**Excerpt 1:**

The report itself refused to impugn the integrity of the British police officers and blamed corruption in the subordinate ranks on the fact that for decades Indian constables had been paid less than a living wage. It insisted that even the most honest and upright constable or sub-inspector with a family to support would sooner or later give in to temptation and accept the benefits of petty bribery and other forms of corruption for which he had already been assigned guilt in the public mind. The British

members of the commission also argued that corruption and despotic tendencies were a pathological part of oriental cultures in general, which British officers could at best keep under control, but never entirely eradicate. Indian critics dismissed this explanation, arguing that it conveniently absolved British police officers from real accountability in the supervision of their men, a responsibility they could never truly fulfil because of inherent linguistic and cultural differences. These critics claimed that the real root of inefficiency and corruption in the Indian Police was British administration. Only the appointment of qualified Indians to the rank of district police superintendent and above could alleviate this chronic problem and build the public’s confidence in their police.
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