

THE INDIAN STATES

in relation to

THE BRITISH CROWN

and

BRITISH INDIA

K. B. MOGHE

THE INDIAN STATES

in relation to

THE BRITISH CROWN

and

BRITISH INDIA

K. B. MOGHE

*Under the kind Patronage of Sir Gangadhar Rao
Ganesh Patwardhan, K. C. I. E., Chief Sahib of Miraj
(Senior) S. M. C.*



'TRUTH PREVAILS'

THE
INDIAN STATES
IN
THEIR RELATIONS
WITH
THE BRITISH PARAMOUNT POWER
AND
THE GOVERNMENT OF BRITISH INDIA

THE BUTLER COMMITTEE
AND
THE STATUTORY COMMISSION
ON
INDIAN REFORMS.

BY
K. B. MOGHE.
(Retd. Deputy Collector,)

"God helps those who seek His help, and help themselves"

SANGLI

1928

PRINTED BY
E. P. MENON AT THE " INDIAN DAILY MAIL " BOMBAY;
AND
PUBLISHED BY
K. B. MOGHE, GAMDEVI, BOMBAY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

1-2 PREFACE 1-IV

INTRODUCTION.

(PAGES V—XXIV).

THE GENESIS OF THE BUTLER INQUIRY—

- 1-3 H. H. THE BIKANER MAHARAJA EXPLAINS IT.
- 4 H. E. THE VICEBOY, ON THE SAME.
- 5-6 H. H. THE JAMSAHEB OF NAWANAVAR ON IT.
- 7-8 H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF PATIALA ON THE SAME.
- 9-15 OBSERVATIONS THEREON.
- 15-A H. H. THE NAWAB OF BHOPAL ON THE SUBJECT.
- 16 DR. KEITH ON "DIRECT RELATIONS" OF STATES WITH THE CROWN.
- 17 INDIAN CRITICISM THEREON.
- 18 THE PRIVY PURSE.
- 19-23 SIR HARCOURT BUTLER ON THE AIMS AND OBJECTS OF INQUIRY AND OBSERVATIONS THEREON.
- 26 THE BUTLER COMMITTEE'S QUESTIONNAIRE.
- 27 REMARKS OF THE TIMES OF INDIA WEEKLY THEREON.

SECTION I.

(PAGES 1-6).

THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE STATES IN RELATION TO THE CROWN AND BRITISH INDIA,—

- 1 ITS HISTORICAL RECORD.
- 2 FACTS ELICITED THEREFROM.
- 3 POINTS TO BE NOTED IN TREATIES.
- 4 OBSERVATIONS ON THE ANALYSIS.
- 5 THE ROYAL PROCLAMATIONS.
- 6 THE LEGISLATIVE ACTS OF PARLIAMENT AND OF GOVERNMENT OF BRITISH INDIA.
- 7 LORD ELLENBOROUGH IN 1853 ON THE SEPARATE SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT OF INDIAN STATES.
- 8 INDIAN STATES NOT SUBORDINATE TO BRITISH INDIA UNDER ANY LAW, STATUTE OR ACT OF PARLIAMENT.
- 9 THEY ARE FOREIGN TERRITORY.

SECTION II.

(PAGES 7—8).

RELATIONS OF THE STATES WITH GOVERNMENT OF BRITISH INDIA.—

- 10- FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC ONLY ; NOT POLITICAL NOR CONSTITUTIONAL : ALL NON-TREATY AGREEMENTS ARE " CONVENTIONS."
- 11 PROTECTION AND SUPERVISION OF GOOD ADMINISTRATION IN STATES BOTH IMPERIAL CONCERNS.
- 12 POSITION SUMMARISED.

SECTION III.

(PAGES 9—15).

AUTHORITATIVE RECOGNITION OF SOVEREIGNTY OF TREATY STATES.—

- 13 SIR W. LEE-WARNER ON THE SUBJECT.
- 14 CONSTRUCTION AND INTERPRETATION OF TREATIES.
- 15—18 THE NEED OF INQUIRY BY AN EXPERT COMMITTEE NOTWITHSTANDING—EXPLAINED.
- 19 NO CAUSE OF ANXIETY FOR PRINCES, APPARENTLY.
- 20-21 THE INSISTENT DEMAND OF INDIAN REFORMERS FOR INCLUDING STATES IN REFORMS SCHEME, LIKELY BEFORE COMMITTEE ; AND, IF REJECTED, BEFORE THE ROYAL COMMISSION CERTAINLY.

SECTION IV.

(PAGES 17—49).

PROBABLE PROGRAMME OF THE COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY—

- 22—24 THE TIMES OF INDIA, SUMMARY OF IT.
- 25 REMARKS THEREON—POLITICAL RELATIONS A SETTLED QUESTION ; CONVENTIONS CAN BE REVISED AND ADJUSTED. (*Vide* SECTION VII.)
- 26 DIRECT DISADVANTAGES OF A TRANSFER OF THE CROWN'S RELATIONS WITH STATES TO THE NEW GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, BESIDES ITS BEING ILLEGAL AND NEEDLESS AND INEXPEDIENT.
- 27 EDMUND BURKE'S OBSERVATIONS ON A SIMILAR MOVEMENT FOR DEMOCRACY, WORTHY OF ATTENTION AND RESPECT BY THE INDIAN REFORMERS.
- 28 POPULAR IDEA OF THE SOBER MINDED INDIANS OF GOOD GOVERNMENT—MR. GWYNN, A RETIRED I.C.S., AND SIR WILLIAM LAWRENCE, BART.

- 29 DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PEOPLE OF INDIAN STATES AND OF
BRITISH INDIA IN RESPECT OF THE SYSTEMS OF GOVERN-
MENT IN BOTH.
- 30, 33 THE IMPORTANCE AND NEED OF PRESTIGE AND PERSONALITY
OF THE GOVERNING POWER—A QUESTION WHETHER THE
NEW GOVERNMENT BY REPRESENTATIVES WOULD POSSESS
THESE ATTRIBUTES.
- 33-A WHETHER DEMOCRACY PREVAILED IN ANCIENT INDIA—SIR
CHIMANLAL SETALVAD AND PROFESSOR GADGIL WITH
OPPOSITE OPINIONS.
- 34 DEMOCRACY WITH REPRESENTATIVE INSTITUTIONS, A NEW
PHENOMENON; A NOVEL EXPERIMENT IN BRITISH INDIA.
- 35, 36 SUCH MEASURE NOT YET SUCCESSFULLY TRIED IN BRITISH
INDIA; WHY THEN NEED INDIAN STATES BE DISTURBED.
SIR SIMON'S VIEWS OF ACHIEVING AN UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN EAST AND WEST.
- 37 H. E. THE VICEBOY'S HINT TO THE STATES TO BRING THEIR
ADMINISTRATION TO THE LEVEL OF STANDARDS APPROVED
BY PUBLIC OPINION.
- 38 LORD HALDANE'S VIEWS ON THE QUESTION OF THE REFORMS.
- 39 THE TREND AND RESULT OF THE NEW SCHEME WOULD BE AN
"OLIGARCHY" WHICH WILL NOT BE POPULAR.
- 40 THE MANCHESTER GUARDIAN ON THE SUBJECT.
- 41 THE DEMAND FOR REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT DOES NOT
COME FROM THE MASSES, FOR WHOSE GOOD IT IS SAID TO
BE INTENDED.
- 42 THE NEED FOR A GOOD GOVERNMENT EXISTS DOUBTLESS;
BUT DESTRUCTION OF THE EXISTING STRUCTURE AND A
BUILDING OF A NEW ONE IN ITS STEAD, AN UNSOUND
IDEA AND THEREFORE DANGEROUS.
- 43 THE WISER COURSE; WHAT IS DISCUSSED.
- 44, 46 FRAMING OF A NEW CONSTITUTION BY THE REFORMERS. THE
BRITISH GOVERNMENT HAVING CAST THE FIRST DICE
INDIAN LEADERS HAVE TO PLAY THEIR PART. SIR
BASIL BLACKET ON THE BRITISH POSITION IN INDIA.
- 47, 48 VERY IMPORTANT POINTS FOR ATTENTION OF INDIAN REFOR-
MERS, IN DRAFTING THE NEW SCHEME. SOME DIFFICUL-
TIES OF ADMINISTRATION; HOW THE GRANT OF SELF-
GOVERNMENT CAN BE UTILIZED PERHAPS.

- 48-A GRATTITUDE FOR EXCELLENT BRITISH WORK, SO FAR, ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY.

SECTION V.

(PAGES 51—55.)

THE QUESTION OF INCLUDING INDIAN STATES IN THE REFORM SCHEME FOR BRITISH INDIA.

- 49 IT IS APPARENTLY BEYOND THE FIELD OF INQUIRY BY THE ROYAL COMMISSION. A SPECIAL COMMITTEE FOR STATES BEING APPOINTED.
- 50 LORD MESTON THINKS THE ROYAL COMMISSION'S PRONOUNCEMENT ON THE QUESTION DESIRABLE.
- 51 POSSIBLE GROUNDS FOR SUCH A STEP DISCUSSED.
- 52, 53 THE SWARAJIST'S MOVE IN THE MEANWHILE BY A RESOLUTION BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF STATE—AS A TEST CASE.
- 54 SUGGESTION TO THE INDIAN STATES FOR FOUNDING A COMMONWEALTH OF THE UNITED STATES OF INDIA. (APPENDIX A).
- 55 THE NEED, IF IT ARISES, FOR THE COMMISSION TO CONSIDER THE INDIAN REFORMERS' POINTS AND ARGUMENTS FOR THE INCLUSION OF THE STATES IN THE NEW REFORM SCHEME.
- 56 ALSO THE NECESSITY PROPRIETY AND WISDOM OF THE PROPOSAL.
- 56-A NEHRU COMMITTEE'S REPORT OF A NEW CONSTITUTION. THE IDEA OF THE CROWN RELATIONS HELD BY PRINCES TO GO.

SECTION VI.

(PAGES 57—114).

THE POINTS URGED BY THE REFORMERS FOR THE PROPOSAL—

- 57 (1) SITUATION WITHIN INDIA.
 (2) POPULATION HOMOGENIOUS.
 (3) COMMON DESIRE FOR A COMMON NATIONALITY; COMMON GOVERNMENT, COMMON CITIZENSHIP; THESE IF NOT EXISTING OUGHT TO BE CREATED.
 (4) NEED FOR 'WHAT BRITISH INDIA IS TO BE, THAT MORE, OR LESS, INDIAN INDIA OUGHT TO BE.
 (5) THE NECESSITY OF IT MORE FULLY EXPLAINED.

(6 & 7) OLD TREATIES ANTI QUATED DOCUMENTS · NO LONGER BINDING AUTHORITY. AUTHORITY OF MR. THOMAS TAYLOR AN AMERICAN WRITER QUOTED.

(8) IF BRITISH GOVERNMENT READY TO TRANSFER POWERS OF GOVERNMENT TO PEOPLE IN BRITISH INDIA WHY SHOULD THE RULERS OF THE STATES NOT DO THE SAME ?

(9) TRANSFER OF GOVERNMENT OF BRITISH INDIA IMPLIES TRANSFER OF CONTROL OVER INDIAN STATES.

(10) ALL TREATIES HAVE BEEN WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

(11) MILITARY PROTECTION TO STATES AND ITS COST IS A CHARGE ON INDIAN REVENUES.

(12) FINANCIAL AND ECONOMICAL RELATIONS BETWEEN BRITISH INDIA AND THE STATES INDISSOLUBLY INTERMIXED

(13) LARGEST INDIAN STATES SMALLER THAN THE POWERFUL GOVERNMENT OF BRITISH INDIA : THEY OUGHT NOT, THEREFORE TO ASSERT THEIR INDEPENDENCE.

(14) THE NEW GOVERNMENT, IT IS ALLEGED WOULD NOT BE COMPETENT TO EFFICIENTLY GOVERN INDIA : THAT IS GROUNDLESS : REASONS GIVEN.

(15) THE ALLEGED INABILITY OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY TO GOVERN THE COUNTRY IN THE NEW ORDER, GROUNDLESS ; THINGS WOULD BE AS WELL AS NOW REFORMS HAVE COME TO STAY : THE PEOPLE OF THE STATES CANNOT STAND BY AND LOOK ASKANCE AT IT.

58 GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE ABOVE.

59 OBSERVATIONS TO MEET EVERY POINT URGED BY THE REFORMERS.

FIRST THREE POINTS : THOUGH SITUATE WITHIN LIMITS OF INDIA. THERE ARE FEATURES OF DISTINCTIONS AND DIFFERENCES IN MANY RESPECTS WHICH PREVENT HARMONY AND HOMOGENIETY ; HOW EXPLAINED. GOVERNMENT OF INDIA MEMORANDUM OF 1909 QUOTED.

