1913

ORIENT AND OCCIDENT

A COMPARATIVE STUDY

BY

MANMATH C. MALLIK

OF THE MIDDLE TEMPLE, BARRISTER-AT-LAW,
FELLOW OF THE ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY
OF LONDON,

AUTHOR OF "A STUDY IN IDEALS: GREAT BRITAIN
AND INDIA," "THE PROBLEM OF EXISTENCE," ETC.

T. FISHER UNWIN
LONDON: 1 ADELPHI TERRACE
LEIPSIC: INSELSTRASSE 20

MINISTRY OF CULTURE · GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

CSL

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
17 JUN 1914

ORIENT AND OCCIDENT

MINISTRY OF CULTURE · GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
GSL

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE PROBLEM OF EXISTENCE: Its Mystery, Struggle, and Comfort in the Light of Aryan Wisdom. Demy 8vo, cloth, 10s. 6d.

IMPRESSIONS OF A WANDERER. Crown 8vo, cloth, 5s. net.

A STUDY IN IDEALS: Great Britain and India. Demy 8vo, cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

(See notice at the end, page 316.)

LONDON: T. FISHER UNWIN

MINISTRY OF CULTURE · GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

CSL

ORIENT AND OCCIDENT

A COMPARATIVE STUDY

BY

MANMATH C. MALLIK

OF THE MIDDLE TEMPLE, BARRISTER-AT-LAW,
FELLOW OF THE ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY
OF LONDON,

AUTHOR OF "A STUDY IN IDEALS: GREAT BRITAIN
AND INDIA," "THE PROBLEM OF EXISTENCE," ETC.

T. FISHER UNWIN
LONDON: 1 ADELPHI TERRACE
LEIPSIC: INSELSTRASSE 20

-54(R)
309.1
MAL-O

First published in 1913

-54(R)
CSL-AS-(R)
AS000664
309.1 MAL-O
AS-664

(All rights reserved)

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
17 JUN 1914
SIMLA LIBRARY.

GOD hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth.

THE ACTS.

One altar alone shall be erected, humanity; one principle alone, order; one society alone, the world.

GAMBETTA.

Not though all men call,
Kneeling with void hands,
Shall they see light fall
Till it come for all
Tribes of men and lands.

SWINBURNE.

Tach chhrutam yat kila jnaptyai sá jnaptih samatá yayá
Tat sámyam yatrádvaitá drishtir jagati jáyate.

VASISHTHA.

That is worth hearing which advances knowledge; that is knowledge which helps the growth of serenity; that is serenity by which the vision of the unity of mankind is produced.

GSL

PREFACE

MUCH of the matter contained in this volume was intended for incorporation in the author's "A Study in Ideals: Great Britain and India," published in the autumn of 1912; but to avoid making that volume too bulky such matter was left over to form the nucleus of a separate book, which is now placed before the reader, accompanied by a chapter of Parallel Illustrations from the thoughts of the Sages of the East and of the West.

It is often asserted that Europe and Asia cannot understand each other—that Asia is a mystery to Europe, and must always remain a mystery, and vice versa. The assertion is generally made by persons whose nature or training or self-interest leads them not to wish the understanding to take place. Similar assertions with reference to the relationship of different European countries were not long ago common, and indeed are still not unknown among extreme partisans of the old order. Between Europe and Asia science is bringing about a closer physical

contact, which would, as in European countries, generate an understanding, had the law of nature not provided a counteracting influence in the shape of mutual distrust and suspicion caused by superficial and traditional differences. That attitude cannot continue much longer without imperilling the fabric upon which the future welfare of both West and East depends. A policy of courage and wisdom in authoritative quarters would speedily change the attitude; but nowadays authority, intellectual as well as political, seems too timid to lead opinion and too ready to succumb to popular prejudices. In the dearth of such courage and wisdom, it becomes the task of peacemakers and of believers in human brotherhood, hitherto few, but increasing in numbers and importance with growing enlightenment, to endeavour to counteract and to minimize the influence of the opponents of human progress, so as to bring about a state of things in which the mutual understanding of East and West, however slow, may yet be steadily advanced. Chapter I treats of some similarities and dissimilarities in ideas and habits in the East and in the West. Chapter II deals with some notions of propriety in the Eastern and Western divisions of the Empire of Britain. Chapter III presents a parallelism in some of the thoughts of Eastern and Western sages.

