

THE PROBLEMS OF INDIAN NATIVE STATES

— OR —

THEIR CLAIM FOR THE FULL RIGHTS OF
MEMBERSHIP IN THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH
—FOR JUSTICE, FREEDOM AND
OPPORTUNITY FOR INDIVIDUAL AND NATIONAL
SELF-DEVELOPMENT

WITH AN INTRODUCTION

BY

DR SIR S. SUBRAMANIA IYER

K. C. I. E., LL. D.,

Honorary President, Home Rule League, Madras

SECOND EDITION

REVISED AND ENLARGED

THE HOME RULE LEAGUE

MADRAS.

THE "KARNATAKA" OFFICE

BANGALORE CITY

RAJYADHURANDHARA

Sir K. Seshadri Iyer,

Dewan of Mysore

1883-1901.

*A biographical narrative
and administrative record.*

*With frontispiece and
Lord Hardinge's Eulogy.*

Price 4 As.

**The Shrine on the
Sea-shore.**

A VISIT TO

Dr. Sir S. Subramania Iyer

K.C.I.E., L.L.D.

*With a Portrait
according to a recent
Photo.*

Price 1½ As.

All About Mysore.

*A Historical, Statistical
and General Hand-Book
for all matters
relating to the most
progressive Indian State.*

Price 1 Re.

TOLSTOY

THE PROPHET OF RUSSIA

*A Biographical and
Critical Study,
with a frontispiece and
copious extracts.*

Price 2 As.

Printed by K. S. Krishna Iyer, B.A.,
at the Irish Press, Bangalore City.

PREFACE.

The first edition of this pamphlet was published about two months ago and it was simply a reprint of the "MEMORIALS ON THE PROBLEMS OF INDIAN NATIVE STATES" addressed to H. H. the Maharaja Sahib Bahadur of Bikaner, which had appeared in the *Karnataka* between the 4th and the 15th of August 1917. These memorials, again, were but a connected and concise statement of the ideas that have been expressed in the columns of the *Karnataka* for over three years past.

The very sympathetic and appreciative reception given to the first edition by some leading national journals and by persons known for their patriotism and judgment has encouraged the writer to bring out a second edition, and he has availed himself of this opportunity to add much new matter in the shape of foot-notes and appendices which, he hopes, will be found useful.

These pages had to be written in the hurry and amid the distractions incidental to journalistic work. They must necessarily be very imperfect in respect of literary form and arrangement of matter. The writer hopes that his very imperfections may induce those who are more competent than he can pretend to be, to deal with the subject in better style and with better effect.

Dr. Sir Subramania Iyer, whose name will be written in letters of gold in the history of India's freedom and rejuvenation, has, with characteristic magnanimity, bestowed more than merited appreciation and honour upon the writer by contributing the introduction which, the reader will doubtless agree, forms the more valuable part of the book. Dr. Sir Subramania Iyer's views regarding the political future of the Native States, the essential unity of India, the all-embracing character of the movement for Home Rule and the true meaning of democracy may be further read in the pamphlet entitled "*The Shrine on the Sea-shore*" wherein the writer has recorded the conversation he was privileged to hold with the venerable President of the Home Rule League in September last.

The writer would be failing in his duty if he omitted to place on record his gratitude to the authorities of the Home Rule League, Madras, for having allowed the publication of the book under their auspices. He hopes, that with their support behind it, the subject will receive that wide and serious attention throughout India to which its intrinsic importance entitles it.

The writer has also to acknowledge his indebtedness to his ever-helpful friend Mr. K. S. Krishna Iyer B.A., for the index, and to other kind friends for other valuable assistance.

The "Karnataka" Office,
Bangalore City,
26th Oct. 1917.

D. V. G.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Introduction	... 8—16
MEMORIAL I.—	...17—36
Address to H. H. the Maharaja of Bikaner	17
Native States—not to be ignored	... 18
No sordid opportunism	... 19
England has a mission in the States also	... 20
Representation at the War-Conference—the admission, but not the fulfilment of a Right	22
The problems briefly stated	... 23
Non-interference not to mean Negligence...	24
Home Rule for the States	... 27
<i>Swaraj</i> better than both Benevolent Autocracy and Efficient Bureaucracy	... 29
The Spirit of the Age	... 31
Some Elements of true Constitution	... 32
The example of Lord Buddha	... 35
The Truly Prince-like Attitude	... 35
APPENDIX I.	...37—38
APPENDIX II.	...39—40
MEMORIAL II.—	...41—58
Self-Government—the life-principle of every organization	... 41
Conference of Princes : A chimera	... 44
The Sovereign not to be his own vehicle	... 46
Commonwealth,—Not Hegemony	... 47
The States in All-India and Imperial matters	51
The Sisterhood of States	52
A Tribunal for Native States	... 53
The States-schools for Statesmanship	... 55
" <i>Swadeshi</i> " in public service	... 57
Interchange of officers between States	... 58
APPENDIX III	...59—60

MEMORIAL III.—	...61—78
National value of Native States	... 61
Uses of a Constitutional King	... 62
Education of the Princes	... 65
Choice of British Resident and other officers	69
Minority Administration	... 70
Subjects of Native States and admission into the I.C.S.	... 71
Military training	... 73
Self-Government:—the root of all greatness	74
Home Rule and Native States	... 75
Appeal to the British throne	... 76
The vision of the future	... 77
MEMORIAL IV.—	...79—88
Lord Islington's scheme	... 79
Revision of Treaties	... 80
Re-classification of States	... 81
Princes—and Princes	... 82
Unreality of Advertised Progress	... 84
Participation in the fight for Home Rule— A Vitalizing Process	... 86
True Statesmanship	... 87
APPENDIX IV	...89—90
Lord Islington on Native States	... 89
Comment on the above	... 90
MEMORIAL V.—	...91—98
Are there to be more Native States?	... 91
The Lawrence-Pollen scheme	... 93
True Meaning of Home Rule	... 94
Republican Polity of Ancient India	... 96
Citizenship—not liable to arbitrary changes	97
APPENDIX V	99—100
Sivajee's System of Government	... 98
Tiruvalluvar's Ideals of Kingship	... 99
Democracy in Ancient India	... 100
APPENDIX VI	103—110

The Maharaja of Alwar in Support of Home Rule	...	102
Democracy in Travancore	...	103
Mediaeval-Minded Kashmir	...	104
The Piteous State of Pudukotta	...	105
An Unprincely Prince	...	106
Over-centralized Government in Hyderabad		107
A French Publicist on Native States	...	108
APPENDIX VII	..	110—113
Native States and British Interference	...	110
Native State Governments and Members of the Ruling Family	...	112
APPENDIX VIII		113—118
Native States and Home Rule	...	113
Extract from. a welcome letter to Mrs. Besant	...	113
The <i>Mahratta's</i> comment on the above		116
THOUGHTS ON DEMOCRACY		118—124
Responsibility of the Public of Native States	...	118
Uses of Bureaucracy	...	119
Sir Rabindranath on Self-Rule	...	120
"His Highness' Opposition"	...	122
A Legend of the Foreign Office by Rudyard Kipling	...	125
APHORISMS		126—128
England's Mission (A. C. Swinburne)	...	126
New Times (J. R. Lowell)	...	126
Liberty—the Life-Principle (Joseph Mazzini)		126
Autocracy out of date (Count Tolstoy)	...	127
Political ambition—the Tonic for a weak and backward People	...	127
National Policy for a Native State	...	128
Sir Visvesvaraya on Native States in the Empire	...	129
INDEX.	...	132

INTRODUCTION.

BY DR. SIR S. SUBRAMANIA IYER.

(*Hon. President, Home Rule League; Madras.*)

What should be the attitude of the Home Rulers in British India as regards the political advancement of their brethren in the Native States?

It must be plain to every one that the subjects of our Ruling Princes form no negligible section of the people of India, and that so long as they remain stagnant and backward, our national unification and progress cannot be satisfactory and complete. In all matters of local or provincial - as distinguished from imperial—politics, the citizens of British India and those of the Native States are inseparably linked together; their interests are common and their destinies identical; and the progress or retrogression of each of these two great political divisions of India is bound to have no small influence upon the career of the other. It is therefore unquestionably necessary—as it is natural—that we, of British India, should feel a keen and vital interest in all questions that affect the life and liberty of our fellow-countrymen in the Feudatory States.

Yet, however much the respective inhabitants of British and Feudatory territories may sympathise with each other in their aspiration for a fuller national life or in any matter bearing upon the well-being of both as the children of our common *Bharatamatha*, it must not be overlooked, for a moment, that Home Rule is in every view a political question, and nothing that is done with reference to it by the British Government in its own territory could or should by itself affect the subjects of a Feudatory Ruler or Rulers. Notwithstanding the suzerainty of Britain over the Feudatory States, the latter, for all practical purposes, are foreign territories governed by their own laws and regulations and to be administered by their rulers in the best interests of their subjects. In the face of this fact, it is scarcely necessary to say that it would be inexpedient for our Home Rule League to attempt to carry on its operations in non-British territory. In saying this, I do not, of course, mean to suggest that our friends who reside within the limits of Feudatory States are legally or otherwise precluded from or disqualified for co-operating with us towards the fulfilment of the aims and objects of our League as such. For instance, there is nothing to prevent any person residing out of British Indian territory from becoming a member of our League and helping us in every way, so long as he is not stopped from doing so by any law or rule binding upon him as the subject of his own State. Accordingly, there are many

earnest, able and influential persons who belong to the League, though they are subjects or residents of Feudatory States.

Similarly there is nothing to prevent our sympathising with our brethren in their own independent endeavours to win for themselves a larger measure of political power and responsibility. We ought not to be selfish in our struggle for Home Rule, and while it is not possible for us now to initiate and lead the movement for their emancipation, principle and policy alike require that we should do what we can—without losing sight of the distinctive political character of the Native States as shown above—to hasten the pace of popular progress within their boundaries.

No reflecting man can fail to note that the spirit of Democracy is beginning to manifest itself, more or less, everywhere. This wave will necessarily spread itself throughout the whole of India, both British and Feudatory, and no Native State can be oblivious to or escape from its all-embracing influence. Home Rule may become an accomplished fact sooner in one of such territories than in another; but it would not be very very long before all the people in all the Feudatory States without exception also come to enjoy this birthright of theirs. Signs in this direction are not wanting, though they are as yet neither many nor strong. The highest credit, in this matter, is due to Mr. C. Rangacharlu who, with remarkable

insight, laid the foundations of popular government in Mysore in the eighties. When what was thus begun grows into the worthy institution contemplated by its great originator, the striking impetus which is now being given to it by the present large-hearted, far-seeing and tireless Minister at the head of affairs there, with the enlightened support of his Royal master, will count for not a little.

Real concessions towards popular Government by our Feudatory Rulers cannot but entitle them to the never-ending gratitude of their subjects. For, such concessions verily involve laudable sacrifice of power and wealth, of authority and patronage, and of other pompous paraphernalia, an inordinate love for which invariably makes men tyrants in every sphere of life, from the positions of the heads of families to those of Kings and Emperors. Every Indian Potentate, who paves the way for the substitution of limited monarchical government, of which the noblest example is the British Crown, in place of the more or less arbitrary rule which now prevails in most of our Indian States, will certainly rank among the great harbingers of freedom to the Motherland. Surely, he cannot show his patriotism in a more direct, tangible and useful form. Such a benefactor, by investing infant institutions like the Representative Assembly in Mysore, with real power, and by making them exercise it, thereby training their subjects in the glorious art of Self-Rule, will necessarily force the

hands of British administrators to act similarly within their own territory. If not for setting such example, among others, for what else were these States saved from annihilation which overtook certain few of their kind, at the ruthless hands of Lord Dalhousie, the all-absorbing pro-consul of annexation fame? Such preservation of the States was surely not for the mere delectation and enjoyment of this or that single individual, to whose solemn care High Providence has, in Its infinite wisdom, willed to entrust millions and millions of his fellow-men? Of what avail is the existence of such an individual if his heart constantly moveth not for the uplift of those fellow-men? And with what conscience can any such person think of annexing to his name that noblest of Aryan titles, *Raja*, which, by its very etymology, imposes upon him the solemn obligation of a constant endeavour to sweeten the lives of his *soi-disant* subjects unless he strives hard to faithfully discharge so noble a trust? If, bearing all this in mind, our Feudatory Rulers will fail to fulfil their supreme function in this respect, one may venture to say, with all deference, that Destiny will know what to do with them. The lessons to be drawn from recent Russian events must not be altogether lost upon our Chiefs and Princes. The protecting hand of the Suzerain in future cannot but come to be used not merely in preventing oppression and misrule, but also in the constructive work of carrying out and hastening the extension of popular government

steadily on till such goal is reached throughout this Land of the Rishis.

It gives me pleasure to invite attention to the contributions which appeared in the columns of the Mysore bi-weekly, the *Karnataka*, under the title of "Memorials on the Problems of Native States" to His Highness the Maharaja Saheb Bahadur of Bikaner. The able author of these memorials, Mr. D. V. Gundappa, sets out the chief problems likely to arise in connection with the Native States, in so brief and excellent a manner as to warrant the re-publication of his contributions in a pamphlet form so as to place them within the easy reach of all Home Rulers who will, I am sure, profit by a perusal thereof. The last and the fifth memorial is of special value, touching, as it does among others, the suggestion—well combated by him—that, in the political re-construction of India, territories now under British administration be parcelled out into a number of Indian States, which, with the existing ones, will go to make up Federated India. It is sufficient to say that the altogether retrograde and visionary character of the suggested scheme cannot but preclude its being taken into serious consideration by any responsible authority.

In the interests of the people of India at large, the existence, side by side, of the Indian States governed by their indigenous rulers on the one hand, with the British Provinces enjoying a true measure of Home Rule on the other, is invaluable,

forming, as it were, a worthy political balance, each scale with its precious contents of freedom and liberty, vying to outweigh the other. Such co-existing administrations must necessarily react upon each other and lead to a healthy rivalry that would result in benefit to both. It is but right to add that the balance of benefit would in the long run be in favour of the subjects of the Feudatory States, in most of which the rule is quite autocratic now. This last mentioned state of things cannot, as I have already stated, go on long. The claim for more attention to the wishes and the voice of the people in them will pronounce itself sufficiently strongly, so as to make it the duty of the Suzerain to seek compliance with it as Self-Government gains ground more and more in the surrounding British territory. It may not be superfluous to add that, to see in the present intermingling condition of British territory and Feudatory States, accident and chaos and nothing more, is a fatal error. On the contrary, it must be clear that the British territories in question were designed by those who are guiding the destinies of the Motherland from behind the scenes, as the theatre wherein the new spirit of the West was to work and metamorphose this ancient land to the necessary extent, while the Feudatory States were to serve as receptacles of those phases of indigenous life, ideas and institutions that deserve preservation and incorporation in the new order of things. Further-more, the existence of a tiny

territory such as Sandur, on the one hand, with that of the extensive dominions of the Nizam, on the other, of the cocoanut palm-groves of Laccadives and Maldives off the Malabar Coast, with that of Kashmir, the garden of the world in the extreme Himalayan tract, all point to the necessity of multiplicity of administrative units on a scale large and small, in order to meet the needs of a population so large and diversified as ours, speaking many languages, following different faiths, and subject to habits and customs varying from each other in so remarkable a degree.

In conclusion, it remains only to say that though we have no right ourselves to agitate for Home Rule for the people within the territories of Indian States, yet our work as members of the League is bound to be of educative value to them also. None inspired by the modern spirit of democracy can help thinking that the government of the people, for the people, and by the people ought to be the ideal of all the children of India, attainable sooner or later in every part of it. True lovers of the Motherland should, therefore, ever remember the advice of the oldest, the earliest, and the foremost of Indian politicians, DADABHAI NAOROJI, the sage of Versowa and the modern Bhishma. It was, as we all know,— “ agitate, agitate for the goal of self-rule till it is attained.” Likewise should be remembered the dying words of the latest and the youngest of our

patriots who passed away under extremely tragic circumstances the other day,—I mean the founder of *New Era*. The prophetic message delivered by him, as his brave and brilliant life was ebbing away, ran—“Agitate vigorously and victory is nigh.”

सर्वं परवशं दुःखं सर्वमात्मवशं सुखम् ।

एतद्विद्यात्समासेन लक्षणं सुखदुःखयोः ॥

मनुस्मृतिः, अध्यायः, ४-१६०॥

THE MESSAGE OF DADABHAI NAOROJI

“If I can leave a word of affection and devotion for my country and countrymen, I say : Be united, persevere and achieve Self-Government, so that the millions now perishing by poverty, famine and plagues, and the scores of millions that are starving on scanty subsistence, may be saved, and India may once more occupy her proud position of yore among the greatest and most civilised Nations of the world.”—At the Calcutta Congress, 1906.

**MEMORIALS ON THE PROBLEMS OF
NATIVE STATES.—I.**

To

His Highness the Maharaja

Saheb Bahadur of Bikaner.

PRINCE OF PRINCES,

Your valour on the field and your wisdom in the council have made Your Highness the cynosure of all eyes. Our British Rulers look upon Your Highness as one of the most trustworthy pillars of the Empire. Our countrymen in British India regard Your Highness as one of the most influential supporters of their cause. Our Native Princes have reason to esteem Your Highness as the elect of their royal fraternity. Some admire your soldierly demeanour; others are proud of your courage and independence; some others set a high value on your tact and sagacity. And whatever be the worth of your views on questions of current practical politics, all are unanimous in gratefully recognizing the warm glow of your patriotism and the forward-looking tendency of your statesmanship. This many-sided distinction places Your Highness in a position of great responsibility

towards those who are genuinely interested in the well-being and prosperity of our Native States. As one of the first two or three among the most illustrious of our Ruling Princes, it is incumbent upon Your Highness to lend a sympathetic ear to any representation that may be made regarding the present needs and the future destiny of the 70 millions of human beings who form the "submerged class," as it were, of the British Empire. Readiness to listen to the weak and to help the helpless is the most princely of all prince-like attributes, and that consideration encourages me to respectfully submit to Your Highness a few thoughts on a subject than which, I feel sure, nothing could be nearer to Your Highness's heart.

NATIVE STATES—NOT TO BE IGNORED.

Amid the lengthy and myriad-phased discussions that one finds to-day in innumerable newspaper articles, public speeches, books and pamphlets, on the subject of the re-organization of the Empire after the termination of the present War, the one factor that has not been seriously considered, nor even sufficiently recognized, is that aggregation of territories which, while forming a third of the area and inhabited by a fourth of the population of the Indian Empire, is happily spared from the British red on the map of this country. If India is the most useful and most important member of the Imperial household, it is undeniable that she owes that usefulness and that importance

mostly to her Native States. When the deluge of 1857 threatened to overwhelm the Empire in India, it is these States that acted as breakwaters and saved India for England. And now when the Empire is involved in what is practically a world-war, these States have spontaneously come forward to place their all unreservedly at the disposal of the Paramount Power. The contributions in men and money made by India to the resources of the Empire during this crisis have been acknowledged in the most eloquent and most grateful terms by Imperial statesmen of all sections; and it would scarcely be an exaggeration to say that a very substantial part of those contributions is the fruit of the sincere loyalty of Feudatory India. In the face of this fact, it is obvious that the Native States are not a negligible factor in the economy of the Empire, and that in any re-adjustment of relations that might come with peace, they stand, no less than any other constituent of the Empire, to demand a higher status and to insist on a better treatment.