60—62 POINT 4 : NOTHING TEMPTING OR FRUITFUL IN BRITISH INDIAN SYSTEM FOR PEOPLE OF STATES TO FOLLOW : THEY WOULD NOT LIKE TO BE WHAT BRITISH INDIA WOULD BE : THE DEFIANT ATTITUDE EVEN TO THE CROWN AND (TO THE RULERS TOO) BY UNGRATEFULLY FORGETTING THEM-

SELVES IGNORING HARD FACTS ; THESE STATED. CHALLENGE TO INDIAN REFORMERS BY H. H. THE MIR OF KHAIRPUR.

- 63 INDIAN REFORMERS REMINDED OF CERTAIN IMPORTANT POINTS LEST THEY FORGET THEM. GOVERNMENT OF INDIA'S PRAISE OF GOOD ADMINISTRATION IN INDIAN STATES IN 1909.
- 64 A CLAIM FOR THE NEW GOVERNMENT FOR POWERS TO MAKE AND UNMAKE TREATIES WITH PRINCES ; DISCUSSED. THIS CLAIM IS MADE WITH A VIEW TO INTRODUCE CHANGES IN THE SYSTEM OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE STATES. IT IS PREMATURE AND ABSURD.
- 65 AS IN BRITISH INDIA, SO IN THE INDIAN STATES, CENTRAL POWER IS WITH RULERS. TRADITIONAL SENTIMENT OF PEOPLE OF STATES ALREADY DESCRIBED IN PARA. 28 : THE VIEWS ON THIS SUBJECT OF MR. LOVET FRASER QUOTED " LORD CURZON AND AFTER 1911 ."
- 66 QUESTION WHETHER MONARCHY OR DEMOCRACY IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LAW OF NATURE DISCUSSED ; THERE IS A RIGHT TO BE RULED WELL : BUT A RIGHT TO QUESTION THE MONARCH'S RIGHT TO RULE DOES NOT EXIST.
- 67 PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO CLAIM A GOOD GOVERNMENT REASONABLE NOT SO TO QUESTION THE RIGHT OF THE RULER TO RULE
- 68 WHY SHOULD A NEED FOR DEMOCRACY ARISE ? DISCUSSED
- 69-70 DIRE RESULTS OF THE ABANDONMENT OF THE IDEA OF KINGSHIP.
THE INGRAINED FEELINGS OF THE POPULAR MINDS ABOUT KINGSHIP. (*Vide* PARA. 33-A ALSO).
- 71 DIGNITY OF ROYAL BIRTH ; BUT ABSOLUTE NEED TO EDUCATE, TRAIN, GUARD IT FROM EVIL CONTACTS. A GREAT RESPONSIBILITY.
- 72 IMPROPRIETY OF PREACHING A REVOLT, EVEN NON-VIOLENT, OF PEOPLE IN STATES AGAINST RULERS
- 73 POINT 5 : THE EXISTENCE OF INDIAN STATES SIDE BY SIDE WITH BRITISH INDIA NO BAR TO THE GRANT OF SELF-GOVERNMENT TO HER. THE THREAT REFERRED TO IS A MERE HOAX ; HOW EXPLAINED IN THE FACE OF THE DECLARATION OF 1917. BASED ON ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL PRINCIPLES.

- 74 POINTS 6 & 7: NO. 7 ANSWERED ALREADY; REGARDING NO. 6 IT PUTS FORTH A NOVEL AND EXTRAORDINARY IDEA; AGAINST TRADITION AND HISTORY AND NATURE; HOW EXPLAINED (ALSO *see* APPENDIX D). WANT OF DUE APPRECIATION OF THE MOTIVES OF BRITISH CAUTION AND OF PATIENCE AND PRUDENCE.
- 75-76 POINT 8; BRITISH GOVERNMENT HOLDING INDIA AS A SACRED TRUST REALISE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF IT; H. E. THE VICEBOY ON WHY THE ENGLISH ARE HERE, THEIR IDEA OF DUTY AND RESPONSIBILITY; AND WHEN INDIAN WILL RECEIVE COMPLETE SELF-GOVERNMENT.
- 77 EARNEST REQUEST TO INDIAN REFORMERS TO STUDY AND THINK OVER THE VICEBOY'S UTTERENCE.
- 78 REASONS WHY BRITISH GOVERNMENT OUGHT TO CARE MORE FOR INDIAN STATES STATED; THEY ARE THE FIRST FRIENDS OF BRITISH NATION WHO HAVE HELPED IT TO BUILD AN EMPIRE.
- 79 THE REFORMER'S DEMAND FOR TRANSFER TO PEOPLE OF GOVERNMENT OF STATES, BECAUSE PARAMOUNT POWER DOES IT, IN BRITISH INDIA, ILLOGICAL: HOW EXPLAINED.
- 80 MANY DIFFICULTIES IN THE WAY POINTED OUT.
- 81 INDIAN REFORMERS TO STUDY THEM AND FAVOUR PRINCES WITH SUITABLE SUGGESTION AND THE LATTER WILL CERTAINLY CONSIDER THEM; PROVIDED THEY ARE ON LINES INDICATED.
- 81-A CONDITION OF RURAL PARTS UNFIT TO ENTER POLITICS.
- 81-B THE 'NEW COUNTRY LEAGUE' LATELY ESTABLISHED, ITS AIMS AND OBJECTS.
- 82 THE ABSENCE OF TRI-LATERAL CONSTITUTION IN BRITISH INDIA, NO REASON AGAINST IT, IN INDIAN STATES.
- 83-84 POINTS 9-11: DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE IMPERIAL, BRITISH INDIAN, AND THE INDIAN STATES' GOVERNMENT, LONG STANDING: THE LAST TWO NOT INTER-DEPENDENT. THE TRANSFER OF THE SECOND TO THE PEOPLE CANNOT MEAN TRANSFER OF GOVERNMENT OR CONTROL OVER THE THIRD.
- 84 POINT 12: NO COMPLEXITY IN ADJUSTING FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC RELATIONS OF STATES WITH BRITISH INDIA:

- HOW STATED, (FOR FURTHER TREATMENT OF THIS SUBJECT
Vid. SECTION VII INFRA).
- 85 POINT 13: IS AN UNMANLY THREAT TO INDIAN STATES. IT
CARRIES ITS OWN CONDEMNATION, HOW EXPLAINED
- 86 POINT 14: NO QUESTION OF CAPACITY OF INDIAN POLITICAL
LEADERS TO GOVERN WELL. IT IS ONE OF TEMPER AND
TEMPERAMENT WHICH, AS EXHIBITED SO FAR, IS ANY
THING BUT MANLY.
- 87 EXTREMELY WISE WORDS ON THE SUBJECT OF H. E. THE
VICEROY LORD IRWIN.
- 88 CONCLUSIONS FROM THE ABOVE.
- 89 POINT 15: BRITISH DECISION TO GRANT SELF-GOVERNMENT
FINAL; INDIA IS TO DECIDE ITS FORM: BUT MUST BE
APPROVED BY HER PEOPLE UNANIMOUSLY; TILL TO DAY
NO SCHEME READY; PREMATURE THEREFORE AND IN-
DISCREET TO ASK STATES' PEOPLE TO GIVE UP WHAT
THEY HAPPILY HAVE.
- 90 RULERS OF STATES FULLY AWARE OF SHORT-COMINGS IN
THEIR SYSTEMS OF GOVERNMENT, NO GOVERNMENT IS
FREE FROM THEM: IF BRITISH INDIA HAS DEFECTS IN
HER GOVERNMENT; REFORMERS CRY AGAINST THE STATES
IS OUT OF PLACE. THE VICEROY'S ADVICE TO RULERS
OF STATE ON THE WAYS OF GOOD GOVERNMENT:
- 90-A H. H. PATIALA MAHARAJA'S ADDRESS BEFORE EAST INDIA
ASSOCIATION. PLEADING FOR UNDERSTANDING INDIAN
STATES BETTER.
- 91 PROBABLE CAUSES OF SHORT COMINGS STATED AND REMEDIES
FOR CURE SUGGESTED.

FEDERATED INDIA.

(PAGES 92—114).

- 92 THE IDEA OF A FEDERATED INDIA: PROFESSOR SAPRE THERE-
ON.
- 93 OBSERVATIONS ON THE IDEA.—THE REFORMERS ATTITUDE
TOWARDS IT.
- 94 THE RULERS OF STATE'S CONTRARY VIEW; OF THEIR IN-
DEPENDENCE FROM BRITISH INDIA.
- 95—97 THE VIEW OF SOUND THINKERS ON THE ATTITUDE OF THE
INDIAN REFORMERS; AND CAUSES, THAT INDUCED SUCH

ATTITUDE ; IN THEIR OPINION A PASSING PHASE : OMISSION TO APPOINT INDIAN MEMBERS NEED NOT BE TREATED AS AN INTENTIONAL INSULT.

- 98 PROFESSOR SAPRE'S EARNEST ADVICE.
- 99 THE ADVANCED PUBLIC OPINION : AND RESPECT DUE TO IT.
- 100 A CURIOUS IRONY OF FATE ; THAT STATES, ON THE ONE HAND, HAVE TO SUFFER AT THE HANDS OF GOVERNMENT OF INDIA FINANCIALLY AND ECONOMICALLY ; AND BE RENDERED POWERLESS TO DO GOOD ; AND ON THE OTHER BE SEVERELY CRITICISED BY THEM AS WELL AS BY THE INDIAN ENLIGHTENED PUBLIC OPINION FOR IN-EFFICIENT ADMINISTRATION.
- 101 WHAT REALLY SOUND PUBLIC OPINION MEANS

SECTION VII.

(PAGES 115—160).

THE FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC RELATIONS BETWEEN THE INDIAN STATES AND BRITISH INDIA.

PRELIMINARY.

- 102 THESE RELATIONS NOT POLITICAL ; THE POLITICAL INFLUENCE BROUGHT THEM ABOUT—YET OF VITAL IMPORTANCE TO THE STATES. CERTAIN CONSIDERATIONS IN THAT CONNECTION FOR THE COMMITTEE'S ATTENTION.
- 103 HOW THESE RELATIONS WERE BROUGHT ABOUT.
- 104 DR. SAPRE ON THE STATES' HELPLESSNESS IN FISCAL AND ECONOMIC MATTERS ; THE ECONOMIC TRANSITION OF INDIA—FREE TRADE POLICY OF ENGLAND ; NEED FOR RESTRAINTS ; THE HISTORY OF THE TRANSITION ; THE GLARING INCONSISTENCY IN THE ATTITUDE OF BRITISH GOVERNMENT, AS PROTECTORS OF STATES AND YET SAPPING THE FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC RESOURCES OF INDIAN STATES—UNACCOUNTABLE—THEIR FIELD OF WORK IN BRITISH INDIA COMPARED WITH THAT WITH EUROPEAN STATES.
- 105 THE BUTLER COMMITTEE'S TASK TO SET MATTERS RIGHT. THEIR ATTENTION INVITED TO THE EXPERIENCE OF GREAT BRITAIN AFTER THE UNION OF SCOTLAND UNDER THE POLICY OF PROTECTION ; WITH IRELAND, UNDER THE

FREE TRADE POLICY: RESULTING DISASTROUSLY FOR IRELAND AND THE CONSEQUENT APPOINTMENT OF A ROYAL COMMISSION FOR IT.

- 106 QUESTIONS ARISING FROM THIS REFERENCE TO IRELAND AS BEING APPLICABLE TO SUCH RELATIONS BETWEEN BRITISH INDIA AND THE STATES.
- 107 DIFFICULTIES IN APPLICATION—HOW SHOULD BE MET.
- 108 THE BENEFITS EXPECTED TO RESULT FROM SUCH MEASURES, THE BUTLER COMMITTEE'S QUESTIONNAIRE—
- 109 THE COMMITTEE'S PRELIMINARY REMARKS RE. THE LIMITATIONS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE REGARDING THE SCOPE OF THEIR INQUIRY, WHICH IS MAINLY CONFINED TO PART II OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE ONLY.
- 110 THE BASIS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE: THE QUESTIONS RAISED THEREIN: LEAVING STATES TO RAISE OTHERS IF NECESSARY.
- 111 THE IMPORTANT QUESTION OF THE PROCEDURE FOR DISCUSSION OF QUESTIONS RELATING TO STATES' INTEREST WITH BRITISH INDIA, WHEREIN THE INTERESTS OF THE TWO ARE NOT IDENTICAL: SIR LESLIE SCOTT'S DRAFT OF A MEMORIAL IN THIS CONNECTION DEALING WITH WEIGHTY POLITICAL CASES.
ITS PROBABLE LINES NOT KNOWN—WHAT IT MAY POSSIBLY BE.
- THE EVIDENCE FOR A WRITTEN STATEMENT OF THE PRINCES TO BE PLACED BEFORE THE COMMITTEE—
- 112 THE COMMITTEE PREPARED TO BE ASSISTED BY THE LEGAL ASSISTANCE OBTAINED BY THE CHAMBER AND OTHER PRINCES.
- 113 WHAT THE COMMITTEE IS NOT EMPOWERED TO INQUIRE INTO—EXCEPTIONS—AS REGARDS PART I. OF THE POINTS OF REFERENCE.
- 114 PART II OF THE REFERENCE—POINTS TOUCHING THE RELATIONS OF THE STATES, WITH BRITISH INDIA: THOSE MENTIONED IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE.
- 115 FIRST IN IMPORTANCE IS THAT OF CUSTOMS: STATEMENTS ABOUT THEM (*vide* PRELIMINARY REMARKS IN THIS SECTION FROM PARA. 102).

