CHAPTER XXVIII

ADMINISTRATION OF THE EAST INDIA COMPANY

SECTION I

ADMINISTRATIVE AND SOCIAL CHANGES

THE CHARTER ACT OF 1813

During the period 1784-1813 no substantial change was introduced in the main structure of Indian government as defined by Pitt's India Act. The renewal of the Charter in 1813 was preceded by elaborate discussions about the justification of the commercial privileges enjoyed by the Company. The Continental System introduced by Napoleon had closed the European ports to British trade, and it was no longer found possible to continue the Company's monopoly of trade with India. So by the Charter Act of 1813 that trade was thrown open to all British merchants, but the Company was allowed to retain its monopoly of the trade in tea and also the trade with China. The Act continued to the Company for a further term of twenty years the possession of the territories and revenues of India, 'without prejudice to the undoubted sovereignty of the Crown . . . . in and over the same'. The constitutional position of the British territories in India was thus explicitly defined. Separate accounts were to be kept regarding commercial transactions and territorial revenues. The authority of the Board of Control was strengthened. As regards the Civil Service, the Company retained its patronage. An interesting feature of the Act was that it provided for the expenditure of a lakh of rupees per year for education.

THE CHARTER ACT OF 1833

The next Charter, which came twenty years later, was based on Whig principles which were then triumphant in England. Macaulay was then Secretary to the Board of Control, and James Mill, the famous historian, a disciple of Bentham, occupied a very high post at the India House. Their influence may be clearly traced in the Charter Act of 1833.
The Company now lost its commercial privileges. The territorial possessions of the Company were left in its control for a further period of twenty years 'in trust for His Majesty, his heirs and successors.' The Governor-General of Bengal now became the Governor-General of India. His Council was to consist of four members, one for legislation only; the Commander-in-Chief might be made an additional member. As regards the administration of Bengal, the Governor-General remained the Governor of Bengal, a position relieved in practice by the appointment under the Act of a Deputy Governor. The Council of the Governors of Bombay and Madras was to consist of two members.

The Act introduced vital changes in the system of law-making in India. The Governments of Bombay and Madras lost their legislative authority; the Governor-General and Council received the power of legislating for the whole of British India. The fourth member of the Council was expected to give professional advice regarding law-making. He was entitled, in theory, to sit and vote at meetings of the Council only for the purpose of making laws. At the suggestion of the Directors Macaulay, who was the first holder of this post, was in practice admitted to all the meetings. A Law Commission was constituted with the purpose of consolidating, codifying and improving Indian laws.

The system of excluding Indians from all high offices, introduced by Lord Cornwallis, and sanctioned by the Charter Act of 1793, had been disapproved by experienced administrators like Munro, Malcolm and Elphinstone. The Act of 1833 provided that no Indian or natural-born subject of the Crown resident in India should be, by reason only of his religion, place of birth, descent, colour, or any of them, be disqualified for any place in the Company's service. In practice, however, very little was done to give effect to this pious provision.

**THE CHARTER ACT OF 1853**

The next Act was a compromise between two conflicting views. Those who favoured the retention of the Company's territorial authority were satisfied by the provision that the Company should continue to govern India in trust for the
Crown until Parliament should otherwise direct. Those who wanted the substitution of Crown control for that of the Company found to their satisfaction that the number of Directors was reduced from 24 to 18, of whom 6 were to be nominees of the Crown, and that the quorum was so reduced that the Crown Directors could occasionally constitute the majority. The Directors lost their patronage; officers of the Company were henceforth to be recruited by competitive examination. The position of the President of the Board of Control was improved; it was placed on equality with that of a Secretary of State.

Provision was made for the appointment of a Governor or a Lieutenant-Governor for the administration of Bengal. A Lieutenant-Governor was appointed in 1854. The fourth member of the Governor-General's Council was given full rank and voting power in all business. Certain special arrangements were made for law-making. The Council was increased in size; it was to be constituted of the following members—the Governor-General, the Commander-in-Chief, the four members of the Council, a representative of each province selected by the head of the local Government, the Chief Justice of Bengal and another Supreme Court Judge. Two other members might be added, but in practice this option was not exercised. The proposal to add Indian members was rejected. This expanded Council may be called the Legislative Council, as distinguished from the smaller Council which dealt with executive business. Its sittings were made public and its proceedings were published.

ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS OF LORD HASTINGS

In spite of his pre-occupation with wars, Lord Hastings found time to devote his attention to administrative reforms. The recovery of the Company's financial position, begun by Barlow, was continued, in spite of the heavy expenditure necessitated by the wars, and the Government bonds rose to a high premium at the close of his administration.

In England the controversy connected with the renewal of the Charter of 1813 had aroused considerable interest in the problem of Indian administration. In 1812 was published the
famous *Fifth Report*, which remains our best source of information about early British administration in India. The Board of Control suggested that the old system of *panchayats* should be revived for the settlement of petty cases, with a view to relieve the heavy pressure on regular courts presided over by British Judges. The proposal was accepted by the Governments of Bombay and Madras. In Bengal Lord Hastings tried to solve the problem by improving the pay and position of petty Indian judicial officers and by adding to their number. The Cornwallis system of separation between the Judicial and Revenue services had already been found to be inconvenient. So the offices of Collector and District Magistrate were gradually combined in all the Presidencies. An improved set of Police regulations was introduced.

In Madras Sir Thomas Munro revived the old *Ryotwari* system, but the actual basis of the existing arrangements dates from as late as 1855. According to this system the cultivators of the soil became the direct payees of revenue without the intervention of a Zamindar. Under Zamindari tenure land is held as independent property; under *Ryotwari* tenure it is held in a right of occupancy which is both heritable and transferable.

The Bombay system, associated with the name of Mountstuart Elphinstone, has a general resemblance to that of Madras. It is technically described as 'survey tenure'.

In 1822 an elaborate Regulation provided for survey and assessment in the province of Agra. Started in 1822, it was first put on a working basis by R. M. Bird in 1833 and consolidated between 1843 and 1853.

The so-called 'Non-Regulation' system for the administration of backward or newly acquired territory was introduced in the time of Lord Hastings, although it was developed under Lord Amherst.

**ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS OF LORD WILLIAM BENTINCK**

Bentinck served as Governor of Madras in 1803-1807. He was censured and recalled by the Court of Directors for his failure to deal satisfactorily with the Vellore Mutiny. He came back to India in 1828. His Governor-Generalship was not signalised by any triumph in war or diplomacy. This is
probably why Thornton says that he did ‘less for the interest of India and for his own reputation than any who had occupied his place since the commencement of the nineteenth century, with the single exception of Sir George Barlow’. On the other hand, Macaulay, who was his colleague in the Council, describes him as a benevolent ruler ‘who infused into Oriental despotism the spirit of British freedom; who never forgot that the end of government is the welfare of the governed; who abolished cruel rites, who effaced humiliating distinctions; who allowed liberty to the expression of public opinion; whose constant study it was to elevate the moral and intellectual character of the Government committed to his charge’. Some justification for this magniloquent eulogy may be found in the reforms associated with his name.

The costly Burmese War had placed a severe strain on the financial resources of India, and Bentinck’s first task was to reduce expenditure. On this point he had received strict instructions from the Court of Directors. He abolished the ‘half-batta’ or field allowances enjoyed by the officers of the army in time of peace and made himself very unpopular. Reductions in the cost of civil administration followed. At the same time steps were taken to increase the receipts. The settlement of the land revenue in the North-Western Provinces by Robert Bird proved ‘equally conducive to the improving resources of the state and the growing prosperity and happiness of the people’. The settlement was made with the village community and fixed for periods of thirty years. It was not collective ownership. A group of persons more or less closely connected were made responsible jointly and severally for the payment of revenue. A new arrangement about Malwa opium increased the revenue. On the whole, Bentinck’s financial administration was efficient, and he succeeded in transforming the deficit into a surplus.

Bentinck also introduced important judicial reforms. The Provincial Courts of Appeal and Circuit established by Cornwallis, which had merely provided ‘resting places for those members of the service who were deemed unfit for higher responsibilities,’ were abolished. This step provided for justice and economy at the same time. The system of employing Indians in judicial offices was extended; their salary and
responsibility were increased. Magistrates and Collectors were placed under the supervision of Commissioners of Revenue and Circuit, who were to be in constant touch with the people through frequent tours. Vernacular replaced Persian as the language of the courts. Smith rightly gives Bentinck 'credit for the clear vision which enabled him to construct for the first time a really workable, efficient framework of administration."

**SOCIAL REFORMS OF BENTINCK**

The average Indian of to-day remembers Bentinck as a benevolent champion of social reforms. He broke up the Thags as an organisation hostile to the community, although preliminary measures had been taken by Lord Hastings and Lord Amherst. The task was well done by F. C. Smith, Agent to the Governor-General in the Narbada Territories, and his more well-known co-adjutor, Major Sleeman.

*Sati* or widow-burning was abolished in 1829. As early as the time of Lord Cornwallis, British officers were specially ordered to discourage the rite, although they were not empowered to prevent it. Lord Wellesley referred the matter to the Judges of the *Sadr Nizamat Adalat*, who, instead of supporting total prohibition, suggested some restrictive measures. These suggestions were not given effect to till 1813, when Lord Minto incorporated them in a circular to all judicial authorities. No widow was to be immolated without the permission of a Magistrate or Police Officer and except at the presence of the police. These precautionary measures served very little useful purpose; in 1818, 800 widows sacrificed themselves in the Presidency of Bengal. Lord Amherst, anxious not to wound the religious sentiments of the Hindus, thought that abolition would lead to 'evils infinitely greater than those arising from the existence of the practice'. But Bentinck was determined to take the final step. He was strengthened by the support of the Judges of the *Sadr Nizamat Adalat* and also the co-operation of enlightened Hindus like Raja Ram Mohan Roy and 'Prince' Dwarka Nath Tagore.

**ABOLITION OF SLAVERY**

The Charter Act of 1833 required the Governor-General-in-Council to take steps for the amelioration of the condition of
slaves and the ultimate extinction of slavery. In 1843 Lord Ellenborough passed an act prohibiting the legal recognition of slavery in India. Lord Hardinge took strong measures for the extinction of the horrible practice of human sacrifice prevalent in the hill tracts of Orissa.

EDUCATION

Although Warren Hastings took measures for the promotion of Oriental learning, the responsibility of the State for the education of the people was not recognised till the passing of the Charter Act of 1813. The gradual extension of British rule over territories ruled by Indian Princes had an adverse effect on education and culture. Lord Minto observed, "The principal cause of the present neglected state of literature in India is to be traced to the want of that encouragement which was formerly afforded to it by princes, chieftains, and opulent individuals under the native governments".

