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England Parliament had had seen brilliant members. Thomas Munro, Edmund Burke, Blackstone and Winston Churchill were remarkable members. Among them Thomas Munro stood first. His constructive role in the British Parliament is examined in this chapter.

Munro’s council adopted his policy for jury trials on the same day it was presented, but Lushington set it aside shortly after assuming his place in Madras. He declared that the measures was being rushed into law without due consideration of its many provisions. Lushington added a harsh personal judgment of Munro. He charged that the trial by jury measure was ‘one of the mistakes of the wise in life’s last days.’

Lushington’s rejection of the trial by jury regulation was followed by a minute of 27 January 1828 charging Henry Graeme with irregularities while he was Acting Governor and suspending him from the council. This evoked an infuriated response from Graeme, on his own behalf and on that of the martyred Munro’s humane and liberal principles toward the natives of India in his minute of 31 Dec 1824.

The first six months of 1828 saw violent verbal exchanges and minute fustians between Graeme and Lushington in which the latter was supported by minutes from Graeme’s former colleagues on the Madras Council, General George T. Walker, and the senior judge, J.H.D. Ogilvie.

The works of ‘this master-workman’, as Malcolm had called Munro in 1818, appeared somewhat fragile ten years later. This was only beginning. Less than a month after rejecting the trial by jury regulation and humiliating Graeme, Lushington dismissed
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another of Munro’s key allies in the Madras establishment, David Hill, the Chief Secretary. Hill was one of the most distinguished and capable public servants in Madras who followed Josiah Webbe into the chief secretary ship during the nineteenth century.

His early career as an assistant collector in Tinnevelly and Malabar was followed by twenty years in the central secretariat of Madras, where he rose to be its head in 1824.\(^6\) Hill had earned the highest public praise from Munro during the final years of his governorship for his management of the administration during the years that Munro was occupied with the Burma war, and when Madras was making massive contributions of soldiers and material to the war.

Thus, when in February 1828 Lushington dismissed Hill from his high office and assigned him to a provincial judgeship in Musulipatanam, three hundred miles from Madras, there was a deep shock among Munro claque\(^7\). Hill was accused by Lushington of being part of a cabal of officials, along with Graeme and others, to deceive him, though the specific charges were withheld from Hill for a considerable time after his dismissal.

Accordingly, Hill dispatched a memorial to the Court of Directors against his demotion in rank and pay without the adjudication process open to civil servants. Lushington denounced this memorial to London when it was presented to him by Hill for transmission to London, claiming that it was an usurpation of government authority.

The directors did not respond to Hill’s memorial for a year, during which time other senior colleagues of Munro were also dismissed from their posts. One was T.H.Baber, during whose thirty-two years of service in Malabar there were frequent, friendly exchanges of letters with Munro and the latter’s praise for Baber’s work. He was dismissed by Lushington for having mismanaged a riot in Mangalore in August 1827, and though a hearing of the case acquitted Baber of any blame and even applauded his bravery and decisiveness, Baber remained under suspension.\(^8\)

---
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Their condemnation of Lushington was shaped partly by the fact that Hill had gone to London to press his case, which may also have accounted for the delay in responding to Madras. Hill was suspended from his office before being appointed to another, judicial, post was punishment, procedural irregularities of which he might have been guilty, but, they continued. Hill stands as high in our opinion as ever he did and that he should be restored his post as chief secretary. Hill was re-employed in that post on his return to India in August 1829.9

Apart from an intention to use the trial by jury act to clear out the strongest Munro men from the centre of Madras political authority so as to place his own imprint on Madras policies. Lushington knew that there remained considerable dissent in London against Munro’s judicial changes. Many directors who supported the judicial reforms urged by Munro were less moved by principle than by the potential economies, of pressure that had been exerted from the Board of Control.

Others at India House had been converted neither to Munro’s principles on Indian judicature nor to their promised economies. Opponents such as Lushington and Ogilvie could reasonably depend on some support from unenchanted directors, and they might have salved their wounds about the restoration of Hill as chief of the Madras secretariat with the proof of the directors’ unwillingness to restore Graeme to the Council.