- 116 THE RAILWAYS—AN IMPORTANT SUBJECT—DEALS WITH—
- (a) LANDS TAKEN UP. THE COMPENSATION FOR THEM, THE LOSS OF PERMANENT ASSESSMENT THEREON TO THE STATE, AND OTHER ITEMS :
 - (b) NO SHARE IN PROFITS IN PROPORTION,
 - (c) THE QUESTION OF JURISDICTION OVER RAILWAYS IN VIEW OF THE FINANCIAL LOSS TO THE STATE BY THE TRANSFER, BESIDES THE LOSS OF JURISDICTION.
- 117 THE SAME PRINCIPLES APPLICABLE TO LANDS TAKEN UP FOR IRRIGATION PROJECTS : THROUGH ROADWAYS, TRAMWAYS.
- 118 MINTS AND CURRENCY—EXISTENCE OF OLD STATE MINTS : SUPPRESSED AT THE INSTANCE OF GOVERNMENT. GOVERNMENT MAKE REVENUE OUT OF MINTS AND CURRENCY. PROPORTIONATE SHARE IN INCOME CAN BE WELL CLAIMED BY STATES, STANDARD TO BE FIXED BY EXPERTS.
- 119 DEALINGS BETWEEN STATES AND FOREIGN CAPITALISTS AND FINANCIAL AGENTS.—HOW THEY TAKE PLACE STATED. NO LOSS TO THE STATE.
- 120 SALT MANUFACTURE—ITS IMPORT, EXPORT AND SALE BY DARBARS—ALL THESE SUPPRESSED—A NOMINAL COMPENSATION IS BEING PAID, FOR EARTH SALT ONLY FIXED MANY YEARS AGO—NOT CHANGED. HOW LOSS RESULTS TO THE STATE—EXPLAINED,—COMPENSATION CAN BE CLAIMED BY PER CAPITA CALCULATION.
- 121 POST AND TELEGRAPH—ESTABLISHED WITH CONSENT NO LOSS TO STATES : CONVENIENT TO PUBLIC BUSINESS : MATTERS OF COMPLAINT : POST OFFICE BANKING AFFECTS LOCAL BANKING BUSINESS : NEW POST OFFICES REQUIRE A MINIMUM GUARANTEE INCOME : ITS UNFAIRNESS THE CONDITION FIT TO BE ABOLISHED : STATE SERVICE LETTERS AND ARTICLES SHOULD BE CARRIED WITHOUT COST TO THE STATE.
- 122 DISCUSSION OF MATTERS OF JOINT INTERESTS TO THE STATES AND BRITISH INDIA, A VERY IMPORTANT POINT—THE CENTRAL ONE—A JOINT INTEREST MEANS—A UNITY OF INTEREST : NO QUESTION OF DISPUTE. IN THAT CASE—A FULL RECIPROCITY AND UNITY OF HEART SHOULD PAVE THE WAY FOR THE SOLUTION OF ALL QUESTION : PRIN-

- PRINCIPLES OF UNITY OF HEART AND OF INTERESTS EXPLAINED : MATTERS OF JOINT INTERESTS DISCUSSED.
- 123 GENERAL FINANCIAL RELATIONS BETWEEN STATES AND BRITISH INDIA. HOW THE FINANCIAL POLICY INFLUENCES THE STATES EXPLAINED—THE STATES UNABLE TO CONTROL THEM—DEPENDENCE ON GOVERNMENT FOR THEIR PROTECTION ; STATES ARE CALLED PROTECTED STATES AND SHOULD BE PROTECTED IN THIS RESPECT IN ALL POSSIBLE WAYS . BRITISH INDIA AND STATES AS PARTS OF THE SAME EMPIRE . MUTUAL PROTECTION ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY, THE ONE TO BE NEVER HARMFUL TO THE OTHER . BRITISH INDIA SHOULD BE MADE TO UNDERSTAND THIS.
- 124 OPIUM—PRESENT ARRANGEMENTS NEED NOT BE CHANGED : STATE RIGHTS RECOGNIZED.
- 125 EXCISE : INCLUDES THE ABKARI REVENUES FROM ; MANUFACTURE, IMPORT, TRANSPORT AND EXPORT ; POSSESSION AND SALE OF LIQUORS OF ALL SORTS INDIAN OR FOREIGN : KAJU LIQUOR IMPORT MAY BE PERMITTED : PRESENT ARRANGEMENTS ALL RIGHT : STATE RIGHTS RECOGNISED,—REGARDING SMALLER STATES : COMPLAINT ABOUT DISCOURTESY OF ABKARI STAFF TO STATE AUTHORITIES TO BE AVOIDED ; OF BIGGER STATES—THEY MAY MAKE THEIR OWN ARRANGEMENT : BUT ON STRICTLY BRITISH INDIAN LINES . THEY MAY OR MAY NOT FARM THIS SOURCE OF REVENUE.
- 126 GENERAL IN REGARD TO CUSTOMS. PREVIOUS REFERENCE TO PARAS. 48 TO 52 AND 56 TO 58 STATES TO HAVE A VOICE, IN FIXING TARIFF AND IN DECIDING THEIR SHARE IN INCOME : PROBABLE OPPOSITION OF THE NEW GOVERNMENT OF INDIA : PRINCIPLES THEN TO BE REMEMBERED : SOLUTION OF THE DIFFICULTY SUGGESTED.
- 127 MATTERS NOT ENUMERATED IN THE QUESTIONNAIRES STATED—OF PERSONAL INTEREST : REGARDING DIGNITY OF THE RULER AND MATTERS AFFECTING BETTER ADMINISTRATION OF STATES. THEIR NATURE : DEFECTS EXPLAINED WITH REASONS ; AMONG THESE, RANK AND PRECEDENCE ; POWER TO GRANT INAMS NOT DISALLOWED BY TREATY BUT PROHIBITED BY POLITICAL OFFICERS :—CARRYING OUT LAST WILLS : ARE MENTIONED. EMPLOYMENT OF

FOREIGNERS, SUPPLY OF UP-TO-DATE ARMS TO STATE POLICE. LAND REQUIRED FOR STATE PROJECTS PASSING THROUGH BRITISH TERRITORY; PROVISION OF UP-BRINGING OF RULERS' SONS, WHO DO NOT SUCCEED TO THE GADI; OBJECTIONABLE "SARANJAM," RULE OF SUCCESSION. TEMPORARY RESUMPTION OF STATE ON THE DEATH OF A RULER: AUTHORITY OF RULERS OVER SUBORDINATE SARANJAMDARS QUESTIONED IMPROPERLY BY POLITICAL OFFICERS; MINORITIES, ADMINISTRATION OF STATES DURING THE MINORITY OF RULERS, THEIR UP-BRINGING, EDUCATION AND TRAINING UNSATISFACTORY CONSTITUTION OF CHAMBER OF PRINCES; THE COST OF A SALUTE OF HONOUR IS SAID TO BE RECOVERED FROM THE PRINCES AND THE NEED FOR DIGNIFYING PROVISION AND TREATMENT OF A RULERS WIDOW.

SECTION VIII.

(PAGES 161—172).

128—132—CONCLUSION AND RECAPITULATION. AN EARNEST REQUEST TO THE INDIAN STATES TO ESTABLISH AND CONSOLIDATE THEIR POSITION IN A FIRM "COMMONWEALTH OF THE UNITED STATES OF INDIA" WITH A COMMON COUNCIL, CLOSE THE STATEMENT.

THE EPILOGUE.

APPENDIX "A"—A DRAFT SCHEME FOR THE CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE UNITED INDIAN STATES,

(PAGES I—X).

"B"—THE TIMES OF INDIA REVIEW OF THE GROWTH AND PRESENT STATE OF THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT AND THE INDIAN STATES

(PAGES XI—XII).

"C"—AN APPEAL TO THE INDIAN REFORMERS IN THE STRAIN OF THE ADDRESS TO THE HIGHER CLASSES OF ENGLAND BY SIR T. COLERIDGE, UNDER SIMILAR CIRCUMSTANCES.

(PAGES XIII—XVI).

"D"—A STUDY IN POLITICS FROM RALPH WALDO EMERSON,

(PAGES XVII—XXIII).

NAMES OF AUTHORS QUOTED—

SIR WILLIAM LEE-WARNER,
 DR. KEITH—INTRODUCTION,
 LORD ELLENBOROUGH,
 MR. EDMUND BURKE,
 MR. GWYNN, I.C.S.,
 SIR WALTER LAWRENCE,
 PROFESSOR V. A. GADGIL,
 R. W. EMERSON—APPENDIX D.
 MR. THOMAS PAYNE,
 MR. LOVAT FRASER,
 THE ROYAL COMMISSION OF AGRICULTURE
 PROFESSOR SAPRE,
 MR. W. H. WILLIAMS
 GRANT DUFF.,
 THE RIGHT HON. MR. MACDONALD—APPENDIX A
 S. T. COLERIDGE—APPENDIX C.

SPEECHES QUOTED—

H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF BIKANER—INTRODUCTION,
 PATIALA—INTRODUCTION,
 „ THE JAMSAHEB OF NAVANAGAR
 „ „ NAWAB OF BHOPAL
 „ „ MIR OF KHAIRPUR
 H. E. LORD IRWIN—INTRODUCTION,
 SIR HARCOURT BUTLER—INTRODUCTION
 SIR JOHN SIMON
 LORD MORLEY
 SIR CHIMANLAL SETALWAD
 LORD HALDANE
 SIR BASIL BLACKET
 LORD MESTON
 THE RIGHT HON. MR. SHASTRI
 THE ROYAL COMMISSION OF AGRICULTURE

PREFACE.

The entire Government of the whole Universe comes out of the Wisdom and Love of the Divine Providence. In the inscrutable ways of that Divine Providence, the British Government of England was induced to link its fortunes with those of India. More than a century has elapsed since then. India came to be governed, first through the East India Company on behalf of the Sovereign, and thereafter, since 1858 the Crown took up the direct reins of the Government of this country. Since then, it has enjoyed a long spell of peaceful administration in British India; and, in the work of protecting the Indian States. This was disturbed by the Great European War, in which the British Government was dragged perforce. That was due, as a matter of course, to the Great Divine Law that "The Lord's Divine Providence causes evil and its falsity, to serve as an equilibrium, for relation, for purification, and thus for conjunction of truth with good in others." In their great hour of need in that war, British India and the Indian States helped the British Government of England. This help was gratefully appreciated. His Majesty and His Government and people were pleased; and as the reward for such excellent and loyal help, British India has received the gift of Self-Government, to be completed by stages; and, the Indian States trust devoutly that they too will receive their own, in due course. Eight years have passed since the grant of the first instalment of the Reforms in British India. In the meanwhile, recently, one Political Party in England raised objections to the grant of complete Self-Government to India (vide para 16 (2) of the Introduction), on the ground that the existence of the Native States in India, made such a grant an impossible proposition. This objection seems to have been hurled from an influential political circle in England. The Indian Political Reformers unfortunately misinterpreted this "threat"; and saw no way out of the difficulty. They looked upon it as an *impasse*. That threat

referred to the grant, doubtless of Self-Government to the whole of India: including Native States and not certainly to British India; and without trying to understand the real position and meaning of the threat, which was no real threat indeed, and without waiting to gauge the real strength in this threat have rushed to the idea of removing the obstacle of the Indian States in the way of their cherished object of attaining complete Self-Government for British India, by—

- (a) inducing the people of the Indian States to demand Self-Government from their Princes;
- (b) by preaching a non-violent revolt among them and the need of popular demand for Self-Governing Powers of which the people had no idea, and for which they never felt the least need, by an insistent pressure on the Rulers of Indian States;
- (c) by demanding of the British Government, the incorporation of the States in the Indian Reformed Constitution;
- (d) by claiming that the Indian States form a part of the Government of India; and that
- (e) therefore, they should be transferred to the control of the future Government of British India with all the rights and obligations of the British Government.

There are many other grounds for such a claim. These will be found in Para 57 et. seq. Sec. VI. The fact of the above misunderstanding would seem to be clear from the fact that the Reforms Act of 1919 itself applied to British India only. That is further clear from the Montague-Chelmsford Report and the Joint Parliamentary Rules; and yet these absurd claims are now made after long eight years and *after* the political threat came to be hurled.