The Charter Act of 1813 laid down that "... a sum of not less than one lac of rupees in each year shall be set apart and applied to the revival and improvement of literature and the encouragement of the learned natives of India, and for the introduction and promotion of a knowledge of the sciences among the inhabitants of the British territories in India". As an enunciation of the principle of State responsibility for education this famous clause deserves to be remembered as one of the most significant British pronouncements relating to India. But the policy of keeping the Indians in ignorance had still powerful supporters, and Lord Hastings had to raise a voice of protest: "This Government never will be influenced by the erroneous position that to spread information among men is to render them less tractable and less submissive to authority".

The enlightened Hindus of Calcutta, supported by that large-hearted Scotch watch-maker, David Hare, appreciated the value of Western learning before it came into prominence in official eyes, and founded the Hindu College in 1816. This was a step of decisive importance in the history of education in India. There were nearly 400 students on its rolls in 1835. The accepted theory is that we owe English education as it has developed all over India to Lord Macaulay. But organised in-
struction on modern lines and the beginnings of Western education must be dated from 1816 rather than from 1835. The Bombay Education Society was formed in 1815. In 1822 Sir Thomas Munro instituted an enquiry into the actual state of education in Madras. Western education was already in existence in Bengal and Bombay in 1835 and was on the way to introduction in Madras. The glory of introducing modern education in India was not Macaulay's; but "he did decisively determine the inclination of State influence to the side of English education".

About two decades after the foundation of the Hindu College William Adam, a friend of Raja Ram Mohan Roy, was appointed by Bentinck to enquire into the condition of education in Bengal. His Reports were described by Macaulay as 'the best sketches on the state of education that had been submitted before the public.' But although these Reports remained a mine of valuable historical information, they could not influence the policy of the Government. Before the preparation of Adam's Reports Bentinck had passed that famous Resolution dated March 7, 1835: "His Lordship in Council is of opinion that the great object of the British Government ought to be the promotion of European literature and science among the natives of India; and that all the funds appropriated for the purpose of education would be best employed on English education alone." It is well-known that this decision was mainly the result of Macaulay's influence—and his idea about Oriental learning was expressed in the ludicrous statement that "a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia." The party of officers in favour of Oriental learning was led by H. T. Prinsep, Secretary to the Government, and consisted of the old members of the Company's service. After Bentinck's decision this party lost its influence. In 1844 Lord Hardinge declared that preference would be given in Governmental service to candidates who knew English. This artificial stimulus probably did more for the spread of Western education than the exhortations of its British and Indian champions.

In 1854 Sir Charles Wood, President of the Board of Control, sent a comprehensive Educational Despatch which laid down the principles of a graded educational system. A
Department of Public Instruction was to be set up in each of the three Presidencies and also in the North-Western Provinces and the Punjab. A net-work of graded schools was to be spread all over British India. Provision was to be made for the sanction of grant-in-aid to some of these schools. Universities were to be established in Calcutta, Bombay and Madras on the model of the University of London which was then a purely examining body. Lord Dalhousie wholeheartedly supported these principles. The Universities of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras were established in 1857.

THE PRESS IN INDIA

The question of the Press is intimately connected with that of education. The first journal in India, The Bengal Gazette edited by J. A. Hicky, was published on January 29, 1780. Until 1818, when the Samāchār Darpan, the first journal in the Bengali language, appeared in Calcutta, all journals published in India were conducted in English and managed by British editors and owners. Those early British journalists, unlike their modern followers, were sturdy critics of the Government. So stringent restrictions were put upon their liberty. In 1818 Lord Hastings abolished the press censorship, but fresh restrictions were imposed in 1823. In 1823 a Judge of the Supreme Court declared that "this Government and a free press are incompatible, and cannot be consistent." Bentinck, acting under Metcalfe's influence, pursued a liberal policy, although the existing laws were not abrogated. When Metcalfe succeeded Bentinck as temporary Governor-General, he granted statutory freedom to the Press (1835). During the following years the Calcutta press grew in number and solidarity and Indians began to take an increasing share in its management.

WORKS OF PUBLIC UTILITY

During the early part of the nineteenth century the attention of the British rulers of India was usually confined to the construction and repair of buildings and roads of military importance. Lord Hastings secured good water supply for Delhi by repairing an old canal. Lord William Bentinck appreciated the importance of a new trunk road connecting Calcutta with the North-Western Provinces. The project was
given effect to by Théomas, Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces, and by Lord Dalhousie. Lord Hardinge took the preliminary steps towards planning a Railway system for India. He also planned the Ganges Canal.

Lord Dalhousie's enthusiasm for works of public utility was hardly less strong than his zeal for annexation. In 1854 he constituted a special Department of Public Works in the Government of India; subordinate departments on similar lines were constituted in Bombay and Madras. The Ganges Canal and the Bari Doab Canal testify to his interest in irrigation. The first Railway line was opened in 1853 between Bombay and Thana; in 1854 Calcutta was connected with the Raniganj coal fields. Lord Dalhousie also founded the electric telegraph system.

LORD DALHOUSIE AS AN ADMINISTRATOR

Lord Dalhousie's success as an annexationist has eclipsed his reputation as an administrator; but it must be recognised that, while his annexations require elaborate justification, his administrative work was a splendid achievement. He was a masterful man of abundant energy, and the amount of work done by him personally in initiating policy and supervising administration excites our wonder. He had two defects. His autocratic temperament made it difficult for him to tolerate criticism and to work smoothly with others. Secondly, Smith rightly points out that "he worshipped efficiency a little too zealously, and sometimes forgot that even inefficient people have sentiments which need consideration. An unmethodical sentimental person like Sir Henry Lawrence irritated his practical mind intensely".

No account of Dalhousie's administrative work can be complete without reference to the arrangements made by him for the administration of the newly conquered provinces of the Punjab and Pegu. The administration of the Punjab was entrusted to a Board composed of the two famous Lawrence brothers—Henry and John—and a civilian from Bengal. Sometime later Dalhousie removed Henry Lawrence to Rajputana, abolished the Board, and made John Lawrence Chief Commissioner. "The Lawrences, Herbert Edwardes, John Nicholson, Richard Temple, and many other officers whose names are more
or less familiar, contributed to the organization of the model province; but they always worked under the eye of their indefatigable master, who, perhaps, deserves, even more than his brilliant subordinates, the credit for the results obtained'. Pegu was administered by a Commissioner under the Government of India. This important office was held by Sir Arthur Phayre, who became Chief Commissioner of British Burma in 1862. He is one of the makers of modern Burma.

SECTION II

ECONOMIC CHANGES

INDIAN INDUSTRIES IN PRE-BRITISH DAYS

India was the great workshop of cotton manufacture for the world since immemorial times. Dacca was the Manchester of India, Dacca muslin being renowned all over the world for its beauty and firm texture. Cotton and silk piece goods, raw silk, salt petre and opium formed India's chief articles of export. There was a happy blending of agriculture and handicrafts, particularly in Bengal. According to Verelst who succeeded Clive as Governor of Bengal, the customs office books at Murshidabad even in Alivardi Khan's time showed an entry of seventy lakhs in raw silk. This was exclusive of European investment which was not registered at Murshidabad and which was either duty free or paid duty at Hughli. "The farmer was easy, the artisan encouraged, the merchant enriched and the prince satisfied."

RUIN OF INDIAN INDUSTRIES

The aspect of affairs changed after the battle of Plassey. The drain of Indian wealth which began after 1757 helped the Industrial Revolution in England because it supplied capital to her new industries. Moreover, in Bengal the British merchants became unfairly supreme in inland as also in export trade. The manufacture of silk and cotton goods began to decline. As early as 1769 the Directors wanted the manufacture of raw silk to be encouraged in Bengal and that of silk fabrics discouraged. Over cotton goods and raw silk the Company established a quasi-monopolistic control. The story of oppression is supported by official records. The winders of raw silk cut
off their own thumbs in order to escape compulsory winding of silk. Oppression proved destructive of the industry.

By the Parliamentary enactments of 1700 and 1720 cotton and silk goods imported from India 'could not be worn or otherwise used in England'. They were exported to other countries of Europe. The French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars closed this market. The importation of printed cotton goods from India to England, which had continued up to this time, was also stopped. In the meantime the Industrial Revolution placed England in a position of great advantage. The first sample of English muslin was sent to Bengal in 1783. No attempt was made to improve the quality of cotton piecegoods. The Company could not afford to antagonise British manufacturing interest by restricting the import of British cotton goods to India. Invidious duties further discouraged and repressed Indian industries. The two Indian industries which became practically extinct were the textile industry and ship-building. Even in 1795-96 six ships were built in Calcutta. In 1797-98 several ships were launched from her dockyards. But ship-building was entirely given up in Calcutta. About 1788 the adoption of a new policy is easily discernible. The export of raw materials was encouraged because such a policy would be popular in England. The production of raw materials for British industries, particularly raw silk and indigo, was encouraged.

RUIN OF INDIAN TRADE

The course of trade was very unfair. In 1840 before a Select Committee of the House of Commons evidence was given about Indo-British trade relations that is revealing. British cotton and silk goods conveyed in British ships to India paid a duty of 3½ per cent. and British woollen goods a duty of 2 per cent. only. But Indian cotton goods imported into England paid a duty of 10 per cent., Indian silk goods of 20 per cent. and Indian woollen goods of 30 per cent. It is no wonder that in 1837 the export of British cotton fabrics to India was more than 64,000,000 yards, whereas in 1824 it was hardly 1,000,000 yards. The population of Dacca declined from 150,000 to about 30,000. The entire economic basis of Indian life was blown up and India became the agricultural farm of England.
EARLIER CASES OF MUTINY

Mutiny of troops was not a rare occurrence in the history of the British in India. In 1806 the sepoys at Vellore in the Carnatic revolted as a protest against certain new rules issued by the Commander-in-Chief of Madras with the concurrence of the Governor of the Presidency, Lord William Bentinck. These rules required the sepoys 'to wear a novel pattern of turban, to train their beards in a particular way, and to abstain from putting sectarian marks on their foreheads.' This order created an impression that the sepoys were to be forcibly converted to Christianity. The sepoys occupied the fort of Vellore and massacred some European troops and officers. The mutiny was easily suppressed; the Governor and the Commander-in-Chief of Madras were recalled. In 1808-9 there was a mutiny among the officers of the Madras army, 'occasioned immediately by the stoppage of certain perquisites on tent contracts enforced by Sir George Barlow in compliance with peremptory orders of the Directors'. This mutiny discredited Barlow, who was then Governor of Madras. In 1824 the sepoys at Barrackpore (near Calcutta) mutinied as a protest against the order to go to Burma by sea. They believed that they would lose their caste if they should be sent by sea to take part in the First Burmese War. The ruthless punishment meted out to the mutineers might have been avoided by tactful handling of the sepoys at the beginning of the trouble.