NO SORDID OPPORTUNISM.

Let no one suppose that what the States have to ask for,—or for that matter, what the people of British India are asking for,—is a reward for loyalty. The performance of a duty has always been to India more than a commercial transaction; and when an Indian helps a relative or a neighbour, he seeks only to fulfil a *Dharma* and not to impose an

obligation. The political independence which India is now demanding has been the object of her aspiration for over a third of a century; and the War has simply given her an occasion to show how trustworthy she is and how her growing self-consciousness has not weakened, but has rather strengthened the imperial bond. Now that she has proved, beyond any possibility of suspicion, that she spontaneously thinks and feels and would even shed her blood *for* and *with* the Empire,—to allow her greater freedom for self-development would be to enhance her value as an asset of the Empire itself. The War has not in any way originated or added to her claims, and no one can say that she is now actuated by a vulgar spirit of opportunism. So with her Native States. They will not now ask for anything for which they have not had a claim all these years. Their Princes and their Peoples have, in the most convincing manner possible to them, proved the genuineness and the profundity of their attachment to Britain; and that fact ought to secure their immediate elevation from the position of meek dependants—who need not be cared for except when they have to be coaxed or coerced to be useful,—to the position of responsible partners in the affairs of the imperial family.

ENGLAND HAS A MISSION IN THE STATES ALSO

There is no need for any elaborate argument to support the belief that England is bound to the Native States by the same political and

ethical ties that bind her to the rest of India. She has a mission here as well as there ; and it is to democratize governments, to afford us the privileges of citizenship in a world-wide commonwealth, and to set free the nation to express the very best that is in it, for the benefit of the Empire and of the human race. If these duties did not exist, there would be no moral justification whatsoever for the continuance of the British connection ; and though these duties were never so vividly defined as they are now, they were never beyond the ken of those who represent to us the highest aspect of England's political conscience.*

*In a characteristically vigorous and high-toned article contributed to the *Fortnightly Review* of September 1866, Lord (then Mr.) Morley advocated the restoration of the Mysore State to Native Rule pointing out that, thereby, "we shall allay the dangerous alarm of the native princes, preserve the reputation of the British Government for good faith and gratitude, *avail ourselves of the native social forces for the benefit of the "silent myriads,"* and *make for ourselves an unrivalled opportunity for the infusion of such European ideas as it may be desirable and possible to introduce.*"

In 1865, an Englishman who was an able and tireless champion of the cause of the Native States and persistently fought against the policy of "Annexation," wrote thus :—

"If the great aim and object of British supremacy in India be the reform of native institutions, and the mental and moral improvement of the native races, I cannot doubt that the permanent civilization of a people will be more advanced by the development of their capacity for self-government, than by a stereotyped system—be it ever so benevolent—of exotic and exclusive management. In the cause of progress not less than in the cause of peace, I should plead for the maintenance of Native States, and for the elevation of Native Princes and ministers. If our Government declares that it can devise no substantial reforms for Mysore as a dependent Principality ; that it knows not how to impose such "ordinances and regulations" as would form a constitutional protection to the people ; that it can prescribe no remedy for the defects of this, or any other native State, except extinction ; then I say that it is not proclaiming the incapacity of the minor Princes, but its own incapacity as an Imperial and Paramount Power."—*(Mysore Reversion BY MAJOR EVANS BELL. PAGE 124).*

REPRESENTATION AT THE WAR-CONFERENCE—
 THE ADMISSION, BUT NOT THE FULFILMENT
 OF A RIGHT.

It is not possible to understand the meaning of the invitation accorded to Your Highness to attend and participate in the proceedings of the Imperial War Conference except as a general recognition of the claims which the Native States have upon England and of the status to which they are entitled within the Empire. To Your Highness personally, it could not have appealed as any very great honour. To one of your noble pedigree, your regal dignity, your record of chivalry and your exalted position as the Sovereign of a State and an Ally of His Majesty, there could have been nothing worth coveting in having been called upon to fill what was, after all, a subordinate place amid a group of paid officials. Nor can it be believed that Your Highness was unaware of the unsoundness of the principle of the Secretary of State nominating a Ruling Prince to represent all the interests of our Native States. The matter for gratitude is that none less worthy than Your Highness was chosen. And Your Highness' cordial response to the invitation can only be taken as an evidence of your deep sense of responsibility towards the States and your desire not to lose even the slightest opportunity of advancing their cause.

To be quite candid, Your Highness, the proceedings of the Imperial War Conference have not

served to raise any new hope or kindle any new enthusiasm in the hearts of the people of Native States. All that the Conference has given us so far is a vague message of hope—a platitudinous assurance regarding a change in Britain's "angle of vision." As against this verbal gain, it is said that it did a positive disservice to India in one, - let us trust only one, respect—namely, the treatment to be accorded to our fellow-countrymen in the Colonies. Be that as it may; the subjects of Native States have so far found no reason to think that "the hand of fellowship and of sympathy of both the Government and the people in Great Britain,"—about which we have had very eloquent pronouncements from Your Highness,—means anything in particular to them or to their rulers.

THE PROBLEMS STATED.

The problems relating to Native States may be divided broadly under two heads;

- (1) Their internal administration and its ultimate goal.
- (2) Their relations with the Paramount Power and their position in the British Empire or the Commonwealth.

With reference to the first of these, Your Highness was pleased to observe in the course of a speech delivered at Bikaner early last month, (July 1917) that "every Indian State must be free to decide or itself how best to promote the welfare of its

people and to conduct its internal affairs in ways most suited to local circumstances, peculiarities, traditions, and sentiments, and according to the different ideals and standards of administrative efficiency existing in each State."

NON-INTERFERENCE NOT TO MEAN NEGLIGENCE.

At the last session of the Chiefs' Conference held in Delhi, both H. E. the Viceroy and H. H. the Gaekwar of Baroda spoke in more or less the same strain, laying emphasis on the necessity of the Government of India and the Native Durbars observing mutually a policy of non-interference. But, while meddlesomeness is certainly to be deprecated, it must also be borne in mind that non-interference should not be allowed to degenerate into neglect or want of friendly interest. The officious attentions of the Political Department and the gratuitous solicitude of the British Residents are surely not things to be tolerated under any circumstances; at the same time, the State ought not to close its doors against the vivifying and liberalising influences of the *higher aspect* of British statesmanship. Britain's work for the States was not finished once for all when internal peace and external protection were guaranteed to them, and they were left at liberty to live as they liked causing as little disturbance as possible to the neighbourhood. Lord Ripon of immortal fame, addressing the Princes and Chiefs of the Punjab, declared over a third of a century ago :—

“ Her Majesty the Queen-Empress has commanded me to convey to the Chiefs of India her warm interest in their welfare—and not in their personal welfare alone, but in the success of their administration and in the well-being of the people of their States. For it is well-known, and should be everywhere understood, that the British Government always entertains not only a desire for the honour and advantage of the Chiefs, but also a deep solicitude for their subjects; and that we measure the greatness of a State and the degree of its prosperity not so much by the brilliancy of its court or even by the power and perfection of its army, as by the happiness and contentment of the people. It is my earnest hope that the Chiefs now assembled around me will remember this, and they will continue to administer their hereditary dominions,—the possession of which is secured to them under Her Majesty’s Empire,—with justice and moderation, being careful to retain the affection of their people, and even to introduce necessary reforms.”

Words similar to the above, than which none wiser or nobler were ever spoken, were addressed by that great Briton to the young Princes studying at the Mayo College and to the prominent citizens composing the Sarvajanic Sabha of Poona. The duty therein acknowledged to be England’s continues to call for fulfilment; and it will have been completely discharged only when, to use Lord Morley’s words, “ the spirit, the temper, the princi-

ples, and the maxims of British institutions" are transplanted in the Native States as in the provinces directly under British administration. If Home Rule or Self-Government of the Colonial type is the ultimate goal towards which England has to direct the foot-steps of British India, constitutional government or popular rule of England's own (domestic) pattern ought to be the final ideal which she should endeavour to accomplish in the Native States. To this ideal, all "local circumstances, peculiarities, sentiments and traditions" should be subordinated; and indeed it is unthinkable that anywhere there could be traditions and sentiments hostile to the supremacy of The People,—the true source of all authority and the ultimate sovereign of the State, in the East no less than in the West. The practical application of this democratic principle may vary in accordance with the local peculiarities of the States; but the principle itself must be the foundation of every political constitution worth the name. I rejoice to see that the principle has found unqualified acceptance at the hands of Your Highness. In the recent Bikaner speech, Your Highness expressed it as a conviction "that the possibilities of securing the greatest possible good of the greatest number of my people are vastly greater under a system of government

† Sovereignty "can no longer be said to reside in a determinate person or persons, but in that impalpable congeries of the hopes and fears of a people bound together by common interest and sympathy, which we call *the Common Will*."—(See *Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation*. BY T. H. GREEN).

which is carried on in consonance with the wishes and opinions of the people themselves and, where possible, with the advice and consent of my subjects or their chosen representatives."

HOME RULE FOR THE STATES.

This, after all, is the very heart of the democratic creed; and in the language of the ethicist—its name is justice,—justice as between the citizens who form the State and the power which, as their agent, regulates their lives. It is a truism that kings and constitutions, legislatures and bureaucracies, exist only for The People and not The People for them. All the machinery and instruments of government derive their authority from The People; for, that is the substance of which the State is made. This fundamental principle admits of no difference of opinion; and even Conservatives like Disraeli and Bismarck felt compelled to so restrict the monarchical system as to render it ultimately responsible to and expressive of the Popular Will. It is this feature of the British constitution, which,—as Tennyson, who was certainly no lover of mob-rule, sings,—keeps

" . . . the Throne unshaken still

Broad-based upon the people's will,"—

it is this which makes our King-Emperor the Crowned President of a Loyal Republic.

" OF THE PEOPLE, FOR THE PEOPLE,
BY THE PEOPLE."

May I not here submit, Your Highness, that the words "republic" and "common-wealth" need

not terrify any law-abiding mind; they simply denote the twin principles of justice and co-operation as they operate—or ought to operate—between the different members who constitute a society or state, and also between the individual members and the symbol of authority which holds them together for their common benefit. These principles of justice and co-operation,—which for once incarnated in Europe as the trinity of liberty, equality and fraternity,—have always been recognised as the true bases of political organization almost instinctively by the British people; and what the Home Rulers in British India and the progressive citizens of Native States now demand is simply the extension of those great principles to this country. The greatest contribution which England has made for the good of mankind is her Parliamentary system evolved through ages of experience and experimentation; and all that is to be sought at her hands is the introduction of that noble and beneficent system,—the system of responsible, popular Self-Government,—into every state and every community that is thriving under her aegis. Could any one say that this is unreasonable or extravagant? Is it right that the Indian bureaucracies and Indian autocracies,—for such there are still,—should desire to be above those just laws and constitutional restrictions to which the administrative machinery and the august Sovereign himself cheerfully and loyally submit themselves in England?

The local peculiarities alluded to by Your Highness are, after all, things of little moment. They lose their significance when we recall to mind that the identity of The People with the State was first recognised by Mysore, and that about 35 years ago; and that the courageous move she then made as only "a beginning" towards real *Swaraj*,—namely, the establishment of a Representative Assembly,—has within recent years been followed by several of her sister states, from Travancore in the south up to Your Highness' own Bikaner in the north. Does not this fact suffice to show that, after all, just as humanity is but one spiritual entity, democracy is but one great phase of its self-manifestation: and that it knows no barriers of race or religion or climate?

Then as to fitness. In the speech referred to above, Your Highness is reported as having declared:—"We further realize that the rulers and the ruled have an equal interest in the well-being of the State and that, therefore, the ruled as they prove themselves fit, should have a progressive voice and share in the Government and affairs of the State."

Swaraj BETTER THAN BOTH BENEVOLENT
AUTOCRACY AND EFFICIENT BUREAUCRACY.*

Now, who is to decide about fitness? In the eyes of the self-obsessed official, the people are in a state of eternal baby-hood; and he would never consent to part with power, and place himself in a

* See Appendix.

position of subordination to them. Rangicharlu, the first Dewan of Modern Mysore, held that "if the spread of any high degree of education among the great masses of the people were to be insisted upon as a *sine qua non*, we may have to wait for ever; meanwhile every year, under an autocratic system of government, will find the people less fit for representative institutions." He further said that "the one great problem to be solved by Indian statesmen is how the people could be roused from the *crushing influence of officialdom*;" and the one solution that suggested itself to his genius lay in "representative institutions and Self-Government." The soundness of his statesmanship has been demonstrated by our experience of thirty-five years; and just last year, H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore was graciously pleased to sanction the holding of a half-yearly session of the Representative Assembly. Sense of responsibility is the parent of political wisdom; and it is futile to talk of the people's fitness when they are not given the opportunity to befit themselves by actually exercising power. As your Highness' distinguished colleague, Sir S. P. Sinha, put it, the people might commit mistakes,—many and big mistakes; but that will not prove that it is wrong to entrust the people with responsibility; for, mistakes are necessary incidents in the process of their political education. "Self-Government is better than good government," says an eminent writer on democracy; "and Self-Government implies the right to

go wrong. It is nobler for a nation, as for a man, to struggle towards excellence with its own natural force and vitality, however blindly and vainly, than to live in irreproachable decency under the "expert" guidance of officials and departments." Above all, Self-Government is not merely a device for political convenience and material comfort; it is also a training of character; it can "rouse up the free and spontaneous elements lying deep in the hearts and minds of the people" and generate in them the spirit of noble enterprise.

"God and the People"—inscribed Mazzini on his banner. The People may be misinformed and therefore misled; but they will never knowingly endorse what is unworthy and of ill report. If they lack the specialized skill and technical knowledge of the professional official, the very diversity of their gifts and faculties and that fire of conscience which can never grow wholly cold in a group as it may in an individual, will make them the fittest authority to sit in judgment over the doings of Department-obsessed experts. Democracy is like the sea; it grows dark with clouds and fierce with storms, and may then sweep away some precious things; but when the sun shines and there is calm, it reflects, like the sea, the light of the wide heavens and cleanses the shores of human life.

THE SPIRIT OF THE AGE.

The whole world is now astir with the enthusiasm to advance one step nearer towards the ideal

of freedom. States and constitutions are in the melting-pot : and a new Europe is about to emerge out of the present welter of blood and tears. The vision of a new era has infused a fresh life into British India ; and Your Highness's own contribution towards that happy consummation has not been negligible. At such a time, is it possible that the subjects of Native States can remain dull and unaspiring ? Is it right to leave them untouched as the *pariahs* of the Empire, while the whole world around them is progressing joyously towards liberty and perfection ? No ; the Native States ought not to be allowed to lag behind in humanity's onward journey ; and the responsibility of leading them devolves upon Your Highness, as upon His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore who has long been recognized as the paragon of truly progressive Princes. Constitutional government has long been an accomplished fact in Mysore ; and the time is now come for taking another step forward in that direction. It is an extension of the blessings of constitutionalism in all Native States that the times call for, so that their subjects might not be backward in comparison with their British Indian brethren. In every State there must be :

SOME ELEMENTS OF TRUE CONSTITUTION.

[1] Absolute supremacy of law,—that is, law not subordinate to the will of any individual or class, and a judiciary independent of the executive.

[2] An elected Representative Assembly, of which the legislature* of the State is a part, and to which the executive† of the government is responsible and subordinate ;

[3] A system of autonomous local institutions from the rural *Panchayet* to the urban Municipality;

[4] An executive council‡ of which at least half the number of members are elected by the Representative Assembly ; and

[5] Full freedom of speech and criticism, § subject only to the conditions imposed by the ordinary penal law.

* " A modern law is not brought down from Sinai, or imposed by the will of an irresponsible despot. Every important law must, before it takes its final shape, be submitted to the scrutiny and criticism of, and be liable to amendment and rejection by, a popular assembly elected for that purpose."—

SIR COURTENAY ILBERT.

† (See Appendix on page 39).

‡ " Nobody can reasonably contend that with the advance of civilization, entailing the discussion and solution of new questions of ever-increasing complexity arising everyday, one-man-government is better than council-government. The principle of Executive Council for local governments, by which the local administrations are less dependent upon the personal equation and which ensures a greater continuity of policy, has already taken root in India and cannot now be eradicated."—

LORD HARDINGE.

§ " Under a government of good laws," asks Bentham, " what is the motto of a good citizen ? " And he answers :—" To obey punctually, to *censure freely*."

" Let it be impressed upon your minds, let it be instilled into your children, that the liberty of the press is the palladium of all civil, political and religious rights."—JUNIUS.

These are reforms for which no State can be deemed to be unfit; and all that they will effect is the transfer of political power from the hands of the officialdom to those of the people. In many Native States at present, the prevailing system of administration is one of unqualified autocracy. In an India making rapid strides towards democracy, such States are an obvious anomaly;—they must look like so many heaps of debris amid the environs of a noble mansion. Other States there are in which there is a semblance of constitutional government, the actual fact, however, being that the Assembly or the Council is simply a clever contrivance for preventing true popular ascendancy and for justifying bureaucratic sins with the seeming support of democracy. Yet another class of Native States there is, in which the paid official is the all-important factor, standing between the Sovereign and the People, and binding liberty hand and foot with his formidable red-tape. Too few indeed are the States where the Ruling Prince is really democratic in his policies and really anxious to make the people supreme and powerful in the management of their affairs. And among these States are Mysore and Bikaner; and as such, great is their moral responsibility towards their sisters. Let them, then, go on initiating reforms and widening the sphere of popular liberty so that their citizens might always be ahead of their brethren in British India. Let them be the brave apostles of popular government or democratic rule or *Swaraj*, and let them use their moral influence over the rest of the States.

THE EXAMPLE OF LORD BUDDHA.

Once in the distant past, there arose in our glorious country a great Prince who, moved by the misery and the wretchedness around him, flung aside his royal robe and sceptre, and went forth as a common man among common men to share life with them. The need to-day is for Princes who, actuated by a similar spirit, would share power with their subjects and would continue to wear their crowns only as the emblem of their *Deeksha* or consecration. They have to realize that they are citizens before they are sovereigns, and that they preside over a commonwealth before presiding over a palace. Such seems to have been the ideal which inspired the ancient monarchs of India,—from the time of Sri Rama to that of Sivaji,—for, their course of action was always planned for them by men of proved wisdom and character; and though possessed of unlimited might, they are depicted as having always scrupulously respected the law of the land and never set their face against public opinion. Just as true parental affection precludes all possibility of jealousy, and on the other hand generates pride and joy in a father's heart at the success and good fortune of his son, so true princely magnanimity will make a Ruler rejoice at the ascendancy of his People over his officials and even over himself.

THE TRULY PRINCELIKE ATTITUDE.

So, Your Highness, I humbly and respectfully urge for your benign consideration the momentous

question of the emancipation of the subjects of Native States. Their economic and moral worthiness in the world must obviously depend upon the extent and the genuineness of their political freedom; and hence I say that the task is one of immense spiritual significance. If Your Highness would be present at the Chiefs' Conference to be held in Delhi in November next, may we not,—we, the citizens of Native States,—hope that Your Highness' powerful voice will be raised on behalf of the dumb millions who people the States and have made it possible for the Princes to attain dignity and renown? Such is their present moral and intellectual coma that they are not aware of their own needs and their inferiority of status,—that they have conceived of nothing to strive for and to agitate for,—that they are conscious of no purpose and no mission for them in the world. To be without the sense of a mission,—says Mazzini,—is to be dead. May we not hope that it is given to Your Highness and to Princes of Your Highness' patriotism, to bring life unto those inert masses of humanity?