Such a move, on the part of the Indian Politicians, has created a stir, suspicions, and fears in the Princes of the States of India; and, at their instance, a Committee has been appointed to inquire into the correct position of the relations between the States and the Paramount Power and British India. The following pages make an attempt to discuss the pros and cons of the questions raised; and have been written as an humble contribution of help to the Committee, to the Indian Princes and their Chamber, and to Government, as a case for the Indian States, from their point of view, as well as for our friends of the Indian Reformers to enable them to appreciate that view and the real situation, and also for the general reader, who may be interested in the subject. The views of eminent authorities and statesmen on the subject have been quoted where necessary, on particular relevant points. The views and opinions other than the above, are of the humble writer's own; and may certainly be taken as an individual opinion; and he trusts that they may be treated for what they are worth. It is sufficient to note here that such observations are the result of personal experience and knowledge, obtained by him during his long service in the British territories for about 36 years and in Native States for about 8 years.

K. B. MOGHE.

INTRODUCTION.

There are about 700 Indian States, large and small, in this vast country; which is practically a Sub-Continent. These States are of varying size, population and resources. They form not less than a third part of the area and a fifth part of the population of the whole of India. That will show their importance.

Sir William Lee-Warner, K. C. S. I., I. C. S., in his famous work "The Native States of India," has described a Native State thus:—"A Native State is a Political Community, occupying a territory in India of defined boundaries. It is subject to a Common Ruler, who has exercised, as belonging to him, in his own right, any of the functions and attributes of Internal Sovereignty. This right has been duly recognised by the Supreme Power of British Government. (Chapter II, page 31.) "Parliament the King's Order in Council, and even the Treaties, constantly proclaim, that Princes of India have Sovereign Rights." (Chapter XII, page 359.) This clearly shows their position and dignity, politically and constitutionally, in India.

"It is important to note that the relations of the Native States, however conducted, are essentially, relations with the British Crown;—and not with the Indian Government." (Dr. Keith) "In their loyalty to His Majesty, the Indian Princes are second to none. They have given freely of their blood, of their treasure, of all, that they could give, at the time of need, not only during the Great War, but also on other occasions; and the British Empire will remember them to the very end. The Indian States have played and will play to the end of time, so important a part in this great Empire; and, they are but brothers, co-operating with a great end in view." (Sir Harcourt Butler.)

The Crown, the British Parliament, and the British Nation, fully know that such is the position of the Indian States. Perhaps there are quarters, where this is not known sufficiently well, in India at present; e. g., some of the Beurocracy and most of the Indian Politicians; and that leads us to the Genesis of the

Butler Committee of States Enquiry.

THE GENESIS OF THE BUTLER COMMITTEE.

2. His Highness the Maharaja of Bikaner, once the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes, has stated in his recent speech before his Legislative Council that this inquiry was *solicited* by the Chamber of Princes with a view to safeguard—

- (1) the rights of the States,
- (2) their Governments,
- (3) their people, and
- (4) their internal autonomy and independence.

He adds that such a step was necessary;—because recently there have appeared critics, who bluntly arrogated to themselves and to the new Government of India, that is to come, the right to interfere in all matters, external and internal, pertaining to the States; with a view to infringe their Sovereignty and to violate their autonomy, fiscal and otherwise. A request for such an inquiry was therefore put forward on behalf of the States at a Round Table Conference held at Simla in May 1927. This Conference was presided over by His Excellency the Viceroy and was attended by some high officials of Government also. His Highness adds that the Indian States claim to occupy the position of politically separate and constitutionally independent units of the Great Indian Empire. They want a declaration that—

- (1) They are independent of the future Government of India.
- (2) They ought to be independent of the future democratised *constitution* of India; and
- (3) they claim that the British Government should deal with the States *directly*, and *not* through the new Government of India.

3. It is believed that the present inquiry will be held with a view to safeguard the interests of the States as a separate unit, to which the new constitution of British India will not extend.

Instead of each State, small or great, being an individual separate unit, would it not be still better for all the states, with independent internal Sovereign Powers, to form in addition 'a Commonwealth of the United Indian States?' A draft scheme for such a constitution will be found among these papers as Appendix "A".

THE STATES INQUIRY COMMITTEE.

4. His Excellency Lord Irwin announced in the course of a speech at Rajkot that the Secretary of State has decided to send an expert Committee—

- (1) to report upon the relationship between *the Paramount Power* and the States; with particular reference to the rights and obligations arising from (a) treaties (b) engagements (c) Sanadas and (d) usages, etc.,
- (2) to inquire into the Financial and Economic relations between British India and Indian States, and
- (3) to make recommendations that may be considered desirable or necessary for their more satisfactory adjustment.

His Excellency added that the Indian Princes have been demanding such an investigation; and, it is owing to their persistent requests that the present step has been taken.

This does not seem to include the subject of the internal administration,—autonomy or the rights of the people of the States. But the responsibility of good Government is one of the conditions of the Treaties, which will be examined by the Committee.

5. II. H. the Jamsahb of Nawanagar, in his recent communication, addressed to the Viceroy, states:—

- (1) Our position in the New India, that is being evolved, needs to be thoroughly safeguarded;
- (2) "Our existence, as separate political entities,

distinct from and independent of the neighbouring parts of British India, whatever form her future constitution will assume, will demand an adjustment.

- (3) "This adjustment, while recognising and meeting modern conditions, will not ignore history and traditions, and will fully uphold our dynastic prestige, Prerogative, and Treaty Rights."

Note:—The term "usage" used above in clause 1 in the Viceroy's announcement would seem to affect only the political relations with the Crown,—political usage subsequent to the date of a Treaty.

6. The "adjustment" (clause 3 of the Viceroy's speech) refers to the financial and economic relations and not to the political relations with the Crown. His Highness' reference stated in para (2) is therefore a mistake. That existence of the separate political entity is, however, a settled fact and cannot be revised, or adjusted.

7. Again His Highness the Maharaja of Patiala the present Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes, has made recently a speech at a banquet in honour of the Indian States Inquiry Committee. This speech is important; as it deals with some of the very salient points relating to the subject of the inquiry.

8. His Highness maintains the sanctity of the treaties and engagements, as having been declared by His Majesty the King Emperor, as "inviolable and inviolable." Though that is so, His Highness says:—

- (1) 'Yet the fundamental fact remains that their present position was causing, among all the Princes, grave anxiety;
- (2) 'The British Government of India had gathered vested interests and formulated definite conceptions of its *policy*;

- (3) "Political Practice" as opposed to "Political theory" has led, invariably to the subordination of the interests of the States to those of the British Government of India, whenever the two come into conflict;
- (4) 'the States are isolated and scattered and find close combination between them difficult; while, the British Government of India was a united, centralised machine, always able to dominate.'
- (5) 'These are the fundamental sources of uneasiness in the opinion of His Highness, and of the Chamber; as "Political Practice" seems to threaten seriously to undermine the rights and privileges of the Princes, hitherto believed to be inviolably safeguarded by their treaties and engagements.'
- (6) His Highness then speaks of the form of the treaties. He is afraid that "The Treaties themselves are *not, as a rule*, ideal instruments in this modern age at least, for the purposes for which they are originally designed to serve"; for, "there are gaps in them; and through these gaps the well nigh irresistible influence of the British Government of India tends to percolate; and to modify many aspects of political relationship, in a way unfavourable to the Princes, to their autonomy and to the development of the States and to the welfare of their subjects; and that,
- (7) On the other hand, the Government of India is advancing progressively, step by step and is consolidating its position. The Princes feel helpless as the cumulative process threatens to end disastrously for them; thereby di-

minishing their power to do good, both for the States as well as to the Empire. That would be much more so, when the Government of British India would pass out of the hands of the British Government, with whom the treaties were concluded.'

9. Thus the whole of the above part of His Highness' speech is characterised by uneasy feelings of tribulations, entertained through an incorrect appreciation of the treaties and engagements, and of their spirit and character as well as of the so-called "Political Practice." His Highness is perfectly aware, however, and he has asserted it in clear language,—that to such a "policy" (if it can be called a "Policy," for, a policy can only relate to the administration of the territories that are governed and administered by the British Government only), the consent of the Princes was never given,—nor even invited. It follows then that such practices cannot create a binding force of a permanent nature. Nor do the British Government themselves believe honestly that they are permanently binding. It is impossible that they should do so. Indeed they have been looked upon as mere "conventions" and neither as "policy" nor as an administrative decision, which can be passed in matters arising within the territories administered by them only, can they be binding on States, as unchangeable; as they would contradict the internal Sovereignty of the Princes and Chiefs. (*Vide* paras. 13 and 14 Sec. III pages 8 and 9.) They are certainly liable to be changed, when they can no longer be considered desirable; else, the present orders to the Committee of inquiry to recommend adjustments would be meaningless. Moreover so long as the British Government has been in charge of the Government of India, whatever convention came to be *allowed for the time*, it was only for the sake of the wishes of the British Paramount Government. The Imperial interests (*vide* Section VII *infra*) included certain conveniences for them; and, were allowed by the Princes, as a

matter of courtesy; and, if they have been allowed, even at the cost of extreme inconvenience and loss to the States, it behoves the other party as protectors and as good neighbours, so obliged, to change them when necessary and be cautious not to give away or transfer them to third parties, without the consent (*vide* para. 16 page 14 of this introduction) of the Princes. For that would be ungrateful and the British Government can never be ungrateful, That is the most straightforward, fair and businesslike method of working at them; and, of the solution of the difficulties. The Princes, including His Highness, should not however, forget that these conventions have nothing of a political nature in them. They cannot affect the political theory and principles guaranteed by the Treaties and Engagements. As has been already observed they are merely neighbourly acts of obliging Conventions between the British Paramount Power and the States, not the result of any "gaps" in the Treaties, nor surrenders by the States. They have actually been treated as Conventions.

10. The difficulties of the scattered and isolated condition referred to can be easily got over by the creation of "A Commonwealth of the United States of India" (*vide* Appendix A). The difficulties in the way of a common cause are, it is permissible to point out, due, besides situation, to a peculiar feature of a pride in the relative rank of the Princes among themselves. This pride and prejudice occupy a deeply rooted place. But such a sense of these sentiments ill-becomes a high nobility; for, the greater the nobility, the lesser is the ground for these. Both these give way to grace and nobility; when the very great importance of the unity of all States for their common good is kept in view,—as unity is the greatest strength. Such false sentiments have to be banished for ever. If this is understood, the entire Order of Princes stand on a higher level with brotherly relations between themselves and the Commonwealth of the United States will possess the greatest strength.

11. It is true, the Government of British India has been consolidating its position in this connection, step by step; and this, the Indian States have not been able to do, for causes, which it is never too late to remedy. As Government have by their treaties, left the internal sovereignty of the Princes to themselves, the latter cannot blame the British Government solely for it. Yet the duty of protection includes a wise watch and guidance from the British Government, and, indeed they should make it their duty, as good neighbours and as the protecting Paramount Power, to help them more than hitherto to do so; and, if the conventions in question happen to be inconvenient in any way, to relax them to the full extent necessary. When the Government are requested to do so in the right way, they will certainly be prepared to be very fair and accommodating, (for the history of the introduction and development of these conventions see full treatment of the subject in Section vii later).

12. As regards the Treaties themselves, His Highness' reading of them does not seem to be either correct or accurate, in the spirit in which they were conceived and laid down. How they ought to be read, legally and politically, has been repeatedly explained (*vide* paras. 13 and 14 sec. III) by very high authorities of law and statesmanship; and they have absolutely left no ground for any difficulty. Any subjects, touching the relations mentioned in the treaties, etc., are alone political; all others are either Financial or economical, (*vide* section vii later) and are clearly subject to the strict rules of pure Mathematics, justice and fairness in business matters. How can the British Government transfer to others, what they themselves do not possess as exclusively their own, and is a subject of a contract between the states and the British Government? They can be transferred only with the consent of both. (*Vide* para. 16 of the Introduction.)

13. It is true that, a series of such conventions have been brought into use, throughout the history of the relations between the British Government and the States. Some have called them as "Political Practices;" others as usages, others still, as "policy." But those that have given them these epithets are certainly no authorities; nor are these approved by the Paramount Power as being of a binding nature; also, what can be the meaning of an "adjustment" now proposed? For, they cannot be so treated without the free and voluntary consent of the Princes and *unless an equitable consideration exists*. Nor can the fact that they have been allowed by the Princes, by reason of a loyal courtesy or of fear that the British Government are too powerful and dominant to protest against or resist, alone create a right; much less a vested right, in favour, either of the British Government, or, if transferred, of the new Government of India. This is not a question of lapse between any two private parties. It will be stultifying to the Majesty and dignity of the British Sovereign to set up limitation or lapse, or neglect on the part of the Indian States. The Treaties do not authorise any encroachment on the rights of the States; and as already stated, Government have admitted (*vide* Paras. 13 and 14 also) that the Treaty is the only law that governs the mutual political rights, obligations and relations existing between either party." (See para. 12 (3) page 7 of Sec. II.)

