talk of "half-a-dozen officials" governing a sixth of the human race, under the direction of an ignorant Viceroy, subject to a not less ignorant Secretary of State, with his cumbrous and burdensome Council. It would be equally easy and about as just to talk of England itself as being governed by a Sovereign who is a mere puppet, the strings of which are pulled first by a clumsy committee of politicians called the Cabinet, which has not even got any legal character or powers, and next by a popular assembly of 658 miscellaneous persons, who waste the greater part of whatever powers they may possess in squabbling among themselves. We all know that such a description of the Government of England would show nothing but ignorance and impudence on the part of the describer.

Mr.Bright's description of the Government of India and of the India Office in England is almost as unfair. The number of European officers is certainly small, but they are in as close contact with every class of the population in every part of the country as the agent of an Irish landlord is with his employer's tenants. Their knowledge is collected, digested, and accumulate in a way of which it is impossible to give an adequate notion to anyone who has not seen it. Their zeal and interest in the discharge of their duties are such that it gives me real pain to find Mr. Bright insinuating that their minds are set on personal objects. What pay they have, says Mr. Bright and above all what pensions. Was any service ever paid so well? Was any money ever earned to well? And, after all, what is it? How many men are at this day walking about the streets in honourable poverty and forced idleness, and who are elbowed on one side as being his inferiors by every schoolfellow moderately successful who stayed at home, and minded his own business, while they were risking life and health, and foregoing home and happiness, to earn the sneers of Mr. Bright! Bishop Milman once said to me, "I think upon the whole that the district officers are the very best men I ever knew in my life;" and Bishop Milman was not a bad judge of what constitutes a good man, and was less disposed to praise at random than almost any man I have ever known.

From various sources, of which this is the most important, an amount of knowledge upon every conceivable subject relating to india is collected and methodized at head-quarters, which enables any man fit to be a Viceroy at all to inform himself upon the subjects with which he has to deal with surprising rapidity; and, arduous and multifarious as the duties are which devolve upon him and his Council, it must be remembered that they do not do the actual hard work of Government. Their function is

to decide upon the questions which are proposed to them by their official subordinates who transact upon the spot, and in the vast majority of cases without appeal or complaint, the common routine of business. As for the manner in which the Viceroy and his Council do their share of work I will only say that there are things which it is much easier for seven men to do than for 700, and that the direction of the government of an Empire is one of them.

I have I fear, occupied your space at almost intolerable length, but the subject is one on which I speak from the fulness of my heart. I have had the privilege of being a close spectator of one of the greatest sights in the world, and I cannot bear to see the work misrepresented or those who do it undervalued.

I am, Sir, Your obedient servant,

J.F.STEPHEN

4, Paper-buildings, Temple, Dec. 31.

~~~~~~

2. From the Editorial of "The Times, Friday, January 4, 1878" (last para omitted).

Sir James Stephen is determined that Mr.Bright shall not escape unpunished for his attack, some three weeks ago, on the English administration of India. In a second letter, which we publish this morning, he pursues his old enemy once more from point to point, trips him up half-e-dozen times, tramples him, and finally leaves him prostrate on the ground, an awful example to any would-be offenders like him. It is harsh treatment that Mr. Bright receives, but in strict justice not more than he has deserved. He probably sees by this time that, when he next feels impelled to give reins to his fancy and indulge his taste for hard hitting, he had better not choose India and Indian officials to disport himself with. But to have forced this conviction well into Mr. Bright is, after all, a very small success for Sir James Stephen scarcely worth taking up his pen to secure. Mr. Bright's remarks, ill-advised as they were, and mischievous as they might have been in a wholly different state of the public temper, fell very harmlessly indeed at Manchester. No one is thinking just now how wise it would be for us to withdrew from India in favour of some as yet unformed natives Government, or how much better we could manage India if it were divided into five or six independent Presidencies. The day may come when questions like these will be discussed as pressing, but it has certainly not come at present. We hold India without constantly vexing ourselves with scheming in what way we shall take our departure most gracefully and most advantageously. The method of administration we are satisfied meanwhile to leave in the hands of those who are practically conversant with the country; nor are we always searching into our title deeds to see what flaws we can make out from the mistakes of past administrators. But even if Mr. Bright must be judged to have sinned beyond all forgiveness and to have deserved the scourge as often as Sir James Stephen is pleased to lay it on, yet surely the guileless audience that listened to his remarks at Manchester need not receive the same severity of handling. These sheep, we would ask pityingly, what have they done? They have listened, replies Sir James Stephen, and they have been ready with their applause for a speech of which they were no fit judges. They must share the condemnation of the false prophet they have been silly enough to follow. They do not know where
~~~~~~