Since the Royal visit and the Coronation Durbar, held under the brightest auspices and amid universal rejoicing, ushered in a new era of peaceful progress under the personal oversight of the Sovereign himself, the annals of Indian history have been sullied by an atrocious crime directed against the representative of the King, one of the best and most sympathetic rulers the country has ever had, on the day of his state entry into the new capital of British India. A condition of affairs in which a high officer of State in any part of the British dominions cannot, like the rulers of other civilized States, pass without risk of molestation along the streets of the capital of the country he governs is deplorable and intolerable. The police being inefficient and the authorities still blinding themselves by distrust and aloofness from the people, no clue has been discovered as to whether the crime was the act of a maniac, of an anarchist, of a Moslem fanatic, of a tool of some designing person in authority, or of a secret society. Anarchism, homicidal mania, fanaticism — by whichever name it may be called—seems to have become as much a part of Indian conditions of life as it is of life in the West. The remedy for such diabolical acts is difficult to find: it is still more difficult to apply. Obviously enough, the efficiency of the police ought to be secured: they

should have ample powers with proper safeguards against abuse, and they should be patriotic and high-spirited enough to be anxious to remove from the service the stigma that even the authorities recognize that it now bears—the stigma of being permeated by traditions not only of corruption but of cruelty. But police reform, though patently necessary and urgent, is but a partial remedy. The knife must cut deeper.

The difference between the conditions in the East and in the West is glaringly displayed when a crime of this sort is committed, whether it be the act of a maddened brain or of a conspiracy embracing a group. In the East, it gladdens the hearts of reactionaries and of other enemies of human progress as affording an opportunity for the display of their importance and venom, and for preaching their doctrines for the enslavement of fellow-men. In India, Reaction cries out for more repression, as if harassment or even torture has ever in human history stopped crime. Such sage effusions only frighten and worry the innocent mass, while they scarcely reach the notice of those that are disposed to crime. If it is any use to expect anything sensible from the reactionary brain, it may be invited to contribute to the solution of the problem something wiser and more helpful than large talk of "our power," and homilies as to the duty of the people

of India in general to help in the suppression and detection of crime. Both in the West and in the East "our power," of course, has to be asserted, sometimes openly but generally in quiet administrative measures, to keep all potential mischief-makers under control—to guard authority from insult and assault, to protect wealth and its satellites from being robbed by needy muscles, to restrain privilege from tyrannizing over the helpless, and to silence incitements to hatred as well as to crime. In the East, however, there still exists an additional evil, which has wellnigh disappeared from the West. This evil was recently illustrated in the West at Versailles, where a woman was convicted for getting two hired assassins to murder her husband for 3,000 francs, and at Jersey City, New York, early in February, 1913, and in the East, in the trial of a European Army officer at Agra, who has just been convicted for having induced his Indian servants to murder his wife. It seems possible to get hold of hired ruffians—whose number a reactionary policy is bound to increase—to commit any crime for a few rupees. One can imagine how easy it would be for persons in authority to secure such miserable instruments for executing any nefarious designs. The police may be empowered to search every house, to arrest every suspect,

to insult every citizen, but who shall effectively search the houses of policemen, of other officials, of non-official Europeans or of their tools, and who shall stop their making false accusations? Conditions in India are at present in a state of chaos. Order and light will come in time, but not without patience and perseverance under cool-headed and broad-minded statesmanship.

Critics may find fault with the manner of presentation of ideas in this volume and in its companion, with some of the ideas themselves, or with prolixity of statement. The criticism would be just if readers generally were familiar with the facts and with the bearings of the facts; but, unfortunately, they cannot yet be said to have grasped the situation; and even when facts are quite obvious, it is not always that people trace their influences on political and social life. This is not surprising when one reflects on the distance that still separates East from West, and on the imperious calls of more immediate interests and duties. In the circumstances, therefore, the author cannot but hold the opinion that the causes hindering the Empire of Britain from becoming the most potent instrument ever forged by Providence for the advancement of human welfare cannot be represented under too many aspects or too lucidly expressed. Should the author be deemed to fall short of the aim, he

will humbly hope that his critics, who must be equally interested, will make good his shortcoming. The object is eminently worthy of the best minds among Britons.

This book, then, attempts to indicate the nature of some of the differences and of the agreements between the East and the West, and the stages at which, even when reconciliation of differences is improbable and each may regard the other's mote as a beam, an understanding may be helped and perhaps effected by toleration of each other's weaknesses. Such toleration between individuals, classes, and races is a necessary element in the promotion of the happiness of human life.

The author's acknowledgments are due to those master minds and the publishers of their works, from which quotations are made to illustrate the similarity of idealism in the East and the West, and in ancient and modern thought.

CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE ix

CHAPTER I

EAST AND WEST 1

No geographical distribution of morals — Different moral estimates of East and West—As others see us (and themselves)—Lines of uniformity—Colour distinction—Privileged complexion—Growth of the "colour problem"—A triumph of "Colonial rudeness"—Effects of Colonial example on Asia—Resistance to colour prejudice—Colour influences in Indian society—Animosities undergoing mollification in East and West—Differences in Eastern and Western political upheavals—Differences in social relations—Different standards of judgment—Treatment of women—The basis of authority—Western flattery of national vanity—Survival of antiquated traditions—Minority rule—Irish and Indian parallels—The Press, East and West—Fashions in food and dress—Diet and valour—Basis of success, military and civil—Treatment of criminals—Eagerness for titles—Domestic contrasts—Beggars—Eastern and Western caste—Patriotism—Desire for peace—"Subject races"—Public salutations—Lynch law—Superstitious practices—Gradual *rapprochement* of East and West—Decline of Asiatic combativeness—War is not without its uses—Appeals for sympathy—Preservation of good qualities of all races—Obedience and command—Homicidal maniacs—Ceremonial extravagance—Gorgeous raiment—Paradise and purgatory—The safety-valve of

PAGE

discussion—Aristos and Demos—Rival Powers—Moral emancipation—Gentleness towards the gentle sex—Respect for the Mother—Eastern teaching—The problem of baths—Reconciliation of differences—Unifying factors—Happiness the goal—Predominant characteristics: Eastern contemplation, Western action—Prominent hindrances to progress: Western intemperance, Eastern incontinence—Social misfits—Early marriage in the East—Commercialism and crime—Want and sin—Control of offences—Law and Society—The essential unity of life.

CHAPTER II

THE BRITAINS OF THE EAST AND OF THE WEST . 63

Position of the British Empire—Britain's connection with India—Origin, not by conquest, but by trade—The sword held by more Indians than Europeans—Happy escape from French control—Difficulties under British rule — Conflicting policies — Attitude of European barristers in India — Unfortunate influence of the Mutiny—Preoccupations of Parliament and the Press—The Crown in closer touch with India—Suggestions for a good and progressive administration—Reactionary policy—Results of British education—Gains to England, real and unreal—Early British policy of education and freedom—Modern antipathies—Sham Imperialism—Reflex influences—The theory of inherited governing capacity—The ideal policy of unity under British principles—Reverence for authority—King George's visit—The Coronation Durbar—Colonial forwardness—The Viceroyalty—Warping influences—British loss from Indian connection—Protection or Free Trade?—Discrimination between British and Indian interests—A great example of courageous policy—Peculiar status of British Indians—Monopoly and privilege—The leaven of reaction—The real nature of the new movement in India—Reciprocal influences—Deteriorating contact—Danger of abandoning the old policy of fair play and freedom—Indian questions and Party politics—All kicks and no pence—Colonial preferences—Colonial honours

GSL

PAGE

—The Tory leader's Colonial bribe—Anglo-Indians, wise and unwise—Miscarriage of justice—"Cheap homicide"—Condonation of crimes—Illustrative examples of insult and unmannerliness—Judges, European and Indian—Official partiality—"My lords"—Army and Navy officers—The finger-print system—The "coolie" level—Colonial caste—Deterioration of manners under Colonial example—Colonial dislike and oppressive treatment of Asiatics—Connivance of British statesmen—"Kith and kin"—"Statesmanship of the British race"—Widespread mischief of Colonial arrogance—Colonial privileges and aspirations—The true position of the Colonies—India's duty—Britain's neglect—Revolution in British Indian policy—Responsibility of electors—and of Ministers—Western discrimination against Asiatics—Imperialism transformed—Effects of military successes—Real source of Indian discontent—Privilege *v.* People—The way of peace—A race dictatorship preposterous—Unrest necessary for progress—Government's duty to direct it—Its actual aim—The mind of the masses—The educated mind—Curtailment of educational facilities for Indians in Britain—Indian Law students in London—Social intercourse—Formation of character—Moral control—Tendencies of imperial democracy—Reactionary Government measures—"Ruthless repression"—"Separatist imperialism"—New India—Political pariahs—Indian loyalty—"Imperialism" divides the nation into hostile camps—A divided duty—The Nationalist Party—Lack of official leadership—Invincible prejudice of the bureaucracy—Fitness for self-government—Eligibility for the public services—Restricted permission to bear arms—India's tribute to Britain—Britain's tribute to India—Modern "conspirators" and European example—Military discrimination—Civil sectionalism—Tenure of high office—Wild talk of independence—Limitations of independence (in various countries)—Dependent position of India—Conditions of national revival—Weaknesses of democracy—Who shall govern?—No preference of origin—INDIA'S PRAYER—Hindrances to cordial relationship by no means insurmountable—Recent concessions a step forward—"Divide and rule"—Devotion to the

PAGE

Motherland and personal ability the true tests for promotion—Working of Council majority—Conditions of material progress—Proposal for a CONSULTATIVE ASSEMBLY on social and religious matters—Revival of Panchayet system—Mutual confidence necessary—Peace and justice the true interests—Reserves on both sides—Culture removes social barriers—Position of women—India the only Imperial field for the development of great ideals—Sane imperialism is political idealism.

