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Cupalrao never forgot that we were conquered by the British. Expressing poignant grief at our discomfiture, he said, when the people of one country are conquered by another invariably, the conquered are treated as slaves and suffer a lot.¹

He examined the infra-structure of the Hindu society and spotlighted the social causes responsible for its degeneration.² He concluded that in the confrontation, our weak, unjust and internally divided society was overpowered by the British. For him, the significance of the defeat of the Peshwas and the simultaneous advent of British rule was not merely indicative of a political or dynastical change, but went far deeper - it was the culmination of the social weaknesses of the Hindus. Defeat of the Hindus at the hands of the British was not a singular phenomenon. In the past, before the British arrived on the scene Muslims too had conquered the Hindus, but throughout, the social system of the Hindus had failed to consolidate power and to counteract the aggression. Thus he found that it was the defective social system of the Hindus which was responsible for the political changes.
The British challenge was, however, so formidable that it not only gave a death blow to the rule of the Peshwas but introduced entirely new values and principles in contemporary society.

He pointed out that society was not well integrated. It was divided from within by inequality of men and women on the one hand, and by caste differences (e.g. Brahmins and non-Brahmins) on the other. The antagonism between Shindes and Holkars made any unified resistance to the aggressor impossible. In the absence of harmonious relationship, patriotism was no more to be found. The absence of cohesion among the Hindus created mutual hatred. The Brahmins hated Kunbis, Kulambis and even Prabhus; Sonars hated each other. It is significant that Karl Marx arrived at similar conclusion.

Gopalrao held that the shortcomings in the social system reached their climax during the rule of the last Peshwa who disregarded the development of scientific knowledge, neglected modernisation and ceased to investigate new avenues of knowledge. Tied down by credulity to customs and conventions, the Peshwa could not be absolved of the responsibility of paying attention to the advancement of knowledge.

He critically examined the different forms of government and concluded that the even political set-up
during the Peshwa regime was one of the causes of our subjection. As a strong critic of monarchy, he held that in the monarchical form of government the process of degeneration is accelerated. In order to justify his argument, he said that when Sir John Malcolm asked Dalajponent Natu the cause of the disintegration of the Peshwa's rule, he replied: "our kingdom depended upon an individual ruler and disintegrated with his defeat". From early times, on account of the monarchical form of government, Hindus had been accustomed to subjection and slavery and were ignorant of the benefits of self-rule.

Morale is a thing of the spirit, made up of loyalties, courage, faith and the impulse for the preservation of personality and dignity. It has been ascribed as a healthy frame of mind characterized by reality to a cause.

Gopalrao pointed out that when people are charged with patriotic spirit, even a single man can effectively fight a hundred men. As can be seen from the Ramayana even decapitated bodies continued to fight with courage. But Hindus lacked this feeling all along. Professor Seeley has shown that in the rproper sense of the word, India was never conquered by England. The people of India never united to oppose the British. Whenever one Indian State has been overthrown, it has almost invariably been, with the help of some other Indian state. There was no
Indian nation, and there has, therefore, been no real British conquest of India. No foreign power could conquer India if she were a true nation. 7

The tendency of our people, for all the time, to hanker after government employment itself proves that they had not incalculately the spirit of freedom. He held it as a sign of subjection and servitude. Paradoxically, he himself was government servant. Still instead of holding government service in high esteem, he said that it should not be accepted unless absolutely essential, and thereafter it should be abandoned. He regretted the tendency of the people to accord highest prestige to government service, 8 especially at the cost of trade and agriculture. Pointing out instances from history he said that till then the officers of the rulers regarded their service as a source of personal wealth. For him it was this servile attitude on account of which people were deprived of their independence. 9 It would appear surprising that a such a flimsy cause could result in the loss of kingdoms. In this context, however, Rajwade's thoughts are significant. He pointed out that when the general was killed on the battlefield, his followers used to flee from the battlefield. Foreign historians have interpreted it as a consequence of fear, but it was not fear which put them to flight, but the difficulty of finding another employer. 10 In the absence of patriotic
spirit, none was prepared for self-sacrifice in the cause of the nation. Rajwade further pointed out that even generals like Papu Gokhale were no exception to this rule. He also had outside interests. He obtained a certificate from a European. On account of the absence of patriotic spirit, the morale of the army was at a considerably low ebb.

Just as knowledge and wisdom are essential for preservation of the social system, arms and ammunitions are necessary for guarding it against foreign invasion. Copalearo fully understood its implication, that is why, while advocating pursuit of knowledge and wisdom, he did not underestimate the importance of force made effective with the help of efficient and up-to-date weapons. He pointed out that kingdoms do not survive merely on the strength of wisdom. He accused the earlier Hindu and Muslim rulers alike for neglecting modernisation in their methods of warfare, ignoring the importance of up-to-date weapons, and building up a uniformed and disciplined army. As for the Hindus, he said, they had to surrender in the face of the modernised methods of warfare adopted by the British.

Significance of superior weapons cannot be underestimated. At the same time, our weapons should not only be perfect, but superior to those of the enemy. Rajwade in fact, regarded superior weapons as an indicator of
superior civilization. He pointed out that the Europeans with the help of scientific knowledge invented precision guns and drove Muslims out of Spain and other European countries. The strong and extensive army of the Moguls was defeated by the Portuguese several times on sea only because they had accurate weapons. The Moguls of Delhi who used to frighten the semi-civilised Hindus with the help of the arms and ammunition but yielded to the superior force of the Europeans.  

Besides the social and political causes, Gopalrao also pointed out another cause for our subjection. He held the British rule as divine dispensation. He said that we could not improve ourselves that is why God had sent the British people here for our upliftment. The previous rulers being uncivilised, God has directed these good rulers for our benefit. The British rule, for him, therefore, was the manifestation of the will of God with a definite purpose behind it. He regarded the advent of the British as a manifestation of the will of God.

The idea of divine dispensation propounded by Gopalrao was likely to hurt the feelings of his contemporaries - more so of those who held extreme patriotic views especially as he believed that it was in the interest of India that she should remain within the British Empire. Of course this idea could be seen even in Balsesthrri
Jambhekar's writings who preceded, and in Ranade's writings who followed Copley. In general, almost all the thinkers in the nineteenth century had similar beliefs.

However, Copley's implication of the providential nature of the British rule requires careful consideration. In fact, what he suggested thereby is that the British conquest had given India an opportunity and time to rebuild, repair and renovate her economic and social structure before she regains freedom.
NOTES

English

3. Karl Marx observed: "How came it that English supremacy was established in India? ... A country not only divided between the Mohammedan and Hindu, but between tribe and tribe, between caste and caste; a society whose framework was based on a sort of equilibrium resulting from a general repulsion and constitutional exclusiveness, between all its members. Such a country and such a society, were they not pre-destined prey of conquest?" On India, P. 58

5. Quoted in International Relations by Palmer and Perkins, P. 76.

7. Quoted in New India or India in Transition, by H.J.S. Cotton, P. 130.
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Gopalrao expressed poignant grief at the loss of our independence. He investigated into the causes and nature of British rule, fully considered its implications and what is most remarkable, even visualised its end. He examined British rule from different angles, and in conformity with his social diagnosis, comprehended its nature comparing it with the previous political regimes in India.

It was no surprise for him that weak and ignorant as they were, Hindus were conquered first by Muslims and thereafter by Britishers. Hindus not only failed to protect themselves against the enemies, but also became weak on account of internal strife and dissensions. Not only did the people join hands in this internal struggle, but even the rulers participated in the misdeeds.1

He balm'd the erstwhile rule of the Peshwas for ignorance and tyranny. They never thought of advancement of their country or of promoting knowledge. They patronised only Bhats, Vaidikas and ignorant persons on the one hand, and Pandharis, acchhas, Thugs, thieves who were plundering the country, on the other. He expressed fear that if these people were to rule again, all the previous malpractices
would be repeated. Favouring British rule he said that if, instead of the British, other foreigners such as the Moguls or the French were to rule over us, their rule would have done much more harm to us.²

Gopalrao's esteem for the British people was neither indiscriminate nor unreserved. He pointed out that, though the British had defeated us, all of them have not conquered us with superior strength; nor were all of them wiser and more intelligent. Their wise leaders such as Elphinstone and Hastings, acquired the art of warfare even before they reached India.³