CAUSES OF THE REVOLT OF 1857

The Revolt of 1857 was not a local rising, nor was it caused by the greased cartridges. Its causes were very complex; military, political, religious and social factors played their part in bringing about this catastrophe. Lord William Bentinck had clearly pointed out the defects of the sepoys army; it was expensive but inefficient. Campaigns in strange lands outside the boundaries of India—Burma, Afghanistan, Persia, China—were very unpopular with the sepoys, for these inflicted on
them unnecessary hardship and put a strain on their social usages and religious feelings. Four mutinies occurred during the 13 years preceding 1857—in 1844, in 1849, in 1850, in 1852. Soon after his assumption of office Lord Canning ordered that all recruits to the Bengal Army, like those of the Madras Army, should be placed under an obligation to serve wherever required. This order did not affect the old recruits, but it created suspicions.

The discipline of the Bengal Army was hopelessly bad. This was due to three reasons. Many able military officers were transferred to political duty; the leadership of the army was thus weakened. Secondly, promotion being regulated strictly by seniority, many incompetent officers rose to high places. Thirdly, there was no strict age limit, and men who had obviously outlived their capacity were allowed to remain in active service.

It was not easy to enforce discipline after laxity had got the upper hand. The Bengal Army was united by something like a close family tie, for most of its recruits came from the same area—the modern Uttar Pradesh—and from the same social class. Caste prejudices were too strong to be levelled down by Western ideas about discipline. Sir Charles Napier observed, "High caste, that is to say, Mutiny, is encouraged".

The discontent and lack of discipline in the Bengal Army might not have proved so dangerous if the European element in the military force had been strong. But in 1857 less than 19 per cent. of the Company's officers and men in India were Europeans. Most of the Europeans were concentrated in the newly conquered Punjab; their proportion in the modern Uttar Pradesh was very small. Moreover, many points of strategic importance and most of the guns were under the control of the sepoys. Lord Dalhousie had pointed out the necessity of maintaining an adequate proportion of British troops in India, but no attention was paid to his warning.

While the military importance of the sepoys was thus increasing along with their professional discontent, Lord Dalhousie's policy of annexation disturbed the political equilibrium in the country. The annexation of Oudh and the proposal to remove the Mughal Emperor Bahadur Shah from his ancestral palace in Delhi came as a shock to the Muslims. The
annexation of Hindu States in accordance with the 'Doctrine of Lapse' and the forfeiture of the ex-Peshwa's pension created alarm among the Hindus. Hindu and Muslim Princes who remained unaffected began to entertain a feeling of vague restlessness, lest they should suffer a similar fate in the future. Nor was the annexation of Indian States a blow to the Princes alone. Families dependent upon the favour of the Princess, officers who earned their bread by service in the Indian States, men who composed the inefficient militia of the local Rajas—all these were rudely disturbed and filled with a feeling of sullen resentment against the British intruders. The administration of Coverly Jackson, whom Lord Canning appointed as Chief Commissioner of Oudh in 1856, proved so exasperating to the dependents of the ex-Nawab that he had to be replaced by Sir Henry Lawrence. Smith rightly observes that "the minds of the civil population of all classes and ranks, Hindus and Muhammadans, princes and people, were agitated and disturbed by feelings of uneasiness and vague apprehension".

The uneasiness created by the disturbance of material interests was accentuated by vague apprehensions about the loss of caste and the forcible introduction of Christianity. The abolition of religious practices like Sati and infanticide, the legalisation of widow remarriage, the legal recognition of the right of inheritance of persons forsaking their ancestral religion, the aggressive spirit of missionaries like Alexander Duff, the spread of Western education, the introduction of female education, the construction of Railways and electric telegraph—these were looked upon by many sepoys and civilians as indirect attempts to destroy the Hindu and Muslim religions and to make this country a Christian land. Century-old religious prejudices and dearly valued social customs were thought to be unsafe. The introduction of the Enfield rifle confirmed these suspicions. The assurances of the Government were of no avail. Mysterious chupatties began to pass from village to village about the middle of 1856. On March 29, 1857, a sepoy named Mangal Pande murdered a European officer at Barrackpore. The Revolt began.

PROGRESS AND SUPPRESSION OF THE REVOLT

The military operations connected with the outbreak may be grouped round five principal areas: (1) Delhi, (2) Lucknow,
(3) Cawnpore, (4) Rohilkhand, (5) Central India and Bundelkhand.

On May 10, 1857, the sepoys at Meerut openly revolted, marched to Delhi, and occupied that city on the following day. They proclaimed the revival of the Mughal Empire and placed Bahadur Shah II on the imperial throne. The revolt spread to the province of Agra, although the city of Agra was retained by the British. Delhi was re-occupied in September, 1857; John Nicholson died there. The recovery of Delhi was made possible by the energetic steps taken by John Lawrence, Chief Commissioner of the Punjab, and by the loyalty of the Sikhs. Bahadur Shah did not take any active part in originating or directing the outbreak in Delhi. He was arrested after the fall of Delhi and condemned to exile after trial. He died at Rangoon in 1862. His two sons and a grandson were treacherously murdered by a British officer named Hodson.

At Lucknow Sir Henry Lawrence lost his life in the siege of the Residency by the sepoys. In September, 1857, Outram and Havelock brought relief to the besieged Residency. Two months later Lucknow was evacuated by the British, but it was re-occupied by the new Commander-in-Chief, Sir Colin Campbell, in March, 1858. The rebellion in Oudh was now brought under control, and towards the end of 1858 most of the rebels were driven across the frontier into Nepal.

At Cawnpore the sufferings of the British were largely due to the folly and weakness of General Sir Hugh Wheeler, an old man seventy-five years of age. Here the leader of the sepoys was Nana Sahib, adopted son of ex-Peshwa Baji Rao II. He murdered many British military men and civilians, including women and children. He declared himself as Peshwa. Sir Colin Campbell occupied Cawnpore in December, 1857.

The rising at Bareilly in Rohilkhand began in May, 1857. A grandson of Hafiz Rahamat Khan, the famous Rohilla chief of the time of Warren Hastings, was proclaimed Nawab Nazim; but the Rohilla Nawab of Rampur remained loyal to the British Government. Bareilly was occupied by Campbell in May, 1858.

The operations in Central India and Bundelkhand were conducted by Sir Hugh Rose. At Jhansi the leader of the sepoys was Rani Lakshmi Bai, widow of the childless ruler of
the State upon whose death Lord Dalhousie had annexed it. Sir Hugh Rose described her as the ‘best and bravest’ of the rebels. She was assisted by Tantia Topi, Nana Sahib’s general. After the occupation of Jhansi and Kalpi by Sir Hugh Rose in April-May, 1858, the Rani and Tantia Topi occupied Gwalior and compelled Sindhia, who was loyal to the British, to take refuge at Agra. But Gwalior was captured in June, 1858; the Rani died on the field, fighting bravely in male attire. Tantia Topi was caught and executed a year later. Nana Sahib fled to Nepal, where he ended his days in oblivion.

In Bihar there was a local rebellion at Arrah, led by a Rajput Zamindar named Kumar Singh. There were some disturbances in Rajputana and the Maratha country. No serious trouble occurred in the Madras Presidency. The Punjab kept quiet. The rulers of most of the Indian States rendered active services to the British Government. The services of the ministers of Gwalior, Hyderabad and Nepal proved specially valuable. The reckless cruelty which generally characterised the reprisals taken by the British authorities was to some extent minimised by the politic leniency of Lord Canning, whom many Europeans in their bitterness called ‘Clemency Canning’.

CAUSES OF THE FAILURE OF THE REVOLT

From the very beginning the Revolt was doomed to failure, for it did not receive wide support from the civil population, and it was actively opposed by the Indian Princes who possessed wealth, influence and military force. There was no co-ordinated plan behind the Revolt. Every locality had its own leaders, its own problems, and its own aspirations. The principal leaders, Nana Sahib, Tantia Topi and Lakshmi Bai, were far inferior to their rivals in military and political qualities. The sepoys were inferior to the British soldiers in equipment as well as in discipline. The Government was immensely strengthened by its control over the telegraph and the means of communication. Finally, the reckless vandalism of the sepoys speedily alienated the civil population and deprived them of that popular sympathy which they had commanded in some measure at the beginning.
EFFECTS OF THE REVOLT

Sir Lepel Griffin, a scholarly and experienced Anglo-Indian administrator of the nineteenth century, observed that the Revolt of 1857 "swept the Indian sky clear of many clouds. It disbanded a lazy, pampered army, which, though in its hundred years of life it had done splendid service, had become impossible; it replaced an unprogressive, selfish, and commercial system of administration by one liberal and enlightened...."

It will probably be admitted that the spirit of British administration in India showed no such revolutionary change after 1857, though the Revolt emphasized the undesirability of governing India through the Company and strengthened the hands of those who wanted to bring this vast dependency under the direct control of the Crown-in-Parliament. In vain did the Company protest against the loss of its authority in a petition drawn up by John Stuart Mill. The Government of India Act, passed on August 2, 1858, directed that "India shall be governed by and in the name of the sovereign through one of the principal Secretaries of State, assisted by a Council of 15 members." The Secretary of State received the powers so long enjoyed by the Court of Directors and the Board of Control. Thus the system of 'Double Government' introduced by Pitt's India Act was finally abolished. Of the 15 members of the Council of the Secretary of State, 8 were to be appointed by the Crown and 7 by the Directors. The Council was to be merely advisory; in most cases the initiative and the final decision remained with the Secretary of State. The Governor-General received the title of Viceroy. He became the direct representative of the Crown. His prestige, if not his statutory authority, was increased.

It has been rightly said that the assumption of the government of India by the Crown was 'rather a formal than a substantial change'. The Charter Acts of 1813 and 1833 had explicitly declared the sovereignty of the Crown over the territories acquired by the Company. The President of the Board of Control had for a long time been the de facto supreme authority in Indian administration. John Stuart Mill's petition pointed out that in Indian affairs the British Government had long possessed the decisive voice and was thus 'in the fullest
sense accountable for all that has been done, and for all that has been forborne or omitted to be done'.

The famous Queen's Proclamation of November 1, 1858, assured the Indian Princes that all treaties and engagements made with them by the Company would be 'scrupulously maintained'. The principle of religious toleration was to be followed and no distinction was to be made on grounds of race or creed in the public service. The Government of India openly repudiated the 'Doctrine of Lapse', and permission to adopt heirs was granted as a matter of course.