On the second group of Native States problems and allied points, I crave permission to dwell in another letter. In the meantime, as ever, I pray that the kindly light of the Great Ruler of All may shine upon Your Highness and upon your most worthy friend among whose loyal and loving subjects I am proud to count myself as one.

A MYSOREAN.

APPENDIX I.

(Page 29)

Professor L. T. Hobhouse writes in his book on Liberalism:—

“Democracy is not founded merely on the right or the private interest of the individual. This is only one side of the shield. It is founded equally on the function of the individual as a member of the community. It founds the common good upon the common will, in forming which it bids every grown-up, intelligent person to take a part. No doubt many good things may be achieved for a people without responsive effort on its own part. It may be endowed with a good police, with an equitable system of private law, with education, with personal freedom, with a well organized industry. It may receive these blessings at the hands of a foreign ruler, or from an enlightened bureaucracy or a benevolent monarch. However obtained, they are all very good things. But the democratic theory is that, so obtained, they lack a vitalizing element. A people so governed resembles an individual who has received all the external gifts of fortune, good teachers, healthy surroundings, a fair breeze to fill his sails, but owes his prosperous voyage to little or no effort of his own. We do not rate such a man so high as one who struggles through adversity to a much less eminent position. What we possess has its intrinsic value, but how we came to possess it is also an important question.”

The bureaucrat's boast of “efficiency” has been completely undermined by the revelations of what is known as the Mesopotamian Muddle of the War. Speaking (12-7-'17) in the House of Commons on the report of the Mesopotamia Commission, Mr. E. S. Montagu, then a private member, felt it necessary to say:—“As you increase responsibility in India, you can lessen that responsibility at home. But I am positive of this, that your great claim to continue the illogical system of Government by which we have governed India in the past, is that it was efficient. *It has been proved to be not efficient.* It has been proved to be not sufficiently elastic to express the will of

the Indian people." Commander Wedgewood M.P., a member of the Mesopotamia Commission, wrote in a letter addressed to Dr. Sir Subramania Iyer:—"The objections that the Bureaucracy raise (to the grant of Home Rule to India) are these: They say that Colonial Home Rule would lead to corruption, and to inefficiency. The report of the Mesopotamia Commission destroys the "efficiency" excuse; no uncontrolled Bureaucracy can ever be efficient. Public criticism and control alone can keep a Bureaucracy in check. As for "corruption"—why, it is better to be even corrupt than to be servile."

Commenting on the Mesopotamian affair, the *Manchester Guardian* attributed the imbroglio to "official snubbing of subordinates, and an atmosphere unfavourable to reforming innovation," peculiar to the working of the departments of the Indian Government. Referring to this, a correspondent wrote in that journal, "the evil atmosphere which you deplore, is nearly as bad here as in India; and as far as I can see, the only remedy is a thorough democratisation of management." Thus is proved the absolute necessity of a Government keeping all its doors and windows open to the light and air of public observation and criticism. Even if the criticism of the lay public be sometimes captious in the beginning, it is better for a department to have to meet it rather than to develop within the four walls of its own office an exaggerated notion of its own infallibility. Further, even if there be beneficence and wisdom in one bureaucratic regime, there can be no guarantee as to its continuance after a change of the *personnel*. Every three years or every five years there is a fresh administration, and therefore new policies and new purposes. This want of fixity in ideals is one of the most glaring evils of a purely official-ridden government.

APPENDIX II.

(Page 33.)

In Mr. Gokhale's posthumously published scheme of political reforms for India, the Legislative Council is assigned a position analogous to that of the Reichstag in Germany. That scheme, in spite of Mr. Gokhale's high authority, has been rejected as inadequate and unsatisfactory by his colleagues and countrymen. But even that too cautious and halting scheme appears as being very highly advanced when compared with what actually obtains in some of our so-called *Swaraj* States, possessing a Representative Assembly. Being in almost all cases a child of the bureaucracy, the Assembly must remain content to be nursed and cajoled as an infant; and any manifestation of a desire on its part to play the man is carefully and systematically discouraged. It is only during the past four years that the Mysore Representative Assembly has found a congenial atmosphere to grow. But here, too, the powers which alone can vitalize it and make it effectual are still withheld from it. It was the late Mr. Keir Hardie who, in a mood of generous appreciation, likened the Mysore Representative Assembly to the Reichstag of Germany. But let it be noted that "all laws for the regulation of the [German] Empire must receive the votes of an absolute majority of the Reichstag." The Reichstag works on Parliamentary lines, being composed of several well organized and distinct parties. There have been in it radicals of such influence and individuality as August Bebel, who was the leading social democrat of his time in Europe and whose force was recognized even by men like Bismarck. But what of the Mysore Representative Assembly? It is as yet mostly a body of meek "petitioners" who may or may not be given a generous hearing; a popular Dewan may consult it; but its sanction is not essential to any measure. Mr. Gokhale would 'reserve' no place in the Executive Council of Government for the Civilian,—that is, for the crystallized bureaucrats. The best among them may be chosen, but they have no inherent right

for a place in the body that is responsible for executive Government. But in Mysore, the elected members of the Representative Assembly and the Legislative Council may coo like cuckoos or roar like lions; but most of it is bound to go for nothing, because the bureaucracy is deaf and self-willed, as it is all-powerful. The representations of popular representatives may be "noted" for consideration, but the "noting" is too often a mere formality; for they have no men of their own in the Executive Council of the Government to see that their will is properly given effect to. This powerless and impotent condition of the Representative Assembly accounts for its failure to attract men of education and eminence (except some very few),— which circumstance is naturally converted into an excuse by the bureaucracy for keeping the popular body as it is. What alone can galvanize the Assembly is real political power and responsibility; and when they are denied there can be no real self-government and no effective public life.

**MEMORIALS ON THE PROBLEMS OF
NATIVE STATES.—II.**

To

**His Highness the Maharaja Saheb
Bahadur of Bikaner.**

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HIGHNESS,

Each single State is to the Empire what each individual citizen is to the State. If without real and responsible self-government for the citizens there can be no State of the civilized type, it is equally true that there can be no Empire of the civilized type without a free voice for all its constituent States in regard to the imperial concerns.

**SELF-GOVERNMENT—THE LIFE-PRINCIPLE OF
EVERY ORGANISATION.**

The principle of Right or Justice which demands the establishment of popular self-government at home, demands also that the State should have all legitimate powers of self-development abroad; and a State would obviously be stultifying itself and falling short of the highest requirements of justice if it were to refrain from asking for its due share in the responsibilities of the Commonwealth

of which it is a unit. It is this consideration that has given strength to the propaganda of the *Round Table* politicians; and so far as this aspect of their demand is concerned, Indians can have only gratitude; for, if the claim put forward on behalf of the Colonies be admissible, it must be equally admissible in the case of India. Conversely, it must be agreed that if India is to have a voice in the direction of imperial affairs, she must be autonomous like the Dominions. If Justice,—which in the politician's vocabulary is synonymous with Liberty and Equality,—is the soul of the Empire as of the State, it follows that self-government is a condition essential to both the organizations. Every self-governing State *must* be given a part in the moulding of imperial policies; while no State that has no popular self-government can aspire for such a part. Thus viewed, the representation given to our Native States at the War Conference must be taken to imply the supposition that the States are self-governing organizations, But as a matter of fact, most Native States have *Swaraj* only from the *racial*,* but NOT from the *constitutional* point of view; and we can only hope that, by the time when the War will have ended and the re-adjustment of imperial relationships will be about to take place, and when a

*The Native States "may be said to have local self-government in the sense that the Government is on their own native lines, but not in the sense of representative Government."—SIR CHARLES P. LUCAS in "*The British Empire*."

permanent Imperial Agency of some sort will come into being consisting of representatives of every autonomous unit of the Empire, our Native States will have made themselves fully eligible for representation in it, by establishing full and genuine self-government among their respective subjects. There was Home Rule in the racial sense in pre-Revolutionary Russia, and it is in Germany today ; but when the Czardom fell, all England breathed a sigh of relief as the event meant the disappearance of the one and only defect that was disfiguring the ranks of the Allies. Home Rule stands ultimately for an ethical principle, and the colour of the skin is only an incidental point; and in the absence of that principle, the presence of the "Home" complexion acts not infrequently as a pretension and a snare. If our Princes would be true in their devotion to the King-Emperor, let them assume within their States the position which His Imperial Majesty is proud to hold in the vast Commonwealth, and let them concede to their respective subjects the liberties which His Gracious Majesty, acting through the Parliament, has enabled his subjects to enjoy. Then, no power on earth can deny our States a place of equality in the councils of the Empire. And without such a place, the States can lead but partial lives ;—they will not be able to rise to their full height intellectually and morally, and even their material progress will not be as free and rapid as their resources and capacity could make possible.

CONFERENCE OF PRINCES—A CHIMERA.

This takes us at once to the question of the best manner in which the Native States may be associated with the administration of the Empire. The question was recognised years ago; and from the time of Lord Lytton, the suggestion for the formation of a Council of Ruling Princes has been variously put forward and even experimented. Minds and temperaments so unlike as Lord Curzon's and the *Pioneer's* on the one side and Lord Minto's and your Highness' own on the other have expressed themselves in favour of the idea which, even Lord Morley was bound to admit as being both "interesting and attractive," though with characteristic mental detachment, he expressed doubt as to the likelihood of its proving "a reality" when translated into fact. The *Times*, however, gave its hearty blessings to the scheme; and accordingly, undeterred by the warnings of the past, H. E. Lord Chelmsford convened a Conference of the Chiefs in November last and prognosticated that "in time to come, some constitutional assemblage may grow out of these Conferences." In January last, the *Round Table* took up the proposal and it was backed up by a few Anglo-Indian papers; and recently it was stated that Your Highness re-affirmed your support for it. On the other hand, the scheme has been again and again condemned not only as impracticable, but also as mischievous, by the nationalist politicians of India, their main contention being that generally

the Indian Princes are, by both inclination and training, autocratic and illiberal and that they would be an obstruction to democratic progress. Though this view may be somewhat wanting in charity and may not be justified in some cases, it has unfortunately to be admitted that there is still a very large section of our Ruling Princes which does not reflect the highest class of intelligence existing in the country. Their education is often of a shallow and narrow type; and their opportunities for observation and study are at present too limited. Their political training and their knowledge of the requirements of their own States are often of an amateurish type, so much so that it would be far too much to expect from them the solution of any serious political problem. Apart, however, from these reflections on the personal merits or demerits of Princes, there is, I venture to think, a matter of *principle* to be considered in this connection. The Indian Prince—with all his failings, and present-day disabilities,—is yet a Prince and Ruler of men; and besides considerations of regal status and personal prestige, there are questions of political expediency and diplomatic delicacy which make it impossible for him to take direct part in the transactions of any public political body. In his own State,—supposing for a moment that it is a constitutionally-governed State,—he is superior to the machinery of Government and his position is supreme, being above the legislative and administrative agencies. At any

rate, such ought to be the position of the Sovereign according to the modern conception of a State; and Mr. Lionel Curtis of the *Round Table* has himself described our Emperor as the hereditary President of the British Commonwealth or Republic. On a miniature scale, then, each Native Prince is,—or ought to be,—simply the visible symbol and the unifying bond of a democracy. In any case, he is *above* the region of political disputation; and dragging him into the arena of controversy would be not only humiliating to him personally, but also fatal to his interests politically. If there is to be,—as there must be,—a Council or a Conference for safeguarding the interests of Native States in the Empire, and for securing them their proper share in imperial privileges and responsibilities, I make bold to submit that that body should be composed entirely of the chosen representatives, and not the Rulers, of the States.

THE SOVEREIGN NOT TO BE HIS OWN VEHICLE.

When the case of a State or of its Sovereign is to be pleaded before any court or authority, the proper person to undertake the task would be the responsible minister or ambassador, and never the Sovereign. The latter can only guide and control; but he cannot and should not himself offer to be a diplomatic pugilist. It is not the kings of Europe themselves that meet to settle a dispute, or negotiate the terms of a treaty. It is their ambassadors who, with the assistance of trained

diplomats, and advised by their respective governments, decide every international issue and ensure the peace of the realm. They could be frank where their Sovereigns would have to be reticent; they could be evasive where their Sovereigns would have to be definite; they alone could know when to be aggressive, when to employ tact, when to be effusive and when to be reserved. It is therefore fit and necessary that, if the Native States are to be accorded their due share in the business of the Empire, they should be represented, not by their Sovereigns, but by their Ministers. It is only the latter that can present their cases effectively and in such a manner as to bring both credit and advantage to their Sovereigns as well as to their People.

COMMONWEALTH,—NOT HEGEMONY.

The vast inter-state and inter-national organization,—hitherto called the Empire, but hereafter to be known by the more appropriate name of Commonwealth,—exists to fulfil a spiritual end by playing a beneficent part in human civilization. Otherwise, it would, like the Prussian fabric, be an engine for the domination of one State or Nation over other States and Nationalities, and would thus be bereft of all moral justification for existing. The British Commonwealth stands—and ought to stand—as the guarantor of liberty to each individual, self-government to each political community, independence to

each nationality and peace to the entire human race. To be allowed to participate in the activities of an institution of such magnificent promise to humanity, is itself no ordinary privilege. Added to it is the fact that the material interests of our Native States are inseparably intertwined with those of the other Powers and other States that thrive within the sphere of the Commonwealth; and these interests need constant attention and adjustment. They may be classified roughly under three heads:—

(1) Matters to be settled between each Native State individually and the Government of India;—such as the opening of a Railway line or the starting of a University.

(2) Matters of All-India importance, but not extending beyond India, such as post, fiscal policy with reference to customs duties, salt-tax, excise etc., general industrial and commercial policy, and the question of Indian defence.

(3) Matters of Imperial importance such as the foreign trade of India, questions of emigration and immigration, the treatment of Indians in the Colonies, general questions of Imperial defence.

THE STATES AND THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA. †

With reference to matters of the first group, the deciding factor at present is the Foreign Department of the Government of India. Till the

† See Appendix at the end of this letter.

time of Lords Morley and Minto, the pranks and tyrannies of that Department, working in secret on the reports of Residents and Agents, were in many cases intolerable as they were unmentionable; and for the excellent relations that have come to prevail between the Government of India and the Darbars within recent years, we are indebted entirely to the noble personalities of Lord Minto and Lord Hardinge. But the potential frame-work of the old system is still there, and no one can be sure that attempts will never again be made to revive the old spirit. More than thirty-five years ago, Dewan Rangacharlu felt constrained to complain:—

“ Nothing has so much contributed to the ignorance, intrigue and barbarism of Native States as the mystery which the political agents have made of the action of Government in regard to them. What is wanted is the vivifying influence of the Viceroy placing himself in free communication with Native Chiefs and Native Statesmen directly,—or through a private secretary, as may be fitting in each case.”

These words have not lost their force as yet; on the contrary, as the duties of the Government of India and the enterprises of Native States have both increased in number and magnitude, the unsuitability of the old system has become all the more patent. For instance, schemes for the development of the material resources of a State are now

often delayed because they are not sanctioned, even in cases where that is a mere formality, by the Government of India with anything like promptitude. Correspondence involves a wearisome waste of time, and the Durbar may even have to depute its officers to explain matters personally. The process causes no little annoyance to the Durbar, as to the Government of India; and it also means considerable material loss to the State. These and other difficulties, too varied and numerous to mention, may be best overcome by each important State, or each important group of States being allowed to station a permanent envoy or consul at the Viceregal Court.* That officer would

*Some time after the publication of the first edition of this pamphlet, the writer chanced to read the following in a letter written in 1864 by C. Poorooshottum, a patriot of South India whose name is now quite forgotten. He was a gifted and far-sighted man, and he visited England more than once to lay before H. M. the Queen-Empress the claims of the Nawab of Carnatic. He championed the cause of Native States generally and also that of the people of British India with remarkable courage, persistence and political prevision. On 20th August 1864, he addressed from London an open letter (printed) to his countrymen, in the course of which he said:—"I beg to observe here that the native monarchs, such as their Highnesses the Nizam, the Maharajahs of Cashmere and Nepal, and the Scindia and Holkar, possess the right of accrediting *Native* Ministers to the Court of Her Majesty Queen Victoria herself, in the same way as Her Majesty is represented by her own Ministers (Residents) at their Courts; if this right, which, according to the law of nations, cannot be questioned, be denied to them, the presence of British Ministers in their Courts would subject such Princes to the degradation of being under surveillance. It must, however, be indispensable that such *native* diplomatic agents be men of high character, necessary qualifications, and patriotic feeling; otherwise such missions, instead of being useful, would prove in the highest degree prejudicial."

be the channel of communication, ordinarily, between the State and the Government of India, and would be able to throw full and favourable light on all questions relating to the Durbār, which may or may not obtain proper representation through the British Resident or Agent who, not infrequently, is bureaucratic and "Anglo-Indian" in his policies being the product of the dreaded I. C. S.

THE STATES IN ALL-INDIA AND IMPERIAL MATTERS.

Matters falling under the 2nd and 3rd categories mentioned above may also be settled to the utmost possible satisfaction of the States only through the envoys or consuls. In fact, no other solution of the problem seems feasible. The experiment of an annual Conference of Chiefs has not proved fruitful; and in the very nature of things, it is impossible that it could mean anything to any one—except something to the poor subjects of the States in the shape of the current coin of the realm !! The agenda of the last Conference consisted mostly of items of ephemeral interest and of trivial value; and as regards weightier matters, it must have been obviously impossible for any Prince to express well-considered and candid opinions then and there. As already hinted, a reigning Sovereign, when called upon to play the part of the ambassador,—and that in an assembly,—can only sit tongue-tied, or speak, if necessary, with the tongue in his cheek

It is this diplomatic character of the business that has escaped the attention of most advocates of a Council or Conference of Princes. The proper arrangement would be that the Dewans or Agents of the Princes, instead of Their Highnesses themselves in person, should confer together periodically and carry on business for and on behalf of the Princes and their Durbars, being of course fully instructed in regard to every detail from home. Such an embassy or legation of Native States, besides being the best conceivable mode of settling all questions of All-India importance to the best advantage of the States, would be a source of dignity and honour both to the States and to the Government of India.

And when an Imperial Conference or other institution is brought into being to deal with questions of the whole Commonwealth including India, the members to sit in it as the representatives of our Native States should be chosen from among the aforesaid embassy or legation. It does not matter to what particular State they belong, because so far as All-India and Imperial problems are concerned, the interests of all Native States are common and identical.

THE SISTERHOOD OF STATES.

Indeed, one distinct moral gain to the Native States from the creation of an embassy would be the birth of a sense of unity and solidarity among

them. It is unthinkable that in a body like the embassy, meant purely for business and not for ornament, every State in India, big or small, real or so-called, could have a representative. In any case, there must be a large number of States which will have to be content with being represented by the envoys of other States. Except in cases where two States are close neighbours and their interests might therefore come into a clash, there is no possibility of a division arising between them. There can therefore be no substantial objection to the representative of a particular group of States being chosen out of any one of them. As a matter of fact, it would be best if those States themselves, after mutual consultation, selected the best man available among all their public servants. Such an opportunity of concerted action for the States has long been a desideratum.