Gopalrao believed that the course of all events is controlled by the will of God, and is ultimately beneficial to human beings. Ignorant and undeveloped people, however, fail to calculate its favourable effects and take them to be calamities. In the long run, however, they are beneficial to human beings. With this belief in divine power, he argued, when Hindus became ignorant, deviated from true religion and inculcated unhealthy practices such as Sati, infanticide, maladjustment in the Varnas, aggrandisement by Brahmins, erotism and superiority complex, progressive people had been directed by God to take charge of us in order to improve us, as He found no better means for it.⁴ Gopalrao's belief in the providential nature of British rule is based upon this conviction. To him, God in his wisdom
directed British rulers, since there was no other alternative for making the people of India wide awake. The inconsistent ideas and beliefs of the Hindus must have enraged God who sent these people for our improvement. Gopalrao did not find anything wrong in it and argued that the British people had conquered them in conformity with the principles of justice, so that none could accuse them. Gopalrao suggested that the earlier Hindu rulers connived at the rise of British power in the beginning and thus enabled them to consolidate power. In the beginning, the East India Company sought permission from the Moghul kings for opening factories which was immediately granted and factories were accordingly opened at Surat and Calcutta. In the beginning they were smoothly carrying on their trade but gradually trouble started; when their trade was obstructed, ships captured by the native rulers and reparations demanded, they signed treaties with the authorities for facilitating trade, but even these treaties were violated. In 1757, 130 British people were put to death in the dungeon at Calcutta which compelled the British to adopt strict measures against the mischief-monger, and to strengthen their foothold on the Indian soil. For self defence, they had often to acquire the surrounding territory. In 1802, Baji Rao II deserted Poona, as the Holkar was plundering Poona and sought asylum with the British. Subsequently, though he was enthroned with British help,
he violated the terms of the treaty, and in 1817 even prepared himself for waging war against them. The British, however, defeated him and annexed his territory. His Hindu subjects were gratified by this act and (far from carrying on the fight) in turn welcomed British rule by honouring and presenting Elphinstone with a memorial in which they unequivocally greeted the British conquest of the Deccan.  

Gopalrao fully understood the economic motives of the British rulers behind the conquest when he said that the British people being poverty-stricken, had to wander in search of wealth, and for accumulating wealth, reached India. 

Gopalrao pointed out that the British rulers did not involve themselves in Indian politics on their own, but it was the inevitable trend of events which facilitated their entry into politics. The confusion and chaos which prevailed in the country paved the way for their success. 

Pointing out how British rule was a boon in disguise, he said that the British people had several qualities, and in order to teach these to Hindus, God had arranged that they should rule over us. He exhorted Hindus to take as much advantage of this relationship as possible. 

So deep was his faith in British rule that he warned that unless we were fit for self-government, it will not be fair for British rulers to return to their country before enlightening us; and if they leave us beforehand,
there would again be mismanagement, disorder, anarchy and insecurity of life and property. 'Might is right' would prevail and the weak would perish.⁹

Gopalrao examined at length the effects of British rule, which included its favourable as well as unfavourable aspects.

The favourable features of British rule as explained by Gopalrao related to peace and tranquility in the conquered territory,¹⁰ and to British liberalism.

Immediately after the defeat of the Peshwas, British rulers consolidated their power and the first task they undertook was establishment of peace. During Moghul rule, the corrupt rulers and sirdars gave a desolated appearance to the country, but soon after the advent of British rule, the people were gratified to notice their impartiality, efficiency and benevolence.¹¹

In the beginning, Gopalrao hailed British rule for the peace and security it created, and the absence of oppression of the ryots;¹² subsequently, however, he expressed dissatisfaction over their treatment of ryots.¹³

As for the liberalism of the British, he said that they had created homogeneity out of the heterogeneous elements, by bringing all the people under a unified rule; and by introducing railways which facilitated communication.
Together with the native languages, the employees of the East India Company were required to learn Arabic and Persian, so as to prepare their employees to shoulder the administrative responsibilities in different parts of India. They had encouraged opening of libraries and publication of books and promoted growth of wisdom among the people. It was through their endeavours that the \textit{sharmashastras} and books such as the Vedas were discovered.\textsuperscript{14} It was with their association that factories, machinery and the arts and crafts could be seen here,\textsuperscript{15} which have removed our deficiencies.

As for their tolerance, he said, though they followed a particular religion, they had not interfered with our religion. Gopalrao pointed out that in advanced countries, freedom to follow any religion is granted and nobody envies others on religious grounds. British people believed in similar principle and as a consequence, Hindus had received different types of freedom. If the rulers had been fanatics, it would have been difficult for us.\textsuperscript{16} In other words he appreciated their 'Secularism'.

British rulers had forbidden the evil customs and usages which were followed by the Hindu. Slavery had been made an offence and outmoded customs had been abolished.\textsuperscript{17} It was with their association that organised trade and commerce had been started.\textsuperscript{18}. 
British rulers, he continued, were taking pains for achieving our enlightenment.

Turning to history, he might have recognised our deficiency in the art of warfare. As pointed out earlier, he observed that the Hindus had to surrender in the face of the modernised methods of warfare adopted by the Muslims, and the Muslims in turn were conquered by the British on account of their superior weapons. Considering that the Hindus were deficient in defence equipment, he pleaded that the presence of the British was essential for ensuring security.  

He appreciated that British rulers were persevering for educating our people, as a result of which a sort of confidence has been created in the minds of the subjects. They kept the temples intact, and being enlightened and advanced, were trying to eradicate all evil customs and conventions.

Appreciating the frugality of the Europeans, he pointed out that they paid no attention to pomp and show, but sought perfection in work instead. Though they employed only a few men, they ensured that all of them are efficient in their work. In course of time, however, Copalrao revised his views.
It was on account of these aspects that he held that it was a piece of good luck that we had such rulers.\textsuperscript{22}

Copalrao referred to a general phenomenon as regards the relationship between the conqueror and the conquered. For him, it was a general tendency of the conquered to appreciate the customs and conventions of the conquerors and make them acceptable to a certain extent. The Hindus followed the customs of the British rulers while the latter refrained from following our customs.\textsuperscript{23} It was not a two-way traffic. While we adopted some of the traits of the rulers, they adopted practically nothing from us. This, in fact, was the pinch in his mind, which signalled the partiality of the rulers against the 'Natives'.

Five years after the introduction of the Queen's rule and liquidation of the rule of the East India Company, Copalrao expressed satisfaction over their treatment of the Hindus. As a result, he said that the natives had gradually advanced in education and economic growth; the rights as well as respect of the natives had also gained.\textsuperscript{24} Thus, his examination of British rule revealed several favourable features and resulted in its justification. At the same time, he did not connive at their defects, when he said that in general, respectable positions and assignments were not being untrusted to the natives, but argued that it was but natural under an alien rule. He optimistically
remarked that though such mutual distrust was obvious in the beginning, the rulers would entrust more responsibilities on us in course of time, after understanding us. Again as they had come here from such a long distance, sacrificing thousands of their soldiers, it was quite natural for them to look after their own benefit. 25

The Queen's proclamation brought the rule of the East Indian Company to an end, and gradually, the reforms based upon the former were introduced. Gopalrao, in 1964 pointed out that the time for introducing a democratic form of government in India was ripe. He also pleaded that this right had been endorsed by the Proclamation by introducing such reforms as were prevalent in their country viz. council, Panchayat for city development and administration of justice with the help of assessors. 26

Defects of British rule

Critics have accused Gopalrao for praising British rule all the while, but while eulogising British rule, he did not disregard its deficiencies.

He admitted that British rule was better than the previous one, but was uneasy to notice its growing despotic character which had to be suffered silently and acquiesced in as the gift of God. 27 He warned the
people not to think that the reforms introduced by the new rulers were unique and unknown in the past. For all the dazzling effect of external pomp and show, it was unfair to forget the achievements of our predecessors.

Gopalrao had watched the transfer of power from the East India Company to the Crown. He had also noticed the vindictive acts of British rulers in putting thousands of people to death only on suspicion. He even criticised the rule of the East India Company as more despotic than that of the Peshwa. As for the policy of annexation he said that under one pretext or the other, they seized the property of the native rulers and annexed all the states. As a result, people began to question the motives of the Company and finally lost faith in its administration. When the Company violated the basic principles of justice, the Queen's rule was established. Gopalrao welcomed the transition and hoped that at least after this event the injustice would be removed. He was, however, surprised to find that even the latter had not obviated the defects of the former.

When the Government, on the advice of the Inam Commission was not prepared to restore the inams, he dispassionately asked, "who should be trusted: the Governor's Council, the British Government, or God?" Comparing Dalhousie's policy with that of Allauddin Khalji, he remarked that the separate Inam Commission which the former appointed was
in fact a device of confiscating petty inams, jagirs and vataus.  

