

enjoyed innumerable benefits, it suffered as well under very many evils. Yet I do not certainly mean to pronounce an *unqualified* condemnation of the system of administration introduced by it, for the poet says—

The ills of wine you've sung—its virtues too,  
Pray kindly sing, if you can find a few;  
It is not over wise, though in the mind,  
To deny all science, to please the blind.—*Hafiz*

The maintenance of peace and order, freedom of the roads from highway-men and robbers, capture and annihilation of *Thugs* and *rogues*, construction and repair of roads, both for travelling and traffic, constant transmission of letters, even those of the poorest classes to the most remote parts of the country, suppression of civil wars and bloody affrays, the protection afforded to the oppressed, &c., these and similar other and many more benefits has the country enjoyed under British rule, never before enjoyed to the same degree under any former Government. But, if attentively considered, it will be apparent that these benefits, however inestimable in themselves, could not neutralize the evils I have referred to. Moreover, the benefits in question were chiefly enjoyed by women. They undoubtedly lived in perfect peace and security. They no longer saw their children falling around them in family affrays, nor their property plundered by thieves or *Thugs*. Their husbands and children were protected from the oppressions of the Collectors, and they were, in short, well off in a thousand other ways; and grateful for these benefits received and enjoyed, the women were perfectly loyal to, and stood firmly by, the British Government in its day of trial. Mahajans and tradesmen too, who had enjoyed prosperity under the British Government, were not in any instance found unfavorable to it. The truth is, no class of men was opposed to the British or unfaithful to it, but those who, in some way, suffered under its Government.

*Fourthly*—Neglect in matters which should have received consideration of Government.

*Cause 4th*.—Neglect in matters which, in the administration of the affairs of Hindoostan, should have been attended to by our Government.

In discussing the subject which in this place will engage my attention, though my remarks may meet with the disapproval of some of the authorities, I shall nevertheless speak freely and

Want of cordiality towards the Indians. without reserve. It is incumbent upon me to speak the truth in such a matter,

for what I allude to is a thing so all pervading and powerful in its nature that, not to speak of men, the very birds of the air and wild beasts of the forest are attracted and tamed by it. It is unnecessary to expatiate on the advantages of friendship, love, and union. Lord Bacon's *Essays* on the subject have left nothing unsaid. I need only state that the attachment which *should* exist between a Government and its subjects, is of more importance than what private individuals may bear towards each other. As one person contracts friendship with another, so ought Government with its subjects. Two individuals are considered as one and the same person, on account of the reciprocity of feelings and ideas which subsists between them. A Government, in the same manner, ought to identify itself with its subjects to so great a degree that both may appear one and the same body politic.

"The people are as the roots, and Government the tree,

"The tree, my son, acquires strength and firmness from the roots."—*S'adi*

Could not this have been accomplished by our Government? Certainly it could. For in the daily experience of life we do not unfrequently find the existence of friendship and unity between two races peopling different countries, and differing from each other in religion, habits, and characteristics; while on the contrary, we as often find two persons of the same caste, country, and faith, bearing towards each other feelings of inveterate hatred and deadly enmity. From this it is clear that persons uniting themselves in the bonds of friendship and union, need not be of the same race, country, or religion. How truthful and just is this prayer of Paul the Apostle—"And the Lord make you to increase, and abound in love one towards another, and toward all men, even as we do toward you". In other words, it impresses us with an idea of the importance of loving, not merely our neighbours and friends, but all mankind, even our enemies; and inculcates the necessity of daily

increasing our love and goodness towards our fellow creatures. And is not the precept inculcated by the Messiah, "Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you," equally instructive? Indeed the books of Moses and the Prophets have this object, and the end of the Messiah's lesson is simply the promotion of friendship and unity among all mankind. In short, no wise man will deny the importance and uses of love and union. These two are productive of many good results, and frequently succeed in checking the progress of evil. But it is to be deeply regretted that, up to the present time, our Government has failed to create this love between itself and its subjects.