It might be that Cochin and Pudukotta will not be privileged to send special representatives of their own to the Imperial Conference to be held in London. In that case, they will learn to see that their interests are no less represented by the envoys from Mysore and Travancore. Such a feeling of fellowship and unanimity among our States will surely be a source of strength to the cause of Indian Nationalism.

A TRIBUNAL FOR NATIVE STATES.

Let me now turn to another class of grievances for which the Native States have to seek a remedy

more satisfactory than any hitherto provided. From time to time, disputes have arisen between a Native State and the Government of India (or one of its Provincial Administrations) touching their territorial, riparian and other rights; and till now the deciding authority in such cases has been the more powerful party itself. Within the past few years, Mysore was involved in two such cases of vital importance—one referring to her claim for the Surplus Revenues of the Civil and Military Station of Bangalore and another to her rights for the superfluous waters of the Cauvery; and her success in both proves only the high-principled and fair-minded policy of Lord Hardinge, not the excellence of the system now obtaining. Occasions of such conflict of interest between the Suzerain Power and the Native States will not be rare; and justice requires that the issues should be examined and decided by an independent and impartial court.†

† In the course of a paper on "Mysore" read before the East India Association, London on 5th July 1867, the late Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji said:—"The important question constantly arises: who is to judge when the British Government and a native Prince are at issue? How can the decision of the stronger party in its own favour be free from the suspicion of being interested? Cannot, when such important questions of the right of Governments arise, an impartial judicial commission of some of the best judges of this country be appointed to try the matter? I should think that, considering the confidence the natives of India have in the integrity, uprightness and independence of high English judges, the natives would feel satisfied to have such issues tried by such impartial tribunals. Otherwise the native, like anybody else, naturally thinks when the decision is against him, that injustice is done to him; and it is only when the justice of the decision is so clear as to be *entirely above suspicion*, that the British Government does not run the risk of being considered as having taken advantage of its might against right."

About forty years ago, Sir David Wedderburn M.P.,—brother of that great and famous friend of India, Sir William Wedderburn,—put forward a strong plea for the establishment of a tribunal to provide a public and judicial hearing in cases, civil and criminal, affecting the interests of the Indian States, and more especially those cases in which the Paramount Power, now acting as the sole arbiter, is an interested party. The need for an institution of the kind is clamant, and there is no reason why the Government of India should view the suggestion with disfavour. If we have understood the spirit of the British nation correctly, we need apprehend no difficulty about the Parliament approving of it. The Court may be composed of one or two of the highest judicial officers of Native States and one or two eminent men chosen out of the British judiciary; and the Government of India and the litigant Native State may present their cases before it for adjudication, through their respective legal counsel. The same court may be invested with power to arbitrate and to adjudicate in cases arising between two Native States. It is not at all necessary that the court should be held from year's end to year's end. It is enough if it be in session when there is work enough for it.

THE STATES—SCHOOLS FOR STATESMANSHIP.

Your Highness,—at one time it used to be said that one justification for the existence of Native States in India is the opportunity they afford for

the unfolding of native talent and the evolution of "indigenous" statesmanship. If there were no Native States, there could have been no Rangacharlu, no Sir T. Madhava Rao, no Sir Salar Jang and no Sir Dinkar Rao. These men would then very probably have been absorbed into the clerkdom of British India, and great would have been the loss to the country in point of intellectual attainment and prestige. But the old batch of statesmen and administrators became extinct with the late Dewan Bahadur R. Raghunatha Rao, and now the States are obliged to go abegging for candidates for Dewanship. Their resources in men, instead of being improved, seem to have become impoverished with the lapse of time; and not a few of them have had to import their important officers and Dewans from British India. Could there be a more dismal commentary on the wisdom of the States in matters of public service? Properly speaking, no self-respecting and shrewd-eyed community can have any excuse for bringing in outsiders to manage its internal affairs. A State, however small, must in course of time be able to find its own men for the highest positions in its administration,—the only exception permissible being with regard to expert help and specialist skill. The State that, after decades of education and domestic independence, is still unable to produce its own Dewan and councillors, is either confessing its poverty in brain-power and character, or is condemning its own

policy of the past. We have heard of Japan requisitioning the services of American mechanics and England calling in the aid of German Sanskritists; but we have never heard, and may never hope to hear, of those little islands looking to a foreign country for the supply of their statesmen and administrators.

“*Swadeshi*” IN PUBLIC SERVICE.

A State, small or large, is a distinct political community, and as such it can live an independent and full life only if it endeavours to be “self-contained,”—that is, if it tries to meet its requirements out of its own resources. It was this ideal, presumably, that Lord Hardinge had in mind when he said,—addressing H. H. the Maharaja of Indore,—

“Build up within your own State a body of your own subjects on whom you can rely to serve you. Take them young, educate them, select the best, fit them for high places, and when they are fit, confer high places upon them. Give them responsibility, enlist their interest and sympathy in the work of administration, and I confidently predict that you will not regret the step you have taken.”

The advice embodies a great principle.—the principle that power is best exercised only when it is combined with knowledge,—that the son of the soil possesses more intimate knowledge than the outsider,—that the man born and bred among the

people, who can move with them and is destined to spend his whole life amidst them, is more fitted for positions of power and trust than an alien "bird of passage and of prey."

INTERCHANGE OF OFFICERS BETWEEN STATES.

Owing to the non-observance of the policy above enunciated, many States are now obliged to seek elsewhere the men they need; and for some years to come at least, they may not be able to do without outside supply. For such a State—would it not be better to get the man it requires from another State than to get one from British India? Would not the Councillor of one Native State be better able to fill a similar position in another State than a member of the I. C. S.? This idea of an exchange of officers between two Sister States,—instead of the present system of importing untried men from British India,—seems to be full of possibilities, and when carried out, it would also serve as another bright element in the comity of the States.

Your Highness, I implore to be pardoned for the length of these memorials. I hope to deal with the remaining topics and sum up my humble suggestions in another letter for which I crave your Highness' gracious indulgence. Meanwhile, my prayer, as ever, is that the Lord might grant Your Highness the strength for securing the introduction of all reforms needed for the fair name of the States and the prosperity of their subjects.

A MYSOREAN.

APPENDIX III.

(Page 48.)

The politics of British India have an Imperial or All-India aspect, as well as a purely local or Provincial aspect. Since the former necessarily affects the Native States also, it is only fair that their Durbars should be allowed an effective voice in the settlement of those all-India questions. Instances are not wanting of grave injustice done to the States in this respect in the past. At a stroke of the pen, the British Government put down poppy cultivation; and Indian States have had little or no voice in the settlement of the new opium policy although they were vitally interested in it. The injustice of the policy which governs the regulation of the salt-tax without reference to the States, which are prevented from manufacturing their own salt, is another instance in point. Take again the customs revenue. The States have in every case abolished the ancient system of transit duties, and have, thereby, suffered great loss of revenue, but they receive no share of customs revenue. Is it then too much to ask that the States should have a voice in the regulation of the tariff which affects them and their people quite as much as the Provinces and people? Then again, take the case of opium-boiling and internal liquor traffic in which some States are required to submit to Provincial rules framed without adequate regard to the circumstances of the States. Are the States merely to "obey" the mandates of Local Governments, however unreasonable?

An all-India question, undoubtedly, is that of currency. Yet apparently without any sort of consultation with the States or even the more important ones among them, the Government of India in September last introduced a Bill into the Viceregal Legislative Council to amend Indian Paper Currency Act of 1910 and the Paper Currency Temporary Amendment Act of 1917. As regards the practical effects of this measure, the Hon'ble Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and Mr. B. N. Sarma expressed fear in unambiguous language, and the financial Member of the Government of India, Sir W. Meyer himself

admitted the need for caution. India, like the rest of the world, is now passing through critical and anxious times; and questions of currency are naturally the most difficult and complicated for solution. The flow of trade being slender and uncertain, increase in the output of silver coinage and cheaper token currency may reasonably be feared to have the effect of inflating prices. The matter vitally concerns the people of Native States, and the Durbars had every right to be heard in regard to it.

Another such question discussed at the last session of the Viceregal Legislative Council was that of the administration of the Railways Act. The subjects of Native States are sharers in the grievances connected therewith, and it is one of those All-India problems for the solution of which the Durbars are not yet privileged to say or do anything.

It is not in fiscal matters alone that the destinies of Native States are linked up with those of the rest of India. Industrial, commercial and political questions also are now being settled for *all* India by the Supreme Government, the Native States having absolutely no opportunity to explain how their own interests will thereby suffer. For instance, the States are not at liberty to adopt a policy of protection in regard to industries existing within their borders. They are not free to restrict the emigration of their subjects as indentured labourers to South Africa or elsewhere. Is not the question of emigration one, the satisfactory solution of which is of as much interest to the States as to the Provinces? It is true that the States can have nothing to do with the grant of an Executive Council to a British Province, or the expansion of its Legislative Council, or the opening up of a railway line, or the closing down of a University. In such local or Provincial matters, they neither care, nor are they entitled to be consulted. But in the larger questions which affect *all* India,—which, though meant on paper only for British Provinces, are yet certain to touch the States automatically as it were,—it would be only fair to give their Durbars an opportunity to represent their cases.

MEMORIALS ON THE PROBLEMS OF
NATIVE STATES.—III.

To

His Highness the Maharaja Saheb
Bahadur of Bikaner.

MOST HONOURED ROYAL PATRIOT,

The Native States are the perennial springs of the national life of India. From them has issued forth the stream which, uninterrupted and uncontaminated, runs like the eternal Ganga through the history of our dear motherland. They are the tall isthmian peaks which, never overflowed by the waves of foreign conquest, are standing aloft to connect our beginningless past with our endless future. They are the living monuments of the epic episodes of *Bharatha Varsha*,—of her celestial-born dynasties and the magnificent empires which they organised and administered. And if they will but make some little sacrifices which the inexorable *Kula Purusha* demands,—if their Princes will but condescend to be like loving and equal-eyed brothers in a family of brothers and not like self-important and patronage-dispensing masters amidst a multitude of submissive dependants, and if their people will but come to a sense of citizenship and undertake to bear their share of responsibility for the well-being of their States,—there is nothing

that can prevent their rising to a lofty position once more in the world as the finest products of Indian civilization and giving the lead to the rest of India in every path of National Progress.

USES OF A CONSTITUTIONAL KING.

Let me, even at the risk of seeming a little tedious, repeat that the rise of democracy does not mean the subversion of the throne. For a proof, one has only to turn to our political *Guru*, England. There, if anywhere, is to be found the most respected monarchy and at the same time the most admired republic in the world. The advantages of having a hereditary head of the State are invaluable as illustrated by the history of England; and those countries that still have the good fortune to possess ruling dynasties can ill afford to lose their services. What is needed is simply the grace on the part of the Sovereign to accept a constitutional position for himself. In the organism of the State, as in the organism of every public institution, there are two parts:—[1] the reverence-inspiring or *dignified* parts, and [2] the working or *efficient* parts. In an army, for example, the flag and the uniform are parts of the first class; the man and his gun are of the second class. Without the first, it would be difficult to arise and to hold together an army; without the second there can be no army at all. In a similar way, the crown is the unifying and loyalty-inspiring amulet of the State. In the first place, the Sovereign impresses

the common people as the very personification of the State, evokes their patriotism and secures their ready confidence for the government. Secondly, he sets,—provided he is a gentleman besides being a Prince,—a 'high example of civic and social virtues with an influence which none else can command. Thirdly, he can,—if he is of a genial personality,—dilute the acerbities of contending political parties and soften the harshnesses incidental to public life. Fourthly, he acts as the representative of the State towards the Sovereigns of other States, and his kindness and hospitality go a long way towards bettering the State's relations with foreign powers. Nor is this all. He can be of incalculable use as an *efficient* part also. Firstly, his intimate knowledge of all sides of public affairs, his consecutive experience of changing administrations and his calm discrimination can help him in the choice of a minister. Secondly, during the continuance of a ministry, he is the one authority that can [1] be consulted by the ministers before the initiation of any measure, [2] encourage them when they are wavering in their policies and in need of support, and [3] warn them when a particular measure or policy is about to become inexpedient. Thirdly, when the ministry is dissolved, it is he who takes up and holds the reins of government till they are handed on to another ministry. In times of crises, it is he that can remind the leaders of the nation of their common duty and alleviate the anxiety or anger of the

multitude. Besides performing these all-important functions, he directs and controls the complex and confidential details of the State's foreign affairs. He is, with all this, simply "a cog in the mechanism" of the State. He is the centre and the moving force, but not the manufacturing part of the machinery. As the celebrated Bagehot puts it, "the greatest wisdom of a constitutional king would show itself in well-considered *inaction*." "When a monarch can bless, it is best that he should not be touched. It should be evident that *he* does no wrong. He should not be brought too closely to real measurement. He should be aloof and solitary. As the functions of English royalty are for the most part latent, it fulfils this condition. It seems to order, but it never seems to struggle. It is commonly hidden like a mystery, and sometimes paraded like a pageant, but in neither case is it contentious. The nation is divided into parties, but the crown is of no party. Its apparent separation from business is that which removes it from enmities and from desecration, which preserves its mystery, which enables it to combine the affection of conflicting parties—to be a visible symbol of unity to those still so imperfectly educated as to need a symbol." It is for this reason that, in the last letter, I made bold to emphatically disapprove of the holding of a Ruling Princes' Conference or any assemblage in which our Princes may find themselves placed in delicate and embarrassing situations.

In contrast to the undeniable and incalculable advantages of a crowned democracy as enumerated above, with all its traditional strength and stability, is it possible that any sane people would yearn for the distractions and demoralizations of a presidential government, with its electioneering corruption, its uncertain purposes and unsteady policies, and with no permanent and superior living force to harmonize and moderate its factious elements ?

EDUCATION OF THE PRINCES.†

Having thus indicated the position of the constitutional Prince, may I not proceed to offer a thought or two regarding the sort of education that a Native Prince requires ? The subject has

† In the course of an interview granted to Dr. Tej Bahadur Sapru, M. A., J.L. D., of Allahabad, (reported in the *Hindustan Review* for October 1904, His Highness the Gaekwar of Baroda said: "I am afraid I cannot look upon the present means of educating the Princes with any satisfaction or enthusiasm. As things go at present, our Princes receive merely a smattering of education. I should like them to be brought up as gentlemen, to receive an education which would broaden their minds, enlighten their sympathies and make them care more for the substance than for the shadow. If they want to be of use to their States and to the country at large, they ought to mix with the people and know men of light and culture. As it is, Indian Princes act more as a drag than as a lever, upon the general progress of the country. If the country at large progresses and the Princes lag behind, it cannot be a harmonious progress. I should like the Indian Princes to lead all movements making for the social, moral and intellectual regeneration of the country. But it is impossible for them to sympathise with the people or to direct or check the forces at work unless they receive as good an education as the best of you. If Princes desire to command the genuine respect and confidence of the people, they must be able at least to speak intelligently upon questions of general interest."

long been under discussion, and it seems to have engaged the attention of the last session of the Chiefs' Conference. Strange to say, the problem, instead of approaching towards a solution, has at the end of three or four decades become more difficult to be grappled with than it was at the beginning. The reason apparently lies in the difference in quality between the kind of Englishmen we now get for doing educational work in this country and the kind of men that came to teach us in those days. Those were times when the best families of the British middle class sent their young men to seek honourable occupation in India; and the men came with a noble zeal and ambition for distinction. They were men of culture, possessing a knowledge of their classics, and able to appreciate the beauties of literature and art. And they were gentlemen, with many antique excellences of character and graces of chivalry. Believing in the superiority of their own civilization, they were careful of the manner in which they conducted themselves towards the "natives," and were actuated by the ideals of *noblesse oblige*. Those ideals now stand in the back-ground, mostly unnoticed and unremembered; and the average Englishman in India to-day is a wage-earner or profit-seeker, pure and simple. His pride of race is of too vulgar a sort to let him cultivate the broad-mindedness of the olden days. His sense of self-interest is of too gross a sort to allow of his displaying the old-world chivalry. He *cannot* be

a liberal-hearted aristocrat, and he will not be an unreserved democrat. Persons of this description abound in all branches of Indian public service including education; and it is no wonder that Indo-British relations are not improved through their instrumentality. The European civilian and the European professor of the average sort now seem to be here only to exercise a right, not to fulfil a duty—unless it be the duty of making as much of that right as possible. Their prejudices and perversities are well known; and in the administration of the country, they naturally disappoint the general public, while in the Colleges their conduct naturally vexes our youth. And yet, it is from this class of Anglo-Indians that in these days tutors are often chosen for also our Princes.* Duties which once were being performed by men of the calibre and character of Malleson and Gordon and Porter among Englishmen and scholars of the type of Jaya Rama Rao and Sir T. Madhava Rao among Indians, are now entrusted to the hands of intellectual mediocrities who are by no means remarkable for any lofty idealism or virtue. They are office-hunters, as most men of university education in this country are; and they could train a

* M. Joseph Chailley writes in his "*Administrative Problems of British India*," translated by Sir William Meyer:—

"The fact remains that hitherto the 'chiefs' Colleges have not fulfilled the hopes to which they had given rise, and that most of the Princes who have passed through them have not been specially successful rulers." (1910)

prince to be everything but a constitutional ruler. He might become a good *Shikar*, a fine "society" man, an amiable post-prandial orator, a pompous stickler for ceremonies, and—what is more to the point—a veritable incarnation of obstinacy in his dealings with his ministers. Nurtured upon the traditions of bureaucracy, and scrupulously shut out from the liberalizing influences of history, of the philosophy of politics, and of the literatures of modern national and democratic movements*—it is small wonder that many a Prince suffers from a narrow outlook upon life and from an exaggerated notion of his own importance. These feelings naturally beget in him a partiality for honey-mouthed courtiers; and therein begin the troubles of his subjects. For this radical defect, would it not be an effective remedy,—Your Highness,—to make it a rule that the education of a young Prince should be entrusted to the care of a liberal-minded Englishman of Indian experience and reputation—like, for instance, Sir Hugh Daly—who should be assisted by Indian gentlemen of proved learning, patriotism and moral worth? What is essential is that the guardian or tutor should not be a member of the "heaven-born service," that he should not have an axe to grind and that he should be a man devoted to study and thought, possessed of liberal culture and ripe experience of the world. Such were Rangacharlu and Madhava Rao; and the luminous addresses which the latter delivered for the benefit of the

* For instances see Appendix at the end.

Princes of Travancore on the science of government and the art of statecraft are models of lessons that should be instilled into the minds of kings. Men who could satisfy all the conditions prescribed above are, it is true, very rare; but the training of a king is not a common task that can be left to be managed by anybody anyhow. A constitutional ruler must be as wise, as able and as well-informed as his ministers if he should have any influence for good over their conduct. And they generally are the cleverest and the most capable men in the State. So "a king, to be equal to his ministers in discussion, must work as they work; he must be a man of business as they are men of business." "The only fit material for a constitutional king," continues Bagehot, "is a prince who begins early to reign—who in his youth is superior to pleasure—who in his youth is willing to labour—who has by nature a genius for discretion. Such kings are among God's greatest gifts, but they are among His rarest."