Elphinstone had expressed surprise at the absence of liquor shops in Poona, but gradually they began to increase. Gopalrao attributed this vice of drinking to the new rulers. He pointed out that under Maratha rule, addiction to drinking was regarded as a sign of degeneration, and the brewers were boycotted. The Maratha government could easily suppress the vice as it had no desire to secure any income from it. British rulers, on the other hand, keen on hoarding more revenue from it, were not inclined to ban it. He also argued that if prohibition existed in their own country, why should it not be implemented here also? Here Gopalrao appears to be mis-informed. Nevertheless, he emphasised that it should be the duty of the government to suppress this evil practice in the initial stages only. Prophetically he said that failure to suppress it in time would make it very difficult to suppress in course of time. Failure to pay attention to such a warning has created difficulties in prohibition enactments. So deep rooted has this vice become that mere prohibition enactments have failed to mitigate it. He commented that the brutish temperament of the British people was the consequence of their addiction to liquor and non-vegetarian diet. Besides the rulers, he also held the Shakte sect responsible for spreading the vice. He regretted that even Brahmins had succumbed to it.
He observed that the evil of bribery was rife among British administrators as well as the Hindus. The former were quite unacquainted with the local language and usages when they arrived here. They trusted their Sheristedar who did the entire work on behalf of the judge, and as a result, bribery prevailed. It was accentuated by the disparity in the salaries of the natives and the Europeans. The native Sheristedar received a meagre salary of fifty to a hundred rupees p.m., while the ignorant Sahib was paid an exorbitant salary ranging from two hundred to three hundred rupees p.m. The British officer entrusted almost all his work to the Sheristedar and the former's lack of knowledge about this country increased the chances of further bribery and widened its scope.

Gopalrao classified British civil servants into three categories. In the first category, he included ninety-five per cent of the civilians attracted to India by the inflated emoluments and returning to their country with abundant wealth. These people just enjoyed their stay here. The second category consisted of four per cent mediocre servants who carefully performed their jobs and supervised their subordinates. The last category contained only one per cent who had excellent calibre, were eager to attain perfection in their work and became truly interested in the welfare of the
inhabitants of their districts. Thus, he concluded that the character of administration depended not only upon efficiency but also upon the motivation of the rulers.

He noticed that some civil servants desired praise and were satisfied only with it. He complained that all important and responsible posts were taken up by the British people and only mechanical, manual labour was entrusted to the inhabitants of this country.

As for corruption among Indians, he admitted that it was on the increase. As stated earlier, the British government found some Kotwals corrupt and decided to appoint only Christians instead of Brahmans to responsible posts. This incident provoked Gopalrao to write his maiden letter in the press in which he criticised the policy of the Government pointing out that good and bad people existed in all castes and faiths and the government should employ only deserving persons with good family background. The principal defect in the system, according to him, was that the Sahibs, while offering employment paid no attention to the merits of an individual and as result the ryot was harassed. Ignorance of the native languages also added to difficulties.

The prejudice of British rulers against natives disturbed him and he complained that the Hindus were treated as outcastes and slaves under British rule, and
even though educated, were not given responsible positions. He appealed to the Government to act in such a way that their motives may not be misunderstood.  

He expressed the apprehension that the British people might settle down permanently in India, as they did in North America, and that this country would be pervaded by them alone.  

With the passage of time, the attitude of the British government towards Indians underwent a significant change. Successive famines in the eighties exposed the inherent character of British rule. The economic difficulties, especially of the weaker section in the agriculture, viz. the ryot, were aggravated. Gopalrao, as a result, remarked that though with the advent of British rule, educational advancement and peace has come about, material wealth had declined. He called these "dry benefits devoid of wealth." In comparison, he said that the earlier kings and emperors were wealthy in the true sense of the word, but under British rule there was mere talk of money. Salaries appeared to be inflated, (not of the natives, but of the British Sahib). As a result, wealth was being exported to their country. Previously, he recalled, there was at least sufficient scope and freedom for improvement, but subsequently that too was restricted.  

As for the effect of British rule upon trade and commerce, Gopalrao observed that in the beginning, roads,
bridges and ships were no doubt constructed, accelerating
trade, but in course of time that had to be abandoned. 45

He expected sympathetic treatment to be given to the
agriculturist at least in case of crop failure, and criticised
the government for neglecting the ryot even during this
critical period. 46 Expressing concern over the government's
policy of non-intervention in the predicament of the ryot,
he said that the surprising attitude of the rulers made all
the people indifferent. People were apprehensive whether all
the immovable property which they acquired with assiduous
efforts would eventually remain theirs for all time to come.
He was exasperated at despotic laws, bye-laws and municipal
taxes, local taxes and central taxes which were levied. 47 All
these impositions further discouraged the ryot who was already
leading a hopeless life. 48 Significantly, he made no distinc-
tion between the British rulers and the British administra-
tion.

He criticised the government for mobilising political
power in order to destroy our industries. As for the condi-
tion of the market, he remarked that it was flooded with the
Chinese and the British commodities only. The indigenous
paper mills had come to a standstill. 49

Describing the miserable plight of the people, he said that
apart from the fact that the ryot had become poor, the expendi-
ture on securing justice had tremendously increased as a
consequence of the disintegration of the old system of Nyaya Panchayat. The employment opportunities had declined. General poverty of the ryot had been accentuated by the wet and dry famines, in addition to the exorbitant taxes imposed by the government. 49

Gopaldas believed that the forests were the free property of the community. He made this explicitly clear in the Council by giving references from the old religious texts. 50 He pointed out that the forest acts passed by the government closed all the forests and deprived the poor people of free access in the forest for hay, wood and fuel. 51

He alleged that the government had created new machinery for exploiting the people by introducing the expensive judicial system of litigation in courts and officialdom. He wanted to revive the old judicial system such as, the Panchayat conciliation etc. for the settlement of disputes. 52

As a critic of British rule, he said that the people could not enjoy rights nor prestige in the country. The honesty of the government was questionable, their justice whimsical and based upon misinterpretation of law. Bribes and illegal gratification by way of presents were freely accepted by the government officials. He warned that if British rule tried to expand on these bases, its strength would certainly decline. He recalled that the native rule disintegrated on account of similar malpractices. 53
He pertinently observed that British rule had adversely affected not only ryots, but also the rich people. With the decline in the number of wealthy people, he expressed concern over corresponding decline in charity.54

British rule was an alien rule in which from the Governor to the Assistant Collector and from Commander-in-chief to the soldier, people of all civil and military ranks consisted of the British who had been recruited abroad. His specific objection against this practice was that thereby they were draining wealth out of this country. He, therefore, observed if there would be no difficulty they settled here permanently and did not carry wealth abroad.55

He regretted that British rulers disregarded public opinion because they had no faith in us and because they regarded us as inferiors.56 He, however, admitted that certain reforms were introduced by them but those needed and desired by the people had not been introduced.57 Perhaps Gopalrao here wanted to suggest that political reforms had not been introduced by them.

Pointing out the defects, he nevertheless, said, that the British rule had less defects as compared to any other rule.58 Still he held that the institutions created by them were not whole heartedly backed by them and restrictions of some kind or the other had been imposed upon them. As an example he pointed out that the Council of the Governor was
not independent. It merely performed the function of advising the Governor; besides, Indians were scantily represented in it. 59

**British and Native rule: a comparison**

Gopalrao referred to certain striking features of British rule and compared them with the native rule. British liberalism, democratic spirit and efficiency in administration deeply influenced him in contrast with native rule. He also referred to the defects in the British system vis-à-vis the benefits of the native rule. Though some of the points have already been referred to in course of his examination of British rule, as he himself has given a specific place to such a comparison it has become necessary to include it even at the risk of repetition.

As regards the liberalism of British rulers, he expressed satisfaction with the peace and tranquillity they had created and the order they had established out of chaos. He pointed out that being sympathetic, the British rulers made special endeavour for enlightening our people by establishing schools, adopting city improvement measures, instituting municipal committees, opening libraries, providing hospitals and similar amenities. The industrial development they had introduced with the help of mechanisation has developed skill and encouraged our trade and commerce. Naturally, they have proved to be so trustworthy that if anybody wanted to invest his savings, he invested it with British government.
The native rulers, on the other hand, neglected the intellectual advancement of the people. Whatever libraries and schools they had opened, were used only for pomp and show, they paid no attention to industrialise their state and were not, therefore, regarded trustworthy by their subjects.

As the same time, he was not a blind admirer of British rule, nor an indiscriminate critic of the native rule. He did not fail to notice that there was preponderance of examinations, grading, minimum qualifications etc. Only English was respected being the language of the rulers, while the mother tongue of the natives was ignored. In native rule, however, no undue importance had been attached to English, and no favour shown on that ground.

Copleyad the democratic spirit of British rulers, espoused their policy of gradual democratisation of India, and their respect for public opinion. Though all the laws framed by the British were not favourable to the people, people did enjoy liberty of expression. Every measure, he held, was directed towards the well being of the people. The clearcut division between private and public expenditure had created financial discipline and rule of law instead of autocratic rule, had been established. They scrupulously followed customs and conventions, respected their nation and had patriotic sentiments. Naturally people admired them. Consequently, India was never conquered by the British; it was, fought on the other hand, conquered with the help of the Hindus who among themselves, in favour of British rulers.
The native rule, he pointed out, was devoid of any democratic spirit; it has developed despotism and has been intolerant of liberty of expression. The rulers made no distinction between private and public property and treated everything as their personal wealth. There was no rule of law. Having lost confidence of the people, the ruler was unable to enlist the services of loyal and patriotic fighters, and the fighting forces often walked over to the enemy's camp and even fought for him.