Others who had been close to Munro and harassed by Lushington included Colonel John Carfrae, Munro’s military secretary who was with him at his death. Major – General Sir Robert Scot, who was dismissed from his post as political agent in the court of Arcot and replaced by Lushington’s son, an appointment that was refused by the directors; and Colonel William Morison, whom Munro had appointed to direct supply operations of the Burma war.10 All were charged with financial irregularities of various sorts, all were cleared by military hearings, and some were later offered new positions by Bentinck.

---

10 Ibid.51.
During his earlier career in the southern districts of Madras he had supported his patron Wellesley's policy of introducing the permanent zamindari settlement throughout the Presidency. As governor in the late 1820s he could not attack the restored ryotwari as vigorously as he attacked the reformed judiciary, but he could and did remove senior and committed ryotwari advocates from positions of authority. Graeme was head of the Board of Revenue when he was dismissed. Alexander Duncan Campbell had served on the Madras (Presidency) Board of Revenue as an appointee of Munro until 1827. When he was appointed by Munro to the strategically important district of Tanjore, a place that had long challenged the claims of universality made by ryotwari advocates.

Lushington dismissed Campbell in 1828, thereby denying one of the most troublesome districts for Munro's revenue scheme of an enthusiastic master and also denying the ryotwari establishment at Madras of one of its most able spokesmen. Campbell had proved his ability to justify ryotwari in a broadly comparative way. He was in a few years to do this again before the Select Committee on Indian affairs of the House of Commons. Campbell was interesting in another way which connected him with Munro.

He had been dismissed by Munro from his Collectorate post in Bellary with considerable public criticism for failing to pursue correct practices for the restoration of ryotwari in the core of Munro's old Ceded Districts. Like other revenue officials out of employment, Campbell found a judicial post. In two years, however, he was reconciled with Munro and was appointed by him to the Madras (Presidency) Board of Revenue, and then later to Tanjore. In Munro's final year of life, he had selected Campbell as his companion on his tour of the southern Presidency.

Men like Graeme and Campbell were replaced on the Madras Presidency Board of Revenue by Charles Lushington, the Governor’s brother. Through him the criticism was launched against older ryotwari collectors such as Montague D. Cockburn of Salem district and John Sullivan of Coimbatore. The former was dismissed from his Salem post, to which he had been appointed by Munro in 1820 on charges of revenue irregularities which were not specified until three months after his dismissal; he was later appointed to a judgeship in Malabar.

---

The attack against Sullivan was launched after he had resigned his Coimbatore
collectorship and had retired from the Company in 1830. None had stood higher with
Munro than Sullivan. Sullivan gained much admiration from Munro and prestige in
Madras. The publication of the compendium of revenue and judicial papers by the Court
of Directors in 1820-to be discussed more fully below-included a set of papers jointly
written by Munro and Sullivan on the Coimbatore abuses of Kasi Setti, and this won him
some renown in London as well.12

The second attack upon Sullivan was launched in respect of the latter's properties
in the Nilgiris, on the mountainous northern edge of Coimbatore and under its
administration. Sullivan had done much to improve the high plateau at Ootacamund
through his construction of buildings and roads on lands taken from the indigenous
pastoral people of these hills Todas with almost no compensation.

The attack on Sullivan was also an assault upon the reputation of Munro, for it
was with his support that the Nilgiris were chosen as a sanatorium for returning British
troops from Burma.13 Munro's economizing solution to the provision for this facility was
to lease or purchase houses that have been privately constructed by Europeans. Sullivan,
as a major owner, was a financial beneficiary. Lushington appeared to be even more
enthusiastic about the Nilgiris than Munro and directed that land be acquired to build a
sanatorium and cantonment.

In England, Sullivan petitioned the directors in 1831 for full payment for his
houses, and he won his pleading. The directors faulted Sullivan for attempting to force a
successor into his place (and thus to avert the scandal of a Ramia) and for inadequately
indemnifying the Todas for their land, but they found more harshly against Lushington
and the Madras government for their dealings on the Sullivan properties.14
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Lushington's actions against these officials weakened the momentum of Munro’s programme, and whether that was the intention of his actions, are not clear. An active and experienced politician (partly in India, it must be remembered), Lushington had a stake in seizing effective control of the politics in Madras. Under the control of cabal of officials Munro had become was a condition into which he himself could have fallen, and this he was determined to avoid.