Jubbulpore is, or what was the date and what the effect of the Treaty of Bassein. But, we would ask in return, does not Sir James Stephen himself a little presume on English ignorance when he wishes us to accept his glowing version of the early history of English intercourse with India? That the natives of India have been the better for our dealings with them is what we may take as granted on all hands. But are we therefore to assume, as Sir James Stephen seems to do, that the merit of the unforeseen benefit is to be reckoned backwards in favour of our adventurous ancestors, and that they are to be credited with accidental consequences of which they could have known nothing, and for which they would have cared nothing if they had known of them? The real question for us is, not how we came to be in India, but how we have to act finding ourselves there, weighted with the load of an empire. Nor can we admit that this is a question which concerns no one outside the narrow circle of Indian specialists. It is one on which Englishmen claim to have a voice and will insist on having one - wrongly, Sir James Stephen thinks, rightly, we think - whether they happen to know where Jubbulpore is or not. Our wish is that this interest could be developed, and that Englishmen could be made to care more than they do for Indian questions and to meddle with them more frequently. A knowledge about Jubbulpore and all the rest will follow in due course, but it would not be well that it should be insisted on as a condition precedent.

There is scarcely anything which an expert so much dislikes as the criticism of outsiders, and there is scarcely anything which is more necessary for him and more capable of being turned to good account. It is not in Indian matters alone that the rule holds good. Lewyers, politicians, men of science, and a dozen other classes besides, are always supplying instances of it. the show of viceroy in all these cases rests easily with the specialist. The reality of victory rests, in the long run, with the attack. There may be a thousand errors and absurdities committed while the debate is in progress, far worse, probably, then the very worst evil against which the attack is directed; but these neutralize one another, and pass off, leaving behind them a clear and valuable remainder of sound common sense. Mr. Bright's speech at Manchester and the applause that attended it are thus to be looked upon as simply parts of a process, imperfect in themselves, but by no means useless. Sir James Stephen's letter is another part. The result will have to be looked for somewhere between the two, and it will bear traces of both factors, and of all others that have gone to make it what it is. Sir James Stephen's contribution would have been larger if he had been less mindful of Mr. Bright's mistakes, and had not needlessly warned us against doing what, warned or unwarned, there was not the least chance of our doing. But when he appeals to us to reverse our judgement about the past, and to pronounce honourable and praiseworthy that which we have fully determined is neither one nor the other, he will scarcely obtain a hearing. Ambition, says Sir James Stephen, is a good quality, and we agree with him; but ambition, he adds, must be tempered and kept within bounds by justice, and here we agree with him, too. A love of exercising power, together with a firm purpose that power shall be exercised in a regular way and for the good of its subjects, may go far to account between them for the existing facts of English rule in India. But do they therefore explain past facts? Have the two conjoined influences always thus gone hand it hand? Or should we hold ourselves justified in choosing the same career in another country which we once followed without any misgiving in India? What is Sir James Stephen pointing to with his remarks on the folly of disuniting justice and force, and

with his half hints that it does not always do to be too scrupulous? We know, Well enough, that justice without force to support it can be nothing but a name, powerless for good. But the employment of force in restraint of wrong-doers or in self-defence is a wholly different matter from its employment against our neighbour simply because our neighbour is weak and cannot resist us. Sir James Stephen seems to confuse the two, and to transfer to the latter a tribute of praise which can belong of right only to the former.