CHOICE OF BRITISH RESIDENTS AND OFFICERS.

Before turning to another subject that I have in mind, may I not also submit that the observations above made with reference to the choice of an Englishman for a royal school, apply with equal force to the choice of a Resident or a Private Secretary? The matter, it is true, is entirely in the hands of the Supreme Government; but it certainly cannot be that the Princes are without a voice in the matter. It is they that have to get on

with the Residents and political officers; and they would not be transgressing their bounds if they were to give the Government of India a bit of their mind, once for all, respecting the qualities which they would like to find in a representative of the Paramount Power. A Resident who would be unobtrusive and trustful, and who is of a genial and popular disposition would prove no less a blessing to his own country than to the State wherein he serves; and experience seems to support the opinion that administrators drawn from the military ranks—like Sir Hugh Daly—make better Residents than sun-dried bureaucrats like the late Sir William Lee-Warner. Undoubtedly, the matter is one of first-rate importance; and it would be good for every one concerned if the Princes were to indicate certain principles by which the Government of India may be guided in selecting men for any offices in the States.

MINORITY ADMINISTRATION.

The question of the administration of a State during the minority of a Prince seems to have been another subject that was for discussion at the last session of the Chiefs' Conference. It is a little astonishing that this question should still be perplexing any one, in the face of the most happy solution that Mysore found for it more than twenty years ago. The opinion recorded by Sir T. Madhava Rao in another connection would be as well applicable here. He says:—"Nor ought the State to be

placed under the management of the European Officers, like a British Province. Such a course would not only be unpopular in a high degree, but would render future withdrawal from it very difficult, if not impossible. The course would only lead to annexation in effect, though not in name."

On the other hand, Mysore has proved that administration by a Council, headed by a capable Dewan and controlled by a patriotic Regent, can not only be successful from every material point of view but also be productive of some moral good inasmuch as it calls upon the State to stand manfully during a period of trial and induces the responsible members of Government to put forth their very best.

SUBJECTS OF NATIVE STATES AND ADMISSION INTO THE I. C. S.

Your Highness,—there is one point relating to an important *external* right of a Native State subject, to which allusion has not been made anywhere above. It is to us, let me state at the very outset, a point of *principle* rather than one of profit. The right is none else than that of the eligibility of the subject of a Native State for public services in British India. At present, as Your Highness may be aware, young men of Native States are not allowed admission into the I. C. S. and the I. M. S., whereas there is no such bar against a Colonial or any other subject of His Majesty, however remote be his native land from India.

Some time ago, an attempt was made in the British Parliament to remove the invidious discrimination made against Native States, by inserting a clause in the I. C. S. rules empowering the Viceroy to concede to any State, according to his own discretion, the privilege of sending up its young men to compete for the most coveted line of public service in British India. Publicists of British India, however, suggested that an arrangement of reciprocity should be a condition precedent to the granting of the above concession by the Viceroy. They insist that the Native State which would like to secure the privilege for its subjects should be prepared to open the gates of its own public services for the subjects of British India. But, Your Highness, it is neither a concession nor a privilege that the subjects of the States ask for. They render, as writers on constitutional law have admitted, a "double allegiance" and have thereby acquired a "double right." They are the subjects of their respective Ruling Princes and they are also the subjects of His Imperial Majesty. Could the same be said of a native of British India? As it cannot be said, the advocates of "reciprocity" have no legs to stand upon. Eligibility to public offices being one of the rights inherent in citizenship, the subjects of Native States, in their capacity as British citizens, ought not to be denied admission to any Government appointment in British India that is open to other Indians. Our brethren in British India need not be under any

fear that the best prizes of their public service will all be seized by young men from the States; for, as I stated in my last letter, it appears to be more than any State can hope for that it can find its own men for all of its own administrative posts. On the other side, if the State, under a mistaken notion of reciprocity, were to open its doors for outsiders, its own children would very soon be nowhere. As remarked already, the question is one of bare *justice*; and while the conceding of that justice will not materially affect the interests of our British Indian brethren, it may occasionally serve as an opportunity for distinction and as an encouragement for well-doing to a brilliant youth of some Native State.

MILITARY TRAINING.

A subject that ought to appeal in an especial degree to Your Highness is the utilization of the martial material existing in the Native States. The inauguration of the Indian Defence Force has evoked a wave of military enthusiasm throughout India; but though admission into the said Force is not likely to be denied to qualified subjects of Native States, the absence of what I may call the "local" colour accounts for the comparatively poor response made by the States. Readiness and ability to defend home and honour being one of the essential conditions of a people's fitness for independence, it is important that the States should concert measures for rousing and preparing the manhood of the nation for warlike service.

A nation that is blind to the value of military zeal and discipline annihilates one most important aspect of its very nature, and it cannot possibly lead a manly and fully developed life.

SELF-GOVERNMENT—THE ROOT OF ALL GREATNESS.

I shall not here pause to dilate upon the other problems, not less vital than any touched upon above, but likely to be *best* solved by the people themselves when they are once freed from the solicitude of a *mabap* officialdom.* It is a truth as axiomatic as it is all-important that a system of education, both popular and specialised, is an indispensable condition for the growth of a sane and healthy democracy. To the need for an

*To quote Rangacharlu again, addressing the second session of the Mysore Representative Assembly (1882), he said:—"Whatever Government or any few outsiders may do must be small compared with what the great mass of the population engaged in industrial pursuits could accomplish in their several occupations when stirred up by a desire for advancement." Then, after alluding to the fact that India, which once could export cloth to England, is now obliged to depend for her supplies upon her quondam customer, he goes on to ask:—"What then may not be accomplished if the large population in this country once entered on a similar career of progress?"

The inutility of Governmental endeavours for the promotion of trade and industry in a country where the people are listless and irresponsible is well illustrated in the recent history of Mysore. If the economic activities initiated by Sir Visvesvaraya's administration had been carried on in a province like Bombay, where there is an awakened public and an earnest popular demand for a vigorous industrial policy on the part of Government, the results would have been far more beneficial and remarkably more gratifying than they have been in Mysore. A restless spirit of patriotic aspiration and the political sense that comes with it, are the necessary pre-conditions of true and lasting national progress.

industrial and commercial awakening, I need not refer, because its importance is self-evident. To a nation, as to a man, life would be impossible without certain physical means; and no philosophy could be so ludicrous as to advise us to fancy ourselves as candidates for heaven while we are famishing without bread on God's fair earth. The close of the sanguinary war is sure to be followed by a commercial war; and unless India is up and busy now, her condition is then bound to be far worse than what it was ever before. It is therefore necessary—as it is both possible and fitting—that the Native States should, following the example of Mysore, strive to open a new era in the economic career of India.

HOME RULE AND NATIVE STATES.

Your Highness, people in British India are now under the impulse of a great and potent idea. In throwing themselves into the enterprize for winning Home Rule, they are not only seeking their political and material salvation, but they are also purifying and enriching their *character*. They are learning the lessons of patriotism, of public spirit, of courage in the discharge of national duties, of suffering and sacrificing for the motherland, of banishing petty jealousies and personal motives, of coalescing and organizing national forces. These are lessons without learning which no country can aspire to become great and independent. Let us frankly confess that

there is no such ideal to fire the zeal and capture the imagination of men in the Native States. Let the subjects of Native States, therefore, freely join their brethren in British India and assist in the struggle for Home Rule. Let them be participators in all the national movements of British India like the Congress, the Social Conference, the National Education schemes, the Boy Scouts organizations and other beneficent activities of the present Renaissance. For, after all, India is but as one household amidst the community of nations. She has *one spiritual mission* which binds together the subjects of Native States and those of British India; and besides, victory to the latter in the fight for Swaraj means an impetus to the same cause in the Native States.

APPEAL TO THE BRITISH THRONE.

Leaders of National India are demanding an immediate declaration of policy from the Government of His Majesty to the effect that they recognise Home Rule to be the political goal of India. Would it not be in the highest interests of our common motherland if enlightened and patriotic Princes of Your Highness' eminence—very few as they are—will send up a recommendation to His Majesty on behalf of India's movement towards larger freedom and couple with it a prayer that His Imperial Majesty might also be graciously pleased to make it known to *all* his Indian Allies that they could deserve his approbation and esteem only by submitting themselves to constitutional principles and

processes of administration, similar to those which His Majesty has himself accepted. Wrote Raja Sir T. Madhava Rao:—

“ I am convinced that if unqualified personal and arbitrary rule continue in Native States, they must inevitably collapse one after another, the event being only a question of time. This is a consummation which the British Government is too high-minded to desire, and hence the British Government may well be expected to avail itself of proper and favourable opportunities to bring about the establishment of constitutional government in Native States, in the best interests of these States themselves.”

THE VISION OF THE FUTURE.

These are the words of a renowned statesman; and if, as he suggests, the Paramount Power openly expresses itself in favour of constitutionalism, it is sure to have far-reaching and beneficial consequences. And that will be the first step towards the materialization of that inspiring vision of a United States of India which is filling every patriot's heart with radiance and rapture. Whether it be a Federation or a Confederation, therein will shine the States no less democratic than the Provinces, the Dewans no less honoured than the Governors, the Princes no less adored as heads of republics than the Emperor as the enthroned president [of a world-wide Commonwealth and

the whole joyously and prosperously progressing in the service of God and of Humanity.

Your Highness, the full realization of this dream, which we have all been taught to invite and cherish, may be accelerated not a little by such as you. May the Lord, I pray again and again, shower His choicest blessings on Your Highness and on your most worthy friend and brother who is my beloved Sovereign, so that Your Highnesses may help the nation during these eventful times and lead it on to the anticipated Day of unfading splendour.

A. MYSOREAN.

**MEMORIALS ON THE PROBLEMS OF
NATIVE STATES.—IV.**

To

**His Highness the Maharaja Saheb
Bahadur of Bikaner.**

Pardon me, Your Highness, for the unconscionable length, the tiresome reiterations and the literary infelicities of these hastily written memorials; I had almost decided to give my feeble pen some rest—to the immense relief, no doubt, of my readers—when the daily papers handed to me a telegraphic summary of Lord Islington's speech on Indian Reforms which contains an allusion to the Native States; and that necessitates my adding this postscript. I need not deal with the other points raised by Lord Islington; our nationalist press has examined his scheme and drawn attention to its unhappy tone and its unsubstantial character. With regard to the Indian States, Lord Islington is reported to have "held that they must come into the scheme of their own free will. Treaty rights must be scrupulously respected and nothing must be done to impair the personal link binding them to the Crown."[‡]

Obviously, his Lordship has travelled beyond the proper field of discussion in evincing this

[‡] That part of the speech which relates to this subject is given in full in the Appendix.

needless anxiety about the "personal link." There has been no talk—at all events, no irreverent or ungracious talk—either in India or elsewhere, regarding the Crown and its relations.

REVISION OF TREATIES.

As for treaties, it is but right that they should be reviewed and amended in the light of Europe's refined notions of international justice and fairplay. The war has consigned the old ideas of inter-state ethics into the fire; and when the purified political conscience emerges out of the crucible, it should be applied also to the question of properly adjusting England's relation with the Indian States. Speaking in February last, at the East India Association, London, Mr. Abbas Ali Beg, Ex-Dewan of Janjira and Junagadh States and Retired Member of the Council of India, observed:—"The relations of the Chiefs were based on certain treaties, and some of the clauses of those covenants, if they were closely examined in a court of law, might perhaps be considered void, because they were, to some extent at least, without adequate consideration. To take one instance, that of the salt revenue of an Indian maritime State; a treaty would be entered into, and the Chief would be bound hand and foot not to utilise the natural resources of his State for export at all. Even if he consented to pay in full the duty on salt, he was debarred from making a profitable use of what belonged to him. With regard to this, the question

of the fiscal relations of the Paramount Power and the Indian Chief arose, and, no doubt, the treaty was based on a desire to safeguard British revenues. Another matter the speaker would like to mention was the arrangement about coinage."

Is it not then necessary that the treaties, framed at a time* when there was not the same degree of mutual understanding, friendship and trust as there is at present between the Native States and the British Power, should be re-written now according to our improved conceptions of what would be healthful and creditable to England and her Empire?

RE-CLASSIFICATION OF STATES.

It is also necessary that an attempt should be made to classify the 675 Native States according to their status and importance. Titular Rajas, virtual Jahgirdars and real Sovereigns are all

*As a revelation of the seamy side of British statesmanship of the early days in regard to Native States, the italicised portion of the following quotation from the famous adoption Despatch (dated 30th April 1860) of Lord Canning—so wise and noble in its conclusion—is noteworthy:—

"The safety of our rule is increased, not diminished, by the maintenance of Native Chiefs well affected to us *Restless men*, who will accept no profession but arms, *crafty intriguers* bred up in Native Courts, and *others who would chafe at our stricter and more formal rule*, live there (in the Native States) contentedly It was long ago said by Sir John Malcolm that if we made all India into zillas, it was not in the nature of things that our Empire should last fifty years; but that if we could keep up a number of Native States, *without political power, but as royal instruments*, we should exist in India as long as our naval superiority in Europe was maintained."

promiscuously grouped together at present under the name of Chiefs or Princes ; and it is highly important that the several types should be distinguished from one another. States should be differentiated from estates, and powerful Sovereigns from petty chieftains, so that the position assigned and the treatment accorded to each may be in accordance with some valid and intelligible principle and also so that there might be some rational basis for any arrangement that may be devised for the representation of Native States in bodies constituted to deal with All-India and Imperial questions. It seems to be necessary also that all States, properly recognized as such, should have direct dealings with the Government of India and not be left to the care of Provincial Governments. The necessity for the creation of a special court to adjudicate cases arising between the Supreme Power and the States has already been pointed out. That same court may be vested with the power of interpreting the Treaties and *Sanads* in cases of difference of interpretation.

PRINCES,—AND PRINCES.

What exactly Lord Islington means by " the States coming into the scheme of their own free-will " is not quite clear. If his meaning be that the British Government cannot or need not induce the Princes to " popularize " their political constitutions, we need do no more than refer his Lordship to the words, already quoted, of Lord Ripon and Raja

Sir T. Madhava Rao, both of whom took their stand on the policy enunciated in the Great Queen's proclamation. Further, in expecting the Native States to initiate democratic reforms of their own accord, Lord Islington is only giving evidence of that dense ignorance which prevails in most quarters regarding the present condition and future possibilities of Native States, and whose prevalence, by the bye, has provided the present writer with an excuse for venturing to employ his modest powers in the service of so great a cause. No doubt there are among our Ruling Princes a few who, like H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore, are the liberal-minded pioneers of constitutional reform and are eager to ensure the prosperity of their subjects. But have we not also heard of Rulers* who spend eleven months out of twelve in quest of health or pleasure outside their territory ; who defy public opinion and social laws in contracting domestic relations and friendships ; who expend public funds on matters of such relative importance as the Palace Band and the State Agricultural Department in the proportion of Rs. eight thousand and Rs. three thousand respectively ; who have had no compunction in deporting or otherwise molesting publicists and public workers ; who, even if they *seem* progressive and constitutional, have so designed and shaped the Representative Assembly or the Legislative Council that it is practically a toy for the infant Demos, a cloak and a cat's-paw for

* For instances refer to Appendix.

the officialdom and an imposing but hollow ornament to the Durbar ?

UNREALITY OF ADVERTISED PROGRESS.

Yes; Your Highness—princes properly so called are not many among the hundreds who now glory in that name. Most of them have forgotten the greatness of their ancestry and the responsibility of their heritage. Instead of striving to win the gratitude of their people which is a comparatively easy task, they spare themselves no trouble and cost in trying to propitiate others with a view to gain nothing more substantial than rank and precedence and title to feed their own personal vanity.† Even among the more clever and better known of them, there are not a few who have not cared to make conditions of life in their States really as attractive as they are in the neighbouring British Province, who have kept taxation at a high level, who have centralized all administrative powers in their own hands, who have not bestowed any serious thought on the educational and economic advancement of the millions under their care, and whose veneer of modernism covers the essence of the antiquated *regime*. There is no life—no real, wakeful, purposeful, energetic and progressive life—in the States. Once famed as the refuge of art and literature, they are now conspicuous for their intellectual inanition and soullessness. Among the greatest names of Modern India, not even one can be

† See Kipling's satire given at the end.

claimed by a Native State as its own. Our greatest politicians, public workers, historians, scientists, lawyers, orators, poets and novelists, social reformers—all belong to some part or other of British India. Three decades ago when there was a keen rivalry between "natives" and outsiders for distinction in practical statecraft, and when men had to act in the light of their own independent judgment and had no precedent to follow, the States were able to produce some first-rate administrators and statesmen. But conditions have changed now; and the Dewan of to-day is generally either a glorified clerk, or a fussy amateur, or a hardened British Indian bureaucrat.† The most promising young men in some States are absorbed into the offices of Government where, however, their intelligence withers away, there being no scope for its flowering; and little talent is left in the State for public work and literary pursuits. This intellectual and moral bankruptcy will become a thing of the past only when the people are lifted out of their torpor and listlessness by a growing sense of their own human value and importance. Their abject and self-oblivious dependence on the almighty *Sirkar* should make room for a burning and aggressive self-consciousness; and

†The qualities which distinguish a successful civilian of British India are not exactly the qualities that are essential for success in the administration of a Native State. The atmosphere in which a Dewan has to work and the standpoint from which he has to view the questions coming before him are altogether different from those in which the member of the "heaven-born" service is usually placed.

then alone will their faculties be set free to manifest themselves in the higher domains of thought and of enterprise. The individual should cease to think that he is nobody in the State, and begin to feel that he has something to fight for, something to preserve, something to keep a vigil about—for has it not been said that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty? This political awakening is the necessary pre-condition of all true progress and it should therefore be the first duty of every patriot to try to rid the people of their present moral insensibility miscalled contentment and their low self-satisfaction mistaken for blessedness, and to generate in them that divine discontent and that upward aspiration which is the mother of all manly idealism and effort. One way to achieve that end is to throw political responsibility on the shoulders of the people themselves and force their pace, as it were, on the path of progress; and this is the policy that is being pursued, not without gratifying results on the whole, by H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore and his Dewan Sir M. Visvesvaraya.

PARTICIPATION IN THE FIGHT FOR HOME RULE,
— A VITALIZING PROCESS.

Another way to attain the same end is to allow and even encourage the people of the States to place themselves on the crest of the mighty wave which is now moving the whole of India forward. The impact of that all-inspiring, all-invigorating

and all-uplifting movement will infuse new ambitions, new hopes and new enthusiasms into the hearts of the people and impart to them that element of virility and of daring without which much of the public life of many a State has been but a noisy theatricality. It has already been remarked that even in some apparently advanced States, popular institutions exist only in form and not in fact; those shadowy institutions can be rendered real and effectual only when their members have imbibed the earnestness, the restless zeal and the resistless courage which characterize the surging political life of the larger British India. If what Lord Islington meant by the "free will" of the Native States be the political awakening of their denizens and the resultant constitutional reforms forced *from within*, then the surest preparation for such a consummation would be the popular up-heaval brought about by the example and influence of British India's passionate struggle for liberty.

TRUE STATESMANSHIP.