He found that under British rule, Parliament was an effective instrument of controlling the government because ultimately its income and expenditure had to be approved by the Parliament. Under native rule, on the other hand, there was no such control over the despotism of the ruler.

Lastly, Gopalrao praised British rulers highly for the sound principles they laid down for administrative discipline. He pointed out that British administration was based upon the principle of division of labour, and the administrative responsibility regarding general administration, defence, education, public health etc. is shared by the experts in the respective fields. Government offices had been hierarchically organised without fear and favour. At every stage, safeguards have been provided in the administrative machinery.

Under native rule, instead of administrative principles, the sweet will of the ruler prevailed. Favouritism
led to recruitment of mean, unwise and selfish employees. There was no unity and uniformity of rules. When the ruler went on tour or inspection, several people accompanied him and unnecessary expenditure was incurred on pomp and show. Irrespective of merits, authority was vested in the people on the principle of heredity, and senior officers had to work under inexperienced youngsters. Justice was delayed, and lack of systematic administration led the native rulers to confusion and chaos.

Gopalrao justified the heavy defence expenditure incurred by British government by saying that it was essential on account of the fear of external aggression. For meeting this expenditure, he explained, systematic organisation has been evolved and upto date accounts were kept for the loan advanced by the government. Under native rule, he pointed out, there was no necessity of incurring heavy defence expenditure, or borrowings; there was no inclination to utilise this amount for the welfare of the people. Wealthy people and moneylenders were reluctant to extend any further loan to the native rulers as they had lost faith in them.

Being an experienced judicial officer, he was perfectly aware of the deficiencies of the British administration. What cut him to the quick was the sense of racial superiority among the rulers. He complained about the exclusive attitude of the rulers. All the responsible and remunerative posts were reserved only for the British and yet they made a show of
impartiality. On flimsy grounds and upon biased recommendations of inexperienced officers, those who had spent their entire life in government employment, were suspended. Gradually the laws became oppressive, taxes exorbitant and the agriculturists unhappy.

As for native rule, he said, the rulers treated others as equals and respectfully. There were definitely employment opportunities and absence of burdensome taxes, no indiscriminate punishment and no oppression. 60

Significantly, after the commencement of the Constitution the states have gradually acceded to the Indian Union and the picture has changed altogether.

End of British rule

Gopalrao's praise of British rule was the result of his experience, but at the same time, he did not disregard its nature. He fully understood the alien nature of the rule and even discerned its limitations. He never thought that foreign rule would be a permanent feature but its elimination, according to him, would be a gradual process effected by a variety of factors.

He believed that British rulers had secured this territory in conformity with the principles of justice, and feared that if they left this territory before enlightening the inhabitants, they would be guilty. For him, good
government depended upon education. He did not want to make the foreign rule a permanent feature, hence he said that the British should shoulder the responsibility of educating us as the child is brought up till it becomes self-supporting and then left free, once the purpose is served. This, according to him, was the real duty of British rulers. They should however, continue to rule till the wisdom necessary for self rule is acquired by their Indian subjects and they abrogate bad habits. Soon after this, however, the reins should be made over to the people. If they leave us prematurely, several difficulties would crop up. Gopalrao here pointed out that wisdom was the sine qua non of self rule.

Soon after attaining wisdom, he thought, the people would start asking for a democratic form of government and they would tactfully and gradually ask British rulers to give us a parliament as they had secured one in their own country. People's participation in Parliament would establish our wisdom and they would ask for additional rights. When the Hindus form a majority, the alien government would have to yield before it, and people would get more rights. When our people govern themselves ably and discard corruption, gradually important posts would be entrusted to them and they would rise even to the level of occupying Governorships. Then the British people would be reduced to their previous position as traders. Our people would then enjoy Swaraj and Parliamentary self-rule. Subsequently, our importance in
governmental and commercial matters would be enhanced and our foreign trade also would increase. The people would consolidate their power and oblige the British for some time on account of their intellectual support hitherto extended to us. In case, they try to create disturbances and impose an unfair act, our people would secure independence on the lines followed by the Americans; and would ask the British people to return to their motherland and tell them that we had now secured wisdom, that we know how to govern our country and that we no longer want their leadership. They could be allowed to remain here only in the capacity of traders. We would defend our own country. Thus, their sovereignty would cease. Gradually, step by step, people would secure access to positions of power in self-government and become perfectly free. Gopalrao perhaps believed that the social dynamics could not be hastened and imagined that this process, being a lengthy one would take at least two hundred years. 63 Nevertheless, there was no doubt in his mind about its eventual occurrence. He emphatically claimed that it would definitely take place. 64 It could be seen from his analysis that he did not want British rule forever. For him, it was not an end in itself, but a means of attaining wisdom.

Besides, he visualised the end of British rule in an unusual way, apart from the enlightenment of our people. He said that if there was a discord between British government and the East India Company, the Governor-General would usurp
the power and British people would settle down here only, and would not think of returning to their country. Our people would be wise and enjoy equal rights — equal with British people — and they too would not segregate themselves from us. After living for two or three generations together continuously in this country, they would get assimilated with us, presumably on the lines of America. Otherwise, he continued, if the French closed the sea route connecting India with Britain, the British would be compelled to settle here and consequently they would be interested in this country.

In this analysis, however, it has to be admitted firstly, that he overlooked the factor of race when he talked of their assimilation, and secondly, he failed to comprehend the purpose of the British conquest. It was, in fact, an expanding civilization seeking markets for its produce.

As an apostle of knowledge, in the ultimate analysis, he said that when the Hindus discard folly, God would order British rulers to return to their country. Thus, along with education, the influence of divine will still dominate his thoughts.

It was, nevertheless, an act of extreme optimism that British rulers would easily concede the demand of a Parliament for India, and leave the country of their own, even after enlightening us.
Gopal Rao fairly correctly comprehended the connections between the British and the Indians. How close their contacts were, could be seen from our decision to remain in the British Commonwealth even after Independence.
7. Dr. Tara Chand explains the extraordinary phenomenon in three phases: "In its first phase, the East India Company's activities were confined to trade; in the second phase, the Company entered into armed conflict with its European rivals, established its trade monopoly and acquired political influence in India. In the third phase, which began with the battle of Plassey, the Company combined commerce with conquest and in both achieved success beyond its dreams."
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62. By Hindus, Copts refers meant Indians in general.
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CHAPTER 10

POLITICAL REFORMS

Gopalrao examined the infra-structure of the Hindu society, and besides social reforms, advocated political reforms. He, however, held that social reforms should precede political reforms. He was not however, an impatient reformer. He appreciated the difficulty in introducing social reforms as he believed that social development was a lengthy process which could be accomplished by deliberate efforts.

He pointed out that British people strove hard for centuries together and with perseverance formulated their laws and improved their political institutions. It was through knowledge that they attained glory. Being an optimist he anticipated that we could also rise to such a height in future.¹

Gopalrao has been criticised for indiscriminate flattery of British rule and British people but, in spite of his commendation of it, he never forgot its alien nature. He was fully aware of its limitations and its impact upon our polity. He believed that ignorant as we were, we lacked the capacity of defending ourselves and invited foreigners for our defence.
If we attain the intellectual height, secure self-government, behave impartially like the British people, and if the entire administration is entrusted to our people, he believed that our rule would be a hundred times better than British rule, or even surpass the Ram Raj. Thus while eulogising the British he did not degrade our people. Fully recognising the significance of freedom, he said that it was unique and incomparable.

While advocating political reforms, Copley tried to investigate the origin of the state and the need for the ruler.

Origin of the State and need for a ruler:

His views about the origin of the state bear resemblance to St. Augustine’s when he said that the origin of the state could be found in thieves and robbers. The plunderers when they gain victory, become kings. He did not, however, think the state to be a superfluous institution. On the other hand he emphasised its need and traced its roots to human nature. Had all the people been honest and trustworthy, there would be no need of a ruler. He argued that if people had not become envious of each other, if they had enjoyed the fruits of their own efforts and followed the divine principles, neither the king nor any ruler would be necessary. But either out of laziness or out of selfishness some people relinquished their efforts and began to maintain themselves with the fruits of
stealing and murdering. This created uncertainty everywhere; and put everyone into difficulties. People thought it necessary to appoint someone who could bring the anarchy to an end. The person who was appointed for this was the ruler or the king. Gopalrao here suggested something akin to what Hobbes said about human nature and the origin of the state. Gopalrao as such, appears to have upheld the theory of Social Contract. Nevertheless, there is a significant difference between Hobbes' and Gopalrao's concept. Gopalrao regarded the state as a necessary evil and while he regarded it as improper to be controlled by a ruler, he saw no escape from it. People agreed to pay a part of their wealth to the ruler, which he received as tax, and in return he agreed to serve the people. The duty of the ruler was to defend the people and, as he received financial support from the people, lavishness on his part amounted to theft. Making an exception of British rulers, he said that fortunately they utilised our wealth for improving our condition - especially for our educational advancement.