Again it is a general rule, as regards love and affection, that it flows from the superior to the inferior, which is apparent from its influence not only on men but on the brutes. The love of the father for his son shews itself prior to that of the latter for the former. Similarly the husband begins to love his wife before she loves him and precisely on the same principle, when an inferior makes advances towards his superior, it is considered adulation or flattery, not affection. The object of these remarks is to prove that our Government should have first exerted itself to win the love and attachment of its subjects; for in that case, as all experience shows, mutual love would have attracted its objects to each other, and the latter warmly reciprocated the feelings entertained for them by the former, and become its staunch partisans and adherents.

"Love is that peace-destroyer which forced me to your dwelling."

But it is to be deplored that our Government has not succeeded in effecting this.

If the Government however asserts that all this is untrue, and that on the contrary it had done good, but received evil in return, I would leave the matter for its own decision. Had the Government shewn attachment for its subjects, they would certainly have returned it in a far greater degree. Love is that feeling of the heart which neither words nor skill can produce, and though sometime its existence may be ascertained from external signs, yet it can neither be described nor identified. But

the heart knows it well, and ever possesses a nice balance by means of which it can perceive its slightest increase or diminution.

"In this world hearts with hearts—one course approve,  
"With hatred, hatred's mated; with Love—Love."

Our Government has hitherto kept itself as far aloof and separated from its subjects, as fire [ought to be] from dried grass. They can be aptly compared to two broken pieces of stone. Notwithstanding that the Government and its subjects should have been so much attached to each other as to challenge comparison with a stone of variegated colours, which, in spite of its different hues, is in reality one and the same substance, the distinction between white and black is ever kept up, and the difference perceivable, is daily on the increase. A black spot on a white ground is charming to behold, white one on a black surface is not less beautiful.

I am not speaking here of injustice. Most assuredly it was the duty of the Government to show special attachment for its Christian subjects; but what I contend for is, that the Government should bear towards all its subjects that brotherly kindness, and should add to brotherly kindness that charity which has been so forcibly inculcated by the Apostle Peter.\* Now the European authorities in this country and the Natives were not of the same blood, and differed from each other in religion, habits, and ideas. Besides which there was nothing to bind them together, as there existed no real and sincere attachment for each other. Upon what grounds then did the former expect loyalty and fidelity on the part of the latter?

Let us now consider the condition of Hindoostan under its former rulers. The country was at first conquered by the Mohamadans, but during the Torkoman and Afghan dynasties, no order and tranquillity were established in it so long as no community of feeling existed between the rulers and the ruled. In the reign of the first Akbar, a very

\* "And to godliness, brotherly kindness, and to brotherly kindness, charity." II. Peter, 1-7.

strong feeling of attachment towards each other sprung up, and continued to exist throughout the reign of Shah Jahan, though during this latter period the country suffered much from mis-government. The evil effects, however, resulting therefrom were neutralized by the prevalence of that feeling of brotherly love which I have alluded to. In the year 1779, during the reign of Alamgir, this cordiality between the governors and the governed ceased to exist, and when the Hindus led by Sevaji, the Marhatta Chief, and other leaders resisted the authority of the Emperor, and rebelled against him, he became greatly exasperated at the conduct of his subjects, and issued orders to his Subahdars, directing them to oppress and persecute them, and to levy the *Jaziah* or capitation tax. The discontent that was produced in the country in consequence is too well known to require description. But during a one hundred years' rule, our Government has neglected to gain the attachment and good will of its subjects.

No one can deny that one of the chief causes of the stability and permanence of a Government lies in honoring the people over whom it rules, and in conciliating their affections. A man is more pleased when he is honored though he receive not much, than when he receives much, but is not honored at all. To dishonor one is to give him much heart burning and mortal offence. It is a thing that without producing any perceptible injury, breeds malice and enmity in the heart, and wounds it so deeply that nothing heals the sore.

"Wounds of the spear (*Sinán*) are quickly healed,  
"Wounds of the tongue (*Lisán*) are never healed"

Affection is the very opposite. It is that which transforms an enemy into a friend, makes friends more and more dear, and turns a stranger into a familiar acquaintance. It is that which tames the wild beasts of the forest and birds of the air, and makes them obedient. Its influences, on the subjects of a Government, therefore, are inconceivable. During the early period of the British rule in this country, there existed great affection on the part of the Government for its subjects, who were therefore much attached

to it, and were its staunch adherents. Undoubtedly our Government appears to have lost sight of this. The Natives of India, without perhaps a single exception, blame the Government for having deprived them of their position and dignity and for keeping them *down*. A Native of the highest rank does not receive that consideration and courtesy at the hands of a European of inferior position, which the latter receives at the hands of a Duke. Indeed it appears to be taken for granted that there is not a single *gentleman (sic)* in all India.