7. A.SARADA RAJU: ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN THE MADRAS PRESIDENCY 1800-1850, U of M, 1941.

(Ed P.S.LOKANATHAN)

Note: This document has not been compared with the original document for corrections.

P.19 The share of the crops which was appropriated for the village servants varied generlly from 5 to 12 percent of the gross produce, though in chengelput and Madura the proportion was higher. Mr. Hodgeson wrote that towards the close of the 18th century, the deduction on this account amounted to 40 % (28), leaving only 60 % to the ryot. But this must be an exaggeration, for it would leave hardly anything to the ryot after paying the Government due which was usually half the gross produce.
(28 report on Dindigul, 1808, p.6)

IOR (Rev & 30 NW 1810) by James Cumming.
An Historical account of land Revenues XXXVIII + 921 hacs.
p.895 It is customery throughout that territory (and it is believed in every part of Hindoostan) for deductions to be made from the gross produce of the land as appropriations to the municipal officers of each village; and for the maintenance of the Pagodas and other public establishments.

The village officers are those who in various ways administer to the necessities and wants of the little community to which they belong. The shares of the produce which they recive, are in the nature of fees or a remmuneratory consideration for the services they render. Those to the pagodas and other establishments are charitable appropriations. Both these descriptions of allowances in kind are called `marahs' or `russams'.

The cultivator who paid certain fees or perquisites in ready money called `sadeward' for defraying the expenses of oil and stationary in the cutcherry of the village and for the other purposes.

SOME OTHER MENTIONS OF VILLAGE INFRASTRUCTURE DEDUCTIONS
DINDIGUL: (District records, Madura, Vol.5160 (S.N.25681))
Report by G.Wynch 24.11.1795. p.41,96-8, 99,100-3.
Deduction of over 25% from main crops as SWATANTRAM. Out of the swatantram Circar is allocated 1/4 th.

MALWA (by Sir John Malcolm, later Governor Bombay, written 1820, published 1822) p.430-31,Village Expenses and Establishment range from 22% - 33% (Details of expenses on agriculture and value of total produce)
MASULIPATAM, RAMNAD,etc have similar references ON *RATE OF LAND REVENUE*
1.*MALABAR* : no tax on agriculture till about 1736 (Comnr Graeme report 16.7.1822, TNSA: BRP:Vol 277 A, Para 78)

2.*CANARA:* According to Thomas Munro the tax on agriculture till 1400 was equal to the quantity of paddy seed but was taken in rice.
3. *TRAVANCORE*: Tax on agriculture was no more than 5 % to 10 % (Col.John Munro, Resident in Travancore, House of Commons Papers, year___, Vol. XI, Q.1420,1427, 1478.
4. *RAMNAD* : "The assement of land was very trifling and the principal revenue to Government had arisen from duties levied upon the trade of the country. " Madras. Board of Revenue Proceeding: 6.8.1795, G.Powney to Board.
5. *ADAM SMITH* : Land Revenue in India was 1/5 th of produce. Also similar statements were made by other British observers around 1770.
6. *MANU SMRITI* : 1/6 th to 1/12 th of Agriculatural production as tax.
7. *AKBAR* : Edict of 1/3 rd as land tax.
8. *CAMBRIDGE ECNOMIC HISTORY* : After taking note of Akbar, etc, seems to infer that 1/2 of Agricultural produce was taken as tax.(I,p.358)