The inevitable reorganisation of the army followed. The British element was strengthened; in 1864, out of 205,000 men in the Indian army 65,000 were British. A Royal Commission suggested that 'native regiments should be formed by a general mixture of all classes and castes'; but this suggestion was not given effect to. Artillery was placed under the charge of Europeans.

FOR FURTHER STUDY
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CHAPTER XXIX
MODERN INDIA

SECTION I

FOREIGN POLICY

LORD ELGIN (1862-63)

Internal reconstruction occupied Lord Canning's attention after the Mutiny. He was succeeded in March, 1862, by Lord Elgin, his friend and contemporary and an experienced colonial administrator. Lord Elgin died in India in November, 1863. He conducted the 'Umbeyla campaign' on the North-Western frontier for the chastisement of some Pathan tribes.

SIR JOHN LAWRENCE AND THE BHUTAN WAR

Sir John Lawrence came to India as Lord Elgin's successor in January, 1864, and remained in office till January, 1869. He was raised to the peerage after his departure from India. His appointment was a breach of the tradition that a member of the Civil Service should not be raised to the highest post in India. But Lawrence was well-known for the energetic part he had played during the Mutiny, and his command over the frontier problem was regarded as a peculiarly valuable qualification for the Governor-Generalship.

Soon after his arrival Lawrence was involved in a war with Bhutan. British relations with Bhutan began in the time of Warren Hastings, who sent two commercial missions (1774, 1783) to open up this unknown country. Frontier problems arose after the annexation of Assam (1826). Lord Elgin sent Ashley Eden as an envoy to Bhutan to make a satisfactory settlement about frontier raids; Eden was compelled to sign a humiliating treaty. Lawrence repudiated this treaty and war began. A British force was defeated by the Bhutanese in the battle of Dewangiri (January, 1865). Peace was concluded in
November, 1865. The Bhutanese ceded a large slice of Duar territory in return for an annual subsidy.

Lawrence's Frontier Policy

Lawrence held definite views about North-Western frontier policy, and his views were openly opposed by the so-called 'Forward School'. With regard to those border tribes who nominally owed allegiance to the Amir of Afghanistan but in practice managed their own affairs in their own turbulent way, his policy was 'to leave the tribes their independence and endeavour to win their esteem'; the 'Forward School' wanted the complete subjugation of these wild tribes and the establishment of a well-defined frontier. With regard to Afghanistan, Lawrence's policy was 'friendship towards the actual rulers combined with rigid abstention from interference in domestic feuds'; the 'Forward School' favoured the policy of conquering Afghanistan, or partitioning it among different rulers, 'for the purpose of guarding against an enemy who is still separated from us by six hundred miles of desert and mountains.'

A war of succession broke out in Afghanistan after Dost Muhammad's death in 1863. Sher Ali, his favourite son and heir-designate, ascended the throne, but his authority was disputed by his brothers Azim Khan and Afzal Khan and his nephew Abdur Rahman Khan (son of Afzal Khan). Sher Ali was driven from Kabul in 1866 and from Qandahar in 1867. Afzal Khan became Amir; he died in October, 1867, and was succeeded by Azim Khan. But Sher Ali re-occupied Qandahar in April, 1868, and Kabul in September following. Azim Khan fled to Persia, where he died soon afterwards. Abdur Rahman Khan fled to Tashkend, where he became a Russian pensionary. Sher Ali consolidated his authority and remained undisturbed till the aggressive policy of Lord Lytton created trouble.

During this long war of succession Lawrence strictly followed his policy of 'friendship towards the actual rulers combined with rigid abstention from interference in domestic feuds'. No contestant received any help, political or military or financial, from him. In 1864 Sher Ali was recognised as Amir of Afghanistan; in 1866 he was recognised as ruler of
Qandahar and Herat, while Afzal Khan was recognized as ruler of Kabul; in 1867 Afzal Khan was recognized as ruler of Kabul and Qandahar, while Sher Ali was recognised as ruler of Herat. This 'friendship towards the actual rulers' involved two dangers. In the first place, it indirectly encouraged rebellion against established authority in Afghanistan, for every successful rebel expected that he would receive British recognition. Secondly, 'rigid abstention from interference in domestic feuds' left the rivals dissatisfied, for every one expected British help. Sher Ali spoke bitterly about British indifference towards his interests and Lawrence could hardly pacify him after the final recovery of his power by sending him money and arms. Yet, on the whole, the policy pursued by Lawrence was sensible, and it was the only policy which could avoid the difficulties suffered by Auckland and Lytton.

During Lawrence's term of office Russia was steadily increasing her power in Central Asia. Tashkend was annexed in 1865, Samarqand and Bokhara in 1868. A Russian ambassador in England declared that the occupation of Central Asia would enable Russia to keep England in check by threat of intervention in India. Lawrence appreciated the gravity of the Russian menace; he found the solution, not in the clash of arms, but in the conclusion of a definite Anglo-Russian agreement as to a line of demarcation between the spheres of influence of the two Empires. Such an agreement solved the problem in 1907; it is difficult to say, however, whether it was possible in 1868. Dodwell points out that 'unless England could entrench herself so strongly in Central Asia as to convince Russia of the futility of movements in that direction, an agreement in Europe could only be reached by subordinating English to Russian interests on the Continent.'

**Lord Mayo's Afghan Policy**

Lawrence's Afghan policy was continued by his successor, Lord Mayo, who held office for three years (January, 1869—January, 1872) before he fell a victim to an assassin's dagger. Lawrence had arranged to meet Sher Ali at a conference, but the Amir could not manage to come before his departure from India. In March, 1869, Lord Mayo met the Amir at Ambala.
We are told that the Viceroy's diplomatic geniality induced in Sher Ali's breast a feeling of 'romantic friendship' for him, and that the splendour and military strength of British India made a deep impression on his mind. But the Amir received no substantial concession on any point in which he was interested. He wanted a definite treaty, a fixed annual subsidy, military assistance on requisition, definite British guarantee in support of his throne and dynasty, and British recognition of his favourite younger son, Abdulla Jan, as his successor, to the exclusion of his elder son Yaqub Khan. These terms 'would dangerously have linked up British power and prestige in India with the fortunes of a notoriously unstable Oriental dynasty.' Lord Mayo gave the Amir some vague assurances and Sher Ali returned to Kabul with apparent satisfaction.

A settlement with Russia was an integral part of the Lawrence-Mayo policy regarding Afghanistan. Negotiations were entered into between the British Foreign Secretary, Lord Clarendon, and the famous Russian Minister, Prince Gortschkoff, and the views of the Government of India were represented in St. Petersburg by a Bengal civilian named Douglas Forsyth. Russia acknowledged Sher Ali's authority in Afghanistan (including Badakhshan). Thus Russia admitted that she regarded Afghanistan as beyond her sphere of interest. But this admission did not put a stop to her ambitious intrigues. General Kaufmann, Governor of Russian Turkestan, began to correspond with the Amir. This correspondence Sher Ali sent to the Government of India, and no serious notice was taken of it.

LORD NORTHBROOK'S AFGHAN POLICY

The Russian menace assumed a more definite shape in the time of the next Governor-General, Lord Northbrook (May, 1872—April, 1876), a cold diplomat and a cautious administrator. Khiva was occupied by the Russians in June, 1873. Sher Ali, alarmed by Russian advance, sent an envoy to secure from the Viceroy 'an unequivocal guarantee against Russian attack.' Northbrook was in favour of giving a formal guarantee, but he was directed by the Secretary of State, Duke of Argyll, to declare merely that the British Government would maintain its
settled policy towards Afghanistan. This vague declaration naturally disappointed Sher Ali, who was some time later offended by Northbrook's 'dignified rebuke' for arresting Yaqub Khan and proclaiming Abdulla Jan as heir. The arbitration of the Government of India in the boundary dispute between Afghanistan and Persia in Seistan also displeased the Amir; Sher Ali now inclined towards the Russians; correspondence with General Kaufmann became more frequent from 1875, and Russian agents began to appear in Kabul.

In March, 1874, Disraeli became Prime Minister in England with Lord Salisbury as Secretary of State for India. The Liberal policy of caution was now replaced by the Conservative policy of aggression. The new policy was inspired by a deep distrust of Russia. Salisbury proposed that Sher Ali should be asked to receive a British Resident within his territory. Northbrook, with the unanimous support of his Council, protested. Soon after this he resigned, and Lord Lytton came to India to give effect to Disraeli's 'spirited foreign policy.'

LORD LYTTON'S AFGHAN POLICY: BEGINNING OF THE SECOND AFGHAN WAR

Lord Lytton was an experienced diplomat and a brilliant man of letters, but his Indian administration was not successful. His foreign policy resulted in the Second Afghan War; his internal administration was very unpopular. In its earlier stages his Afghan policy was regulated by the instructions of the British Cabinet; but before the final crisis came he adopted a peculiarly aggressive attitude on his own initiative. Although Disraeli and Salisbury loyally supported him in public utterances, they became uneasy at the development of his policy. The responsibility for the disaster must fall very largely, if not solely, on Lord Lytton alone.

Lord Lytton came to India with instructions to conclude 'a more definite equilateral and practical alliance' with Sher Ali, but he was not bound down by rigid instructions about the time and manner in which the new policy was to be put in practice. So the impatient hurry with which he began negotiations with Kabul cannot be laid at the door of the
British Cabinet. Sher Ali was informed that all the terms which he had wanted from Lord Northbrook in 1873 might be granted if he consented to receive a British Resident at Herat. The reply was that a British Agent could not be received without granting a similar right to Russia. Lord Lytton thought that his reply showed the Amir's 'contemptuous disregard' of British interests. Sher Ali was warned that 'he was isolating Afghanistan from the alliance and support of the British Government.' Three members of the Viceroy's Council justified Sher Ali's attitude and disagreed with Lord Lytton. The Viceroy told the British Muslim agent in Kabul, whom he met at Simla, that if Sher Ali became an enemy of England, British military power 'could break him as a reed.' This offensive statement was intended to be communicated to the Amir. Towards the close of 1876 a treaty concluded with the Khan of Kalat gave the British right to occupy Quetta, a strategical position commanding the Bolan Pass, one of the gates of Afghanistan. The Amir probably looked upon the British occupation of Quetta as a preliminary step to an advance upon Qandahar. In January, 1877, a conference between British and Afghan representatives at Peshawar proved abortive; no agreement was found possible on the question of placing a British Resident at Herat. Lord Lytton now began to work, in his own words, for the 'gradual disintegration and weakening of the Afghan power.' By an arrangement with the Maharaja of Kashmir a British agency was established at Gilgit. This measure was deprecated by many experienced frontier officials, and it was likely to add to the Amir's apprehension and resentment.