Your Highness, Lord Islington has said that India's journey towards her goal must be slow. We could understand it, seeing that he is of the bureaucratic household; but we cannot understand Your Highness saying the same. Great political and intellectual forces flow with a tidal sweep, heedless of petty obstacles; and in the pregnant words of Lord Morley, wise statesmen are those who foresee what time is bringing, and endeavour

to shape institutions and to mould men's thought and purpose in accordance with the change that is about to surround them. Among reformers of such pre-vision, I wish to count my own Sovereign and Your noble Highness. Both of you are Princes of great prestige and influence; both of you are noted for your enlightenment and liberality; both of you have been the paragons of true constitutional progress; and both of you are unsurpassed as patriots, with a profound veneration for our past, with an unwavering faith in the sublime tenets of our ancient religion and philosophy, and with a noble determination to rejuvenate the nation that did so much in the past for the world and its civilization. To Your Highnesses, then, belongs the privilege of comprehending the true significance of the great contemporary events and of so directing affairs that posterity may bless your names as those of great national benefactors who, amidst storm as amidst calm, amidst gloom as amidst sunshine, adhered to the ideal of the People, and placing themselves at the head of the onward forces, strove to enable India to be once again the free and triumphant architect of her own destiny.

A MYSOREAN

APPENDIX IV.

(Page.)

LORD ISLINGTON ON NATIVE STATES.

Their Place in Indian Self-Government.

In any final scheme of Indian self-government, it is clear that provision must be made for the Native States which, in area and population, cover one-third of the Indian peninsula. Comprised within the legal definition of India, they are excluded from that of British India, and do not form part of His Majesty's Dominions. Proud to acknowledge the paramountcy of the British Crown, their rulers are so far from being British subjects that they enjoy an almost complete internal sovereignty solemnly guaranteed to them, with certain limitations, by formal treaties the scrupulous observance of which is a point of honour with the British Government. And yet, though historically and constitutionally divorced from the body politic of British India, they are inextricably bound up with it by their geographical position, which necessarily exposes them on all sides to influences from without; while railways, posts and telegraphs must tend more and more to level artificial barriers and to foster the growth of common sentiment. Thus it is that making no claim to interfere in their own, they claim to take part in the defence of the British Empire, and wherever the Indian Army has fought, Imperial Service Troops have stood side by side with their British and Indian comrades.

Obviously, therefore, they must occupy an important place in any of our schemes. What that place must be, it would be premature to discuss now; but there are certain principles which must always be borne steadily in mind:—

First.—The States must come into our scheme of their own free will. We can put no pressure upon them which the letter and the spirit of our treaty engagements with them do not permit.

Second.—We cannot ask them to come into any scheme which does not reserve to them all the rights which their treaties guarantee to them. However insistent may be the demands for accommodation and give and take, their treaty rights must be scrupulously respected.

Third.—Nothing must be done to impair the personal link which binds them to the Crown.

Subject to the above considerations, there is scope in the future for much mutual intercourse between these States and British India. I can conceive a reciprocal benefit arising to both by such intercourse, and I am sure that the Chiefs themselves will from time to time willingly avail themselves of such opportunities that may offer to secure assistance and co-operation from the British Government in any public movement that they have in contemplation for the advancement and prosperity of their States.

COMMENT ON THE ABOVE.

(From the *Karnataka*)

We have now before us the full text of Lord Islington's Oxford speech on "the Problems of Indian Government," on a telegraphic summary whereof comments were offered in these columns in the fourth of the Memorials on "the Problems of Native States." We are now confirmed in the position we then took; and we may also add that Lord Islington has not done anything like justice to the question of the Native States. He has given evidence of neither insight into their present condition nor interest as to their future possibilities. With regard to the whole question of India's political future, his attitude is that of the honey-mouthed bureaucrat who would solemnly sermonize about Britain's trust and India's unfitness, and counsel patience as the best of all conceivable qualifications. He proposes some concessions too; but all students of history know that the nation which allows itself to be silenced by bureaucratic concessions sells its birthright for a mess of pottage.

MEMORIALS ON THE PROBLEMS OF
NATIVE STATES.—V.

Are There to be More Native States.

In Mr. Montagu's memorable speech on the Report of the Mesopotamia Commission, there is a parenthetical passage whose precise meaning we have not been able to comprehend. Referring to the ideal of "complete Home Rule for India" put forward by that stalwart soldier of liberty, Commander Wedgwood M.P., the then future Secretary of State for India is reported to have declared:

"I do not believe there is any demand for that in India on a large scale. I do not believe it will be possible, or certainly be a cure for these evils."

Commander Wedgwood: "I want that to be the goal towards which we are driving."

Mr. Montagu: "As a goal! I see a different picture! I see the great Self-Governing Dominions and Provinces of India organised and co-ordinated with the great Principalities—the existing Principalities, and perhaps new ones,—not one great Home Rule country, but a series of Self-Governing Provinces and Principalities federated by one Central Government."

In speaking thus, we cannot think that Mr. Montagu was seriously upholding the idea that some of the territory now directly under British administration in India should be converted into Feudatory Principalities. For, apart from the obvious administrative unwisdom of adding to the already unwieldy number—675—of Native States whose existence has given rise to problems too vast, too numerous, and too highly complicated to be complacently or light-heartedly faced, there is the question of the liberty of the people likely to be thereby affected. It is one of the vital principles of Liberalism—of which Mr. Montagu is known to be a doughty champion—that every man has an inalienable right to choose the State of which he shall be the subject. Patriotism being, after all, a natural and instinctive feeling, men spontaneously own their allegiance to the State into which they are born and under whose protection they have grown up. They are not goods and chattel to be transferred, without their consent, by one owner to another. Such compulsory transference of men from one State to another can only be accomplished by means of physical force—which means the negation of liberty and the destruction of Liberalism. And yet—whatever be the meaning of the above-quoted declaration of Mr. Montagu—there have been Englishmen to advocate the creation of more Native States. This policy of so-called “devolution” has found an influential exponent in Sir Walter Lawrence, the character of whose

politics will easily be understood when it is remembered that he was Lord Curzon's Private Secretary in India. Dr. John Pollen, another Retired Anglo-Indian celebrity, pleaded for the same retrogressive policy, maintaining "that the best and simplest way of giving 'Home Rule' to India, if Home Rule be really desired, would be to constitute Bombay, Madras, Calcutta, and possibly Karachi, "free cities," and restore the rest of India to Native Chieftains with British Residents attached to their courts The eulogies bestowed by Mrs. Besant and her new school of "Home Rulers" on the admirable administration of Native States such as Baroda confirm this view, and seem to me to prove that, in spite of the Western agitator, the country has not changed very much since I left it, and that the peoples of India still retain their innate yearning for, and appreciation of personal rule, and that the masses still prefer the Native State form of Government." [*Asiatic Review*, January 1917].

A more hideous travesty of the "Home Rule" idea, it is impossible to conceive of. As an Irishman, Dr. Pollen should have known that "Home Rule," as demanded by his great countrymen like Davitt and O'Connell, Parnell and Redmond, stands not for the resuscitation of some ancient and forgotten Irish dynasty of Brian's or any other's, nor for the crowning of Sir Edward Carson as the Sovereign Lord of Erin—but for the *realization* of the sovereignty of the Irish Nation. "Home Rule" is, in

truth, not a matter of racial preference, but one of universal political justice. It seeks the supremacy of The People over the entire machinery of government. The Indian Home Rulers do not instance Baroda as the full embodiment of their ultimate ideal. Such of the Native States as are, according to Dr. Pollen himself, "admirable" serve only to show that Indians are not inferior to any in organizing and administrative ability. Where they are left free to work out their own destiny, Indians have not been slow to be animated by progressive ideals and they have pursued those ideals with no little success: this, and nothing more than this, is proved by the history of the better known States; and therein they simply support—not satisfy—the demand for Home Rule. As a matter of fact, they need real constitutional "Home Rule" as much as the Provinces of British India. At present, they are mostly under unqualified autocracy, or at best under bureaucracy, and neither of these forms of government could be regarded as "Home Rule." It is puerile mockery to talk of the "preference" or choice of the masses; for they have really no sense of civic responsibility. Politically they are lifeless, and there can be no hope of their being able to exercise their judgment as self-conscious and free citizens before the Governments are democratized. And democracy is really not the peculiar monopoly of any race or country; it is, as already hinted, of universal applicability. The truly Indian type of

government—that is, the type prevalent in times of yore—was not absolute autocracy, but limited monarchy, as “popular” in constitution as it then possibly could be; and into what it could have developed if the natural process of its evolution had not been interfered with by alien hands, it is not possible for any one now to say. But of this, we may be certain: that not even in India could “absolutism” have flourished for any length of time. If any country has been for ages under a despotic form of government, only one of two explanations could be given of it, both of which, however, would go against the evidences of history and the known ingredients of human nature. Either the successive despots of that country must have been uniformly benevolent and patriotic men assisted by equally good officers—which supposition would not be sustained by a consideration of the probabilities of the case as may be inferred from the recorded experiences of the world;—or the people of that country must have lost all instincts of self-interest and so reduced to a condition of dumb serfdom that they could not exercise even the right of rebellion—which supposition would not be tenable in the face of the known limitations of human patience, which at any rate is not much greater than that of lower animals. So in India, as elsewhere, men have been continuously yearning and struggling forward for the attainment of liberation from political bondage; and it is nothing but malice to suggest that all that

they now seek is the substitution of an indigenous autocracy for a foreign bureaucracy,—though even this may perhaps be desired as a preliminary step towards the establishment of national democracy. It is a mischievous contradiction in terms to speak of an Indian autocracy;* for there never was such a thing as autocracy properly so-called in India at any time when she was her own mistress; and what we see to day in the States is, not the faithful reproduction of the true Aryan political ideal, but only the crude handiwork of Anglo-Indian autocrats and bureaucrats who seldom were men imbued with any lofty and enduring ideal. Therefore, the idea of expanding the area of Feudatory India cannot appeal to any save its reactionary apostles and its prospective beneficiaries. It is a slave and not a citizen who can be asked to change the direction of his loyalty irrespective of his own will; and our faith in Britain's innate love and respect for human liberty is too deep to let us fear that she will mistake the true meaning of India's aspiration and hand over those who are now under her direct care to chieftains who, after propitiating the Anglo-Indian Residents, will be free to revive the ugly traditions of *Nawabism*, without having to subject themselves to the legal and constitutional restraints which were religiously respected by the mighty monarchs of old. What Britain should now concern herself with is neither annexation nor relinquishment of

*See quotations from Tiruvalluvar, Ranade and Mr. Telang.

territory. The existing territorial arrangement has for generations been accepted as the work of a power superior to human deliberation and effort, and the country has long reconciled itself to the fact. It would not be wise to meddle with such a fact bequeathed by history. Liberal thinkers in Europe are insisting that when the War draws to a close and the terms of peace are to be settled, one of the essential conditions for international agreement should be that "no transfer of property from one State to another shall be made unless and until the approval of the people of the territory concerned shall have been ascertained in some genuine, fair and appropriate way." (G. L. Dickinson) Surely, England is not going to violate this righteous principle in India and double the political yoke where it is only single at present. Her object, on the contrary, should be to release from the autocratic or bureaucratic yoke the subjects of Native States as well as those of her own, and make each human being under her ægis a free partner in the commonwealth. Mr. Montagu, as a good Liberal, should have no difficulty in seeing that the Lawrence-Pollen interpretation of India's demand for Home Rule, as the desire for a regime of Resident-ridden Nawabism, is like saying that the outstretched hand of a hungry man seeks a stone for performing some blood-curdling feat of stoicism. The principle of democracy—like the principles of truth, love and justice on which it is based—is an eternal and all-transcending principle; and

its highest promise is to secure to every human being, of whatever colour or creed or country, a fair opportunity for full self-development and self-realization. If from this all-embracing humanitarian movement India or her Native States are to be excluded, they can only be assumed to be non-human or less than human,—an assumption which even their enemies will not have the heart or the heartlessness to make.

Shivajee's System of Government.

Mr. M. G. Ranade in his *Rise of the Mahratta Power*, has compared Shivaji's cabinet of government, called *Ashta Pradhan* (Council of Eight Ministers) with the constitution of the Government of India. In his *Introduction to the Peshwas Diaries* he observes:—"If the Peshwas had continued true to the ancient Raj-Mandal, and while substituting themselves as the deputies of the hereditary Rajas' had maintained the old constitution intact, and had not tried to rule the Empire by a machinery of subordinates originally intended by Shivaji for particular offices and commands, there was no reason why the great purposes served by the Raj-Mandal under Shivaji, Rajaram, and Shahu, might not have been fulfilled with equal success in the times of their Brahmin ministers.....The change meant the conversion of the organic whole into an inorganic mass, and it reproduced the old Mahomedan methods of single rule, against which Shivaji had successfully struggled when he organized the Raj-Mandal."

APPENDIX V.

Truvalluvar.

Tiruvalluvar, the great Tamil poet-philosopher of the 2nd century A. D. has laid down the following maxims in his *Kural* for the guidance of rulers of men.

Behold the noble prince who ruleth the people of his dominions with loving care: sovereignty will never depart from him.

It is not the lance that bringeth victory unto the prince: it is rather his sceptre [of justice], and that provided it is straight and leaneth not to either side.

Behold the prince who oppresseth his subjects and doth iniquity; he is worse than an assassin.

Verily it is the tears of those groaning under oppression that wear away the prosperity of the prince.

The udders of the cow will be dried up and the Brahman will forget his science if the prince ruleth not with justice.

Behold the prince who ruleth with a rod of iron and causeth anguish unto his people: he shall stand without a friend and perish forthwith.

Behold the prince whose cruelty is a byword among his people his days will be shortened and he will perish forthwith.

The tyranny that yoketh to itself charlatans is the only burden under which the earth groaneth: there is none other beside.

What do these maxims, formulated seventeen-centuries ago, prove? Do they show that despotism is India's favourite form of government? Do they show that India's best moralists were indifferent towards questions of political justice? Do they show that the "divine right" of autocrats was the

accepted creed of ancient India? Do they show that the people's right to rebel under oppression was altogether absent from the minds of our political theorists? No. The passion for justice has been with men in all countries and in all ages; and that is what suggests man's kinship with the Divine. Love of justice, respect for truth, longing for liberty, the feelings of gratitude, patriotism, filial affection, —these and the like are the elemental passions of every human heart; and they belong to the universal side of our psychology, though their concrete forms may differ according to national temperament and environment and history. Hatred of tyranny and love of equality and freedom were as natural in ancient India as they now are in any civilized country; and Tiruvalluvar, in speaking as he has done, has not expressed any ideals foreign to his nation.

Democracy in Ancient India

Mr. P. K. Telang, editor of *New India*, delivered a thoughtful and eloquent lecture on "the World-Movement towards Democracy, and England's Attitude towards the same," at Tanjore on 7th October, 1917.

He said :—" The word *Rajan* (or King) means one who can keep the people contented. Power and authority were implicitly admitted to rest on the sanction and the good-will and consent of the people. The ultimate right of the people to be the

sole arbiters as to the kind of government they would have and the persons they would have to govern them, was recognised. This recognition was given concrete form in two restraints on the power of the King, which was otherwise absolute. He could not transcend Dharma. What is Dharma? The custom of the people, admitted and sanctified as binding law by the imprimatur of those who were the knowers and the guardians of the people's culture. He could not break the word of the Brahmanas. Who were the Brahmanas? Those who having acquired culture and knowledge, gave everything to the service of the country, and the service of the people without expecting any return. (Hear, hear). Their watch-words were self-renunciation and self-sacrifice in the service of the Nation. You will note how both these checks would lead to the substantiation of the ultimate power of the people. These two doctrines were gradually developed as people advanced in culture and in political experience, till we had actual democracies and republics, as those of which record is found in Jain and Buddhist books. If these were not larger in number, it must be remembered that States in those days were not political: the work of the people was carried on by social institutions, such as the village Panchayats, industrial or mercantile guilds, and caste organisations of various kinds; and there you find that the principle of democracy was fully alive. You will find in these guilds and in these village Panchayats the

democratic feeling perfectly operative. If India had not been so unfortunate as to have laid itself open to attack from outside, if it had not been the target of repeated foreign invasions, democratic institutions would have developed to perfection in India. We should not have had to learn of democracy from the West and to import democratic institutions from outside. But the foreign invasions upset the whole system which had been developed in the country and postponed the full development of democratic institutions, though the germs of democracy remained intact, and remain so still."—(From the report in *New India*.)

APPENDIX VI.

H. H. The Maharaja of Alwar in support of Home Rule.

H. H. the Maharaja of Alwar, presiding at the distribution of prizes to the students of the State High School, (Alwar,) on Saturday the 18th August 1917, delivered a patriotic and thoughtful address which has been widely quoted in the Indian press. The following occurs in the course of that speech.

I say to you, students, whatever sphere of life may lie before you and whatever careers may open out in your future, pray, remember that you are first an Indian — a patriotic Indian, a loyal Indian, both of which terms can be synonymous and need not at all be contradictory.

The air is rife these days in India with the question of Home Rule and Self-Government within the Empire; and the War—in the words of the sagacious and Liberal-minded Britis

Prime Minister—has made us a “thousand years older,” and consequently a thousand years more advanced in our notions of life and people. All these questions of politics, to my mind, do not rest so much on pious hopes and resolutions, nor on gifts and concessions, as they do on self-realisation which, commences from within; and when this light dawns, the darkness of ignorance disappears, and gives place to freedom which, when applied to countries and peoples as a whole, acquires such names as Home Rule, Self-Government, etc. While I cannot conceive of any Indian who is true to his country and to the blood of his parents not uniting in the legitimate aspirations of India towards its ultimate goal of taking its rightful position within the Empire, the progress and attainment of these ends will always depend on the degree to which such self-realisation is attained from within.

Democracy in Travancore.

In the middle part of September 1917, the *Shashthipoorthi* or the 60th birthday of H. H. the Maharaja of Travancore was celebrated with due pomp and ceremony by the people of that State in various centres. On the 25th September a grand People's Address was presented to His Highness at Trivandrum and the address was read by Dewan Bahadur Mr. A. Govinda Pillai, retired High Court Judge. The following passage occurs in the middle of the loyal address; and the sentiments, both expressed and implied in it, are of happy significance:—

“The creation of a Legislative Council, the recognition of the democratic spirit of the age in the constitution of a Popular Assembly, the enunciation of the principle of self-government by the formation of Town Improvement Committees in the

State and the steady enhancement of their powers and privileges, and the establishment of Village Panchayet Courts are epoch-making events in a progressive administration, which have emphasised the wise solicitude of Your Highness for the introduction of the popular element in the governance of the country."

Mediaeval-minded Kashmir.

H. H. the Maharaja of Kashmir, in the course of a speech at a public meeting of about 5000 people on the 20th of August 1917, is reported to have observed as follows with reference to Mrs. Annie Besant's internment:—

"It is a shame for people to follow a woman as their political leader. Women are made by God for the production of the race and not to be our political leaders. We should consider the British Government as our parents. What belongs to the parents is the property of the children. Government will give everything to her children when she deems it fit."