My Tentative Inference

It seems that traditional agricultural production treated the village infrastructure (Religious, Cultural, Technical, Economic and Administrative) as a first charge on the total produce. Along with it, it provided for its share of the intra-village expenses (expenses of larger religious establishments, education and cultural centres,militia services, administration-(Canoongo, Deshmukh, Madoomdar, etc). As indicated by Dindigal, (above) around 1/16 th of the total production was similarly alloted by agriculture to what may be called the `Circar'. Though in certain relatively small areas of India the people may have at times paid 1/4 th, 1/3 rd, or even 1/2 to the `Circar' (as a tribute paid by the conqured to the Conqueror) the norm practiced till about 1750, appears to have been of the primary community budgeting for all the local neighbourhood expenses, and in addition paying a proportion of about 1/16 th (which may at times have risen to 1/12 th or 1/8 th) towards the expenses of a distant political authority.

8. CHARLES WILLIAM BOUGHTON ROUSE: Dissertation Concerning the Landed Property of Bengal, 179 .

pp.200 (apendix 201-322) (secretary Board of Control, dedicated to H. Dundas: 956.k.33)
Note: This document has not been compared with the original for corrections.

(p.171.) For be it from me to ascribe the schemes, which have been formed, at different times, for the increase of the revenue, to intentioned oppression. They arose much more from the expectation excited in Great Britain, by the erroneous notions which had been propagated here, of the inexhaustible wealth of Bengal, and of immense resources concealed by the zemindars, and the officers of collection, I am sorry to say, attempts were still made to mislead (p.172) this country by such extravagant delusions. Nations, like individuals, are, seldom placed in that state of perfect ease and sufficiency, that they can resist the invitation to wealth, and say, "We are content". They are too ready to find plausible grounds of right, when the means of acquisition are held out to them. But, if there is no virtue and firmness enough in those intrusted with the administration of India, to disregard all such fallacies and improvident speculation, for raising the land revenue; we shall inevitably be punished by a defalcation of that we actually enjoy.

These ? and inquisitions have been practised under the, government of our immediate predecessors but still more under our own:-- and I fear Bengal has suffered from such experiments.

J. Grant: ***An Inquiry into the nature of Zemindary Tenures***, 1790 (BM: T.671(2)
(p.24) On the early conquests of the Mahomedans in Hinostan, towards the beginning of the llth century, the Persian word (zemindar) was probably applied indiscriminately to all those Hindoos were found in the possession of lands whether in their own right as independent, or tributary *Rajahs* or princes, or merely as delegates in financial management, under the proper vernacular appellation of *Chowdry*.
Q. Craufurd: *Sketches*...2nd edition 1792, 2 viols. IV: pp 102-22. In those countries the lands were highly cultivated; the towns and their manufactures flourished; the villages were composed of neat and (p.103) commodious habitations, filled with cheerful inhabitants; and wherever the eye turned it beheld marks of the protection of the government and of the ease and industry of the people. Such was Tanjore and some other provinces, not many years ago

How We Tax India: A Lecture, 1858, pp. 40 (BM: 8023. aa. 8.)

(p.25) ..Lord Harris, the present Governor of Madras, in his minute dated October 26, 1854, advises its reduction, because, "In the Presidency, I hear " he writes, "that it is often 50 per cent, or even more" !! ... Aurangzebe, in the necessities consequent upon his long wars, had tried to get 50 per cent- - a proportion almost unheard of since the days (p.26) of Alla-ood- Deen, one of the Mussulman rulers of the twelfth century, whose name is execrated in oriental history as one of the most rapacious of monarchs....

Actually, however, our tax was soon discovered to be a great increase ... because we levied it upon all the land in cultivation, which the native tax-gatherers did not .... You will see how in this way each ryot might find his own individual tax twice as much as his old share of the village tax, and yet the nominal percentage of gross produce might be the same, or even less than before. This over-assessment, or rather rack-rent, was not and could not be paid.

On Bengal Revenue Arrangements (IOR:HM 351)

(p.14) The (Nazir, Naib, and 46 others) were to be paid wages instead of fees and the fees were to be abolished.