And, surely, given the enormous weight of Munro's principles and precedents in Madras and his popularity with so many Madras officials and non-officials. Governors of Madras had before been undone by their subordinates. In the recent past this would have included Bentinck, the Governor-General, who was made responsible for the Vellore mutiny brought on by his Commander-in-Chief.\(^\text{15}\)

Madras civil official to the actions of subordinates European of Indian was widely recognized; most Company collectors feared this and therefore sought to clear their district offices of senior Indian officers whom they inherited and whom they replaced with Indians they could trust and manage, as Thomas did in Coimbatore after succeeding Sullivan there.

Apart from public humiliation, Lushington would rightly have worried about losing the splendid financial rewards of an Indian governorship in the British politics to which he would return.

He would have known as well as any in India of the continued resistance in London to Munro's notions about the British imperial order in India. Directors such as John Hudleston, who had vigorously resisted Munro's appointment as judicial commissioner, were active until 1826 and a letter of Huddleston to Munro in 1821 still expressed regret over ‘our abandonment of the system and opinions of Lord Cornwallis.’\(^\text{16}\)

\(^{15}\) Munro Collections F/151/73, 29th November 1821, TNAC.

Serious attention was given to Munro's revenue methods and in 1813 Munro's and Ravenshaw's instructions in ryotwari issued to subordinates in Madras were sent to Bengal for their instruction. To this humiliation of Bengal, Lord Hastings, the Governor-General, added another. So much uncertainty about conditions in the new territories existed and so many 'evils' could result from this ignorance that he thought a commission on internal administration, like that of Munro's of 1814-19, should be formed.

He ordered his Supreme Council to obtain from the directors their orders to Munro of 4 May 1814, setting the Madras commission. Other records from Munro and from Madras provided guidance for future inquiries into the revenue and judicial administration of the new Gangetic territories. Documents from the directors of 1819 were cited to confirm Hastings’ cautions about the extension of the Bengal regulations for a permanent zamindari settlement in the new territories and providing instead for a scheme of periodic settlements.17

Sullivan and Cumming from 1808 to 1819 show that he participated in the preparation of the records and instructions that were sent to Bengal in connection with the debate over the revenue system to be followed in the new northern territories. Hence, he played a role in the double embarrassment of the 'Bengalees' at the hands of the Governor-General in Calcutta and the directors in London. The 1820 volumes of the Selections record the triumph of Munro’s ryotwari over his opponents in Madras.

If The Fifth Report was Cumming’s instrument for the victory of ryotwari among most directors, then the 1820 volume of revenue selections, also Cumming’s work, traces how the directors’ will was worked against the entrenched opponents of ryotwari in Madras and Bengal. Almost without a hitch, this volume picks up the history from where it was left in 1812 by discussing the 1808 imposition of the decennial village-lease system in all parts of Madras then under ryotwari.

---
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This is followed by the rebuke delivered upon Hodgson’s Madras (Presidency) Board of Revenue by the directors on 18 December 1811, and their more firm and humiliating instructions of a year later that ryotwari was to be introduced into the entire Presidency not under a permanent zamindari settlement.

Hence, by 1820, with Munro the governor, it might have been thought that the victory of his system was altogether secure. However, for many readers the 1820 record of Munro's triumphs and the humiliation of his Madras opponents must have been galling, and, worse, the later(1826) of revenue documents from India House continued the Munro litany, its gloria being the great 31 December 1824 minute which concluded the Madras section of revenue selections.18

The 1826 selection of Madras revenue papers was more brief, and, apart from Munro’s 1824 minute on the state of the country and the condition of the people, reported some of the adjustments made in ryotwari procedures to improve its operations.19 One of these adjustments pertained to ‘putkut’, which had vexed Thackeray as assistant collector in the Ceded Districts twenty years earlier. In September 1821 the matter was still vexing, and Ravenshaw, a director and an authoritative spokesman on ryotwari, asked Munro for clarification of the term and its use in revenue practice.