It is through the medium of the Covenanted Servants of the Government, who administer its laws, and who, in carrying out its orders, are brought into immediate contact with the people in the execution of their daily duties,—that the expression of the good intentions and the paternal feelings of the former are conveyed to the latter. How good and pure soever may be the intentions of the Government, the same can never find adequate expression, so long as its recognized public officers will not exert themselves in making them fully and unreservedly known. In customs, manners, and habits, the Covenanted Officials of former days were quite different from their brethren of the present day. The former used to show esteem and respect for the Natives of India in all possible ways, and thus secured their attachment. Like sympathizing friends they participated in their joys and griefs, notwithstanding that they occupied posts of great honor and respectability; and while on the one hand they managed to preserve intact the dignity inseparable from their high rank and office, they were on the other so cordial and affable to the people that all were lost in admiration of their conduct, and wondered how those so high in rank, and holding such dignified offices, could be so condescending and polite to all around them. Such was the conduct of the Officials of a former day towards Natives of rank and wealth, who undoubtedly followed in the footsteps of the holy Apostle Peter, and not content with showing brotherly kindness to all, added to it love and charity. The majority of the Covenanted Officers of the present day, however, are quite different

And to godliness, brotherly kindness, and to brotherly kindness, charity. II. Peter V. 7.

and officers of high rank, as well as the people in general, used to receive rewards in lands, money, dresses of honor, &c., on every suitable occasion. Titles were conferred on persons of rank and birth, who thereby rose in public estimation, and accordingly grew ambitious of performing great deeds. The Natives of India were very much attached to this order of things, as it had existed in their country for centuries past. But the British Government at once put a stop to this custom, and accordingly no subject, however deserving, could aspire with any hope of success to these public rewards. For this reason the people were desirous of a change of Government; and this desire was so strong in them that they were greatly delighted whenever a report was circulated that the period of the Hon'ble East India Company's Charter would cease and determine, and the Government of the country be assumed by the illustrious Queen of Great Britain herself. During the reigns of former kings of Hindoostan, rewards that were distributed to the people were generally of two sorts. The first included all those rewards which were conferred by the Sovereign on his own courtiers, or expended for the gratification of his libertine pleasures or desires. This of course displeased all, as it was simply lavishing rewards and prizes on mean and unworthy persons, and consequently could not but be productive of discontent and dissatisfaction. The second class comprehended all rewards conferred by the Sovereign on his loyal and faithful servants and officers, victorious generals, learned men and poets, councillors, mendicants, and other distressed persons. Every body expects and aspires to such rewards, and becomes discontented if they are not conferred. I admit that the practice of distributing rewards with too lavish a hand, deprives men of energy, and inclines them to luxury, and renders them incapable of carrying on trade. It may therefore be contended that the King, instead of withdrawing all inducement to labor by unnecessary and useless rewards, ought rather to give his subjects free scope for earning independence by their own exertions. But such a policy, however admirable, can be introduced only when the people have become somewhat better circumstanced, and better educated. They ought not to be driven, like wild beasts unchained, to seek food and water in the jungles.

The inevitable consequence of such a proceeding must be either their death, or the commission of such savage outrages, as distinguished the actors in the late rebellion.