(p.19) The Chief Rs. 3OOO per month, Second Rs. 600 pm Persian Translator Rs 100 p.m.

(p.270) ***Warren Hastings to new Council***: Oct 1774: Pallemow and Ramgur, --- and Jugleterry & c... These may be properly termed military collectorships. They are composed of the wild and mountain parts of the country which have been lately reduced to a state of submission to government and require the continual presence of a military force to keep them in subjection. The revenue which they yield is inconsiderable but the possession of them is a security to peace of the cultivated and more civilized lands in their neighbourhood (p.28) which till their reduction were continually exposed to the ravages of the wild and lawless people inhabiting them.

Plan of 1781: (p.138) 13. That a commission of 2% on all net sums paid immediately into the Treasury ... and a commission of 1% on all sums paid to the Treasuries which remain under charge of the collectors ... shall on the passing of each month's accounts be (p.139) allowed to the Members of the Committee (of revenue) ... the whole being divided into 25 shares. The President shall take six shares, each of the other members of the council shall have five shares, and the remaining four shares shall be divided equally between the Secretary and the present Assistant of the Khalsa records.

Certain Religious Ceremonies at Surat 1836

Minute of Governor R Grant :22.11.1836

(IOR :BC: vol. 1618: No.64968 (115), pp 37-51, 20 paras; Governor General Auckland Minute :

l.4.1837, pp.81-92; ***Coconut ceremony at Surat*** thrown in Tapti, salutes fired; Minutes Feb 1833-31.10.1836; Madras GO: 26.7.1836; also No. 64969(79) Minutes of Munro Thackeray Lushington 1822-29.)

4. I have never proposed to touch any of those great establishments which the superstition of past dynasties has created in honor of the religions of the country; I have not sought to intercept any of the funds which law or immemorial usage may leave appropriated to the service of those religions. There is not a single zillah under this presidency, not a single pergannah, not even a single village, a portion of whose tenures is not employed in feeding priests, maintaining temples, and purchasing superstitious services and in some places, very large endowments are thus supported. Yet the British government (p.40) meddles not with these appropriations where it finds them sanctified by time, however wanting in other sanctity; and on the present occasion, I have not tried to move one of them, as I have already intimated, even with a finger...

6. To Mahomedans, I believe that this forced participation in rites which they detest and despise is often distasteful. The feeling does not break out into act, for the fact is, that men will seldom sacrifice their interest to a scruple of conscience. It is however well known that, a few years ago, a Muslim officer on the Madras side refused to attend in honor of (p.42) a Hindu festival. A court of enquiry sat on his conduct, which by the law subjected him even to capital punishment, and it was found expedient to let the affair drop into obscurity.

The Hedaya (translated by C. Hamilton), 4vols, 1791.
(I: Larceny lxxi: Book VIII; vol II 82-138. Institutes: vol I, lxxi-lxxii Book IX; vol II 139-256. Bail: Book XVIII; vol II 567-605, Offences against person lxxxii- lxxxiv: Book XLIX; vol IV 270-327; Misc Cases: vol IV 568-74. Amputation: for stealing above 10 dirms. Robbery: imprisonment till repentance; right hand, left foot (robbing). (??without robbing) murder without robbery: death. both murder and robbery: option of magistrate.)
Tithe and Tribute: vol II: 2O4-ll: (p.208) "The learned in the law allege that the utmost extent of tribute is *one half of the actual product,* nor is it allowable to exact more; but the taking of a *half* is no more than *strict justice,* and is not tyrannical, because it is lawful to take the *whole* of the pers and property of infidels, and to distribute them among the Mussulmans, it follows that taking half their incomes is ?? a fortiori".