The outbreak of the Russo-Turkish War in Europe (April, 1877), the treaty of San Stefano (March, 1878), Disraeli's war-like preparations (which included the summoning of Indian troops to Europe) and the Berlin Congress (June-July, 1878) profoundly influenced Russian policy in Central Asia. Foiled by England in Europe, Russia decided to seek for compensations in Asia. In June, 1878, General Stoloff, a Russian officer, started from Tashkend to Kabul with a letter from General Kaufmann. Sher Ali opposed his advance, whether firmly or half-heartedly we cannot determine; but he reached Kabul in July and concluded a treaty of perpetual friendship.
with the Amir. With the approval of the British Cabinet, Lord Lytton now asked the Amir to receive a British envoy. There was no urgent need to press the matter, for the treaty of Berlin had restored peace in Europe, and Stoletoff left Kabul when he heard that the British intended to send a mission. But with undue haste Lord Lytton sent Sir Neville Chamberlain on a mission to Kabul. Both Disraeli and Salisbury deprecated this haste, but they had no time to prevent the mischief. The Afghans did not allow the envoy to enter the Khyber Pass. Lord Lytton declared that the mission had been ‘forcibly repulsed.’ War began in November, 1878.

SECOND AFGHAN WAR (1878-81)

Nothing reveals the unwisdom of Lord Lytton’s haste more than Kaufmann’s unsympathetic reply to Sher Ali’s appeal for assistance on the eve of the war. The Russian General advised the Amir to make peace with the British.

Three British armies advanced into Afghanistan through different routes: Sir Samuel Browne through the Khyber Pass, General Roberts through the Kurram valley, and General Stewart through the Bolan Pass. Qandahar was easily occupied. Sher Ali fled to Russian Turkestan and died in February, 1879. His son Yaqub Khan concluded the treaty of Gandamak in May, 1879. He was recognised as Amir on the following conditions: the foreign relations of Afghanistan were to be regulated according to British advice; the districts of Kurram, Pishin and Sibi were to be ceded to the British; a permanent British Resident would be received at Kabul and British agents would be stationed at Herat and other places on the frontier; the Amir would receive an annual subsidy of six lakhs and military assistance in case of foreign attack.

But Yaqub Khan soon became as unpopular with the freedom-loving Afghans as Shah Shuja had been, and Cavagnari, the British Resident in his court, was murdered in September, 1879, by the Afghans, like Macnaghten. Yakub Khan was suspected of complicity in this treachery. He was deported to India, where he lived till 1923. Qandahar and Kabul were re-occupied by British troops. Lord Lytton thought of separating Kabul from Qandahar. At this stage
Abdur Rahman Khan took leave of the Russians, came to Afghanistan, and proclaimed his claim to the throne of Kabul. Lord Lytton decided to recognise him as Amir, but before he could take that step the change of the Ministry in England led to his resignation (June, 1880).

In the summer of 1880 Disraeli was defeated in a General Election. The Liberals came back to power, with Gladstone as Prime Minister. The Liberals were bitterly opposed to the Afghan policy of Disraeli and Lytton. They sent Lord Ripon to inaugurate a new policy in India. After his arrival in India (June, 1880) Lord Ripon brought the negotiations with Abdur Rahman to a satisfactory conclusion and recognised him as Amir on three conditions: the Amir would have no political relations with any foreign Power except the British; the districts of Pishin and Sibi were to remain under British control; the Amir would receive an annual subsidy. The demand for maintaining a British Resident at Kabul was given up.

New complications were, however, created by Ayub Khan, a son of Sher Ali, who held Herat under his control. He defeated a British force at Maiwand in July, 1880, and compelled the survivors to take shelter within the walls of Kandahar. General Roberts marched from Kabul to Kandahar—a distance of more than 200 miles in a hilly country—in 20 days, relieved the besieged garrison, and routed Ayub Khan's army. Ayub Khan was finally vanquished by Abdur Rahman. Lytton's plan of partitioning Afghanistan was abandoned. The whole of the country passed under Abdur Rahman's rule, and all British troops were withdrawn.

Unjustifiable alarm and injudicious haste might have been the root causes of the Second Afghan War, but it was not as fruitless as the First Afghan War from the political and military points of view. A definite check to Russian ambition in Central Asia, the establishment of British control over the foreign relations of Afghanistan, the establishment of British suzerainty over the strategic principality of Kalat, the occupation of Quetta and Gilgit, the creation of the province of British Baluchistan (in which were incorporated the districts of Sibi and Pishin taken from the Amir)—these were solid and substantial gains.
ANGLO-RUSSIAN RIVALRY IN CENTRAL ASIA (1881-1907)

While the Second Afghan War kept the British and the Afghans busy, the Russians steadily advanced in Central Asia. The incorporation of Khokand in the Russian Empire (1876) was followed by the subjugation of the Tekke Turkomans (1881) and the fall of Merv (1884). As Merv lay within 150 miles from the Afghan frontier, a sinister significance was attached to its occupation by the Russians. Lord Ripon accepted a Russian proposal for a joint Russo-British commission to demarcate the northern boundary of Afghanistan. His successor, Lord Dufferin, had to deal with a crisis. In March, 1885, when the discussions of the joint commission had reached a deadlock, the Russians occupied Panjdeh, a village situated a hundred miles due south of Merv. War seemed imminent, but it was avoided by the good sense of the Viceroy and the Amir, both of whom refused to make a casus belli of Panjdeh. The disputed line of demarcation was settled by an agreement in July, 1887. The progress of Russia towards Herat was definitely checked. A meeting between the Amir and the Viceroy at Rawalpindi in 1885 established a good understanding between the two Governments.

The relations between Abdur Rahman and the British became less cordial when Lord Lansdowne succeeded Lord Dufferin (December, 1888). Lansdowne was not a tactful diplomat like his predecessor; the Amir resented his 'dictatorial' advice regarding the internal administration of his country. The activities of the 'Forward School' also disturbed the Amir. A strategic Railway was completed up to the Bolan Pass; general activity was evident on the Kashmir frontier—at Gilgit and Chitral. In 1892 Sir Mortimer Durand led a mission to Kabul and concluded an agreement by which the Amir engaged in future not to interfere with the Afridis, Waziris, and other frontier tribes.

In 1895 a new boundary convention was concluded with Russia. The southern boundary of the Russian Empire was fixed at the Oxus. "The boundary lines now set up by British and Russian officers on the Hindukush and by the Oxus record the first deliberate and practical attempts made by the two European powers to stave off the contact of their incessantly expanding Asiatic empires."
ANGLO-RUSSIAN CONVENTION

Lord Elgin, the Viceroy who dealt with this matter, had to suppress a widespread frontier rising in 1897-98. British interference in the affairs of Chitral was the immediate cause of this rising, but it was really the culmination of the aggressive activities of the ‘Forward School’. Peace was finally restored in this disturbed area by Lord Curzon, who gradually withdrew British troops from the tribal territory and left its defence to tribal levies. The formation of a new province—the present North-West Frontier Province—was also intended to provide for better regulation of tribal affairs.

Amir Abdur Rahman died in 1901; he was succeeded by his son Habibullah—and no civil war broke out. The question of renewing the British treaty with the old Amir in favour of the new Amir created trouble for some time; but a mission sent to Kabul by Lord Ampthill, the acting Viceroy, during Lord Curzon’s absence on leave, renewed the treaty (March, 1905) and re-established cordial relations with Habibullah.

A new agreement with Russia was now found necessary for the reconciliation of British and Russian interests in Central Asia and Persia. The growing tension between England and Germany in Europe, and the conclusion of the Franco-Russian agreement and the Anglo-French entente (1904), removed the political and diplomatic difficulties in the way of such an agreement. The famous Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907 was signed on August 31; although Lord Minto suggested that a previous discussion with the Amir was necessary and desirable, the Secretary of State, John Morley, insisted that ‘the terms should only be communicated to the Amir as a settled thing’. Russia recognised that Afghanistan lay outside the sphere of her influence and engaged to conduct her relations with the Amir through the British Government. British and Russian subjects were to enjoy equal commercial privileges in Afghanistan. The Amir refused formal assent to this convention concluded behind his back, and Lord Minto himself was doubtful about its utility.

ANNEXATION OF UPPER BURMA (1885-86)

If Russia threatened Britain on the north-west of India, France threatened her on the north-east. The activities of
France in Indo-China led to the incorporation of Upper Burma in the British Empire.

King Mindon, who usurped the throne of Burma after the Second Burmese War, was very anxious for the recovery of Pegu; after Lord Dalhousie's positive refusal to accept his request he sent missions to Napoleon III, Emperor of France, in the vain hope that he would prevail upon the Queen and the Ministers of England to reverse the policy of the Government of India. A treaty was concluded with France after the downfall of the Second Empire. Another treaty was concluded with Italy. The Czar of Russia refused to accept a Burmese mission, but the Shah of Persia welcomed a Burmese envoy in 1874. Mindon's persistent attempts to open diplomatic relations with foreign Powers were primarily intended to free Upper Burma from British political influence.

Mondon's internal policy was very cautious; he wisely refrained from giving any offence to the Government of India. By two commercial treaties (1862, 1867) he offered valuable commercial privileges to British subjects trading in Burma. Towards the close of his reign, however, he refused to continue official intercourse with the British Agent at Mandalay.

Minden was succeeded in 1878 by his son Thibaw, a youngman of 20, without any political training or administrative experience. He was not likely to be able to proceed successfully through the tangled web of British diplomacy. Lord Lytton's attempt to tighten British control on Upper Burma was overruled by the British Cabinet. Lord Ripon tried to settle the outstanding political and commercial questions by concluding a new treaty, but no agreement was found possible.

Thibaw sealed his doom by renewing political intercourse with France. In the eighties of the last century the relations between England and France were strained. England could not tolerate the extension of French influence to Upper Burma which lay very close to and within striking distance of two British provinces—British Burma and Assam. In 1883 Thibaw's envoys visited Paris; in 1884 the previous treaty with Mindon was renewed. In 1885 a new Franco-Burmese treaty was concluded. Although these treaties were nothing more
than commercial agreements, the British Government scented danger. The alarm was increased when Thibaw granted the concession of some ruby mines in Upper Burma to a French Company. A dispute between a British Company (Bombay-Burma Trading Corporation) and the Burmese Government, relating to some royalties due by the former to the latter, became the *casus belli*. A British force sent by Lord Dufferin occupied Mandalay (November, 1885) almost unopposed. Thibaw surrendered. A proclamation annexing Upper Burma was issued by Lord Dufferin on January 1, 1886.