14. His Highness' apprehensions, however, that such conventions threaten seriously to undermine the rights and privileges of Princes, which have been declared by His Majesty himself to be "inviolable and inviolable," are natural,—but they are groundless. Times there were, no doubt, when the officers of Government that were then in power and position, thought that such conventions were then necessary to avoid what appeared to them to be complications to secure a smooth working of their own administration of Imperial Economic interests (*Vide* Sec. VII *infra*) in certain Departments of

the Government of India. They were after all servants of the Crown and of His Majesty's Government; and, had not the power to act against the distinct terms of the Treaties, that had been declared by the Imperial Crown to be "inviolable and inviolable." Any such conventions must, therefore, stand the risk of being altered at any time, when they are found and proved to be contrary to the Treaties, as well as causing annoyance, loss, harm, or inconvenience to the States concerned or as sapping their necessary auxiliary sources of revenue. If such be the consequences of these conventions, they would certainly be inquired into by the Committee now appointed, when, and if, they are brought to their notice; and an adjustment or settlement can be arrived at by a fair "give and take" method. No sacred right or privilege need be infringed or sacrificed, without loss or harm to either party; for, that is never intended (*vide* Sec. VII of this work.)

15. That the so-called "Policy" (a direct consequence of the principle of the Free Trade Doctrine then prevailing and since almost abandoned, (*vide* Ces. VII later) of the Government of India in introducing the conventions has since been given up, has been fully explained in an able review on this very subject, which appeared in a leader of the *Times of India*. A summary of this explanation and review has been appended to these papers as Appendix "B."

15A. His Highness the Nawab of Bhopal has also made a valuable speech on the subject. His Highness observes:—
 "An enlightened and progressive Ruler must spend more and still more money for the improvement of his administration and the peace and contentment of his subjects; but if the State is to enjoy the full benefit of development along these lines, it must be free to use the whole of its resources and to be allowed to spend upon the people and the State, the whole of the income raised directly or indirectly from the people; of course always keeping in view the obligations which we may have contracted. It is for these reasons that I am joining with my brother

Princes in an appeal to the Paramount Power, through the Indian States Committee for such an adjustment of the Fiscal and financial relations with British India, as will enable the States to develop and govern on the lines indicated by the movement of the times."

"The inquiry to be conducted by the Committee will, I feel sure, lead to the recognition of facts that may have escaped notice heretofore or may have been forgotten, and therefore not taken into account, such recognition in its turn necessarily resulting in an adjustment based on rights which were *never surrendered*, in the adoption of a policy, calculated to strengthen the ties, which bind the Princes of India to the Person and the Throne of His Imperial Majesty. The States unwittingly contribute towards *revenues* exclusively employed in the development of British India, *with no benefit to themselves*; as they ought to derive."

His Highness refers to all matters in this connections, besides the difficulties, disabilities and economic losses arising from those conditions, including other matters of general financial and economic importance. These would be pressed to their utmost capacity, by the Princes.

His Highness pointed out "we have no vestige of quarrel with the legitimate aspiration of British India for which we have our fullest sympathies. On the above speech. The *Times of India*, in its leader dated 31 March 1928, lays down the following propositions:—

1. "But, whatever the need for re-adjustment may be, the Butler Committee is not likely to accept any plea that contributions to the Government of India are wrong in principle; that is what the Nawab suggests.

2. Political security and economic advantage can only be bought at a price.

3. The defence and development of the Indian Empire ought not to fall on the shoulders of the Imperial Government and

the Government of India, without any assistance whatever from the Indian States.

4. It would be a burden which the people of British India could not be expected to bear—

5. The States and British India are economically inter-dependant. Upon the prosperity of British India the prosperity of Indian States depends.

6. Actual harm might be done to a State, if it were permitted to withhold its contribution.”

The above propositions are groundless. These are no contributions paid by the Indian States to British Indian Exchequer, either for their defence or for the defence of the Indian Empire. His Highness does not refer at all to any actual contributions levied from the States, as there are none, except in the case of tributes in lieu of service—

The defence of the Indian Empire is a charge on the British Indian Revenues—and certainly not on the Indian States. For the Protection of the Indian States, the British Government have, for due considerations of Political and strategical character, solemnly undertaken to protect the States from both external and internal troubles. The treaties do not bind the States to pay for such defence and protection. The levy of indirect taxation on the people of the States and the several conventions for some of which some compensation is paid by Government to the States and for others, no such compensation is paid, are only matters which arise from the Financial and Economic relations between British India and States through such conventions, brought about by Political influence of Government. They have nothing to do with the security of peace of the States, nor with the security of their economic interests, which have on the contrary *enormously* suffered: and Government being aware of this fact have asked the Committee to inquire into the grievances and recommend their views on a more equitable adjustment. The Butler Committee

will certainly go into the question in a straight-forward business-like manner and will certainly accept any reasonable plea.

16. On the subject of the direct relations of the Indian States with the Crown, Dr. Keith writes:—

- (1) 'it is important to note that the relations of the Native States, however conducted, are essentially relations with the British Crown, and not with the Indian Government.
- (2) 'This fact presents an essential complication as regards the establishment of Responsible Government in India, *as a whole*. (That is probably the basis of the threat hurled on the India Reformers above alluded to—)
- (3) 'It is clear that it is not possible for the Crown to transfer its rights, under a treaty, without the assent of the Native States, to the Government of India under Responsible Government.'
(The British Empire—a survey.)

17. Indian critics do not accept this position. One among such has given his reasons, which in themselves contain several grounds for refutation of the very position he takes. This criticism appears in the *Servant of India* of 9th February 1928. The subordinate position of the East India Company to the Crown, from 1767, has been admitted. Before that year the company was not a power. All moneys received by the Company then, were to be reserved for disposal *by the Parliament*. The critic makes a curious distinction between the Crown and the British Parliament in this respect when both the terms mean the same thing. It is also admitted that the Company was authorised to act by the King's Charters. That was their authority to act. The critic quietly passes over the provisions of the Charters from 1767, which define and limit the powers of the Company. It is also admitted that they only "negotiated" the conditions of the Treaties. The quotations from Mr. Edmund Burke given by this critic him-

self fully support the fact that the East India Company held a *Subordinate Sovereignty* under the Crown;—delegated to them; and yet this Critic boldly concludes that, “this genesis of the Company and its territorial acquisitions brings home ‘the Sovereign Powers,’ (*vide* para. 2 Section I) which the Directors of the Company Enjoyed.” When the above mentions the ‘delegation of powers’ and the ‘subordinate Sovereignty,’ one cannot follow the logic of the above conclusion,—and assuming that the Company abused the powers of such Sovereignty, delegated to them, the fact remains that even a Governor-General was tried for the abuse of his powers, before the Houses of Parliament. Is that independent Sovereignty? Such criticisms are unworthy of serious notice.

18. The Privy Purse of the Ruling Princes has been the subject of much adverse criticism on the part of the Indian Political Reformers. An all round allegation is made often that they waste an amount of public money on personal pleasures. That is a matter of a comparative view, coming out of persons, who wish to bring the Rulers to the level of an ordinary commoner,—because one, being not a Prince himself, is incapable of appreciating the needs of such a position and life. Even an ordinary trader or a merchant charges an unreasonable commission and profits, without any reason, disproportionately large. The money-lender does the same; and what do the large capitalist Firms do? Where is the sense of proportion in the Lawyer’s fees levied from clients? Is not the position of the Ruler much higher than these enjoy—having Sovereign powers and infinitely higher position? There is certainly a distinction, little understood and appreciated by the commoner, however educated, between the two. The preservation and maintenance of that position with its symbols and all that they mean, is an absolute necessity in India as elsewhere. The distinction between the State expenses and private expenses, both attached to the Ruler, must be borne in mind. The perma-

nent charges of all that is necessary to maintain the high dignity of the Ruler must be treated as State. The Ruler has no private being, any time. This can be seen from the fact that the Governor of the Presidency or the Viceroy has all his domestic charges of the Household of the Government House, to be paid from the public revenues. Has any one considered and challenged the propriety of the figure? The people have an unwritten standard of the position and dignity of the Prince or the Governor and the Viceroy. That must be maintained; of course in due proportion to the resources of the State. Strictly private expenses must indeed be and will certainly be found to be few. But what may happen is, an incorrect classification of such items in the Budgets; and when with all this there is in any case an excess which can be reasonably held as not discreet, that is a matter which the Ruler can be advised to correct himself. But with such small matters any Commission or Committee will not care to deal. That is a matter for the Paramount Power only.

19. In his latest speech at Alwar, Sir Harcourt Butler has declared the aims of his committee in the following words:—

“The spirit actuating the Committee was a constructive one. Their object is to find out something, which would build up, some Political Edifice for the good of (a) the Indian States, (b) of the Indian Empire, and (c) the British Empire.”

“In their loyalty to his Majesty, the Indian Princes are second to none. They have given freely of their blood, of their treasure, of all that they could give, at the time of need; not only during the Great War, but also on other occasions; and the British Empire will remember them to the very end.”

Note one of the foremost of these are the famous Patwardhans of the S. M. C. Bombay—*vide* para. 127 page 139.

“The Indian States have played and will play to the end of time, so important a part in this great Empire; and they are but brothers, co-operating with a great end in view.”

20. This frank expression of the Noble President of the Committee, must be looked upon as most authoritative and convincing of the attitude of the British Nation towards the Rulers of the Indian States; and ought to dispel all their suspicions and fears on any account regarding the future of their status, dignity and position.

21. What would be that "something" which would build up such a Political Edifice? The following features of it would seem to be relevant to the question:—

The absolute recognition by all concerned, of

- (1) His Majesty the King Emperor, as the Head of the Empire, as the all-pervading strength of that Edifice; and, full loyalty to the Crown in the first place, as a fitting response to it.
- (2) Of the essential fact that British India and the States need Great Britain; and Great Britain needs both for maintaining her Political and economic interests—in India and Asia.
- (3) Of the need for Great Britain as well as for British India to keep strong good faith with the Indian States, for the good of all, as bound by the Treaties.
- (4) Of the need for Indian States to remain loyal to the Paramount Power and friendly to British India as hitherto and ready to help both.
- (5) Of the need of British India, who would derive her powers of self-Government, from the British Government, to be as friendly with the Indian States; under the protection of the Crown.

All the three—The British Government, the new British Indian Government, as well as the Indian States will find it, for that purpose, necessary to exercise an amount of good sense, wisdom, good-will and perfect good faith, between one another.

22. The main idea for the political Edifice will be the safe-guarding of the interests of each of the three. That will be its foundation. On the other hand, however, the Swarajist Indian Leaders have resolved, unanimously that they claim complete Self-Government *without* the Empire; and that they will *assume*, to begin with, all the full powers of the Crown over the Indian States—which the British Government, at present possess! But that is a wild talk.

23. According to the States Inquiry Committee, the design of the edifice would be that the British interests would be maintained, through the two blocks—British India and the States—developed, nourished and strengthened, Politically and, economically—under British protection.

24. Thus the British Government would maintain, as strong and healthy as ever, its political as well as her strategical and economical relation with the whole of India. It would include under its wings the two blocks, to make them strong politically and economically. Each may within its own limits evolve and develop its own future good, as separate individual and independent units of the great Commonwealth of the British Empire. At the same time they have to keep a full regard for the Imperial interests,—Political, strategic and economic. For this purpose it is that each cannot do without another of the three. For, to the British Government these Imperial interests are of as vital importance as is the keeping of the Suez Canal; and for that purpose Great Britain shall control them and co-operate with both. Great Britain also expects both to be loyally co-operating with them. Great Britain on her part will undertake to help both in every respect. Her Imperial economic interests consist in her insistent desire to trade with India as hitherto. Her Imperial Political interests lie with the Indian States chiefly, and with British India, with a greater importance for strategical purposes. For that purpose she wants both the parts to be economically as

well as Politically strong. Great Britain has other more important political and strategical as well as economic interests in Asia, and, in the Indian waters; India would be the base of her operations in that respect.

25. Elsewhere, it has been stated that Great Britain has been generous in her recognition of the services of British India in the late war; and that is the grant of self-governing powers to her. She has yet to do the same, as regards the Indian Princes and their people. That claim is over-due. To this fact the Indian States will doubtless, draw the attention of the British Government, through the Butler Committee. Great Britain has decided to help British India. She would be bound to do the same in respect of the Indian States; and in a more substantial manner, than she has been able to do hitherto. Their claims are certainly superior to those of British India, in that—

- (1) They have helped the British Government to build up the Indian Empire; and have been the first to help them at the outset at critical times.
- (2) They have helped the British Government in the last European War with men and money and some of the Princes have actually served on the battle field.
- (3) They have hitherto quietly accepted the economical and financial conventions imposed upon them by the use of political influence, suppressing taxes locally levied from years past, as Sovereigns of the States, under the free Trade Policy of the Imperial Government, without any compensation, in all matters now being dealt with in the questionnaire of the States Inquiry Committee.