Bombay Petition for law to enable Charitable Institutions to *Hold Land and Property in their own name; Turned down* (IOR:BC: Vol.2529 : No.146002(75), in Leg Despatch 31.3.1853, II, para 25; also. No.146167(22) Jud from Madras 21.3.1853(10), Para 13. Hindu-Muslim affray at Trichi; No.146006(71) Calcutta Memorial against police interference (2000 inhabitants) 25.9.1852. police notification 25.6.1849 prohibiting processions in several streets, stopped in 1850 Durga Poojah, interference in Dec 1851, *conviction for playing music in streets*, Home Leg letter 31.3.1853(2) para 35, section 61 Act XII of 1852:23.10. 1852; *No.146166(197)* Fatal accident at Trichi from furious riding, Mad Jud Letter 21.3.1853(10) paras 9-12; *No.146003 (353)* draft Act for further repression of Dacoity in Lower Provinces) 25.Fully as much evil as good, we thought would be likely to arise from an indiscriminate permission to create perpetual endowments for all purposes which might take the fancy of individuals. The circumstances of a country change, and independently of that consideration many institutions, from which great good is at first expected, are found, by experience to develop evils not contemplated by their founders. We therefore doubted the expediency of complying with the wish of the memorialists unless some distinct and well defined power of control were vested either in the executive government or in the court of justice which should under the institution established under the Act, not only subject to periodical examination in respect of their manner of working and their usefulness to the community generally, but would empower the controlling authority to make such changes in the system and management as from time to time might be deemed necessary. *Practice of Bharwittye*: Judge and Magistrate Kaira to Government (IOR: BC: vol 458: N0.11064(32) General state of society in Ceded territories)

Rev Despatch to Bombay: 10. 1. 1810 : l04.II. The second general head to which the information you have collected may be reduced is the state of society in the ceded territories. In the pergunnah of Broach much
greater order and tranquility prevail than in the northern districts of Guzerat, nor does there seem to be any serious obstruction in the manners and habits of the people to the introduction of a permanent system analogous to that which we have established in other parts of India.
Rev Letter from Bombay: 2l.l2.l8l3: 94: The state of society in Gujarat and the prevalence of crimes in that province have not we are happy to say proved of that disorderly and serious nature which from the observations contained in these paragraphs your Hon'ble court would appear to apprehend.
Bombay Jud Cons:7.4.1813:14(p.12.) Yet it is no less certaian that the Bharwittiya hardly ever failed to gain his object ultimately. The almost solitary instance of Naar Singh is both too recent and the scene too remote to have any detering influence in the # ? to which I allude.

Madras Presidency Religious Places;1841-
N.W.Kindersley, Principal Collector, Tanjore to B of R : 26.11.1841 (IOR:M Bof R Proceedings: P/303/32:16-23.12.1841, pp.18870- 94, 95-7; Despatch 21.4.1841: Government Letter 12.6.1841: Bd's proceedings 24.6.1841 in P/303/12;Dispatch 16.12.1840 No.18) ---------- (pp.8134-37)

2. The places of native worship under the superintendence of government officers in Tanjore are all Hindoo and their number 2, 874
Receiving money allowances 875
Depending on the land &c 1, 999

2, 874

They were brought under the superintendence of the collector in 1812. But all those whose annual receipts from land and money endowments did not 30 chucrums (Rs 46-10-8) per annum 2,247 in number, were made over, upon my own responsibility, to the entire management of their respective stanicks in 1833. The aggregate amount (p.18871) of their endowed revenues, averaging about 11 1/2Rs per annum to each institution, and the extent of land attached to them, which is confined entirely to topesare exhibited in the margin.

	v m g	Rs a p
Lands(area)707 - 19 -45	(value)17, 610- 1-10	
Money allowance	8, 342- 5- 4	Rs 25, 952- 7-2

3. These may be considered disposed of agreeably to the wishes of Government, and will require no further reference in this report.
4. There remain 627 places of native worship the annual revenues of which at the time of their assumption, amounted according to the Dowle Beriz, to Rs 3, 31, 709-12-2.