Anger is a passion that blinds the mind to the real causes of any occurrence, and leads us to court revenge and oppress those who happen to fall under it. I admit that the outrages perpetrated in this country during 1857, fully justified the authorities in all that they did in exacting retribution from the people; but it is necessary to consider calmly and dispassionately what were the real dimensions of the rebellion at its commencement; why it attained its subsequent magnitude, and finally assumed such a threatening and dangerous aspect; and why in certain districts the ill-fated Mohammadans were more highly distinguished for disloyalty than the Hindus? It is a matter worthy of consideration that for centuries past, India has been in a state of commotion. Whenever any Chief or Prince proved victorious and obtained power, thousands of people flocked to his standard in the expectation of securing his favor. They did not consider it a crime to enter his service, whether as collectors of revenue or otherwise. There is a proverb current in India, to the effect that in taking service there can be no crime, for whoso employeth another, pays him for the service done [*i. e.* if there be fault, it lies with the employer alone]. There was certainly crime in the opinion of the Natives in refusing to obey or serve the Chief who supplanted his predecessor and occupied his place. It was a practice observed by the Chiefs and Princes who ruled over India previous to the establishment of British supremacy, never to injure or persecute those who gained their living by taking service, whether in a Civil or Military capacity. The same practice was in vogue among the people at large. Accordingly when the rebels gained power, and desired to give employment to the people, thousands who had been suffering greatly from want, and who wished to take service, readily embraced the offer. They saw nothing objectionable in their conduct, as they were employed for the service they professed to follow, and procured their living by. Following therefore the

ancient custom of their country, of obeying and bearing allegiance to the ruler of the moment, large numbers of otherwise well disposed men went over to the side of the rebels and espoused their cause. Again, numbers of Government servants who, for the sake of saving their lives, had outwardly favored the rebel cause, but who intended to return to their posts on the restoration of British authority, were held guilty, though there could be no doubt whatever that these men were at heart true to their allegiance. Many people, and Government Native officials too, who had either at once under compulsion, through ignorance or the frailty of human nature, implicated themselves in the rebellion, and who were under the impresson that their guilt, whether the result of accident, compulsion, or ignorance, would not be pardoned, but that they should receive condign punishment, were at last obliged to go over and swell the ranks of the insurgents. There were many persons, who though not actually guilty of acts of rebellion, gradually joined the rebel ranks, either through fear or from other considerations. In the course of the rebellion various acts were committed, which their perpetrators did not look upon in the light of crimes against the State. When the whole of the facts connected with the Indian revolt will undergo careful investigation, the two great races that people the country, will be found to have been equally guilty, and the state of the country during that eventful crisis bears sufficient testimony to the truth of this statement. The cause of the Mohammadans having been more guilty of sedition and disloyalty in certain districts was not merely that a Mohammadan King aspired to the throne of Delhi. They were not in reality as guilty as they appeared to be, and the authorities without consideration became greatly exasperated with them for acts which they were simply *supposed* to have committed. The opportunity was too good not to be taken advantage of by their enemies, who influenced by interested motives, mis-represented and exaggerated the particulars of every occurrence in which they were known to be concerned. The authorities, already prejudiced, became still more exasperated, and the Mohammadans more terrified and hopeless in proportion, and consequently they appeared more guilty than in reality they had been. There can be no doubt, however, that there were numerous examples

of Mohammadans being guilty of the fifth kind of rebellion already explained, and that they were very glad indeed at the prospect of a change of Government, for reasons which I have touched upon on more than one occasion. Notwithstanding all this, Government is aware that none risked their all, and exposed their lives in its cause with greater devotion. Before Almighty God, the real Sovereign of this Earth, as well as before earthly kings, to whom he has consigned it in trust, all are equally sinful and guilty. How just are the words of the Psalmist David:—“And enter not into judgment with thy

servant, for in thy sight shall no man living be justified.”\* And again “Have mercy upon me, O God! according to thy loving kindness; according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies, blot out my transgressions.

† Psalm LI., 1 and 2.

(2.) Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sins.”†

May God preserve Her Majesty the Queen for ever. I feel myself quite unable to admire in adequate terms the Royal Proclamation which she has been graciously pleased to issue. Certainly God's hands are upon Her Majesty's head, and this Proclamation, so full of benevolence and mercy, may be said to have originated under Divine inspiration. From the most remote ages of antiquity the Chiefs and Princes of India have been accustomed to offer their allegiance to the Sovereign, who, whether by right or usurpation, has taken possession of the throne and assumed the crown. Accordingly during the late rebellion this took place. When the ex-King of Delhi ascended the throne, and the fact was made generally known in the provinces, the people, looking upon him as their Sovereign, supported him. When, however, his ex-Majesty was captured, and the town and fort re-taken by our Government, people believed that, perhaps, with the exception of the mutinous soldiery, all would return to their allegiance. Contrary however to the general expectation such was not the case; but I do not consider it necessary here to enter upon an inquiry into the causes which prevented the consummation of so desirable a result.