All these make out an important claim on the good sense of the British Nation, who will not fail to act consistently with their good faith and justice, befitting the dignity of the Imperial Paramount Power. It will be understood that the one fair settlement and adjustment of financial and economic claims will only be on business lines. The matter of their war services and others will expect and wait for a special recognition.

26 Since the above was written, a questionnaire issued by the Committee of Inquiry has been received. They preface it with the following remarks (*Vide* Sec. VII).

- (1) As regards part I of the reference, the questionnaire will not deal with the rights and obligations arising from the Treaties, etc. They will take advantage of the legal advice on the subject obtained by the Chamber of Princes and by other Princes individually.
- (2) They make it clear that they will not deal with the "past decisions" of the Paramount Power or the present differences between States and that Power; except in so far as they illustrate the existing relationship and to the extent, the Committee deem it necessary to do so.
- (3) The questionnaire deals with the second part only;—viz., the financial and economic relations of the States with British India.

The Committee has drawn up the questionnaire on the basis of information from Government Records, and mentions the several points of inquiry. These are all dealt with in Section VII of this work.

The important question of the procedure, which the States desire for discussion of questions in which the interests of the States and those of British India are not identical, has been referred to. The Chamber has proposed the appointment of a

Statutory Council for this purpose, with the Viceroy as its President and six Members; of whom three shall be selected or nominated Princes and the remaining three, independent European Members. The question is still under consideration. But the propriety of including the Viceroy in the Council will be considered, as it would be inconvenient for His Excellency, for obvious reasons.

27. While on this subject, we have the following observations from the *Times of India Weekly*. It states that the Indian States Committee will complete its work in England. It is certain that Sir Harcourt Butler's friendship with the Indian Princes and his high regard for their Order, has encouraged a considerable Section of them to raise questions of higher policy; and, a Meeting of the Standing Committee of the Chamber of Princes in Bombay on the eve of the departure of the Butler Committee to London, has lent color to the reports that the whole question of the future constitutional relationship between British and Indian India was under discussion; and even a provisional scheme had been discussed.

28. The Butler Committee cannot, however, entertain any such proposals, and there is no truth in the report that a number of leading Princes are proceeding to England, with a view to discussing the constitutional question with the India Office, and coming to some understanding. There might be some such feeling in certain State Circles; but these have been now removed. The Princes will not be given an opportunity to discuss the question with the India Office. In fact, the question of discussion will not arise, until the Butler Committee have reported, and the views of the Government of India and of the Local Governments have been obtained thereon. For, after all, they are to be the instruments for the working of any revised political relations, between the Paramount Power and the Indian States.

29. It is quite probable that Sir John Simon will re-

view the constitutional position of the Indian States, in evolving his plans of the political structure of India. For that, the Butler Report will be a good basis; but a scheme for co-operation between the two Indias will have to be worked out by Sir Simon himself;—no doubt in close collaboration with the chosen representatives of the Chamber of Princes. But that is for the present a remote event; and will not be a practical proposition till the Commission returns to India and takes evidence on British India problems; and after getting a fuller grasp of them turns its mind to the Indian States

grace of the Reforms will hardly reach those for whom it is intended.

Happily the people of the Indian States are quite free from these anxieties; and one would devoutly wish that they should remain so for ever, in their little Monarchical Constitution with all improvements gradually made by their Rulers.

APPENDIX A.

A proposed draft Scheme, for the Constitution of the Commonwealth of the United States of India.

The immediate need for such a constitution and its expediency, at the present juncture, appears to be clear. For "Unity is strength." A desire for it is bound to arise especially during the present times; when His Excellency the Most Noble Viceroy, has brought forward the question of the future relations of the Indian States with the future Government of India, at their instance.

2. Very opportunely the Right Hon'ble Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald has recently written an important article on "A United States of Europe" (Times of India, 8th September 1927). His suggestions therein relate to Europe. But they are indeed valuable, in many respects, to the Indian States at present.

3. From it the following important points are put forth:—

- (a) A United Indian States shall perforce be an ideal for Indian States, including their Princes and people; not for peace only, but also for happy and peaceful relations—
as between the States themselves
with the coming New Government of India, and
with the Imperial Government.

NOTE.—Indeed, during the palmy days of the height of power of the Maratha Empire, there was a sort of United States of India, for some time. It was a Federation, loyal to the common Maratha Empire; and each State had full powers of internal Government, yet ready to fight for the maintenance of the power and dignity of that Empire. But as that Empire began its downward course, the Federation gradually fell off from its trunk; and eventually became extinct.

The causes that brought about this destruction are matters of History. After the fall of the Peshwa's Government the British Government succeeded; and the separate Treaties with the individual States pulled the Federation to pieces. The reasons which compelled the British Government to adopt this policy then, no longer exist. The times have altered; so have the circumstances; and the situation is changed. The British power has been established for good; though

APPENDIX A.

the people of British India are going to obtain Self-Government within the Empire. Further, there are no grounds for fear of its disturbance from within.

- (b) Yet questions are bound to arise between the States and British India, affecting the interests of the States.
- (c) The evolution and development of the Empire and its maintenance on firm grounds have made it necessary now to strengthen each component part on solid foundations, for the well-being of the whole Empire, as well of its different parts. The Indian States form an important part of that Empire. Their union, therefore, on common grounds will mean "A United States of India." It would mean strength to themselves and an accession of their united strength to the British Empire; and God willing, for indissoluble friendship between the States and British India.

4. Mr. Macdonald has traced the history of the idea of United States of Europe from ancient days since 1519 A.D. He finds the basis of unity as being a spirit of humaneness rather than political agreements. Thereafter he finds the object of such unity to be—

- (a) to discuss different interests;
- (b) to pacify quarrels;
- (c) to throw light on and to oversee the civil, political and religious affairs; and
- (d) arrange for a common army and common Navy. Later on the idea included general arbitration, settling all questions, guaranteeing the security of each State and securing a common action against the State who would break the compact; and last, to found the commonwealth of Europe. From the idea of federation in juridical relations with each other, sprang up a common court of International Judicature. The present League of Nations is practically the result of all these attempts at Unity.

5. Mr. Macdonald treats all these as antiquated and fit only for a time of simple architectural thought. That may be so for Europe; but for the Indian States there is sufficient material in these suggestions, in their first attempt to develop the idea of founding the 'United States of India.'

(a) The spirit of humaneness contains a principle, not only not objectionable but such as would be recognised as the very first foundation of Unity. That means avoiding all sorts of quarrels.

APPENDIX A.

That means security of peace for the human race committed to the charge of the Rulers of the Indian States.

(b) The following principles can be adopted for the proposed Commonwealth of the United States of India with a few modifications and alterations:—

- (1) a discussion of common interests, and even particular interests, as between any two or more States;
- (2) arbitration or pacifying disputes;
- (3) to guide and advise,—and for that purpose to throw light on or to oversee the Civil, the political and other affairs of the United States as a whole; and,
- (4) to found a Commonwealth of the United States of India.

6. What Mr. Macdonald has himself to offer as his own suggestions will be seen from the following. He lays down certain cardinal principles, not found in the above. These are given below:—

- (a) *Non-interference* in the *internal* affairs of any State.
- (b) The Nationality of any individual State, however should not be a nuisance to any other State. That is Self-Government rightly understood;
- (c) The United States shall, therefore, be not a Federation with a common Parliament, but a common Council for common purposes of the States. The Self-Government of each State must be left to itself; and must be placed beyond dispute;
- (d) The Common Council of such United States will deal only—
 - (1) with the external relations, and not internal questions, and
 - (2) any disputes arising between any two or more States, as a Board of Conciliation and Arbitration; and
- (e) it should make it its duty to vindicate the existing independence of the States.

7. These principles are undoubtedly sound and extremely suitable for adoption by the Indian States for their new constitution.

8. Summing up the principles above enumerated we get the following: it provides an efficient key to the solution of the problem raised by His Excellency.

- (1) There should be a Common Council of the United States of India; in which each major sub-division should be represented.

APPENDIX A.

- (2) The basic principles, on which it should work, shall be—
a spirit of justice ; peace and humanity for the common good of all States with their subjects ; and, in full harmony with the spirit of perfect loyalty to the British Crown and of sincere friendship between individual States : and constant readiness to be friends with the Government of British India.
- (3) The constituent States shall form the Commonwealth of the United States of India.
- (4) A strict policy of non-interference in the internal affairs of each State shall be maintained.
- (5) Each constituent State will be at full liberty to maintain its own Nationality. This means the full right of each Prince or Chief to do, as he and his people desire to do with its own destiny ; receiving light and advice from the Common Council as occasion requires. But it does not mean that it can be a nuisance to others. The aim of such Nationality should be the happiness, peace and prosperity of its people. That in effect, is self-Government, under the protection of the Rulers and the Crown.
- (6) The “ United States of India ” shall therefore, not be a Federation, with a common Parliament. It shall be only a Common Council, for the purposes herein mentioned. The Self-Government of each State shall remain beyond dispute. It will deal only with external questions and not with the internal affairs. It shall deal with any dispute as between individual States, and with questions of common interest ; and, with such special questions as may arise, as between a State and the Paramount Power and British India, or later on with the New Government of British India. It shall be the duty of the Council to vindicate the independence of its constituent States.
- (7) Subject to the above mentioned principles, the Common Council of the “ United States of India ” shall have the power of :—
 - (a) discussion of (1) all questions of common interests as well as special interest as between the constituent States, (2) as between the States and the Government of British India, and, (3) interests between a State and the British Crown ;
 - (b) *arbitration* or settling of disputes of the nature above described between the States, and *negotiation* with

APPENDIX A.

a view to settlement of questions referred to in (a) (2) and (a) (3);

- (c) throwing light on all general questions arising in the United States; and also on any question in any particular State; and overseeing, *at the special request of that State*, such questions or matters of civil, political or of any other important character, as may be brought to the notice of the Council.

9. The above leaves the important question of the constitution of the Commonwealth of the United States of India and of its Common Council. The following suggestions in that respect are offered —

- (a) "The United States of India" should consist of Rulers as members, as are, by virtue of the terms of their treaties, recognised as (1) possessing full sovereign or quasi-sovereign rights over their States and (2) with Rulers exercising all executive and Legislative powers and (3) with full protection from the Crown from external and internal troubles and an obligation on the States of loyalty to the Crown and to help the British Government in times of need.
- (b) Thus constituted "The United States of India" shall form their common working council. These members shall elect the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and Secretaries. The Common Working Council will frame Rules for the conduct of its business subject to the approval of the General Body. The Viceroy will be the Ex-officio President. The working Common Council shall be representative of all territorial divisions.

10. Such a Common Council of the United States of India will at the same time be wise to obtain from the Imperial Government the help of the best experienced and tactful English Political Officers, for advice and guidance. This would be found to be especially expedient, when the present British India will be given full powers of Self-Government. Such help would be of immense value and influence in the negotiation and settlement of questions that may crop up, as they are bound to crop up, by the inter-relations between the United States of India and the new Government of British India. It will also be of an incalculable value in the settlement of questions between the Imperial Government and the Indian States. The advent of such a strength to the Council will advance the cause of real interests of justice and liberty, as it will be able to protect existing rights and interests of the States from unjust and improper interference.

APPENDIX A.

11. The benefits from such a Commonwealth of the United States of India would be incalculable. The present Chamber of Princes must doubtless be doing a good deal in this direction. But they may not search in vain in the above Memorandum for something that is bound to be useful and advantageous to the vital interests of the Indian States, and with that view, and with a view that they would be able thus to maintain in full vigour, the great link between them and the Imperial Government, it is, that this humble note of suggestions has been drawn up; and in this I feel deeply indebted to the very valuable contribution from the hands of such a great Statesman as the Right Hon'ble Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald, once the Premier of the Great British Government.

12. Such a United States of India and its Commonwealth would be a magnificent and dignified institution, in the Empire. It would form the core of a system of Government of the Indian States with the fullest support of the British Crown and Government. A unanimous proposal to constitute such a Commonwealth on some such lines as have been indicated above on the part of the Indian States, would certainly be welcomed and is bound to receive the full appreciation and recognition from the Imperial Government, who would not fail to bring about such a constitution by using if need be their influence to induce all eligible states to join the Commonwealth of the United States of India. The rule of eligibility need not be a rigid one. It should be framed to be elastic so that every state, large or small should join without making a fetish of individual dignity. The distinction of salutes, &c., should be abolished, if necessary. The only rule applicable may be that the Rulers to be members have powers of internal sovereignty or almost a sovereignty under advice or not.