Munro answered that ‘putkut’ (pattukattu in Telugu, pattukadu in Tamil) was the revenue liability of a cultivator based on the totality of the fields his ‘farm’ held under ryotwari tenure. It was, as he had long ago explained to Thackeray, an ordinary, practical way in ryotwari to assess individual revenue obligations. However, the individual ‘farm’ should not regarded as a proper or permanent unit of assessment, for that was the separate surveyed field. Munro told Ravenshaw that Thackeray had never got that right, and had made misleading and incorrect statements about ‘putkut’. He also advised Ravenshaw to consult a report by Henry Graeme on the whole matter.20
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Throughout his governorship, Munro received letters from London friends reporting a continuing campaign against his 1816 judicial reforms in London. His enemies in the directorate remained formidable. Charles Grant remained opposed to the Madras reforms, and John Huddleston, a major and unrepentant opponent of Munro's changes in 1814, also continued to criticize them until he left the Court of Directors in 1826.\(^{21}\)

James Cumming had provided Munro with the most detailed information on these developments. A letter of his of May 1823, provided a small history of the decision making structure at India House in relationship to the Board of Control. This was also an explanation to Munro or why Cumming decided to retire from the Board. Written in a crab like hand, Cumming's letter suggested an ageing and ill man, which he was, but also one on such terms of intimacy with Munro that he did not need to write in that careful hand he used as a subordinate correspondent of a decade before.

The general conditions in the Direction and at the Board worried Cumming as they did the older Sullivan. Allies like Alexander Allan and Samuel Davis were dead, and George Canning, who had proved a strong supporter on Munro and his programme, had resigned the presidency of the Board. Canning was succeeded, by Charles Bathurst, and then with a long tenure by Charles Wynn, who was less favourably disposed to the Madras system.

Sullivan had also resigned from the Board, but had arranged that Indian correspondence on revenue and the judiciary should be available to him. He told Munro that in that way he 'could co-operate with our friend Cumming in keeping things right'.\(^{22}\) One of the ways in which Cumming was employed to this end was in countering the attack that was being launched by supporters of the Bengal system on the directors during Munro's governorship.

Before he retired, Cumming performed one last service for the cause that he had made the centre of his administrative career at the Board of Control: he assembled a reply to the attack upon the reformed Madras judiciary by Robert Fullerton in 1820. These documents comprised the core of India House printed Madras judicial selections of 1826.


\(^{22}\) Home Miscellaneous Serious, Volume II 530, TNAC.
Fullerton’s minute of 7 June 1820 resembled that of John Hodgson’s when he resigned from the Madras Council and retired from the Company in the same year. Fullerton’s was a final argument against the Munro system in its judicial aspect, as Hodgson's had been against its revenue provisions, and it came, like Hodgson's, at the end of a long service of thirty years in Madras courts. Fullerton recalled that he had previously minute the Madras Council (in March 1816) with Objections to the 1816 regulation.

There, he had criticized the Court of Directors, judicial letter of 29 April 1816 authorizing Munro’s reforms. He expanded these earlier criticisms and began with the disarming observation that, contrary to his own fears of 1816, the provisions for civil justice of 1816 had proved successful and were appreciated by experienced Madras judicial officials as well as by the general public.

But of the police and criminal provisions of 1816 he was more certain than ever that they would produce ‘ruinous effects’, and this principally ‘from the union of revenue and magisterial power in one person’, the collector. He also rejected the claims of success being made for panchyats and dreaded the consequences of extending their use in criminal cases. He concluded his minute with a criticism of the directors themselves. London had failed to consult adequately with Madras officials before framing the 1816 regulations and defining the scope of the judicial commission headed by Munro: ‘nothing had been left to the [Madras] Government but obedience.’

Fullerton's minute was tabled three days before Munro arrived in Madras to assume the governorship, and Munro decided against responding to it; indeed, he told Ravenshaw, he did not even read it because of his certainty that it would merely reopen issues that were now settled. When he learned from Ravenshaw and from John Sullivan that Fullerton's attack was being taken up by Charles Grant and John Hudleston as focus for their
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continuing opposition, he reacted. Two minutes were prepared against Fullerton's, one by George Stratton, a member of his council, and the other by Munro himself.

To some extent the responses prepared by Munro and Stratton recognized deficiencies in the 1816 regulations and outlined remedies which were to be proposed to the directors: otherwise both minutes and another by Stratton in June 1821 defended the 1816 conception and programme of judicial reforms.

James Cumming’s letter of May 1823, referring to the continued opposition of the Madras reforms within India House, identified Edward Strachey as their centre. This can have been no surprise to Munro or to Cumming, for Strachey was an early opponent of Munro’s reform programme and had expressed his dissent when the directors sought the views of prominent judicial officials who were in England before Munro’s commission was formed in 1814. But Munro was reassured that George Canning was not impressed with Fullerton’s argument, nor by those who had found it a flag of convenience under which to mobilize to oppose Munro’s reformed judicature.