**FOREIGN POLICY OF LORD CURZON**

Lord Curzon (1899-1905) was undoubtedly one of the greatest pro-consuls sent by England to govern her Eastern dominions. He was the youngest of the Governors-General, excepting Lord Dalhousie; and he resembled Lord Dalhousie as an administrator of superabundant energy. He had travelled widely and acquired first hand experience about Asiatic countries before his assumption of the Viceregal office. He was gifted with literary brilliance, eloquence, and imagination. His autocratic temperament and the impatient haste which characterised his work made him unpopular in India and minimised the value of his reforms. He was a typical benevolent despot, looking forward to the welfare of the millions entrusted by Providence to his care, but unable to reconcile himself with their new-born political aspirations. After his departure from India he played a distinguished part in the political life of England, and he missed the Premiership—the *sumnum bonum* of his political ambition—mainly because he was a Peer.

We have already referred to Lord Curzon's policy towards the frontier tribes and the Amir of Afghanistan. Persia next claimed his attention. After the failure of the siege of Herat (1838) the Persians continued their efforts to capture that strategic city. Their encroachments in this direction resulted in a short Anglo-Persian War in 1856-57.

The next chapter in the history of British relations with Persia opened with the question of the Persian Gulf. To Britain control over this Gulf was a vital necessity; the safety
of the Indian Empire required that this narrow sea, or any part of its coast, should not fall under the influence of any other European power. But Britain's right to control this important region was contested by France, Russia, Germany and Turkey. Lord Curzon adopted a strong attitude and defeated several attempts made by these Powers to establish themselves on the coast of the Persian Gulf. The Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907 divided Persia into two spheres of influence; northern Persia under Russia and south-eastern Persia under England. Formally, however, both England and Russia engaged to respect the integrity and political independence of Persia.

From Persia we turn to Tibet. This nominal dependency of China was really an independent theocracy, the supreme ruler being a priest known as the Dalai Lama. The history of British relations with this secluded country begins in the days of Warren Hastings, who sent Bogle to Tibet. In 1887 the Tibetans invaded Sikim; they were repulsed by a British force. Boundary conventions and commercial agreements concluded in 1890 and 1893 were quietly ignored by the Tibetans. On the eve of Lord Curzon's assumption of office the Dalai Lama fell under the influence of a Russian named Dorjieff and it was rumoured that Russia had secured some special rights in Tibet by a secret treaty with China. Lord Curzon secured the consent of the British Cabinet to send a mission to Tibet. Colonel Younghusband reached Lhasa in August, 1904, and concluded a treaty which provided for the opening of commercial marts and also for the payment of an indemnity by the Tibetans. Although Younghusband unveiled Lhasa, the political value of the agreement concluded by him hardly justified the spectacular publicity accorded to his journey. By the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907 both England and Russia engaged to conduct their political relations with Tibet through China and to refrain from interfering in the internal administration of Tibet and also from acquiring any part of Tibetan territory.

THIRD AFGHAN WAR (1919)

Amir Habibullah was murdered in February, 1910, and was succeeded by his son Amanullah. The new Amir made
a departure from the wise policy laid down by his grandfather; he invaded British territory. The Third Afghan War was short and swift. Peace was restored by the treaty of Rawalpindi (August, 1919) which was confirmed by another treaty concluded in November, 1921. Afghanistan now secured her freedom from British control in external affairs and became a fully sovereign State. The British Government agreed to receive an Afghan envoy in London and to appoint a British minister in Kabul. A commercial agreement was concluded in 1923.

Amanullah's hasty attempt to modernise Afghanistan resulted in his abdication in 1929. The throne was seized by an adventurer named Bachai Saqao, who was soon overthrown by Nadir, an ex-officer of the late Amir. The British Government remained strictly neutral during the revolution; after the restoration of order Nadir Shah was recognised as Amir.

SECTION II

ADMINISTRATION AND CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

LORD CANNING (1856-62)

After the suppression of the Revolt of 1857 Lord Canning's attention was naturally devoted to the restoration of order and peace through sympathetic ameliorative measures. In this respect, however, his work was obstructed by the bitter criticism of non-official Europeans, who attributed all evils to his 'blindness, weakness, and incapacity'. The aggressive spirit of the European merchants found expression in the notorious indigo disputes in Bengal.

The deficits caused by the Revolt of 1857 necessitated a reorganization of the financial system. The work was begun by James Wilson, a British Treasury expert sent to India in 1859. After his untimely death it was continued by Samuel Laing, who was sent from England to succeed him as the Finance Member of the Governor-General's Council. Wilson introduced the Income Tax and established a uniform import
tariff of ten per cent. His plan for a convertible paper currency and his schemes for retrenchment were given effect to by Laing.

It was widely recognised that the Permanent Settlement had adversely affected the interests of the tenants. In 1858 the Court of Directors declared that "the rights of the Bengal ryots had passed away sub silentio, and they had become, to all intents and purposes, tenants-at-will". The Rent Act of 1859, which was applicable to Bengal, Bihar, Agra and the Central Provinces, but not to Oudh or the Punjab, conferred on the ryot right of occupancy under certain conditions. Its good effects were largely nullified by litigation initiated by the Zamindars.

In Lord Canning's time the work of codification begun by Macaulay about three decades ago came to a successful completion. The Indian Penal Code was enacted in 1860. The Criminal Procedure Code appeared in 1861. In the same year the old Supreme Courts and Company's Adalats were replaced by chartered High Courts in each Presidency.

**THE INDIAN COUNCILS ACT, 1861**

The Legislature created by the Charter Act of 1853 had assumed a tone of independent criticism towards the Executive. The autocratic Dalhousie supported this assertion of legislative independence, but Sir Charles Wood, who was then President of the Board of Control, was not prepared to allow the transformation of the Legislative Council into 'an Anglo-Indian House of Commons'. Lord Canning, who resented criticism, agreed with him. So it was felt that steps should be taken to confine the Council specifically to legislation. At the same time there was a reaction against the centralisation of the legislative machinery. The Governments of Madras and Bombay were put into considerable inconvenience by the loss of legislative authority. Some decentralisation of the legislative system was urgently called for. Another reason for remodelling the system of legislation was the necessity of admitting some representative and influential Indians into the Legislative Council. Sir Charles Wood pointed out that such a step 'will tend more to conciliate to our rule the minds of Natives of high rank'. After
the Revolt of 1857 the conciliation of the ‘Natives of high rank’ was an urgent political necessity.

The Indian Councils Act of 1861 provided that the function of the Legislative Council should be confined strictly to legislation; it would have no control over administration or finance, no right of interpellation. The Governments of Madras and Bombay regained their legislative power. There was no demarcation between Central and Provincial subjects, but all Provincial laws were subject to the veto of the Governor-General. Legislative Councils were established in Bengal, the North-Western Provinces (now called Uttar Pradesh) and the Punjab in 1862, 1886 and 1897. Thirdly, the Councils of the Governor-General and the Governors of Madras and Bombay were expanded for legislative purposes by the appointment by nomination of additional members, half of whom were to be non-officials. No statutory provision was made for the admission of Indians, but in practice some of the non-official seats were offered to ‘Natives of high rank’. The Governor-General was empowered, in cases of emergency, to make, without the concurrence of the Legislative Council, ordinances which were not to remain in force for more than six months.

The Act of 1861 also introduced the portfolio system in the Government of India. Up to the time of Lord Canning the theory was that the Government of India was a Government by the entire body of the Executive Council; so all business and all official papers had to be brought to the notice of all members of the Council. This system was very inconvenient. In pursuance of the power conferred on the Governor-General by the Act of 1861 Lord Canning divided the departments of Government between the members of the Council. “Thereby were laid the foundations of Cabinet Government in India, . . . each branch of the Administration having its official head and spokesman in the Government, who was responsible for its administration and its defence.”

SIR JOHN LAWRENCE (1864-69)

Lawrence came to the Viceroyal office with a great reputation as an administrator. In this exalted office he revealed two
defects. In the first place, he paid so much attention to details that he could not do his duty as a supervisor of general administration. Secondly, he was 'never able to shake off the habits of the Punjab officials of old days, and admittedly was too indifferent to the ordinary daily maintenance of the dignity of his great office'. He paid great attention to Railways, irrigation, and roads, and continued Dalhousie's policy in this respect. By two Tenancy Acts he extended to the tenants of Oudh and the Punjab rights similar to those enjoyed by the tenants of Bengal under Canning's Act of 1859.

**LORD MAYO (1869-72)**

Lawrence left to his successor a large deficit. Lord Mayo was, therefore, compelled to start his career as a financial reformer. Supported by experienced officers like Sir Richard Temple and Sir John Strachey, he increased the Income Tax as well as the salt duties and introduced a new distribution of income between the Central and the Local Governments. So long all grants by the Central Government to the Local Governments were definitely ear-marked for special purposes, so that any amount saved by the latter had to be returned to the former. This severe restriction on the discretion of the Local Governments was now removed. They were now to receive a fixed yearly grant (subject to revision every five years) which they could spend according to their discretion within certain carefully defined limits. One of the criticisms levelled against the new system is that it compelled Provincial Governments to impose new taxes—mostly cesses on land—and thereby increased the general burden of taxation.

Lord Mayo organised the first general census of India (1871) and created a department of agriculture and commerce in the Government of India.

**RELATIONS WITH INDIAN STATES**

We have already referred to the Queen's assurance to the Indian Princes and also to the withdrawal of the 'Doctrine of Lapse'.
In the time of Lord Northbrook Malhar Rao Gaikwar of Baroda was arrested (1875) and tried by a Commission on the charge of trying to poison the Resident at his Court. The Commissioners being equally divided on the question of his guilt, the Government of India did not formally convict him, but he was deposed for 'his notorious misconduct, his gross misgovernment of the State, and his evident incapacity to carry into effect necessary reforms'.

In 1876 the Royal Titles Act, passed by the British Parliament at the instance of Disraeli, authorised the Queen to alter her title in India. On January 1, 1877, she was proclaimed as Queen Empress in 'a durbar of unsurpassed magnificence' presided over by Lord Lytton. The assumption of this new title by the Queen brought the Indian States within the boundary of the British Empire. The Princes ceased to be allies; they became vassals.

In 1881 Lord Ripon restored the Maharaja of Mysore to power and withdrew British administration from that State. This was done in accordance with a decision reached in 1867. After half a century of direct British rule this premier State was restored to its old position.

In 1886 Lord Dufferin conciliated Sindia by restoring to him the fort of Gwalior.

Lord Lansdowne had to suppress a revolt in Manipur. A disputed succession in this petty State led to the decision that Tikendrajit, the local commander-in-chief, should be exiled. A British officer who went to Manipur to control the situation was publicly beheaded (1891). Within a short time Tikendrajit was hanged and the administration was placed in charge of the Resident.

Lord Lansdowne also compelled the Khan of Kalat to abdicate in favour of his son.