Gopalrao pointed out that if all the people abided by moral principles scrupulously, government was redundant. It was, therefore, human nature, which necessitated government. In its absence, all the people would plunder one another, contend with one another and wage wars which would create uncertainty all around. In fact, man is gifted with talent and intelligence and these should be utilised for beneficial
purposes. But Gopalrao regretted, it was generally used otherwise. Thus, every society needs a ruler. On the basis of this analysis, he tried to interpret political institutions in the light of human nature. The nature of the ruler, he pointed out, depends upon the character of the people and their institutional set-up. As the people in Iran and China lacked administrative efficiency, democratic government was not feasible there. Barbarians need a strong ruler. Wise people keep the power to themselves, and instead of depending upon the ruler, they depend upon themselves. Thus, Gopalrao held that the people get the government they deserve. He also accounted for differences in the forms of government: Some states being despotic and others democratic. Consequently, in Iran, China and Russian, there was autocracy while in England and America, there was democracy. Further he distinguished between the British and the American forms of democracy. In England, though the Queen's rule was hereditary, it was controlled by the people, while in America, there was a different form of democracy. He, however, did not explain at length the difference between the two. He concluded that unless the ruler was responsible to the people, he was not likely to act properly. Sometimes temperamentally, or on account of the absolute power he enjoys, the ruler might tend to be corrupt. In case this happens, Gopalrao pointed out, the influence of law and parliament would be brought to bear upon the ruler. He
found that the significance of this principle had been fully recognised in Western countries. 11

Duties of Government

Gopalrao was an individualist. He gave a charter of duties of government which would promote welfare among the people:-

1. For protection of person and property, the government should maintain army and police force. He, however, was not prepared to place the entire responsibility for it upon the government. Besides he wanted the people's cooperation in this connection.

2. Justice should be so administered that the rich could not exploit the poor. It should not be partial, corrupt, delayed, difficult or expensive.

3. The system of taxation should be equitable and the burden should be kept at the minimum. Neither the rich nor the poor should feel it burdensome.

4. The government should evolve a system of promoting education, though efforts in this connection will have to be put in by the people. The responsibility of opening schools and workshops should be mainly with the government.

5. Commercial activities, manufacture of machinery, building of roads, bridges, chetas etc. should be
especially promoted by the Government as such activities are not likely to be undertaken by private individuals.

6. Public morality should be safeguarded and traffic in liquor, opium and similar commodities detrimental to health should be suppressed. Of course, in order to accomplish this, the government should adhere strictly to the ethical principles.

7. The government should grant freedom of petitioning. People must be free to suggest whatever reform they think desirable. Again they should have freedom of speech and freedom of the press to a certain extent.

Gopalrao held that prodigality was not the essence of good government. He suggested that indiscriminate expenditure could never promote the well being of the people. He warned that if the government did not take the initiative in creating favourable conditions, people themselves would bring them about. He warned of the possibility of the occurrence of revolution in that case.

As an individualist, he wanted minimum state interference. He said that the key to the working of the government was that the less it works, the better it is. He wanted to increase the sphere of the rights of the people. He tried to justify extreme individualism when he expressed the view that he in principle favoured a stateless society, but as
there were practical difficulties in it, he suggested the via media of restricting the role of the government to the minimum. At the same time, he argued that the responsibility of propagating knowledge especially among the poor should be shouldered by the government. 12

Self-Government and decentralisation

Gopalrao not only wanted to reduce the role of the government, but at the same time he wanted to introduce self-government, based upon decentralisation. As for decentralisation, he said that judicial administration, police administration in cities and villages, and legislation should be governed by the people. Explaining how the character of the government depends upon the character of the people, he said, in an illiterate country, the government acts either as parent or as a thief. In a partially advanced country, it is a friend and in advanced countries, it is regarded as a servant; and the expanding authority of the state is controlled by the people. 13

Gopalrao also laid down the limits of state interference. He said that there should be no law passed until the necessity for it is fully established, because every law is an encroachment on the liberty of people.

Reverting to British rule he said that if natives were given a share in the government much discontentment could
be avoided and people also would find some way for their improvement.\textsuperscript{14}

Gopalrao went a step ahead and made a very bold and radical suggestion. He pointed out that as the laws were framed by distant foreigners who did not know the environment, these become troublesome to the people. For surmounting this difficulty, intelligent natives should be given equal rights while framing legislation in the Parliament; otherwise Parliament should be established in India.\textsuperscript{15} It appears that he was not satisfied with a nominal representation of the natives in the Council which existed in his time.

As he found the administration of justice extremely expensive, as if it was a device for exploiting the poor ryot, he advocated restoration of the ancient \textit{Panchayati} system in place of the prevailing judicial system.\textsuperscript{16} Soon after the advent of their rule, the British made a radical change in the system of administration of justice and introduced courts. It was at variance with the Pre-British Panchayat system which Gopalrao favoured.

\textbf{Local Self-Government}

Gopalrao was a champion of local self-government. Lord Ripon's Resolution of 1982 is regarded as a landmark in the evolution of local self-government in India. As pointed out earlier, Gopalrao, as early as 1965 had argued
that judicial administration, legislation, cities and villages and police administration should be entrusted to the people in order that they may enjoy freedom.\textsuperscript{17} Further he said that the ryot was gradually securing freedom, but the taxes were exorbitant. He advocated that these should be levied with the consent of the people. Minor differences in the village should be settled locally. Unless this type of local freedom was granted, we could not say that the ryot was free. Nevertheless, he did not ignore his principal thesis, that for enjoyment of freedom, wisdom was essential so that people properly understand the nature of village administration.\textsuperscript{18}

As a sympathiser of decentralisation and local self-government, with the declaration of Lord Ripon's Resolution in 1882, Gopalrao vigorously supported its introduction into India; and criticised those who opposed it by saying that Indians lacked the necessary wisdom for local self-government. He called them wicked\textsuperscript{19} and pointed out that internal differences were rampant everywhere. It was but natural for an evolutionary reformer like him to stress the importance of local self-government especially because he regarded it as a gateway for further political participation. He, therefore, said that proper working of local self-government at the hands of our people would pave the way of their progressively increasing participation in politics.\textsuperscript{20}
For him, local self-government had an educative value; it was not an end, but a means of attaining further stages of freedom such as the establishment of Parliament. He regretted the general apathy of the people towards the benefits of freedom, and held the alien rule responsible for this predicament. He pointed out that in England people enjoyed all types of freedom while the king was merely a figurehead.

The meaning of Revolution

Gopalrao constantly thought of bringing about political freedom. A revolutionary thought might possibly have occurred to his mind for effecting our freedom. He, however, attached quite a distinct meaning to the word 'Revolution'. Negatively speaking, he said it was not merely a rebellion. When people attack each other either for revenge or looting poor ryot, it was called rebellion. But revolution was not rebellion in this sense. In Europe, the spirit of nationalism being dominant, the citizens constantly thought in terms of their nation, and in case the king or his ministers misruled, they took steps to remove the latter. This was possible in their country, because of the spirit of patriotism. In our country, however, as the king was regarded as God incarnate, such revolutions could not be conceived of. Of course, he admitted that religious reformation instead of political reforms had been undertaken here - with the exception of Shivaji, who led a true 'revolution', to emancipate and restore Maratha rule from the clutches of the Muslims who had usurped the power
for about five centuries. Thus, he clearly distinguished between 'revolution' and 'rebellion'.

He believed that in general, as Indians were accustomed to be ruled by despotic rulers, they did not understand the true meaning of 'Revolution'. Revolutions took place in countries where people were wise, educated, and had developed fraternal feeling for their countrymen. As such, a revolution was not likely to take place in countries like India. Gopalrao favoured a similar 'revolution' in India.

A Parliament for India

Gopalrao's thought has been centred around the phenomenon of loss of freedom which he considered from several angles. He was constrained to notice that the people here were ignorant of the benefits of freedom. He pointed out that the rule of the East India Company did not permit our people any freedom which the proprietors enjoyed in their own country. He appreciated their political institutions and explained the principle of responsibility observed in England: with Parliament as a legislative body and the King in Council as an executive body. He held that separation of powers had been maintained in principle. The power of levying taxes had been vested in Parliament and as such, it was the people who practically governed the country. He favoured the democratic form of government instead of the autocratic form. In case the democratic form was accepted
in India, he believed, our people could eventually be appointed to responsible posts. The notion of the separation of executive and the legislative was a part of the liberal tradition which Gopalrao imbibed.