But sometime in early 1820 it was decided that selections from the burgeoning judicial and revenue records at India House should be published by the directors, and it was obviously Cumming's and John Sullivan's intentions to continue to Marshall documents for a subsequent set of volumes, which were finally published by the directors in 1826.

The initiative for this could have come only from the Board, and this is attested to by an 1825 letter to the Board's secretary, Thomas Courtenay, from the secretary for Indian correspondence at India House, James Dart. The latter said that he had reported to the directors the Board's view of the 'expediency of printing a further Selection of Papers in continuation of that made on the subjects of the Revenue and Judicial Systems of India', and the directors agreed entirely and would soon send a list of selections to the Board for consideration.

Munro maintained a steady and shaping correspondence from Madras. Several files of his papers contain his letters and memoranda on revenue and judicial questions.

26 Munro Collection F/151/72, Cumming to Munro 14 December, 1819, TNAC.
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28 Munro Collection F/151/72, Sullivan to Munro, 7 May 1821, TNAC.
addressed to the governors-general, Lord Hastings and Amherst. These reinforced Sullivan’s letters to Hastings, exploiting what Sullivan called ‘my habits of intimacy’ with him. Sullivan also passed Munro’s letters to Canning and after him to Bathurst.29

Munro himself sent frequent letters to the less sympathetic Wynn on revenue and judicial matter after the latter succeeded to the presidency of the Board. Knowing that his letters were being retailed by his friends at the Board, as well as by Ravenshaw at India House, Munro assembled arguments in defense of his system in Madras and against critics of the Bengal persuasion intent on protecting, the domain of their authority.

He skillfully exploited the favour that Mountstuart Elphinstone enjoyed among directors by extolling the policies that were being pursued in Bombay, which were modeled on his in Madras, and being carried out by Chaplin, with whom Munro kept in close touch. He could be confident that his approbation of Elphinstone’s procedures would be passed along to others by his influential friends.

A point that he made in letters then was that since Bombay came under Company rule last among the great provinces of British India, it benefited from the innovations pioneered in Madras and the errors being exposed in the administration of Bengal. He also suggested that the modifications of the Madras system in Bombay provided a valuable pattern for all of British India.

Malcolm also lamented past practices that gave whole provinces over to men who had little knowledge on India or talent for rule, but who knew ‘the right people’ and had connections; and he applauded the new arrangements of 1813 which gave the Board of Control a commanding place in Indian policy formation. Under Buckinghamshire and Canning, Malcolm saw great changes, most especially the appointments of Elphinstone and Munro.30

The wisdom of these and the Board’s generally constructive role was not merely in choosing men who knew India, for that was not sufficient: ‘local [Indian] experience, unless attended with other qualifications, is but a poor recommendation to status which

29 Munro Collection F/151/92, Sullivan to Munro, 7 May 1821, and the letter of 18 February 1821, TNAC.
does not so much require an acquaintance with details as that enlarged knowledge of human nature, that active energy of character, and that commanding talent of rule which has in all ages, distinguished those who have exercised power to the benefit of their country and mankind. Moreover, we cannot assimilate the rules and principles of British Government with those which are essential to the maintenance of our sovereignty, as foreign conquerors.31

The final episode in the short-term aftermath of Munro’s death in relation to Indian colonial policy was simultaneously the final struggle against the Bengal model of Indian imperialism; this came with the debate occasioned by the charter renewal of 1833.32 For, then, the marginalization of Bengal was confirmed, in, among other ways, by the prominent place taken in the deliberations before the Select Committee on Indian affairs of some of the very Munro men dismissed and dishonored by Lushington.

These were David Hill, Alexander D. Campbell, and the younger John Sullivan. In addition, the elder Sullivan was invited to submit a long statement for the Committee that served to anchor the continuing debate over Indian policies and against Bengal in Buckinghamshire’s Board of Control of twenty years earlier.

Munro and his successors in Madras merely improved ryotwari systems. However, contrary to some of his master’s accommodation to critics. Sullivan insisted that an actual survey and assessment was required under ryotwari, but he strongly agreed with Munro that this could be entrusted to Indian servants and strongly advocated ‘native agency’ in revenue administration.