Lord Curzon gave the finishing touch to Lord Dalhousie's policy of incorporating Berar within British India. The Nizam was persuaded to hand over this province to the Government

1 The Indian Independence Act of 1947 led to the renunciation of the Imperial title by the ruler of England, who became King of the Dominions of India and Pakistan.
of India 'under the fiction of a perpetual lease, so as to preserve the nominal sovereignty of Hyderabad.' In 1926 Lord Reading reminded the Nizam that 'the right of the British Government to intervene in the internal affairs of Indian States is another instance of the consequences necessarily involved in the supremacy of the British Crown'.

The plan for uniting the Indian Princes in a Council was first formed by Lord Curzon and later developed by Lord Minto, Lord Hardinge and Lord Chelmsford. The Montagu-Chelmsford Report made a definite recommendation for the creation of 'a permanent consultative body'. The Chamber of Princes was inaugurated by a Royal Proclamation on February 8, 1921. The lapse of British Paramountcy led to the abolition of the Chamber of Princes.

The tightening of British control over the Princes since the transfer of India to the British Crown had an important consequence. They became, as Lord Curzon pointed out, 'the colleagues and partners' of the British rulers of India. In other words, to quote Mahatma Gandhi, the Princes became 'British officers in Indian dress'. As a result of their transformation into 'an integral factor in the Imperial organisation of India' they gradually lost their contact with their people; they were found more 'on the polo-ground, or on the race-course, or in the European hotel' than by the side of their suffering subjects. Some wise British administrators foresaw the inevitable effects of this growing estrangement between the Princes and their people. One Viceroy after another—from Lord Lansdowne to Lord Linlithgow—warned the Princes that their States should be well-governed. The spirit underlying these warnings was quite in harmony with the system of patriarchal government which prevailed in British India till the early years of the present century; but as a result of the gradual introduction of political reforms in British India that oft-repeated insistence on good government in the States became an anachronism. Although the people of the States began to demand political reforms on the model of British India, the British Government deliberately left the Princes free to continue the medieval system of autocracy as long as they remained submissive to their British masters.
FAMINES

A succession of famines constitutes one of the darkest features of the history of the post-1857 period. A terrible famine desolated Agra, the Punjab, Rajputana and Cutch in 1861. In 1866 the victim was Orissa. Sir John Lawrence miserably failed to deal with the situation. In 1873-74 a less serious famine visited Bihar and parts of Bengal; Sir Richard Temple conducted the relief operations with credit. Large areas in Mysore, in the Madras and Bombay Presidencies, in the Central and United Provinces, and also some parts of the Punjab suffered terribly in the famine of 1876-78. The Government of Madras committed many mistakes, and Lord Lytton was not very successful in relieving distress. The famine of 1896-97, 'believed to have been the most severe ever known', desolated the United Provinces, the Central Provinces, Bihar and some parts of the Punjab. In 1900 Gujarat suffered from a serious famine. Lord Curzon set up a Famine Commission which reported in 1901 and suggested measures for the prevention of famine.

LORD LYTON (1876-1880)

Lord Lytton's internal administration was hardly less unpopular than his Afghan policy. The Vernacular Press Act of 1878 put stringent restrictions on the liberty of the Press; but these restrictions were not applicable to journals conducted in English. This reactionary legislation was the product of Lord Lytton's irritation at the bitter criticism of his foreign policy in the Indian Press. His failure to deal with the famine of 1876-78, and his absorption in a magnificent Durbar at a time when millions were dying of hunger and disease, made him deservedly unpopular with the Indian people. The financial reforms of Sir John Strachey were important steps towards the introduction of Free Trade in India. The creation of the Statutory Civil Service (1879) was intended to give Indians a chance to occupy important posts in the higher administrative service, but the measure proved a failure. It was abolished eight years later.
LORD RIPON (1880-1884)

Lord Ripon’s period of office, like that of Lord William Bentinck, deserves to be remembered as an era when victories in peace were deliberately preferred to victories in war. Lord Ripon was every inch a typical mid-Victorian Liberal. A loyal political disciple of Gladstone, he was far more interested in dull administrative reforms than in a spirited foreign policy. In him the benevolent despotism characteristic of British rule in India in the nineteenth century reached its climax.

In finance, the result of the policy pursued by Sir John Strachey in the time of Lord Lytton became evident in the time of Lord Ripon. In spite of the Second Afghan War, there was no deficit. Advantage was taken of the increasing revenue to carry to its logical conclusion the Free Trade policy pursued by Northbrook and Lytton. Evelyn Baring (afterwards Lord Cromer) ably managed the department of finance. Lord Ripon tried to secure the immunity of the tenant from enhancement of rent except on the sole ground of a rise in prices, but he was overruled by the Secretary of State.

Lord Ripon abolished the Vernacular Press Act, took a general census of India, excluding Nepal and Kashmir, in 1881, appointed a commission under the presidency of Sir William Hunter to inquire into the condition of education, and introduced legislation to regulate and improve the conditions of labour in Indian factories. All these measures made him very popular with the Indian people; but his popularity reached its climax in connection with the agitation over the Ilbert Bill. Mr. C. P. Ilbert, Law Member of Lord Ripon’s Council, prepared a Bill which sought to remove from the Code of Criminal Procedure ‘every judicial disqualification based merely on race distinctions’ by bringing European British subjects under the jurisdiction of Indian magistrates and judges. This simple administrative measure excited the racial feelings of the Europeans who violently protested against any alteration in the existing law. This produced a reaction among the Indians, who discovered in the Bill a charter of racial equality. Lord Ripon became very unpopular with the Europeans; he had to bow before the storm. The principle of the Bill was abandoned; although Indian magistrates and judges were given the-
right of exercising jurisdiction over European British subjects, the privileged position of the latter found expression in their right to claim trial by European jurors.

BEGINNINGS OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT

The first attempt to establish a municipal organisation outside the Presidency towns was made in 1842. Before the Revolt of 1857 municipal institutions were established in many British Indian towns. In most cases, however, the municipal commissioners were nominated by the Government; there was yet no question of making them dependent on popular suffrage.

In 1870 Lord Mayo took a decisive step towards the establishment of local self-governing institutions. A Resolution of the Government of India declared: "... local interest, supervision, and care are necessary to success in the management of funds devoted to education, sanitation, medical charity and local public works. The operation of this Resolution... will afford opportunities for the development of self-government, for strengthening municipal institutions, and for the association of Natives and Europeans to a greater extent than heretofore in the administration of affairs." This Resolution led to the passing of new Municipal Acts and the establishment of new municipalities in different provinces.

In 1882 Lord Ripon extended and liberalised Lord Mayo's policy. His aim was "to advance and promote the political and popular education of the people and to induce the best and most intelligent men in the community to come forward and take a share in the management of their own local affairs and to guide and train them in the attainment of that important object." Acts were passed in 1883-84, which extended the elective principle and brought the municipalities under partial popular control. Lord Ripon's system remained in force till 1915, when Lord Hardinge introduced some important changes.

In the rural areas Lord Ripon established Local Boards and District Boards. Emphasis was laid on the elective principle, and it was felt that 'the necessary Government control... should be exercised rather from without than from within'. Acts were passed in 1883-85 in different provinces.
creating rural Boards, which were based on the same general principle.

THE INDIAN COUNCILS ACT, 1892

The Indian Councils Act of 1861 had provided some scope for some eminent Indians to participate in the important work of legislation. But as the work of the Legislatures was confined to legislation alone, they had very little scope to improve the condition of the country. Demands for the extension of the functions of the Legislatures and also for the expansion of the elective principle were made by the Indian National Congress founded in 1885. A Committee was appointed to deal with this matter in the time of Lord Dufferin. Upon the deliberations of this Committee was based the Indian Councils Act of 1892, which was passed by the British Government at the instance of Lord Cross, Secretary of State for India. It was provided that the number of the additional members of the Governor-General’s Council must not be less than ten or more than sixteen. The number of the additional members in the Provincial Legislative Councils was also raised. All the additional members were to be nominated by the Government, as before; but the rules framed under the Act conferred on local bodies like the municipalities and the District Boards the right to nominate members for vacant seats in the Provincial Legislative Councils. This indirect recognition of the principle of election was a measure of great constitutional significance. In two respects the rights of the members of the Legislatures were increased. They were entitled to express their views upon financial statements which were henceforth to be made on the floor of the Legislatures, although they were not empowered to move resolutions or divide the House in respect of any financial question. Secondly, they were empowered to put questions within certain limits to the Government on matters of public interest.

The Act of 1892 failed to satisfy the Nationalists. It was very ably criticised at successive sessions of the Congress. But the Legislatures functioning under this Act were joined by eminent Indian leaders like Gopal Krishna Gokhale, Asutosh Mookherjee, Rash Behari Ghosh and Surendra Nath Banerjee.
Their eloquence and political wisdom amply demonstrated the Parliamentary capacity and patriotism of the educated Indians.

LORD CURZON (1899-1905)

Lord Curzon's zeal for administrative reforms found vent through many channels. He appointed commissions to inquire into the defects of existing systems and methods and promptly gave effect to their recommendations. Some improvements were introduced into the Police system. The miserable condition of the tenants did not escape Lord Curzon's attention. The Punjab Land Alienation Act (1900) sought to protect the cultivators of that province from eviction by crafty money-lenders. The revenue Resolutions of 1902 and 1905 regulated the enhancement of rent by the Government. Co-operative Credit Societies were founded to provide cultivators with capital at a nominal rate of interest. An Inspector-General of Agriculture was appointed and an Imperial Agricultural Department was founded with a view to put primitive Indian agriculture on a scientific basis. The whole irrigation system was put on an improved basis. A new impetus was given to the Railway programme; about 6,000 miles of new lines were constructed. A new Department of Commerce and Industry was created; it was put under the charge of a sixth member of the Executive Council.

Students of Indian History and Archaeology must remain grateful to Lord Curzon for the measures he adopted for preserving ancient buildings and monuments. But his attempt to solve the problem of education made him very unpopular among Indians. The Indian Universities Act of 1904 was intended by him 'to raise the standard of education all round, and particularly of higher education'; but Indian public opinion suspected that its purpose was to bring the universities and the colleges under official control.

Lord Curzon created two new Provinces for the convenience of administration. The trans-Indus districts of the Punjab were joined with the tribal territories under British control to form the North-West Frontier Province, which was placed under a Chief Commissioner directly responsible to the Government of India. It was a wise measure, but the Partition of Bengal (1905) was different. Lord Curzon divided Bengal into two
parts: the eastern and northern districts were joined with Assam to form the new Province of Eastern Bengal and Assam and the western districts were joined with Bihar and Orissa to constitute the Province of Bengal. The people of Bengal bitterly resented this attempt to create an artificial political boundary between them; the revocation of the Partition became the battle-cry of the Nationalists. Bengal was re-united in 1911.