13. The great Nobleman and Statesman, who is at present, under the Divine Providence, ruling over the destinies of this Indian Continent, will doubtless, be pleased to give this scheme his most sincere sympathies and support. Indeed as already noted, Lord Ellenborough, so far back as in 1853, has, when he was the President of the Board of Control then expressed his view of the position of Government with reference to the Indian States, thus: he stated then that—

“ I consider that in fact our Government is at the head of a system composed of Native States.”

This indicates that, it forms a part,—an important part,—of the duty and responsibility of the British Government to guide safely the Indian States in their desire for securing for their States, jointly and severally, perfect security, peace, amity, and good Government within, and good relations outside, with all concerned. That Gov-

APPENDIX A.

ernment will certainly, with such relations, help the Indian States in their desire to found the Commonwealth of the United States of India. The several treaties embody the most solemn pledges of friendship, and guardianship and a scrupulous good faith to maintain these. Such friendship indeed means everything for the welfare of these Indian States.

It is essentially necessary however, to create and maintain a sense of equality between all members irrespective of their dignity, in the honour of their salutes, in the magnitude of their resources, etc. An equality produces unity and when a Common cause happens to be discussed, unity becomes strength.

14. This memorandum is submitted for the earnest, careful and patient consideration of every eligible Indian State in the Country, small and great. The present times are favourable. The opportunities are great and important. A great Viceroy has come to India. His sympathies and those of the Secretary of State, of the British Ministry and of His Most August Majesty the King Emperor will be enlisted and their joint help would be simply invaluable. The Noble Viceroy is the Apostol of good, for all, who seek it of him. It is hoped that no Indian State will, from any cause whatsoever, let this fine opportunity slip off its hands. The foundation of a Commonwealth of the United States of India will be a great land mark in the history of this ancient country and a glory both to the States as well as to the Great British Empire.

Since writing the above the "Times of India" has published a Scheme prepared by the Chamber of Princes with the help of their Counsel Sir Leslie Scott. This is a provisional Scheme. It is comprehensive and an ambitious Scheme. Briefly, its main features are the following:—

Besides the existing Chamber of Princes, there shall be three statutory Bodies—

The first, is the Viceroy's Indian States' Council.

The second is the Union Council; and,

The third is the Union Supreme Court, for States.

All these are to be created by the British Parliament with the Royal sanction by a Statute.

Their constitution is thus described:—

The Viceroy's Indian States' Council is to consist of—

3 Princes or Ministers, selected or nominated by the Viceroy;

APPENDIX A.

2 Independent British Members unconnected with India ;

1 The Political Secretary of the Viceroy.

This Council will be presided over by the Viceroy. It will be a parallel Council for the States to the one of British India, presided over by the Governor-General,—which will have no Viceroy.

The Union Council will be a Joint Council of the Members of the Indian States' Council and the British India Council. It will meet to discuss matters, where there is a difference of opinion between the two. It will be presided over by the Viceroy not as Governor-General.

The Supreme Court is to consist of—

One Chief Justice : a Judge of wide experience ;

Two other Judges ; all British Officers.

All these Institutions will deal with State matters only.

The Indian States' Council shall have the Viceroy's present Political Secretary as the Council Secretary. This Council will be provided with a Secretariat. All the Political Records of the Viceroy at present in the Political Department shall be transferred to this Council ; and the Prince-Members shall have full access to them. It will deal with all State matters placed before them, in consultation with the Standing Committee of the Chamber of Princes and shall be guided by that Committee.

In the Union Council the Indian States' Council Members shall not be out-voted.

In the Supreme Court too the Standing Committee of the Chamber will exercise its influence.

The Chamber shall have its present powers enlarged by a statutory provision. The Scheme has not so far been approved generally by the States. The whole Scheme would involve an enormous cost. The question, who is to bear it, still remains a moot point. British Government will not pay it ; British India will refuse to pay it and the Indian States will be simply unable to bear it. It follows that it is not likely that the Scheme will be approved.

There is no authentic information available as to the proposed functions assigned to each of the three bodies ; but it is believed, that—

(1) The Indian States' Council with its President will look to the business arising from the States' affairs only ; and having regard to the fact that the Viceroy is tied down to these duties only, the *British Political interests*,

APPENDIX A.

seem to have no Viceroy to attend to them. All such interests are quietly excluded ; in fact, the Viceroy would be an Officer of the States only,—to protect their interests—and is to be accompanied by his Political Secretary, who shall also be a servant of the States. The British Political interests as such, separately and independently, shall have no existence. This can scarcely be allowed by the British Government. No Viceroy shall accept such a position. The whole of the Council would thus be the Servants of the States only and of their Chamber.

- (2) The Union Council too, it is said, is to be subject to the strong influence of the States Council: which, in its turn, is practically to act under the guidance of the Chamber's Standing Committee.
- (3) The Union Supreme Court, is to be a developed form of a Court of Arbitration. and is to decide judicial disputes between the States and British India and the Crown and between States and States. An appeal will lie to the Privy Council.
- (4) The Chamber would exercise a statutory and fuller control over the doings of the Indian States and over the Indian States' Council. In many other matters, it is said it will have very large powers in all State matters under the proposed Statute.

Such a Scheme as the above, is bound to be opposed, it is feared, by every one concerned ;—by the British Government, by the Viceroy, to whom it is stultifying and by the States who will be, under this Scheme, under the entire control of the Chamber of Indian Princes and its Standing Committee ; which again is made up almost of the Northern Princes. Such a proposal shall militate against the internal Sovereignty of the Rulers of the Indian States. The proposal starts from the Chamber or rather from its Standing Committee. These Bodies would seem to be desirous to obtain powers to exercise the fullest control over both ;—the Viceroy and his Council on the one hand, and over all the Indian States on the other. These States have been threatened already by the Indian Political Leaders and they would now find another power in the Chamber and its Standing Committee threatening to violate the sanctity of their internal Sovereignty ; and shall have to say ' Save me from my friends.' The Chamber and its Standing Committee desire to possess a power to intervene in the internal affairs of an independent State in cases of mis-government and flagrant injustice. That prerogative to intervene in such matters solely belongs to the Crown and cannot and ought not to be transferred to the Chamber,

APPENDIX A.

which may offer an opinion when referred to. The consequences of such transfer of this prerogative to the Chamber would be serious. A powerful political 'oligarchy' will have been created over the States. It is apt to be dangerous both to the States as well as to the Crown.

APPENDIX B.

The Times of India review of the growth and present state of the relations between the British Government and the Indian States.

His Excellency the Viceroy has raised the question of the problem of the future relations of the Indian States with the future Government of India and Mr. K. M. Panikar's work on the subject is an interesting reading. His Excellency has given a great importance to that problem. In reviewing the work, the "Times of India" makes the following observations:—

1. The Indian States were divided once into two classes : those created by the British Government and those that existed before the British Rule.
2. The absorption of the Indian States into British territories by the "Doctrine of Lapse" related to the latter class.

NOTE:—The accuracy of this statement can hardly be questioned as there are many instances of States essentially old, having been resumed for want of a direct lineal heir.

3. During the time that elapsed since 1858, when the Government of India was transferred to the Crown there has been a change of policy, and in the relations between the British power and the States. It was recognised that it was foolish to ignore the Princes ; as they were "Political Facts" of the hardest order.
4. Accordingly, endeavours were made to enlist their co-operation to make them feel that they were units, important units, not merely of India but also of the British Empire.
5. Such indeed, has been the declared policy of the last Seventy years.
6. But by degrees, *complicating factors were introduced.* These are:—
 - (a) The Government of India became more strongly centralized, and the Administration became more and more complex :

APPENDIX B.

- (b) It asserted, by slow degrees, its authority in spheres, where Indian States hitherto believed themselves unchallenged; these were transport facilities, banking, Military services and the like. In these, Government put forward its own claims.
7. The Princes were unable to discuss them or come to an agreement among themselves. And have been unable or incapable of resisting.
 8. The result was an increasing measure of intervention or interference in the domestic affairs of the States; and the spirit, if not the letter, of the original Treaties was not infrequently endangered.
 9. The Princes made representations of their grievances and at the same time set their own House in order as that was the main excuse for intervention, under the treaties.
 10. Then came the Great War; and on its heels, the Chamber of Princes, and their representation at the War Cabinet, the Imperial Conferences, and the League of Nations and the tide is now so strongly in favour of the Princes that Statesmen of England are now asking, not how to push things forward to whittle down their power, but how best their unique position can be conserved and utilised as a source of strength to the Empire in General and India in particular.
-

APPENDIX C.

AN APPEAL TO THE INDIAN STATESMEN.

*In the strain of a lay sermon addressed to the Higher Classes of society
by S. T. Coleridge, Esquire.*

One would very respectfully request our Indian Statesmen to find a little time to look at and ponder over the Creation. They already know, God has created it. They also know that God has established the testimony of His being there, and of His law; and that He has given to men a knowledge of both to be handed down from generation to generation so that they may set their hope in God; and not forget the works of God. The scriptures of every religion are the record of that knowledge. They contain the rules and assistances for all conditions of men and circumstances, for communities, no less than for individuals. They contain the character and design of the Work-Master; and the inference from these in the present case is too obvious to be overlooked, too plain, to be resisted. Is the record concealed? The answer would be "no"; it is an open book; 'as in the record so in Nature.' Let the rational functions of your intellect which is a Divine gift, be not suspended; to let it lie in slumber and disregard it is a sin. India is a land of *Light* for you. We have that light in every dwelling. The ignorance which may be an excuse for others, will be our crime. Our birth and denizenship is in an enlightened and spiritual land. It is the land of the Aryans. We are proud of our ancient glories and of the country; and if we fail to make the best use of what God has given us, why? that would be our shame; and our condemnation is bound to be all the greater. Please reflect on this. If you fail to do it, you will be to blame. It is not a question with the ignorant masses, and the majority of the labouring classes. You move in the higher class of society. You are educated, and are proud of that fact. You profess to be Statesmen. Pray avail yourself of the ampler means entrusted to you by God's Providence, to a more extensive and practical study for a wider use and application of His wishes, as they have been revealed in Nature and also in the scriptures. We have a right to expect from you a sober and meditative accommodation to our own present times and country, at this important juncture, (as you have doubtless been thinking to do), of those important truths in nature and in the scriptures, declared and illustrated, for the use of generations. Would you

APPENDIX C.

like to be in consciousness of being unequal to your station in your society? Certainly not, for you are quite equal to it. You are certainly conversant with the peculiar acts and constitutions of God, (as designed for the good of all), in this blessed land: whose Law executeth itself, and whose Word is the foundation, the power, and the life of the Universe, that revolves under law round its own centre. You are aware that it would not be right for you merely to hold it a requisite of your rank to show yourself inquisitive concerning only the expectations, plans and doings of statesmen elsewhere. One can rest assured that you cannot have looked in vain for a proportionate interest and instruction in Nature as in your holy scriptures, for the temporal destinies of men and Nations, stored up for our guidance; not the less will you delight to retrace the paths, by which Providence, has led the kingdoms of this world, through the valley of this mortal life:—paths engraved with the foot-marks of Captains, sent forth from God; Nations in whose guidance or chastisement, the arm of Omnipotence itself was made bare. Collate the present with the past, in the habit of thoughtfully assimilating the events of the present with those of the past, in all humility and without vanity. That will provide an antidote to the restless craving for the *wonders* of the day. That will provide a natural home and workshop of all the active virtues.

2. If we fail to study—the book of Nature, and the scriptural key how to read it, we render ourselves slaves of mere sense and fancy. Reason and religion are their own evidence. If we read history for the facts only instead of reading it for the sake of general principles, which are to the facts, as the root and sap of a tree for its leaves, no wonder, if we should find the result to be dangerous.

3. There are brains of three classes;—the one understands of itself the other understands as much as is shown to it by others; the third neither understands of itself, nor what is shown to it by others. Do not let people say as they often do in our times that there are more perhaps, who belong to the third class, more from vanity and acquired frivolity of mind, than from natural incapacity. Certainly you do not belong to that class; yet it is said that there are men among the highest class who, honoured with the acquaintance of the great, attribute national events to particular persons, particular measures to the errors of one man, to the intrigues of another, to any possible spark of a particular occasion, rather than to the true proximate cause, the *predominant emotional state of public opinion*. This they are less inclined to refer to the ascendancy of speculative principles, the scheme and mode of thinking in vogue.

4. In tranquil moods and peaceful times, we are quite practical, as events of the past few years have proved. Facts only and cool common-sense are then in fashion. But let the winds of passions swell,

APPENDIX C.

and straight way, men begin to generalise ; to connect by remotest analogies ; to express the most universal positions of reason, in the most glowing figures of fancy ; in short to feel particular truths as mere facts, as poor, cold, narrow and incommensurate with their own feelings. In periods of popular tumult and innovation, the more abstract a notion is, the more readily has it been found to combine, the closer has appeared its affinity with the feelings of a people and with all their immediate impulses to action ; for they are mere followers of leaders.