It is plain that H. H. the Maharaja of Kashmir is living mentally in the dark ages; or he has a very bad memory and has forgotten that he had himself sworn allegiance to a woman who ruled the British Empire for more than sixty years. Commenting upon His Highness's speech, the *Mahratta* wrote:—

We do not think any detailed comment is necessary. The Maharajah lives in the hills secluded from the progressive influences of the go-ahead parts of the country and may well be excused for holding views regarding women which any sane man to-day would consider ante-deluvian. As regards the "parent" theory of Government, it is on a par with the

"production of the race" theory about women. Both once "prevailed," but are now disowned by even the common run of sane people. A contemporary suggests that the Maharaja of Kashmir must have been imposed upon by the person responsible for writing out a speech for him, and that the Maharaja himself is not capable of giving vent to such views. We shall not go into the merits of this suggestion. We shall only say that we can conceive of "a benighted Maharaja" and do not see the necessity of finding some one else to receive the lashes of public criticism upon a "Highness" speech.

The Piteous State of Pudukotta

The sixteenth session of the Pudukotta Representative Assembly was held on 7th September 1917. The address read by the Superintendent Mr. Sidney Burn I.C.S., was marked neither by enthusiasm for improvement nor by dignity of expression. It insinuated that the popular representatives were joking in advocating temperance reform, and rebuked them for being argumentative. Instead of there being any discussion and deliberation, the questions of members and the answers of Government were "taken as read." *New India*—a journal by no means wanting in partiality for "Native" administrations—was constrained to comment thus on the address of Mr. Sidney Burn :—

The address of the "Pudukottai Darbar" to the Representative Assembly is an insipid statement recording little progress in any branch of State activities. The absentee Raja is as usual spending his time in Australia with "the Rani Sahiba and the Yuvaraja"; and the Representative Assembly is asked to console itself with the assurance "when the journey can be made without the present danger, delay and uncertainty"—all

the three will be returning to the State. Meanwhile, the administration is being conducted in the old groove and the rate of progress can be gleaned from the fact that for even such small matters as the appointment of a lady doctor, sanction must come from Australia. The Financial transactions of last year resulted in a surplus of two lakhs which has, however, been spent, we had almost said wasted, in needlessly converting Government paper into War Loan stock. The Darbar seem to be guided by most up-to-date financial ideals, not merely because large surpluses are budgeted for—thereby wringing out more money from the taxpayers than is needed for administrative purposes—but also because the surpluses are not used for any productive or useful purposes, such as the expansion of educational or irrigational facilities.

An unprincely Prince.

Two years ago (in 1915) the *London Times*, reviewing the then published collection of Lord Curzon's addresses on the Imperial Mission of England, wrote:—

“Our success cannot be illustrated more significantly than by Lord Curzon's story of the Indian Prince who came to him and said he wanted to go home. By “home” he meant, not Bombay or Bengal; he meant England.”

If the above is not a mere “story,” and then, if its hero's proficiency in English was such as to deserve any degree of respect, the only inference possible to draw from it is that there is at least one among our princes who is denationalized and is not ashamed to proclaim that fact. It must be a very unnatural and unlovely form of Imperialism which requires an Indian to renounce India; and if the Prince of the above story was really not a renegade, there can be no doubt about his having played the hypocrite.

Over-centralized Government in Hyderabad.

In the fourth memorial on the problems of Native States, the proper position of a constitutional Prince in the government of his State has been described as "a cog in the mechanism." He holds the administration in tact and keeps it going; but he does not so identify himself with it that, when things go wrong, he should have to bear all the blame. Every school-boy knows that in England the King can do no wrong and that the Sovereign is always above criticism. The advantages—not only personal, but also national—of the ruler occupying such a position of consequential inconspicuousness, or invisible effectualness, are yet to be realized in several Indian States; and in many of them, the Dewan is merely a Secretary to the Maharaja. This, in truth, is the condition even in Hyderabad, the largest of the States. As the *Hindu* (19th Sept. 1917) put it:—

"It was a most momentous step that His Highness the Nizam of Hyderabad took when he accepted the resignation of his minister Nawab Sir Salar Jung and resolved to carry on the administration himself. It was also a novel step; but apart from the novelty of such a course, it does not appear it will be possible for the ruler of so large a State as Hyderabad personally to provide for the rapidly growing needs of a progressive modern system of administration. Nor does it look in the fitness of things that the Sovereign of a State should dissipate his energy in the routine and tedious details of administration, when there is and must be sufficient scope for its employment in more valuable directions. Two years

have now elapsed since His Highness took personal charge of the administration of the State. We do not suggest that the administration has suffered in efficiency in these years. Indeed, there is evidence that His Highness' Government are actuated by zeal to carry out reforms which are very urgent in several directions; but we do think that—with a carefully selected Dewan or Minister and with an Executive Council of able men working in co-operation with representatives of the people—Hyderabad must be able to make a more rapid progress than it has been doing in these years. The need for the change indicated by us is evident from the extremely backward state of Hyderabad. Neither in the matter of education nor sanitation, in the development of agriculture or industries, in the improvement of railways or roads, in the efficiency of the police or the administration of justice, can the state of affairs in Hyderabad be said to be satisfactory from the point of view of a modern state.

A French Publicist on Native States.

In view of the interest now evinced on all sides in matters relating to Indian Native States, it might be of some use to note what an eminent and apparently disinterested observer like M. Joseph Chailley, a "distinguished member and publicist of the French Colonial School," has to say on the subject. His book *L'Inde Britannique* [1910] contains, no doubt, many incorrect statements and unwarranted conclusions; nevertheless, it deserves attention as "the fruit of twenty years of thought, and ten of actual labour." What is more, the work has been rendered accessible to the English-reading public by no less a person than the Hon. Sir William Meyer, K.C.I.E., at present member for

Finance in the Viceroy's Council; and Lord Morley has recognized its value by "accepting the dedication of the English version." Such a work is not to be dismissed as the irresponsible effusion of an irrepressible globe-trotter. In the chapter dealing with Native States, M. Joseph Chailley observes:—

The States and their princes vary enormously in character. They include powerful rulers of veritable kingdoms and simple tribal chiefs, or owners of a few square miles. Some are almost savages, others possess a relatively high civilization. (P. 212)

If we wish to form an idea of what the bulk of the Native States still are, we must think of the Europe of the Middle Ages. We shall find the same practices, the same sufferings, the same prejudices, and the same barbarity. [P. 225].

We may divide the chiefs of India into three classes:—(1) The very few who govern according to European ideas of order and justice, and who seem to take a personal interest in the welfare of their people. (2) Those who have introduced the elements of a reformed organization, have enacted laws, have appointed judges, and have then appointed a Wazir to govern for them and relieve them of responsibility. And (3) those who still imagine they are the State; that its resources are their private property, and its inhabitants their slaves; that their affairs should take precedence of all others; and that their chief business is pleasure. This last class is still the largest The chief of such a State is a despot. He lives in his palace, surrounded by his wives and concubines, the members of his family, courtiers mountebanks, jugglers and astrologers. Sometimes he has no minister; but that does not lead him to work for himself, or prevent him from occasionally leaving his State and allowing its affairs to look after themselves. What does it matter, so

long as the chief has a good time? In his little court, intrigue is rampant. Parties form round his favourites, his wives, and his concubines; and denunciation and calumny are their usual weapons in the struggle for favour. . . . The *par Britannica* has killed the military vocation. The princes of to-day. . . . are naturally indolent, and live idly both as regards body and mind. When they wake from their torpor, it is to think about wasting money and obtaining the means to do so. [P. 229]

In taking into account the condition of the Natives States of India, one must not allow oneself to rely wholly on appearances. So-called reforms are often words which signify nothing; an ambitious programme may have been set forth, but it has not been carried out. [P. 251]

APPENDIX VII.

Native States and British Interference.

Rangacharlu once had occasion to write:—
 “The weakness of a native *Samsthanam* is that, instead of the affairs of the People, the Palace becomes the chief object of thought and the governing principle.” In recent times, in some Native States, the centre of interest has shifted from the Palace to the officialdom. Whatever be the ideals professed on paper by a Government, its real character must depend upon the personal predilections and calculations of those who conduct the administration from day to day; and that is why people in the States are more keenly interested in appointments and promotions than in principles and public institutions. If the State’s destinies are not to be mercilessly beaten and

blown from side to side by the capricious gales of bureaucratic will, it is imperative that the "State" itself—i.e., "The People"—should become the supreme concern of every one. In other words, there must be a strong democratic agency which, under the watchful care of the Sovereign, and amid changing Dewans and officials, could remain firm and changeless, safeguarding the permanent interests of the State, ensuring the continuance of wise policies and aiming at the lasting good of the People. When there is such a wakeful and powerful *popular* party, interference in the affairs of the State from without—exercised either through Residents or otherwise—would be both out of place and impossible.

A Government must in these days be responsible to some one and amenable to some control. Mr. Montagu has laid down that if the Indian Government should be free from the British Parliamentary control, it should be made more responsible to the people of India. Similarly if the Durbar of a Native State would be free from the leading strings of the Foreign office and the inconvenient kindnesses of the British Resident, it should consent to be under wholesome constitutional checks and find its strength in an ever-increasing measure in the support of its own people. When the destinies of the State are thus upborne by the wholebody of its people, the Government of India will not find it easy to interfere in its affairs.

Native State Governments and Members of the Ruling Family.

One important point not dealt with in the foregoing pages is that of the inadvisability of appointing a near relative of the reigning Sovereign to be a member in the Councils of the Government. It is not unlikely that his presence there will fetter the freedom of the other members of Government and induce them to acquiesce in a measure or a policy which at heart they may not approve of—unless these be men of extraordinary independence and courage. Just as a constitutional sovereign is not to be mixed up with, but kept above the executive machinery of the State, so the heir-apparent or other blood-relation must also, as a rule, hold a position of constitutional detachment. The case in Mysore is an exception; and a happy exception it has proved to be. By nature as by training, H. H. The Yuvaraja of Mysore is a repector of constitutional procedure; and His Highness is too much of a gentleman to seek to exert undue influence over the minds of others. Further, His Highness, being an *extra-ordinary* member, does not concern himself with the details of *all* Departments, nor does he attend *all* the meetings of the Executive Council. His opinion is given only when it is sought; and His Highness is known to take particular care not to press a point too far and make a situation embarrassing to any one. If the career of H. H. The Yuvaraja as *Extra-ordinary*

Member of Council has proved a success, it reflects very great credit upon the personal qualities of His Highness, but absolutely none upon the principle itself. It is unsound in principle and inexpedient in practice to assign to any near relation of a ruler a seat in the responsible councils of government.

APPENDIX VIII.

Native States and Home Rule.

In the course of a letter of welcome addressed to Mrs. Annie Besant on her release from Internment, the writer said :—

One point, Madam, I beg leave to press for your particular and friendly attention. In the course of the 28 years of your devoted labours for the growth and triumph of Indian nationalism, you have scrupulously cultivated the friendship of many of our Native Princes and have missed no opportunity of paying a tribute of praise for the depth of their patriotism and the excellence of their administration. But to the question of the emancipation of their 70 millions of subjects—who are politically the “submerged” or the “depressed” classes of India—you have hitherto found no occasion to turn your thought. It is true that some of the Native States have risen to renown under paternal autocracy or benevolent bureaucracy; but are not their subjects ever to enjoy the incomparably greater blessings of democratic rule? One of

the most fruitful ideas which you have striven to strengthen in the domain of our political philosophy is that of the inviolable relationship that exists between religion and politics. Human life, you have said, cannot be cut out into absolutely disconnected and independent compartments; and religion is the very life-breath of existence and effort in every sphere, political, social or economic. Religion supplies the end to which all material activities and equipments are the means; and not the least important among these is the exercise of the rights and duties of citizenship. The man who has no sense of civic responsibility and no political power is robbed of one entire aspect of life; and his growth, however luxuriant in other respects, must necessarily be imperfect and unsatisfactory on the whole. There can be no sane and humane politics without the inspiration of a true and humane religion; and there can be no true and complete religious life and spiritual self-expression without a due exercise of the political faculties. Free and equal partnership in the concerns of the State being one of the necessary conditions for every individual's moral self-development— for the full flowering of his social and humanitarian instincts no less than for his material well-being, the aspiration for Home Rule is regarded as a spiritual aspiration. Are the subjects of Native States unfit for such aspiration? Have they been denied the intellectual and moral gifts for political life with which their brethren elsewhere are endowed? Are they ever to remain backward in the national

march of India? And if they remain so, can the progress of the rest be real and complete? No, Madam, they ought not to be denied the helping hand which they so much need and which you—and you alone—are so well fitted to extend. The differentiation between British and Non-British provinces in India is mostly only legal and technical. From the nationalist's standpoint, all India is one. Nay, to the standard-bearer of human liberty, all mankind is one; Lowell expressed not an idle poetic fancy, but an actual political fact when he sang:

All mankind are one in spirit and an instinct
 bears along,
 Round the earth's electric circle the swift flash
 of right or wrong;
 Whether conscious or unconscious, yet Hu-
 manity's vast frame
 Through its ocean-sundered fibres feels the
 gush of joy or shame;
 In the gain or loss of one race all the rest
 have equal claim

So I say that it would be in the fitness of things if you, revered Madam, were to bestow some thought on the problem of securing the benefits of citizenship for the subjects of Native States. The absence of the political impulse in them at present has kept them intellectually dormant; and they are bearing no honorable share in the great national enterprises of our common motherland. To whom is it given in a larger measure than to you

to hold high the torch of Liberty" even for the people of our Native States, singing in the words of the premier bard of your native isle:—

Take Freedom, take thy radiant round
 When dimmed, revive—when lost, return—
 O Till not a shrine through earth be found
 On which thy glories shall not burn.

The *Mahratta* commented thus on the above:—

The *Karnataka* of the 22nd instant contains a letter to Mrs. Besant by "A Non-Theosophist Nationalist" according her a reverent welcome back amongst the people and praying her, among other things, to turn her thought to the question of the emancipation of the 70 millions of people who are living under the rule of Native Princes. The writer feels very keenly the backward state of these people, whom he describes as "politically the submerged—depressed classes—of India." He is not satisfied that some of the Native States have risen to renown under paternal autocracy or benevolent bureaucracy. He craves for the blessings of democratic rule for the people of these and other Native States. We may assure the writer that his brothers in British India feel equally with him the necessity of the Native States coming under the influence of the Home Rule wave. Mrs. Besant, we are sure, does not make any difference between British-ruled and Native-ruled, so far as the right of the people to govern themselves is concerned. If she has not as yet thought of rousing by her pen

and tongue the peoples of the Native States to agitate for the popularisation of the system of Government under which they live, the reason is to be sought, we believe, in her conviction that as a rule, the rapid progress of the Native States towards Democracy will be possible and easy of achievement, only when Indians under the direct rule of the British have made some progress in the direction of Responsible Self-Government. Further, be it remembered that Mrs. Besant did not *start* the agitation for Self-rule. That agitation was started before Mrs. Besant came into the arena of Indian politics. It is for the subjects of Native States themselves to *start* the "Home-Rule" movement in their respective States. Some earnest souls must raise aloft the standard of Democracy in their autocratically or bureaucratically ruled States. We have no doubt that such steps will be enthusiastically supported, in every way possible, by Mrs. Besant and others of British India. The ultimate goal for the whole of India, British-ruled as well as Native-ruled, is one and the same. It is Democracy. But this ultimate "boon" is not received, unasked and unfought for. Every Native State is separately connected with the British rulers of the land. The treaties and agreements between the rulers of Native States and the British sovereign give each State a semi-foreign character in certain respects. This semi-foreign character is an anomaly; but so long as it exists, the "politics" of British India and of the several States have to be kept "distinct".

to a considerable extent. At the same time, as we have said above, people in any Native State who inaugurate an agitation for the progressive realisation of Democracy in their State will have all possible active sympathy and support from their brothers in British India.

THOUGHTS ON 'DEMOCRACY.

Responsibility of the Public of Native States.

Lord Morley, the "conscript father of literature," and the Nestor among political philosophers, has said:—

"Democracy, in the discussions of the day, means government working through public opinion. The star of strength and greatness rises or sinks in a State according to the proportion in its numbers of men and women with courage, energy, will, and open, supple, teachable intelligence; and then, besides, on their power of making their qualities effectively felt."

o o o o

One fear of democracy is that it may easily degenerate into mobocracy. The instructed few may be superseded by the uninstructed many; and serene wisdom may have to yield to unreasoning passion and ignorant prejudice. This fear will however, appear groundless when we remember that democracy does not necessarily mean the dwarfing of intellectual and moral stature, and

that on the contrary it has meant the removal of the¹ impediments which bureaucratic castes and conventions place on the path of genius. It is democracy that gave Lincoln to America and Lloyd George to England.

o o o o

On the other side, the one claim of bureaucracy is that it can manage affairs in an efficient and business-like fashion. But it has been shown (p. 38) that this merit cannot truly exist where the working of the bureaucracy is not open to constant supervision and scrutiny by democracy. Again, when a man of constructive talent, commanding ability and generous impulses—like Sir K. Seshadri Iyer—is at the head of a bureaucracy, he makes the people forget or tolerate its faults and foibles. But it is not in the power of bureaucracy to produce a succession of Seshadri Iyers; and when lesser men come to power, bureaucracy becomes doubly hateful and intolerable. Even the shadow of efficiency departs from it, making room for incompetency and dull drudgery. All noble idealism vanishes from the country wherein the ruling power is an officialdom composed of mediocrities.

o o o o

What alone can save democracy from its only danger—namely, degenerating into mob-rule—is high purposefulness. The nation must have some lofty ideal, some large and generous enterprise which can absorb all its best energies, and discipline all its faculties; and such devotion to some

great humanitarian mission will keep the nation's mind away from ignoble ends and petty considerations. The leaders of the nation will then be high-minded and introspective, and they will save the country from stagnation and decay. In other words, the success of democracy depends upon the depth and the breadth of the wisdom, patriotism and love of high ideals prevailing among the citizens of the country.

o o o o

Well has Sir Rabindranath Tagore said:—

“Self-government not only leads to efficiency and a sense of responsibility, but it makes for an uplift of the human spirit. Those who are confined within the parochial limits of village or community—it is only when they are given the opportunity of thinking and acting imperially that they will be able to realise humanity in its larger sense. For want of this opportunity, every person in this country remains a lesser man. All his thoughts, his powers, his hopes and his strivings remain petty. And this enforced pettiness of soul is for him a greater calamity than loss of life itself.”

The truth of the above observation is nowhere better illustrated than in the Native States where the chief mental pabulum of the educated classes is supplied by the officialdom. Men's energies are lost in the local tin-god worship and tea-pot excitement, and they have not even a healthy curiosity about things higher. Lacking the sense of

civic responsibility and higher political life, their eyes are centred on petty parochial incidents and personal squabbles; and they have no inclination to respond seriously to the calls of economic and social reformers. It is the political impulse that can generate and sustain enthusiasm for all great national causes; and Home Rule is nothing but the popularizing of politics—transferring it from the Secretariat or the Council Chamber to the market-square and enabling every citizen to have a responsible share in the management of the State's affairs.

o o o o

Even a tiro knows that the most distinguishing and vital feature of the British Parliamentary system of government is its bipartile organization. The party system found a valiant champion in Burke, the master of civil wisdom, and Broughton gave an immortal phrase to friends of constitutional government when he spoke of "His Majesty's Opposition." For the good of a State, a body of critics of government is quite as essential as the body of ministers who are in charge of government. The Opposition stands as much for the best interests of the State as does the Ministry; and both are therefore equally "His Majesty's." This supreme value of an agency of "Opposition"—not opposition to government in general or to the Sovereign, but only to the men in power—has not been fully understood by our countrymen; and that accounts for their governments being so full of easily remediable shortcomings and inexcusable vagaries.