Military reforms interested Lord Curzon as much as administrative reforms. The transport system of the army was re-organized. New arms and guns were provided. In 1901 the Imperial Cadet Corps was founded; it consisted of young men of aristocratic descent. A disagreement with Lord Kitchener, the then Commander-in-Chief, on the question of military administration led to Lord Curzon's resignation in 1905, for the Secretary of State supported Lord Kitchener.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS

The spread of western education lies at the bottom of India's political awakening. Intimate acquaintance with progressive writers like Burke, Macaulay, Bentham, Mill, Herbert Spencer and Comte changed the outlook of the new generations which arose after the establishment of British supremacy. Leaders of Indian religious and social thought, like Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Keshab Chandra Sen, Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar, Dayananda Saraswati and Swami Vivekananda created in the Indian mind a desire for emancipation. Economic troubles—the indigo disputes in Bengal and the frequent outbreak of famine in many parts of India—and administrative abuses gradually convinced intelligent Indians that self-government was not a luxury but a necessity. The rise of Japan filled the East with new hopes and aspirations.

The Revolt of 1857 undoubtedly estranged Europeans from Indians in this country; this estrangement found a new lease of life as a result of the bitter agitation over the Ilbert Bill. "The passionate claim of the European to predominance", says Dodwell, "was to be answered by the passionate claim of the Indian to equality." The Indian National Congress, which owes its origin to the initiative of a benevolent British civilian named Allan Octavian Hume, met for the first time in Bombay on December 27, 1885, under the presidency of a great Bengali
lawyer, Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee. In the early stage of its development the Congress received the support of some prominent officials, but within a short time the Government of India began to look upon it with suspicion. Sir Syed Ahmed, the founder of the ‘Aligarh Movement’, at first kept aloof from, then became definitely opposed to, the Congress. The aim of the Congress was to secure constitutional and representative government for India through constitutional means. This mild programme failed to satisfy the ardent patriots, and the Indian Councils Act of 1892 showed that the British Government was yet unprepared to adopt the principle of election in the constitution of the legislatures. An extremist party developed within the Congress under the leadership of Bal Gangadhar Tilak, a great son of Maharashtra, who found able assistants in Lala Lajpat Rai and Bipin Chandra Pal. The Partition of Bengal strengthened the hands of this party, and in the Surat Congress of 1907 there was an open breach between the moderate and extremist sections. Simultaneously a terrorist movement was organised in Bengal. Lord Minto took repressive measures; some prominent leaders were deported without trial. But repression was not enough, and Lord Minto knew it. With the concurrence of the Liberal Secretary of State, Lord Morley, he adopted a policy of kicks and kisses.

THE COMMUNAL PROBLEM

While the Congress was growing stronger as the exponent of national freedom, the Muslims generally kept themselves aloof from it. According to Coupland, ‘the indifference, if not antagonism’, of the Muslims towards the nationalist movement was due to their ‘relative backwardness in education, coupled with the knowledge that they were only about one-quarter of the Indian population as a whole’. Their ‘indifference’, at its initial stage, was largely due to the policy advocated by Sir Syed Ahmed. It gradually became something like ‘antagonism’ when the British Bureaucracy, alarmed at the growing influence of the Congress as ‘a mighty nationaliser’, deliberately adopted the policy of divide et impera. The first official expression of this policy may be noticed in Lord Minto’s reply to a deputation of Muslim leaders led by the Aga Khan in 1906. He promised them what is known as ‘Separate Electorate’ and
assured them that "their political rights and interests as a community will be safeguarded." The importance of this attempt to drive a wedge between the Hindus and the Muslims was clearly realised by the British Bureaucracy. A British official wrote to Lady Minto: "A work of statesmanship that will affect India and Indian history for many a long year. It is nothing less than the pulling back of sixty-two millions of people from joining the ranks of the seditious opposition". Lord Morley emphasized the deep-rooted differences between Hinduism and Islam. He said, "It is a difference in life, in tradition, in history, in all the social things as well as articles of belief that constitute a community. . . ."

THE MORLEY-MINTO REFORMS (1907-1909)

The 'seditious opposition' was, however, too strong to be broken up by the 'antagonism' of a microscopic minority of politically conscious Muslims. So Lord Morley and Lord Minto decided to introduce a further instalment of reforms. In 1907 two Indians (Sir K. G. Gupta and Syed Hussain Bilgrami) were admitted to the Council of India. In 1909 Sir S. P. (later Lord) Sinha was appointed to the Governor-General's Executive Council as Law Member. Then followed the Indian Councils Act, 1909, which introduced important constitutional changes. The size of the Legislatures was increased. The number of additional members of the Governor-General's Council was now raised, at the maximum, to 60. The maximum number of additional members for the Legislative Councils of the Punjab and Burma was fixed at 30 and for the other Provinces at 50. The principle of election was at last frankly accepted. In the Imperial Legislative Council a standing official majority was maintained; in the Provincial Councils the non-officials (elected and nominated) constituted the majority. Only Bengal secured elected majority in her Legislative Council. The good effects of these provisions were largely nullified by the introduction of 'Separate Electorate' which widened the political gulf between the Hindus and the Muslims.

The introduction of 'Separate Electorate' and some anomalies connected with the franchise provoked the criticism of the Congress, which for the time being overlooked the more
fundamental defects in the Morley-Minto scheme. Lord Minto made it clear that representative government of the Western type was not suitable for India. Lord Morley was not prepared to see India 'on the footing of a self-governing colony'. Thus the fundamental principle behind the Morley-Minto Reforms made no concession to the Congress demand for self-government within the British Empire.

The Montagu-Chelmsford Report points out the illogical and ineffective character of the Morley-Minto Reforms and suggests several causes for their failure. "There was no general advance in local bodies; no real setting free of provincial finance; and in spite of some progress no widespread admission of Indians in greater number into the public service". The Government of India did not relax their control over the Provincial Governments; so the sphere in which the Provincial Legislative Councils could affect the Governments' actions was closely circumscribed. The steady growth of national consciousness increased the demand for effective political power.

THE FIRST WORLD WAR (1914-18)

Although the outbreak of war in Europe in August, 1914, had no immediate connection with the defence of India, yet as a part of the British Empire India automatically became involved in it, and she made splendid contributions to victory. Not only did she send troops and munitions; she took up responsibility for one hundred millions of the war debt. Lord Birkenhead declared, "Without India the war would have been immensely prolonged, if indeed without her help it could have been brought to a victorious conclusion."

The War gave a new impetus to Indian political aspirations. Mrs. Annie Besant established the Home Rule League in September, 1916. The Lucknow session of the Congress, held in December, 1916, healed the breach between the moderate and the extremist sections. In the same year the Congress and the Muslim League formulated a joint scheme of reforms. The League had already renounced its reactionary policy by declaring that its aim was 'the attainment of self-government for India along with the other Communities' (March, 1913). In 1916 the Congress placated the Muslim League by accepting the system of 'Separate Electorate'. The concessions made by the Congress
were, says Coupland, 'far more substantial concessions than the Moslems had been given by Morley and Minto to secure their acquiescence in the Reforms of 1909'. The Lucknow Pact, which thus brought the Congress and the Muslim League together in the same camp, was 'the most striking expression of Indian nationalism so far achieved'.

Towards the close of the War the anti-British feeling in India reached its climax. The Report of the Rowlatt Committee on Sedition revealed the existence of a net-work of terrorist organisations. The special legislation introduced to crush these organisations evoked strong protests from all sections of Indian opinion and outbreak of local disturbances led to the notorious Jallianwala Bagh Massacre. The Khalifat question, i.e., the fate of Turkey, created grave discontent in the Muslim community, and under the leadership of the Ali brothers the Muslims joined the Congress and the Non-co-operation movement started by Mahatma Gandhi. A British writer observes, 'The wave of unrest which swept through the country after the War was totally unlike any of the earlier periods of agitation .... The new phase of nationalism was broad enough to include the Moslems and sufficiently popular to attract the masses'.

GOVERNORS-GENERAL AND VICEROYS UNDER THE BRITISH CROWN

Lord Canning (November, 1858—March, 1862). 1
Lord Elgin I (March, 1862—November, 1863).
Sir Robert Napier. 2
Sir William Denison.
Sir John Lawrence (January, 1864—January, 1869).
Lord Mayo (January, 1869—January, 1872).
Sir John Strachey.
Lord Napier.
Lord Northbrook (May, 1872—April, 1876).

1 Canning came to India as Governor-General under the Company in February, 1856. He became the first Viceroy of India on the transfer of India from the Company to the Crown in November, 1858.
2 The names of those who held the post temporarily are printed in italics.
Lord Lytton (April, 1876—June, 1880).
Lord Ripon (June, 1880—December, 1884).
Lord Dufferin (December, 1884—December, 1888).
Lord Lansdowne (December, 1888—January, 1894).
Lord Elgin II (January, 1894—January, 1899).
Lord Curzon (January, 1899—November, 1905).
Lord Amphiil (April—December, 1904)\(^1\).
Lord Minto II (November, 1905—November, 1910).
Lord Hardinge II (November, 1910—April, 1916).
Lord Chelmsford (April, 1916—April, 1921).
Lord Reading (April, 1921—April, 1926).
Lord Lytton II.\(^2\)
Lord Irwin\(^3\) (April, 1926—April, 1931).
Lord Goschen.\(^4\)
Lord Willingdon (April, 1931—April, 1936).
Sir George Stanley.\(^5\)
Lord Linlithgow (April, 1936—October, 1943).
Lord Wavell (October, 1943—March, 1947).
Lord Louis Mountbatten (March—August 14, 1947).\(^6\)
Sir John Colville.\(^7\)
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A. C. Banerjee, *Indian Constitutional Documents, Vol. II.*
Coupland, *The Constitutional Problem in India.*
P. Sitaramyaa, *History of the Indian National Congress,*
Vols. I-II.

\(^1\) Officiated during Lord Curzon's absence on leave.
\(^2\) Officiated during Lord Reading's absence on leave in 1925.
\(^3\) Now Lord Halifax.
\(^4\) Officiated during Lord Irwin's absence on leave in 1929.
\(^5\) Officiated during Lord Willingdon's absence on leave in 1934.
\(^6\) Ceased to be Viceroy according to the Indian Independence Act of 1947 and became Governor-General of the Dominion of India on August 15, 1947.
\(^7\) Officiated in December, 1946, and May, 1947, when Lord Wavell and Lord Louis Mountbatten, respectively, went to England for consultation with His Majesty's Government.