5. There are two distinct but immense advantages in particular rules and precepts ; which flow directly and visibly from universal principles, as from a fountain ;—though they do not at first sight seem properly conformed by reason, for they are reason itself ; also, in principles in act and profession,—disjoined from which and from the emotions that inevitably accompany the actual intuition of their truth, the widest maxims of prudence are like arms without hearts, muscles without nerves. Secondly, from the very nature of these principles, given in scriptures and observed in Nature, they are understood in exact proportion as they are *believed and felt*. The human race lives in faith. The regulator is never separated from the main spring. It is identical with its own being. This primal act of Faith is enunciated in the word “ God ” ; does that word ever occur with all it means to you in your present thoughts ? It is devoutly to be wished that it always does. Be it noted, however, that this is a faith not derived from experience, but from its ground and source, and without which the fleeting chaos of facts would no more form experience, than the dust of the grave can of itself make a living man. The imperative and oracular form of the inscribed scriptures and their illustration in nature is the form of reason itself, of all things purely rational or moral.

6. If then there is divine wisdom in that word, it must be distinguished from others as the supreme reason. For its knowledge is creative and always antecedent to things known. It must be on that account distinguished from the human mind, whose acts are posterior to the things it records and arranges.

7. Man alone was created in the image of God with immense potentialities in him : that is his position : that it is inexplicable to some is clear. Yet it is not difficult to trace the grounds of such conclusions convincing enough. However that is your proud position. A perfect calm judgment, best and discreet use of language,—the sacred gift of God,—never provocative in the presence of the gravest provocation or threat from others, are the ornaments of superior statesmanship. That is your right treasure. One would very earnestly beseech you to be a little more thoughtful, yet brave, in surmounting difficulties, avoiding rocks and shoals, and on the

APPENDIX C.

lines of least resistance. Your sound judgment would certainly help you to find out how to calm the seas, and prevent the surging waves that always destroy. Goodness is never wasted. All material things are perishable though they have doubtless their own use, but the spirit is imperishable. Material inclinations, therefore, come and go, working their own results. They need not be heeded. Spiritual goodness produces the best results ; but on the other hand improper use of words inflict wounds that take long to heal. They come out of indiscretion in untrained and weak minds ; and they are weak minds who unwittingly are caught in the grips of passion under the fair guise of patriotism, self respect, self defence, and public good. But all these can remain powerful, without passion, but with firmness and patience and strength of purpose with best use of words. We appeal to you to achieve the best in British India by those and like means ; and when you have done this and not till then shall be your time to approach and invite the Indian States to imitate you.

APPENDIX D.

A STUDY IN 'POLITICS.'

(From *Ralph Waldo Emerson.*)

'Nor kind nor coinage buys
Aught above its rate,
'Fear, craft, and Avarice,
Cannot rear a State,
Out of dust to build,
What is more than dust.'
'When the Church is social worth,
When the State-House is the hearth,
Then the perfect State is come,
The Republican at home.'

Is such a Republic possible to attain? It does not seem to be. Society is an illusion to *young* citizens. It lies before them in rigid repose. Names, men, institutions are rooted like oak trees to the centre. A statesman comes. He knows however that it is fluid. A strong will changes the centre, *for a time*; and he becomes the centre. But every man of truth and wisdom does so forever.

But politics rest on necessary foundations and cannot be treated with levity. Republics abound in young Civilians. They believe that any measure, though it were absurd, may be imposed on the people; if only, you can get sufficient voices to make it a law.

The wise know that foolish legislation is a rope of sand, which perishes in the twisting; that, *the State must follow and not lead*, the character and progress of the citizens; that they only, who build on *ideas*, build for eternity: and that *Government is the expression of what cultivation exists, in the population*, which permits it. So much *life*, as it has in the character of *living men*, is its force.

Nature is not democratic; nor 'limited-monarchical'; but despotic; and will not be fooled or abated of any jot of her authority, by the pretext of her sons. The history of the State sketches in coarse outline the progress of thought, and follows *at a distance*, the delicacy of culture and of aspiration.

2. The theory of politics considers persons and property, as two objects for whose protection Government exists. *Of persons,*

APPENDIX D.

all have equal rights, being identical in nature; this interest would seem to demand democracy. While this is so, their rights in property are very unequal. Personal rights demand a Government on the ratio of the census. Property demands a Government framed on the ratio of owners and owning. So property should make the law for property; and persons the law for persons.

But persons and property mix themselves in every transaction. It was, therefore, at one time, settled that proprietors should have more elective franchise than non-proprietors;—on the Spartan principle 'calling that which is just, equal: not that which is equal, just.' But again this raised doubts; as too much weight was given to property; as it allowed the rich to encroach on the poor:—especially as the whole constitution of property is injurious, and its influence on men deteriorating and degrading. The only interest for the consideration of the State is, truly, persons; as property will follow persons, that *the highest end of Government is the culture of men*; and *if men can be educated*, the institutions will share their improvement; and *the moral sentiment will write the law of the land*.

Society always consists, in greatest parts, of young and indiscreet persons. The old see through the hypocrisy of Courts and Statesmen. They die, and leave no wisdom to their sons. These latter believe their own newspaper. With such an ignorant and deceivable majority, States would soon run to ruin; but there are limitations, beyond which the folly and ambition of Governors cannot go.

Things have their laws, as well as men. Things refuse to be trifled with. Poverty will be protected. The farmer will not plant or sow corn, unless the chances are that he will be able to cut and harvest it. Under any forms, persons and property must and will have their just sway.

Personal influence has no boundaries. They are organs of moral or supernatural force. Under the dominion of an idea of civil freedom or the religious sentiment, when it comes, the powers of persons are no longer subjects of calculation. They can achieve extravagant actions. But if the law were to declare that all shall have power, except property, they shall have no vote. But by a higher law, the property will year after year, write every statute that respects property. This refers to all the property;—the joint treasury of the poor exceeds the accumulations of the rich.

The same necessity determines the form and methods of Government; proper to each Nation and to its habits of thought. They spring from the character and condition of people. *They may not be better, but are fitter*. The Western Nations may be wise in asserting the advantage in modern times, of the democratic form; but to other

APPENDIX D.

states of Society in which religion consecrated the monarchical, that, and not this, was expedient. That prevails in Indian people. Democracy is better for those whose religious sentiment of the present time accords better with it. Such a sentiment does not exist in India. Born democrats are no wise qualified to judge of monarchy; which, to their fathers, living in the monarchical idea, was also relatively right. But their institutions, though in coincidence with the spirit of the age, have not any exemption from the practical defects, which have discredited other forms. But strange and curious is the position of Reformers, who though living in a monarchical Government read of democratic institutions and are taken up by their accounts, and wish to change outright the form of Government, existing from ages past, against the will of the people. They hardly know that every actual State is corrupt. What satire on Government can equal the severity of the censure conveyed in the word "*Politics*," which, now for ages, has signified cunning, intimating that the State is a trick: The duties of the sincere Reformer are to try to remove the impurities that there may be and not to change the form of Government which has existed long to the satisfaction of the people.

3. The State divides itself into parties;—of opponents and defenders of the administration of Government. The same necessities and the same practical abuse appear in them. They are founded on *instincts*: which have better guides to their own humble aims than the sagacity of the leaders; there is nothing perverse in their origin: but rudely mark some real and lasting relation.

A party is perpetually corrupted by personality. They are of circumstances and not of principle. The vice of the leading parties is that they do not plant themselves on the deep and necessary grounds to which they are entitled: but lash themselves to fury in the carrying of some local or momentary measure, no wise useful to the Commonwealth. Sometimes one has the best cause, the other, the best men.

The spirit of the American radicalism is destructive and aimless: it is not loving: it has no ulterior and divine ends: but is destructive only out of hatred and selfishness. India will not allow herself to be tempted by it.

On the other side, the Conservative Party, composed of most moderate, able and cultivated part of the population, is timid and defensive of property. It vindicates no right; it aspires to no real good; it brands no crime; it proposes no generous policy; it does not build, nor write, nor cherish the arts, nor foster religion; nor establish schools of thought; nor encourage science; nor emancipate the slave; nor befriend the poor, or the immigrant.

APPENDIX D.

Thus from neither party, when in power, has the world any benefit to expect, at all commensurate with the resources of the nation. That beneficent necessity shines through all moral laws and we must trust it infinitely. Human nature expresses itself in them. Governments have their origin in the moral identity of men. Reason for one is seen to be reason for another, and for every other. There is a middle measure which satisfies all parties, be they never so many, or so resolute, for their own. Every man finds a sanction for his simplest claims and deeds, in decisions of his own mind, which he calls Truth and Holiness. In these decisions, all the citizens find a perfect agreement, and only in these. Absolute right is the first Governor; or, every Government is an impure theocracy. The idea is the will of the wise man. The wise man, it cannot find in nature. Therefore earnest efforts to secure Government are made by contrivance; as:—

- (a) Entire people to give their voice on every measure;
- (b) By a double choice to get the representation of the whole;
- (c) By a selection of the best citizens;
- (d) By confiding the Government to one, to secure the advantages of efficiency and internal peace; that one to select himself his agents.

All good forms of Government symbolise an immortal Government, common to all dynasties, independent of members, perfect when two men exist, perfect when there is only one man;

Every man knows the character of his fellows from his own nature. So long as he does what is fit for him and abstains from what is not fit, he and his neighbour work together to one end, for a time. But whenever he finds his dominion over himself not sufficient for him, and yet undertakes the direction of the other also, he oversteps the truth; and comes into false relations to the other. Love and nature cannot maintain that assumption; and it must be executed by a lie, namely by force. Such an undertaking for another is the blunder which stands in colossal ugliness in the Governments of the world. This is the history of Governments;—one man does something, which is to bind another.

The antidote to this abuse of formal Government is the influence of private character; the growth of the Individual; the appearance of the principal to supercede the proxy; the appearance of the wise man; of whom the existing Government is a shabby imitation.

That which all things tend to educe, which freedom, cultivation, intercourse, revolutions, go to form and deliver, is *character*; that is the end of nature, to reach unto this coronation of her King.

APPENDIX · D.

To educate the wise man, the State exists :—and with the *appearance* of the wise man the State ceases to exist,—in fact makes it unnecessary.

In our present society the influence of character is yet in infancy. Yet it is never nothing. Every thought which genius and piety throw into the world, alters the world. The very strife of trade and ambition are confession of this divinity. An unwilling homage is being paid to it in all quarters. That is because we know how much is due from us, that, we are impatient to show some petty talent as a substitute for worth. We are haunted by a conscience of this right to grandeur of character and yet are false to it.

But each of us has some talent, can do somewhat useful, or graceful, or formidable, or amusing or lucrative. That we do as an apology for reaching the mark of a good and equal life. But it does not satisfy us ; and we thrust it on the notice of our companions. It may throw dust in their eyes ; but does not smooth our own brow, or give us the tranquillity of the strong, when we walk abroad. If a man found himself so rich natured that he could enter into strict relations with the best persons and make life serene around him, by the dignity and sweetness of his behaviour, could he afford to circumvent the favour of the caucus and the press, and court relations so hollow and pompous as those of a politician ? Surely, no body would be a charlatan, who could afford to be sincere.

The tendencies of the times favour the idea of Self-Government, and leave the individual, for all code, to the regards and penalties of his own constitution ; which work with more energy than we believe, whilst we depend upon artificial restraints. It is purely a moral force ;—never adopted by any party, neither can be.

It separates the individual from all party, and unites him, at the same time, to the race. It promises a recognition of higher rights than those of personal freedom or the security of property. A man has a right to be employed, to be trusted, to be loved, to be revered.

The power of love, as the basis of a State has never been tried. According to the order of nature, which is quite superior to our will, it stands thus : there will always be a Government of force, when men are selfish ; and when they are pure enough to abjure the code of force, they will be wise enough to see how the public ends are answered.

We live in a very low State of the world, and pay unwilling tribute to Government founded on force. There is not a reliance on the moral sentiment and a sufficient belief in the unity of things, to persuade men, even among the most religious and civil, that society can be maintained without artificial restraints, as well as

APPENDIX D.

the solar system : or that the private citizen might be reasonable and a good neighbour, without the hint of a jail or a confiscation. ,

What is strange too, there never was in any man sufficient faith in the power of rectitude to inspire with the broad design or renovating the State on the principle of *right* and *love*. Thousands of human beings might exercise towards each other, as they often do, the grandest and simplest sentiments, as well as a knot of friends or a pair of lovers.

G. R. BHADBHADDE, B.A., L.L.B.
7 (18) Ganeshwadi,
Deccan Gymkhana, Poona 4.