Gopalrao, in the beginning was rather over-optimistic. Six years before the renewal of the Charter of the East India Company in 1854, he remarked that as the people would become wise in the meantime, all the people should come together and send a detailed petition to the Queen, explaining how the rule of the Company was in no way beneficial to the Indians and pleading that on the basis of equality with British people, Indians too should be given Parliament here. He proposed Bombay as the proper venue for it. As for the method of representation, he said that it should be a representative body consisting of one elected representative from each city and two from each district; with the Governor at the head of it. As a liberal thinker, he wanted all castes to be equally eligible for being represented at the district level. The representative elected by the people should not only be wise in general, but be wise in the art of diplomacy, and should be elected irrespective of caste and creed. Of course, he fully understood the limitations of petitions, and for active efforts he suggested that some people should be asked to go to England for accelerating the reforms. Unless such steps were taken, he believed, no improvement in our condition could be effected. This would have a favourable
effect: it would eliminate poverty and the misconception in the minds of our rulers about our ignorance. This would facilitate introduction of desirable reforms and the benefits of a democratic form of government *vis a vis* the autocratic form could easily be demonstrated. Equality would be promoted, and the differences which disintegrated the Hindu society would wither away. He hoped that people would appreciate this course of things as willed by God.\(^23\)

Besides this, Gopalrao visualised another picture. Soon after our people become wise, they would ask British rulers to grant Parliament in India like the one in England. After getting experience in this Parliament, they would ask for equal rights. When the Hindus prove their majority, British rulers will have to grant the Parliament. If the people ensure proper administration of their affairs discarding corruption, responsible posts like Governorship would also be entrusted to them and as explained earlier, the British people would live here only for trade and commerce. The Indians would repudiate the sovereignty of British rulers and bring into existence a new and perfect government. No doubt this was a time-consuming process, estimated by Gopalrao to require two centuries\(^24\) but he was confident that at the end of the period it would be achieved. He asked, if there can be a Parliament in England, why should it not be in India?\(^25\)
Thus as a gradualist, he started from a representative body like the Council in India, and ended with Parliament, which would definitely achieve for India the status of a free and independent country. But this had necessarily to be a gradual process, because for running the government of a country, he regarded that people should possess certain qualities gained from acquiring knowledge in schools, considerate action, absence of caste differences and parochialism, and the sentiment of fraternity.  

He also suggested that if Parliament was established here by the grace of God, the government should be run with the consent of the people, and one of his contemporaries such as G.V. Joshi, alias Srvajaneek Kaka, would be useful for the purpose.  

He traced the Hindu obsession with government employment to the former autocratic regimes. Hindu religion, he pointed out, had been conducive to this tendency because it always recognised the king as uncontrollable; but the times had changed and this form of government had become an anachronism in an age of democracy. He found that the best form of government was the one prevailing in the United States. Probably he wanted to suggest that democratic republic was the best form of government; next came the 'mixed' form prevailing in England, and then the various forms in other countries. The rulers of the countries in Asia, he
continued, oppressed their subjects. Examining all the forms of government, he recommended the democratic form of government which increased happiness of the people. He pointed out that the laws should be formulated by those who would be affected by their application. Corruption was the greatest hindrance to the rule of law.  

As an antithesis of the democratic form, he held that the autocratic government was the worst form. Turkey, China and Iran, on account of their ignorance, were not developed and as such were unworthy of comprehending the democratic form. England was favourably disposed towards democracy because of the general wisdom of the people and enlightened leadership, able to control the eventual despotism of the rulers: Parliament being the gateway of democracy.

He favoured the democratic form as a safeguard against the despotism of the rulers. In a despotic rule, whether the government was good or bad was the reflection of a good or bad ruler. If the ruler was wicked, the people were doomed. One, however, cannot always expect good rulers. For example, he said, that in the beginning landlords used to influence the ruler, but when the ownership of land became hereditary, landlords become oppressive. Here, Gopalrao suggested that when the kingship becomes hereditary it becomes uncontrollable and oppressive. He criticised the principle of heredity in political and social spheres alike.
Towards the end of his career and after a close study of the effects of reforms introduced by the British, he felt that the time was still not opportune for pleading for further reforms. He found certain fundamental difficulties in their practical operation. He pointed out that though British government had introduced reforms such as legislative council schemes like town improvement, institutions like Panchayats and appointment of Indian assessors, ignorance was the greatest impediment. All such reforms were nullified by the attitude of the people. He explained that when committees were appointed for improvement of villages, the members of the committees did not work properly. People were very apathetic towards the work of the representative bodies as the work involved was honorary and without financial benefit. The Panchayats always complained that it was compulsory for them to serve and wondered why they should bother about the unremunerative work. In particular, the wealthy people dissociated themselves from the institutions under one pretext or the other. Moreover, they were quite ignorant of the working of the Panchayat. Besides, the advice tendered by the members of the Council was not binding on the Governor. This he believed, made position of the new system of local self-government and the council precarious.\(^3^2\)

As for the people, he regretted their general indifference and interest in the cause only if they derived direct monetary benefit out of it. They had, therefore, no regard
for the honour bestowed upon them or for the general well-being. Restriction of castes and untouchability came in the way of working on these bodies along with others. The Brahmins obsessed with superiority complex said: how could they get along with the members of other castes such as शिम्पासा (tailor), वाणि (petty trader), or गावंडी (Mason). All were self-centred, and nobody was prepared to cross the boundaries laid down by his caste; as a result, patriotism had ceased to exist.

Gopalrao suggested the requisites of self-rule. He said that for self-government ability is required. Good schools, modern advanced and up-to-date knowledge, capacity for mature deliberation, absence of differences on the basis of caste and religion, a fraternal attitude towards the ryot—these were among the requisites essential which alone would enable us to work with the ryot. What Gopalrao thought to be the requisite of self-rule were in fact the pre-requisites of an ideal democracy.

Considering these, he suggested that until we realise our basic homogeneity and discard our ignorance, it was not fair to have power bestowed upon us.  

Thus, Gopalrao was not an antagonist of India's independence, what he was against was premature independence to those devoid of ability to carry out the basic responsibilities involved in it.
N.R. Phatak has hailed him as the first advocate of India's independence; while Acharya Javadekar praised him as the first thinker to place before the Marathi readers such views about revolution and democracy. He pointed out that Gopalrao's views were more progressive than those of the contemporary Bengali reformers.
NOTES

English

4. St. Augustine in 'City of God' says: -
"For what are robbers themselves, but little kingdoms? The band itself is made up of men; it is knit together by the pact of the confederacy; the booty is divided by the law agreed on....."
Quoted by William Ebenstein in 'Great Political Thinkers', P.173.

8. Thomas Paine writes:-
"The more perfect the civilization is, the less occasion has it for government, because the more does it regulate its own affairs and govern itself...."

22. As is well known, even Montesquieu made similar observation, which is not borne out by fact. There is, however, no evidence to indicate that Gopalrao had read the Spirit of Laws by Montesquieu.

29. Thomas Paine said:-
"As America was the only spot in the political world where principles of universal reformation could begin, so also was it the best in the
natural world. An assemblage of circumstances conspired, not only to give birth, but to add gigantic maturity to its principles. "Rights of Man, Part II, Introduction.

30. Bentham also was a strong admirer of the United States which he considered only "pure democracy" in existence. "Ebenstein, Great Political Thinkers, P. 500."
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ECONOMIC THOUGHT

Although Gopalrao was not an economist, he understood economic ideas and fully realized the necessity of making efforts for economic development.

Gopalrao studied the problem of poverty of India historically as well as analytically. In the former analysis he enumerated the causes of poverty before the advent of British rule while in the latter he dealt with poverty as its consequence. He attributed pre-British-rule poverty to our social deficiencies and the post-British rule poverty to the alien rule.

Pre-British-rule poverty

Gopalrao held social factors responsible for the poverty before British rule. He pointed out that it was the inertness of our people which led them to poverty. Moreover, restrictions on voyages introduced by the Hindu religion circumscribed their experience. The Hindus failed to understand the true meaning of wealth, its use and the methods of its acquisition; and remained economically backward all along. They incurred exhorbitant expenditure on religious occasions like marriage and thread ceremonies and spent lavishly on dinners to thousands of Brahmins. Again
wealthy people made idle investment in ornaments. Irre- pective of income, some people regarded lavishness as a sign of prosperity. The fatalists laboured under the misconcep- tion that wealth was a consequence of good fortune rather than of effort, and developed inaction. With particular religious bias, Hindus believed that wealthy people being virtuous, reached heaven.