Drawing upon twenty-three years of Indian experience, Hill strongly defended the Madras system. He believed it to be suited to all of British India because it preserved ancient rights and practices and because, whatever the nominal system of revenue and judicial administration, ‘the ryotwari system must form an essential part of it. In his answers to questions from the Committee Hill repeatedly referred to Munro and his expressed principles, and he dismissed the criticism that successful ryotwari required collectors of unusual abilities: ‘Some of our best officers have not been men of superior capacity.’ However, for the

31 Ibid.

32 Report of the select Committee 16th August 1832, Minutes of Evidence, Judicial, 19, TNAC.
system to succeed reliance had to be placed upon Indian subordinates and Munro's judicial reforms demonstrated the work-ability of 'native agency'.

Ryotwari was a 'novel doctrine' based on the 'assumption that it harmonized better with the habits and dispositions of our native subjects and with usages and institutions of the country', Munro, present governor of Madras, was the doctrine's able, intelligent, and zealous advocate'. Tucker protested that there were other voices in Madras which opposed Munro's innovations, and among these were Robert Fullerton and John Hodgson. He acknowledges the latter's help to him in discovering the papers of Fullerton and other writings critical of ryotwari.

Tucker's attack on ryotwari prompted a defense from John Sullivan while he was still in Coimbatore, and this was published in London under the title sketch of the Ryotwari System in 1831. By then a director, Tucker's objections to ryotwari, repeated and elaborated in a paper of 1827, carried additional weight. Here he denounced Munro's ryotwari for violating the historical rights of intermediaries such as zamindars and talukdars. It was an innovation that destroyed the very 'native institutions' which its advocates claimed to protect.

Campbell’s career as a Judicial official had consisted of two brief spells of about three years altogether out of a service career of over twenty years. Curiously, both judicial appointments resulted from conflict with a governor of Madras. One was Munro who recommended Campbell’s dismissal from his position as Collector of Bellary. The other was Lushington who dismissed him from the Collectorate of Tanjore in 1828 and who only permitted his re-employment as registrar of the Sadr Adalat Court in Madras in 1830.

Campbell’s standing as a revenue expert was confirmed by Munro’s appointment of him to the Madras (Presidency) Board of Revenue in 1826, two years after dismissing him from Bellary. Munro also asked him to attend his final tour of the Southern districts

---

34 Thackeray’s report of 1807 is in *The Fifth Report Vol.3*.562, TNAC.
35 Ibid.
36 Munro Collection F/151/92 Letter Book July 1820 to 1826 e.g. 14th June 1828, TNAC.
of the Presidency in early 1827. In his report of that tour Munro praised Campbell for his work in Tanjore and for his assistance in the tour.

The select committee of 1832 announced itself contented with the Madras and Bombay revenue systems based on Munro’s ryotwari. Both Provinces were briefly discussed in comparation with Bengal and its problems. The Report closed its discussion of revenue ironically, or with consummate rhetorical artistry, with a quotation from William Thackeray’s report of 4th August 1807, the same text that Cumming had contrived to close the last volume of The Fifth Report of 1812.

There was another aftermath to consider first, however, that has to do with Munro’s system fared in Madras from his death to the middle of the century when the so-called ‘scientific survey’ of ryotwari was launched and formed the basis of revenue settlements throughout the Presidency to the end of the century. This examination reveals that the purported administration of ryotwari as a technical order, rather than a concept, was little more than a cover for highly variable arrangements, the single purpose of which was the creation of a base of political economy for Munro’s conception of empire in India.

The interval between Munro’s death and the promulgation of the 1833 Charter Act may be taken as the short-term aftermath of his career. By 1833 conditions are discernible which set the future course of imperial development in a direction that made most of what Munro had accomplished. It made his vision of empire just that, a fleeting and imagined conception of an order that was destined never to materialize.

To present, to discuss, to debate, to move to censure, to condemn and to impeach are the major challenges in the House of Commons in England. A very few members could do all the above mention actions for the welfare of the people. Thomas Munro beyond doubt that all his qualities went in favour of the Indians during the debates in the Parliament.

---

38 Report of the Select Committee Minutes of Evidence, Revenue, Extract from the Report of the Select Committee, 9, TNAC.
39 Mukherjee Nilmani, the Ryotwari System in Madras, 1792-1827, Calcutta, 1962, 117.
40 Ibid.