Land	13, 117 v	Rs 2, 04, 902- 8- 8
Money allowance	Rs 1,26,807-3-6	Rs 3,31,709-12-2

5.No money allowances have been assigned for the support nor any sum been expended in the repair of the buildings or for any other object... since the assumption of the province by the Company's government.

Madras Board of Revenue:**24.6.1841** (IOR:P / 303 / 12, p.8138; *also*
28.6.1841: Bd to Govt on *Trees*, Govt letter 31.5.1841, Bombay Enquiry:
(pp.8210-14)

1. Ordered that transcript of the foregoing letter be forwarded by circular to the several collectors in the provinces and to the collector of Madras, with reference to the communication from this department of date the 10th June.

2.It will be the duty of the collector to report in detail the arrangement he would propose for each institution in his district, explaining the present extent of interference and control and shewing how far that is withdrawn by the operation of the method of administration that is to supercede the present management. It will be proper also to suggest in what manner vacancies to be supplied in the trustees whether arising from death or resignation so that the withdrawal of active interference by government in the affairs of pagodas and mosques shall be final and complete. The attention of the several authorities is specially drawn to the observation in para 5 of the chief Secretary's letter and it is requested that the arrangements best calculated to give effect to the best wishes of Govt be supplied from each district at the earliest practicable period.

Steps regarding route to India through Egypt, etc.

Board of Control to Marquis of Carmarthen on Instructions to Mr. Baldwin, Consul-General in Egypt (IOR:F / 2 / 1:Board's Letters: 7.9.1784- 14.10.1795, pp.162; pp. 74-94, dated 19.5.1786,instructions: pp.95-107:28 paras, route by Suez to East Indies:108-119)

(p.75) The grand end of Mr Baldwin's residence at Cairo is the opening of a communication to India through Egypt ...keeping up a constant and uniform succession of correspondence with these important, but distant parts of the British empire. This might be accomplished alternatively by the three ways of the Cape, Bussorah, and Suez. The two former are already open to us, but being excluded from the latter, a material interval occurs from the month of April till July, when no other route can be performed so soon by nearly two thirds of the time.

Capitulations between HM and the Port of 1675

If the English Nation had, in fact, shewn any such design as the Firmaun imputes to them, of "seizing on the cities and territories or enslaving the subjects belonging to the Porte", (p.82) how is it that no ill consequences have resulted from their having factories at Constantinople, Smyrna, Aleppo and other places, without ever having yet shewn any such design.

(p. 88) Sir Robert (Ainslee, envoy to Porte) may have full liberty to employ (if he finds it absolutely necessary for the accomplishment of both these objects) a sum of money not exceeding 2,000 (p.89) pounds sterling, and a further sum not exceeding L. 600 per annum to be employed in making suitable presents as occasion may require.

(p.110) travelling times:

London to Venice (or Leghorn) 15 days
Venice to Alexandria 20 days

Alexandria to Suez (via Cairo)	6 days
Suez to Anjengo	20 days
Anjengo to Calcutta	40-45 days #?

Liberal estimate	100 days

Stratton, AW: (1866-1902: Oriental College, Lahore) *Letters from India* l908, introduction by Maurice Bloomfield.

Intro : Many days and nights have gone since Dr. Strutton's untimely death. In the language of the little Brahmna legend about Yami the Hindu Eve, who will not foreget her dead Adam, Yama, until the gods create night to alternate with day:` 't is days and nights that cause men to forget sorrows.'

Sardar Patel Correspondence: Vol 8: JN to Rajendrababu 8.12.49 pp.219-23; R to JN 12.12.1949, pp. 224-5; JN to Sardar, 19.6.49,#244 (on Lohia arrest) We are rapidly getting out of touch with public opinion and becoming just a government and more. An extreme development of this is Calcutta. But even in Delhi the Congress has hardly any position left. They are afraid of holding public meetings, unless (p.221: Calcutta meeting ; #??)