In his analysis of poverty, Gopal Rao did not ignore the means of acquisition of property. He criticised Hindus for acquiring wealth by unfair means, and pointed out that it was not the outcome of their efforts. Had it been the product of their efforts, they would not have spent their wealth indiscriminately. The wealthy people were plunged in the dark depths of ignorance, so that instead of investing money in trade and commerce, they used it for buying orna- ments, which always created a problem of guarding them from thieves and robbers. Either the servants of the wealthy people stole their money, or their stupid sons foolishly squandered it or their wives eloped with ornaments. Moreover, when their sons were assured of their subsistence, they not only remained aloof from society but fell into bad ways. ²

Along with individual tendencies, Gopal Rao held the institutional set-up responsible for our poverty. He pointed out that the system of joint family retarded the development of trade and commerce. In this system, only one person earns
wealth and the rest just spend it. The earning member also feels proud of it, but soon after his death all his dependants are rendered homeless and they actually become beggars. Thus, he explained how the system was detrimental even to the development of individuality. Gopalrao's criticism of the joint family system was not indiscriminate. He also acknowledged its advantages viz. accommodating the weak and disabled members in the family and of promoting self-help among them.  

He also explained how the lavish expenses in marriages were incurred merely for prestige, irrespective of one's capacity to spend, which sometimes permanently indebted them and led to miserable life. Again, pilgrimages constituted a waste of effort as well as money. Many people even disposed of their immovable property or borrowed money for it. These actions, Gopalrao believed, neither promoted happiness of the individual nor did they increase the wealth of the nation.

Gopalrao had shown his historical bias and traced how ornaments came to be used. He pointed out that in the beginning, abundance led to excess of production over consumption. People being ignorant, spent their money on ornaments. Apart from this, absence of trustworthy banks, shops and industries curtailed investment opportunities. As a result, they invented a novel method of accumulating wealth by preparing different types of ornaments. Individual prestige came to be measured on the display of ornaments on one's person. Gopalrao wanted all the wealth to be used as capital
for augmenting wealth. Ornaments, on the other hand, he said, are worn out in use, and no interest could be earned when money is sunk in ornaments. Apart from these monetary disadvantages of ornaments, he pointed out another non-monetary disadvantage. He said, when ornaments are put on the person of the children, servants steal them or even kill the children. Ornaments reduce the mobility of the wearer: he cannot go out of his home; his business slackens. Gopal Rao concluded that in general, use of ornaments was much more detrimental to the nation as a whole rather than to individuals.

As for the economy he said that use of ornaments had curtailed our investment opportunities and as all the wealth was tied up in gold and silver big companies and business concerns could not be established. He significantly asked; how can a Columbus appear in India when all her wealth is imprisoned in ornaments only? He said that joint stock companies could not be established in India only on account of this tendency. 6

After 1860, American Civil War had boosted up India's cotton manufactures and wealth flowed into India. 7 Gopal Rao insisted that it should be utilised for the economic development of our country.

He pointed out that in keeping with the spirit of the times, it was essential to be economical. 8 As our predecessors lived in affluence, they could afford to spend on good
workmanship and pompous ceremonies; but as the wealth had depleted to a great extent, he wanted the expenditure to be curtailed drastically.

Post-British-Rule Poverty

While analysing India's poverty as a consequence of British rule, Gopalrao pointed out that in the beginning the Moguls, and subsequently British rulers, drew upon our national wealth, and acted as parasites. They had found their way in this land of plenty. They did not come here for any labour, but for exporting wealth from this country. Naturally, as they hailed from the ruler's class they were not expected to toil and moil like the natives, hence all influential and remunerative posts were theirs for the asking. Thousands of soldiers came here and ate into our vital resources. The foreigners, being talented, wise and strong, did not face any opposition. Gopalrao thought it paradoxical that in spite of adequate rainfall, famine existed, making our people poor and destitute. He further complained that the British people had not only reduced our employment opportunities, but also taken over our trade and commerce. As for the previous governments, Gopalrao said that though they were ignorant, despotic and extravagant, all our wealth used to remain within the country. In British rule, however, the wealth was being exported beyond sea. Significantly, in 1849, Gopalrao pointed out that wealth was being exported out of India.
Though he complained of the British people taking over our trade and commerce he appreciated the superiority of their knowledge and technique which reduced the cost of production, and price of their commodities. As a result, except food-grains, everything including clothes, umbrellas, scissors, watches, clocks, carts, etc. were manufactured in foreign countries. 11

Again Gopalrao did not ignore the part played by export of wealth to England. He said that in return, we were getting schools and railways. Instead, had the wealth remained in India, it would have been utilised for unproductive purposes such as ornaments and feasts. 12 He emphatically said that the phenomenon of export of wealth cannot be denied and squarely placed the responsibility for our poverty on the foreign industries. He also admitted that though educational opportunities were extended day by day, we had not achieved anything substantially in the industrial sphere. 13 On the other hand he believed that we were becoming increasingly dependent upon foreign commodities like printing presses or paper and thereby serving foreign markets at the cost of ours. 14

In the early phase of British rule, Gopalrao continued, roads, bridges and ships facilitated trade and commerce, but subsequently such constructive activities too came to a standstill.
As a protagonist of protection to Indian industries, Gopalrao pointed out that while opium had been taxed, American cotton, and British products such as iron and glass were imported without levying any duties with the result that they were enabled to conquer our markets. Our paper mills too had to be closed down. 15

Gopalrao made a searching and thorough analysis of the poverty of the agriculturist under British rule, soon after the devastating famines in Maharashtra. According to him, the exorbitant land revenue and the money-lending Acts evidently aiming at protecting the interests of the money-lenders were the principal causes of this predicament. He pointed out that the poor agriculturist had become destitute and was unable to maintain his family. With all the efforts he puts on the land, the fruits were seized by the government and the moneylender. This, he argued, was the consequence of misgovernment and indifference to the welfare of the people which had impoverished the agriculturist. Moreover, the condition of other professions was in no way different from this one. 16

The land revenue, he pointed out was determined and increased seven-fold when the share market was boosted due to the American Civil War. But this proved to be a temporary boom which lasted for six months only. Though prices dwindled subsequently, the valuation of land remained
exorbitant due to such faulty assessment.17 The position of the agriculturist further deteriorated after the famine of 1867.

Apart from these phenomena, he also pointed out that the judicial system had become expensive and its procedures time-consuming during British rule. As all the judicial work was conducted in English, a pleader was needed on a daily payment ranging from one hundred to two hundred rupees. As a result, for recovering a single rupee, expenses to the extent of four rupees were required to be incurred. Thus, as the agriculturist was on the verge of ruin, the government had to pass debt adjustment and debt relief legislation. This indicated that economically the agriculturist was worse off under British rule. Further, when government officials came for inspection, the agriculturist had to bear the cost of compulsory hospitality.18

Thus, the agriculturist was impoverished, the cost of justice had increased, employment opportunities had dwindled, dry and wet famines left him in a state of perpetual hunger, prices had increased and taxes had become unbearable.19 Government in turn paid no attention to his precarious condition and showed no mercy to him even when there was crop failure.20 The Forest Act passed by the Government made the forest out-of-bounds for him and thereby deprived him of free access there for fuel.21 He held that
Hindu law made forests, hills, rivers, sacred places, temples, seas and tanks free property of the public.

He pointed out that in old days, the agriculturist had several incentives for developing his land, but under British rule, his position had become desperate. It was becoming increasingly difficult for him to maintain himself on his small piece of land. Agricultural had therefore, been subjected to innumerable hardships under British rule. The position was more precarious where British rule had been introduced earlier. His analysis led him to the conclusion that the agriculturist had lost his freedom under British rule. Further, Gopalrao expressed surprise how under such adverse circumstances, the agriculturist could remain alive at all.

Presenting the overall picture of the economy, Gopalrao said that the condition of trade was precarious because the market was flooded with foreign commodities and foreign competition has brought our paper-mills to a standstill. The farmers' hand that once so proudly and firmly held the plough now held the begging bowl in shame and desperation, all the military services had been reserved for the British people, other employment opportunities also had come to a nought. Employment of European barristers in the courts left no scope for any Indian barrister. Thus Indians had been deprived of opportunities everywhere: in agriculture, in commerce or in employment.
Economic Reforms

Gopelraco was not merely a dissatisfied critic; as a constructive thinker, he suggested economic reforms.

At the outset, he warned that if Hindus, specifically the Marathas, had to improve their position they must discard their contemporary customs and conventions and devote themselves to new discoveries. Resourcefulness, education and morality, according to him, were the principal means of increasing wealth. He wanted conscious efforts to be made for it.