When we speak of democratic government, it is necessary to bear in mind that for all practical administration, a certain amount of bureaucratic organization and procedure is inevitable. The British Parliament and the United States Congress, democratic as they undoubtedly are, are still under the necessity of being bureaucratic in some respects and working through the bureaucracy—the Cabinet itself being, in a considerable measure, a bureaucracy. Since it is given to no man to be credited with infallibility and immaculateness, the one and only safeguard against the possibility of a government's error is scrutiny and criticism. Even if a democracy were to count a few angels among its members and elect them to form a cabinet, it seems reasonable to fear that those angels too, becoming habituated to the human environment, would fall into error like the rest of the earth; and the only remedy against this danger lies in a body of men being ever on the watch to point out chances of error and to remind the angel-made government of its angelic responsibilities.

o o o o

Such an "opposition," we venture to think, it is the business of a Representative Assembly to provide in every Native State. It should be "His Highness' Opposition"—that is to say, all its observations and criticisms, its proposals and protests should be absolutely in the interests of the State and in the service of His Highness the Maharaja. The republican poet who was Cromwell's

secretary, said, speaking of the court of the King of the Universe :-

“ They also serve who only stand and wait.”

The enlightened and active citizen of to-day may well say, with reference to the earthly State,

“ They also serve who firmly stand and speak.”

The speech ought not to be frivolous, the tone ought not to be irreverent, the criticism ought not to be malicious, and the opposition ought not to be wanton; for if it were whimsical or ignorant or defiant, it would not be “His Highness’.” An upright, honest and disinterested Opposition which is as eager to correct itself as to correct others, as willing to learn as to inform, as competent to guide as to check, and as ready to applaud as to expose, is no less valuable an adjunct to the machinery of the State than the Government in charge of that machinery. So that this “Opposition” might be efficient and influential, it has to work as the Government works, prepare as the Government prepares and act responsibly as the Government acts responsibly.

o o o o

A tremendous responsibility rests now with the public of the Native States. In the first place, they have to secure their own political emancipation; in the second place, they have to facilitate the Journey of the rest of India towards freedom. “ Nations are by themselves made ”—said the late

Mr. A. O. Hume, father of the Indian National Congress; and so say all the great leaders of men. It is time for the people of Native States to heed the lesson and enter upon an active campaign of self-liberation. They may draw their inspiration from the struggle in British India. They may look for help from the Princes and Dewans. They may ask for sympathy from the British Government also. But the initiative must be theirs; the heart that yearns, the brain that thinks, the voice that pleads and the hand that fights for their liberty must be their own. If they will not move to regenerate themselves, not only will they for ever remain as they are, but they will also be damaging the cause of the rest of India. For, the question will very naturally be asked:— If Indians cannot reform and democratize the administration where it is in the hands of their own men, could they hope to do it where the administration is in foreign hands? If Indians have no political life while under their own men, will they have it when the outsider is gone? If public opinion is impotent where the men in power are of their own race, what reason is there to expect better treatment for it at the hands of those who have no permanent stake in the country?

A Legend of the Foreign Office.

(A Caricature by Rudyard Kipling.)

This is the reason why Rustum Beg,
Rajah of Kolazai,
Drinketh the "simpkin" and brandy peg,
Maketh the money to fly,
Vexeth a Government, tender and kind,
Also—but this is a detail—blind.

Rustum Beg of Kolazai—slightly backward Native State—
Lusted for a C. S. L.—so began to sanitate.
Built a Goal and Hospital—nearly built a city drain—
Till his faithful subjects all thought their ruler was insane.
Strange departures made he then—yea, Departments stranger
still,
Half a dozen Englishmen helped the Rajah with a will,
Talked of noble aims and high, hinted of a future fine
For the State of Kolazai, on a strictly Western line.
Rajah Rustum held his peace; lowered octroi dues a half;
Organized a State police; purified the Civil Staff;
Settled cess and tax afresh in a very liberal way;
Cut temptations of the flesh—also cut the Bukshi's pay;
Roused his Secretariat to a fine Mahratta fury,
By a *Hookum* hinting at supervision of *dastoori*;
Turned the State of Kolazai very nearly upside-down;
When the end of May was nigh waited his achievement crown.
Then the Birthday Honours came. sad to state and sad to see,
stood against the Rajah's name nothing more than *C.L.E!*

Things were lively for a week in the State of Kolazai,
Even now the people speak of that time regretfully.
How he disendowed the Goal—stopped at once the City drain;
Turned to beauty fair and frail—got his senses back again;
Doubled taxes, cesses, all; cleared away each new-built *thana*;
Turned the two-lakh Hospital into a superb *Zamane*;
Heaped upon the Bukshi Sahib wealth and honours manifold;
Clad himself in Eastern garb—squeezed his people as of old.
Happy, happy Kolazai! Never more will Rustum Beg
Play to catch the Viceroy's eye. He prefers the 'simpkin' peg.

APHORISMS.

England's Mission

O people, O perfect nation,
 O England that shall be,
 How long till thou take station?
 How long till thralls live free?
 How long till all thy soul be one with all thy sea?

—A. C. SWINBURNE.

New Times.

“New times demand new measures and new men;
 The world advances, and in time outgrows
 The laws that in our fathers' day were best;
 And, doubtless, after us, some purer scheme
 Will be shaped out by wiser men than we,
 Made wiser by the steady growth of truth.
 We cannot bring Utopia by force;
 But better, almost, be at work in sin
 Than in a brute inaction browse and sleep.”

—J. R. LOWELL.

Liberty—the life-principle.

Without *Liberty* morality does not exist, because if there is not freedom of choice between good and evil, between devotion to the common progress and the spirit of egoism, there is no responsibility. Without Liberty no true society exists, because between free men and slaves there can be no *association*, but only dominion of some over the others. Liberty is sacred as the *individual* whose life it represents is sacred. Where there is no Liberty, life is reduced to a mere organic function. A man who allows his liberty to be violated is false to his own nature and a rebel against the decrees of God. There is no Liberty where a class, a family, or a

man assumes dominion over others in virtue of a pretended divine right, or of a privilege derived from birth or wealth. Liberty must be for all and in the sight of all. God does not delegate sovereignty to any individual; the degree of sovereignty which can be represented on our earth is entrusted by God to Humanity, to the Nations, to Society. . .

. . . O my brothers, Liberty is only a *means*. . . Your Liberty will be sacred so long as it develops under the ruling influence of the Idea of Duty and of Faith in the common perfectibility."—JOSEPH MAZZINI.

Autocracy out of date.

"Autocracy is an obsolete form of Government which may suit the demands of people cut off from the world somewhere in Central Africa, but not the demands of the Russian people, who are growing ever more and more enlightened by the enlightenment common to the whole world; and therefore that form of government, and the orthodoxy bound up with it, can only be upheld (as is now being done) by violence of all kinds—a state of siege, banishments by administrative order, executions; religious persecution, the prohibition of books and newspapers, the perversion of education, and in general by all kinds of evil and cruel deeds."—COUNT TOLSTOY.

Political ambition—the tonic for a weak and backward people.

Home-Rule, otherwise termed constitutional government or democracy, must be established in the Native States. Because [1] just as self-help is the most natural rule of life for an individual, self-government is the most *natural* rule of life for a nation; [2] it is the only *right* or just form of government; [3] it is also the only *efficient* and the least unsatisfactory mode of government: [4] it is

moreover, a process of moral and spiritual education for the citizen, for it awakens his civic conscience and fixes upon him some responsibility thereby inducing him to exercise his faculties for the common good and liberalizing his attitude towards his fellowmen in all social and other relations.

National Policy for a Native State.

1. The People should have an ever-increasing share in the business of Government; and—necessarily—the working of the various Departments should be more and more open to scrutiny and guidance by popular representatives.

2. Education should be free from outside control and should progress forward on technical as well as on general lines, in popular as well as in academical spheres.

3. The Government should play a direct and active part in the building up of industries and trade.

4. As a necessary corollary to principle [1], Municipal bodies should be strengthened and set free to do their best.

5. The terms and relations between the State and the Imperial Government should be revised and liberalized from time to time.

Sir M. Visvesvaraya on Native States in the Empire.

On the 26th October, 1917—when the whole of the body of this book had been printed and the preface and the index had been set in type—Sir M. Visvesvaraya, Dewan of Mysore, delivering his annual address to the 34th Dasara Session of the Mysore Representative Assembly, concluded with the observations quoted below regarding “the place of Indian States in the future constitution of the Government of India.” If Sir Visvesvaraya is the first among ministers of Native States to go beyond the usual sphere of “local politics” and assert the claim of the States to have a voice and a vote in determining questions that affect their interests as units of the Empire, the present is the first time that he has made that very reasonable and necessary departure; and he has not made it a day too soon. Speaking at the Mysore Legislative Council in June last—just four months ago—he very modestly said, referring to Mysore’s endeavours and aspirations,

“We are not seeking a ‘new world.’

We are not seeking a ‘place in the sun.’”

Since the above was spoken, Sir Visvesvaraya must have had occasions to see that the State has a real right for a place in the Empire on which the sun never sets, and that the State’s internal development is, to a very large extent, dependent upon its external freedom and power. It is of course necessary that the State which aspires for its own representation in the Imperial Parliament or Cabinet or any similar organization should have recognized the principle of such representation within its own territory as between its Durbar and its subjects. A State that is autocratic or bureaucratic at home can have no claim for democratic privileges abroad. The subject has been dealt with at considerable length on pages 42, 47, 48, and 59 of this brochure; and when Mr. Lionel

Curtis of the *Round Table* was in Bangalore, the present writer had an opportunity of discussing it with him briefly and in a general manner. The writer feels grateful to Sir Visvesvaraya for the most valuable support he has given to the cause, and it is in the fitness of things that the Dewan of the leading Native State should have thus spoken on behalf of the entire fraternity of the States.

Sir Visvesvaraya said :—

There is one more matter, of no small importance at the present time, in regard to which I should like to say a word or two before I close, namely, the projected reforms in the constitution of the Government of India. We have of course no wish to take part in British Indian politics. But having regard to the recent announcements in Parliament and the approaching visit of the Secretary of State for India, it seems important that the point of view of Indian States should receive adequate recognition.

The Indian States, as is well-known, occupy nearly two-fifths of the area of the Empire and hold a quarter of the entire population. Questions connected with currency, fiscal and commercial policy, imports, exports, salt duties, emigration, army, navy, foreign affairs,—all these affect the subjects of Indian States quite as much as they do people in British India. Many of the States pay subsidies; several contribute a substantial share of the indirect taxes of the Government of India and maintain Local as well as Imperial Service troops which add to the fighting strength of the Empire. It has been the proud privilege of many States, including ours, to contribute in men and money, their small share to the British cause in the present world-war.

The normal yearly contribution, both direct and indirect, from the Government and the people of Mysore into the coffers of the Government of India, is equivalent to between one-fourth and one-third of the entire revenues of our State.

In the recent Imperial War Conference in London, His Highness the Maharaja of Bikaner worthily represented the Indian States, beside his two colleagues from the Government of India. We feel sure that, in any future Conferences, the chosen representatives of Indian States will find a place. It may be permitted to us to hope that the Indian States will also be represented in the future Executive Council or Cabinet of His Excellency the Viceroy.

In the discussions on the subject so far, the question of giving representation to Indian States does not appear to have received adequate attention. One view of the position is that representatives of Indian States should find a place in any future Legislative Assembly or Assemblies of the Indian Empire. The extent of representation from individual States, or groups of States, may be based on their population, modified if necessary by other considerations such as, literacy, revenues etc. As members of the Assembly, the representatives of the Indian States may take part in the discussions and vote, but only on questions in which the States are interested along with the rest of India.

The Indian States are vitally concerned in the live issues of the forthcoming enquiry. Even as matters stand, public opinion in British India naturally exercises a certain amount of influence over the decisions of the Government of India on questions of policy which affect India as a whole, including the Indian States. The tendency of all future reforms will be the same, namely, to increase the influence of public opinion on Government. It is all the more necessary that a suitable machinery should be provided in the new constitution to elicit the views and safeguard the interests of the States and ensure to them their rightful place in the Councils of the Indian Empire.

INDEX.

	PAGE.
Abbas Ali Beg	80
Addresses to the Princes of Travancore, By Sir T. Madhava Rao	68
Adoption Despatch	81
Alwar,—Maharaja of	102
Annexation—the Policy of	12, 21
Appeal to the Princes	88
<i>Asiatic Review</i> , The	93
Bagehot	64, 69
Bebel, August	39
Bell, Evans, Major	21
Besant, Mrs. Annie, as leader	104, 113
Bikaner, Maharaja of (see under Maharaja)	17, 18
Bismarck	27, 39
Bentham	33
Buddha, Lord	35
Bureaucracy	29, 38, 119, 122
Canning, Lord—adoption despatch	81
Cauveri—The, arbitration	54
Chailley, Joseph M.	67, 108
Chelmsford, Lord	44
Chiefs' College	67
" Conference	36, 44, 52, 64, 66, 70
" " Its inutility	44, 45, 51
Choice of a Resident	69
Citizenship not transferable	92, 97
Classification of Native States	81, 82
Constitutional King	62
Council of Ruling Princes	44
Curtis, Lionel	46, 130
Curzon, Lord	44
Daly, Sir Hugh,	68, 70
Democracy <i>versus</i> Bureaucracy	30, 31, 119, 121
Democracy in Travancore	103
Democratization of Native States	10, 76, 78, 97, 98
Democratic Polity in Ancient India	95, 96, 100
Dickinson G. L.	97
Dinkar Rao, Sir	56

Disraeli	27
East India Association, The	54
Economic Development necessary	74
Education of the Princes	65, 69
England's duty to Native States	20, 21
England—an Indian Prince's "Home"	106
Executive Council	33, 60, 108
<i>Fortnightly Review</i> , The,	21
Gaekwar of Baroda	24, 65
Goal of Government in India	77, 91
Gokhale, Gopala Krishna	39
Gordon	67
Hardinge, Lord	33, 49, 54
Hereditary King	67
'Hindu' The	107
'Hindustan Review' The	65
Hobhouse L. T.,	37
Home Rule and Native States	75, 93, 94, 102
Home Rule for	26, 27, 28, 43, 75, 113, 117	...	
" " Spiritual character of	75, 114
Hyderabad over-centralised Govt. in	107
I. C. S. The	71, 73, 85
Ilbert, Sir Courtenay	33
Imperial War Conference	22, 130
Indentured Labour	60
Indian Defence Force...	73
Indore, Maharaja of	57
Interference of Residents	69
" by the Government of India	110, 111
Lalington, Lord	79, 82, 83, 87
" speech on Native States	89
Jaya Rama Rao	67
Junius	33
Kashmir, Maharaja of	104
Keir Hardie	39
Kipling, Rudyard	125
Lawrence, Sir Walter	93, 97
Lee Warner, Sir William	70
Legislative Council	39, 60
<i>L'Ind Britannique</i>	108
Liberal Education to the Princes	68, 69

Lucas, Sir Charles P.	42
Lytton, Lord	44
Malavia, Madan Mohan—Pandit	59
Madhava Rao, Sir T.	56, 67, 68, 70, 77, 83		
Maharaja of Alwar	102
" of Bikaner	17, 18, 88
His position and importance	22
Invitation to the war conference	32
On Internal administration of Native States	23, 24
On the Principle of Govt.	26, 27, 29
Maharaja of Indore	57
" of Kashmere	103
" of Mysore	...	30, 32, 86, 88	
" of Pudukota	105
<i>Mahratta, The</i>	104, 116
Malleon	67
<i>Manchester Guardian, The</i>	38
Mayo College	25
Mazzini	31, 36, 127
Mesopotamia Commission	37, 38
Meyer, Sir William	59, 108
Minority Administration in Native States	70
Minto, Lord	49, 44
Military Training	73, 110
Montagu E. S.	37, 91, 92, 97
Morley, Lord	21, 25, 49, 118
Mysore, Maharaja of	11, 32, 75
Nerooji—Dadabhai	15, 16, 54
Native Government, not self-government	42, 94
NATIVE STATES—			
Administration: Irresponsibility of	38, 105, 111, 122
Allegiance, "double" in	72
Chailley's views on	109, 110
Classification of	81
Creation of more	91, 93
Degeneration of Statesmanship, and absence of Public Life	36, 85
Devolution of power from the officialdom to the people	34, 111, 121
Economic Growth	74, 75

Education of Princes, past and present ...	65, 69
Emancipation of the people	8, 12, 117, 123
Embassy, the Composition of ...	53
Envoys for	50
Extent and value of Native States	14, 19, 19, 61, 129
Greater Responsibilities, their claim to	19, 20, 22, 42, 129
Hereditary Head ...	62
Hollowness of Representative Assemblies	39, 40, 83
Interchange of officers ...	58
Members of the Ruling family, in ...	112
National Policy for	128
Public life—to be developed ...	86, 87, 128
Relationship with the Government of India	47, 48, 49, 59, 60, 129
Statesmanship—training ground for ...	55, 50
Tribunal for	53, 54
Types of Native States ...	34
New Times ...	10, 31, 126
<i>New India</i>	100, 105
Nizam of Hyderabad ...	107
Panchayet ...	33
Parnell ...	93
<i>Pioneer</i> , The ...	44
Poorooshottam, C. ...	50
Presidential Govt.—drawbacks in ...	65
Porter, ...	67
Pollen, Dr. John ...	93, 97
Pudukotta	105
Raghunatha Rao, R. Dewan Bahadur ...	56
Railways ...	48, 60
"Raja"—meaning of	12, 100
Rangacharlu, Dewan 10, 30, 49, 56, 68, 74, 110	
Ranade, Mahdev Govind ...	98
Redmond ...	93
Reichstag ...	3c
Representative Assembly, 29, 30, 33,	
Restoration of Mysore, The ...	29
Resident, The British ...	41
The Limit to his interference ...	24
The Choice of	69

Ripon, Lord 24, 82
<i>Round Table, The</i>	...	44, 46, 129
Salar Jung, Sir 56
Sapru, Tej Bahadur 65
Sarma B N. 59
Sarvajanik Sabha, Poona 25
Secretary of State for India 22
Self Government	...	27, 74, 75
Shivaji's system of Government 98
Sinha, Sir S. P. 30
Sovereign—Citizen first and Ruler next 35
„ Not to be his own vehicle 46
Sovereignty of the People26, 126
Statesmanship, the Growth of in Native States 55, 85
Subramania Iyer, Dr. Sir S. 8, 38
Surplus Revenues of Baangalore Cantt. 54
Swadeshi in public Service 57
Swaraj 29, 34
Tagore, Sir Rabindranath 120
Telang P. K. 100
Tennyson, Alfred, Lord 27
<i>Times, The</i>	...	44, 106
Tiruvalluvar 96, 99
Travancore: Democracy in 103
Treaties—need for the amendment of 80, 81
Tribunal for Native States 53
Victoria, Queen 25, 83
Visvesvaraya, Sir M.	...	11, 74, 86, 129
Wedderburn, Sir David, 55
„ Sir William 55
Wedgewood, Commander 38, 91