Aware of the immobility of the Hindus, he advised them that instead of following hereditary occupations, they should follow other profession of their liking. He made a preferential arrangement of different occupations: Agriculture, commerce and employment were the three sources of income out of which agriculture was foremost and the best, commerce the second best and employment or service, being inferior, the last. At the same time, he pointed out that special efforts should be made to promote industry. Thus though he theoretically gave first place to agriculture, considering the hardships experienced by the agriculturist in those days, he might have in practice, given first place to industry, specifically when he said that trade was the best occupation out of the three.
As Gopalrao was closely watching the impact of the industrial revolution in England and her economic prosperity and resultant political supremacy, he suggested comprehensive measures for industrialisation in India. At the same time, he had also studied the problem of poverty and recognised the difficulties in utilising the common man’s wealth for this purpose. As a result, he placed the entire burden of industrialisation upon the wealthy people; and argued that if they expended their trade, secured mechanical know-how and technique from the British people, much improvement could be effected.\(^{32}\) Gopalrao even went ahead and suggested that if they were not prepared to industrialise, the responsibility should beShouldered by the government.\(^{33}\) He wanted industrialisation as he believed that if trade and commerce flourished, employment opportunities would increase.\(^{34}\) He advised that the fillip given by the American Civil War should be properly utilised by our people. Moreover, in order to make up the deficiency of capital investment, he suggested that personal ornaments should be sold and the proceeds utilised for installing steam engines which would increase further the wealth of our nation.

Gopalrao fully understood the implications of imperialism. As a result, though he theoretically expected the government to promote industrialisation, he also perceived that no help could be expected from an alien government in this regard.\(^{35}\) He predicted that Asia and America would
compete with British market and capture it. How he foresaw that Asia would excel British market cannot be explained; nevertheless, it is a fact that in course of time the American manufacturers ousted British commodities in several respects.

Gopalrao was fully aware of the importance of livestock especially in a country like India. Appreciating the significance of cattle in agriculture, he said that the main cause for diminution of cattle was cow slaughter; and recommended its prohibition not on sentimental considerations, but on purely economic grounds. Recognition of this thought is found in Article 48 of Constitution of India in the form of Directive Principle of State Policy which states that the state shall strive to prevent slaughter of useful cattle, i.e. cows, calves, and other milch and draught cattle.

Believing charity to be an unproductive waste, he suggested that it should not be extended to the Brahmins, or the ablebodied. It appears that Gopalrao was in favour of extending charity to the weaker sections. Money intended for being spent on sacrifices, pilgrimages and dinners should be diverted to agriculture. Charity should be extended to the learned and to those who propagate knowledge. As for the extravagance at the marriage ceremony he suggested that marriages should be performed very economically. What Gopalrao advocated was prudent expenditure.

He pointed out that though there were abundant resources in our country, these could not be exploited for lack of funds.
The deficiency could be made up not only by economy, but also by utilising the proceeds from ornaments for manufacturing cloth, mirror, paper, in our own country\textsuperscript{42} and hoped that our people would acquire the British technique and produce commodities like them.\textsuperscript{43}

He counted longevity as one of the factors in economic development. He pointed out that longevity enables children to secure employment of their choice and makes them self-supporting. He recommended that medical research should be undertaken to increase longevity.\textsuperscript{44}

Believing that the system of joint family was conducive to idleness, he advocated individual family system, but at the same time warned that the duties to our brethren should not be neglected.\textsuperscript{45}

If the Brahmins wanted economic prosperity, he wanted them not to be superstitious and not to hanker after priestlyhood or clerical employment but to follow other professions.\textsuperscript{46}

As for the relief to the agriculturist, he suggested that his tax burden should be reduced by levying taxes according to his income and making remissions according to his capacity.\textsuperscript{47}

In addition to the above methods, Gopalrao also pronounced an extreme method: He warned that when people were exploited, they become violent. When the ryot is against
the ruler, hot-tempered people gather together and form societies which are ready to undertake any drastic measure, and as a result, he continued, socialists, communists and nihilists have emerged.48

As a measure for curtailing export of wealth, together with industrialisation, he suggested a radical measure viz. 'Swadeshi' so that wealth might remain in our country.49 He significantly asked: "If paper, mirror, steel articles and similar commodities were imported by spending crores of rupees on them, why should we not manufacture them ourselves?" 50 Further he remarked that manufacture of these articles was one of the best means of promoting happiness among the people.51

When Gopalrao observed that all our markets were flooded with British commodities, his reaction was natural. He showed a thorough understanding of the drain of Indian wealth; and remarked that this condition adversely affected our trade and restricted employment opportunities of our people. To obviate this, Gopalrao suggested that all our people should commonly swear52 that whatever is produced in our country only will be consumed; whatever its quality. He appealed to Purusha and Heridasa to make special efforts for popularising this movement.53 In this connection, as already pointed out,54 Gopalrao subscribed the entire amount he received while at Ahmedabad, towards promoting indigenous invention. What he advocated here was 'Swadeshi'.
Nevertheless, he was not satisfied with mere 'Gwedeshi' he went ahead and even advocated boycott of foreign commodities in order to boost our trade. He said, mirrors, clothes scissors, wooden furniture, and watches should be manufactured in our own country and their excess production exported to other countries. Imports from England should be discontinued forthwith and instead our commodities should be exported there. Nevertheless, he was aware of the limitations of our industries. He, therefore, said that it did not matter much if we had to use inferior products in case of boycott. He believed that this would give an indirect protection to our industries and create additional employment opportunities within our country. As an exception, he could permit import of commodities which could not be produced within our country.

Gopalrao himself summarised the measures to be taken for our economic advancement as follows:-

1. Indigenous capital should be fully explored and utilised for investment.

2. Expensive customs and traditions should be replaced by prudent ones. Economy should be secured in performing ceremonies and savings should be accumulated.

3. No charity should be extended to the able-bodied. This will compel them to seek employment and, as a consequence, national income would increase.
4. Use of foreign commodities should be restricted to the barest minimum and the habit of using foreign commodities totally abandoned in order to give incentive to our manufacture.

5. Machinery should be installed so that thousands of people could find employment opportunities.

6. People should receive education in different branches such as medicine, engineering etc. through the government-recognised institutions and secure government employment so that wealth might remain within the country only.\(^58\)

In his economic reforms, Gopalrao stood firmly for industrialisation. He advocated curtailment of unproductive expenditure in order that it could be profitably utilised for capital formation and further economic development. This need has been acknowledged even in modern times. Further, for reducing our expenditure on foreign employees he asked our people to promote technological and professional education. What is still spectacular in his thought is his advocacy of 'Swadeshi' and boycott at a time when the British imperialism was at its zenith. It is significant that the weapon of 'Swadeshi' and boycott was further picked up by the extremists' leader, Lokamanya Tilak.

According to Padhye and Tikekar, Gopalrao showed considerable boldness in advocating boycott of English goods
while he himself was a government servant. Not only Justice Ranade, but Gokhale too hesitated to express the idea of boycott. 59

Wealth

Incidental to the problem of poverty, Gopalrao also made an elementary analysis of wealth. Of course, here he does not appear to have deviated from the concepts of the Classical economists.

As for the meaning of wealth, he said that all articles required for our consumption are wealth. Cows, cattle, trees, minerals are also wealth. Sunlight, air and water when abundant, are not wealth. However, as these are scarce in congested cities like Bombay, airy bungalows command higher rents.

Suggesting vaguely the idea of form utility, he said that the articles which have no natural price, but have use, become wealth; e.g. a clod when moulded is converted into an earthen pot. Although the concepts of circulating and fixed capital were not known to him, he saw some wealth like corn consumed in the process of production. As for productive wealth, he said that some wealth is productive because it produces more e.g. seeds when sown give more product. He, however, did not explain the clearcut distinction between productive and unproductive wealth. His example of the
productive wealth, however, is similar to the Physiocratic concept of 'net product'.

Gopalrao pointed out that wealth waxes with our progress. Increase in demand necessitates change in the economic organisation. Historically, he said when the demand increased, individual supply could not be reciprocally increased to that extent. In order to meet the increasing demand, division of labour was evolved. As economic activity increased, the outdated barter economy was replaced by money economy. Then metallic currency came to be used, further credit system came into existence and thereafter paper currency backed by gold was used.

He pointed out that if capital formation in our country increased, employment opportunities would be created, but for bringing this about, savings must be properly invested. The country which utilises its savings fully, becomes rich. When no investible surplus is available, we have to depend upon foreign countries for meeting our consumption needs, and dependance is further increased. This could be obvisted by utilizing our wealth so as to create employment opportunities at home. Only the commodities which cannot be produced within our country should be imported.

Gopalrao insisted that it was essential to increase wealth and utilize it for proper purposes. At last he warned that for production of wealth, efforts are required.
Gopalrao's analysis of wealth is rather elementary, and reminds us of Physiocratic influence. Such elementary discussion has also been provided by Vishnushastri Chiplunkar in Nibandhamela. His remark that savings determine the capital formation, however, can be perfectly applied to our economy even today when no planning can be implemented without foreign assistance in one form or the other.
NOTES

English

52. The literal translation of this world would be 'Common Conspiracy'.

54. Refer Chapter 2.

55. Gopalrao appears to have expressed his extreme optimism here, disregarding the achievements of England, the hub of industrial civilization, for emphasising his argument of Swadeshi, because thereafter he said that certain commodities would have to be imported here, moreover, he knew the quality of our products.
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