CHAPTER III

EASTERN AND WESTERN THOUGHT: PARALLEL ILLUSTRATIONS 216

Eastern and Western ideals and some illustrative parallels.

ORIENT AND OCCIDENT

CHAPTER I

EAST AND WEST

Among certain types of mind that are bent upon dividing mankind into rival or antagonistic camps, Asia has, in modern parlance, come to stand for the East, and Europe and its offshoots, even when morally and physically farther away from Europe than Asia itself, for the West. A few among such minds are generous enough at times to attribute some virtues to Asia, and are also even candid enough to acknowledge some defects in Europe. But, taken as a whole, Asia has, owing to the loud trumpet-blast of its enemies and to its own humility, come to be regarded by Europeans in general as the nursery of every imaginable vice, and, by contrast, Europe necessarily becomes the home of all the virtues. It would doubtless be beneficial for mankind if even a comparatively small spot on earth or some single race could become a special repository of

virtue, in order to be able to hold aloft the torch of light and truth as a beacon for the guidance of the benighted spots and races. How much more beneficial would it be if a whole continent or a congeries of races endowed with a fair skin could rightly claim the position! Those, however, that lay claim for themselves and their kith and kin to all the virtues are always advocating dissimulation of or a lapse from the virtues in dealing with other races; and the result naturally follows that the non-virtuous portions are apt to take all mankind to be like themselves and thus to miss improvement, while the virtuous portion, by contact with the non-virtuous and by practice, tends to recede from its own high standard.

Apart, however, from the absolutely prejudiced persons, whose numbers, owing to circumstances of the time, may be on the increase, the more thoughtful generally acknowledge that virtues or vices are not the monopoly or the distinguishing characteristic of any particular longitude or latitude, or of any one age or race. A view of the platform on which all sides of the mariner's compass—north, south, east, and west—and all ages of time—past, present, and future—unite, would readily convince observers that the same electric thrill influences every soul among mankind according to the local conditions. The platform of animosities, appetites, passions,

prejudices, and wickedness has been and will be common for a certain type of mind in all ages and climes. Equally common to the opposite type—the more virile and virtuous—has been and will be the platform on which that type has steadily and resolutely attempted to advance their fellow-men towards excellence. Wickedness in one sphere, and wisdom, like true and unsectarian religion, in another sphere, unify men in one brotherhood. It ought to be instructive to disruptionists to note how the selfsame ideas have been promulgated, in varying forms and fullness, by minds that have flourished centuries or thousands of years apart from each other—ideas that ought by this time to have been universal in practice if the emissaries of darkness had not prevailed. Ages, Empires, and States have come and gone, but the thoughts of the great minds they produced are immortal: they will live to the end of time to illumine the path of those that are in need of light and life.

Persons of different temperaments give different explanations why East and West do not meet in friendly intercourse. The true explanation is that East is down and West is up, and until East goes up the two cannot meet without strain and injury to either or to both. Hence it has always been the aim of great minds to level up classes and races to avoid the evil consequences of contact.

The East is now showing signs of coming up again, and it is to be hoped that, as the East moves upwards, the turn of the wheel of fortune will not take the West downwards and leave mankind in as sad a plight as before. Meantime, however, until East shows steadiness in its apparent upward tendency, Western facetiousness describes Eastern indifference in face of danger and death as a sign of immobility, while a similar demeanour under similar circumstances of Westerners becomes fortitude and defiance. Eastern resentment of bad manners or of crude treatment is called impertinence; similar self-assertion of Westerns is called independence. Eastern objection to tyranny of rulers, or of supporters of rulers, is called disloyalty and anarchism; in Westerns it is lauded as a rightful struggle for freedom. Eastern criticism of unpalatable legislation is called sedition and repressed without remorse; Western resistance to Acts of Parliament, or incitement to civil war, rebellion, and violence, is—in the eyes of one political party at least—not inconsistent with loyalty and lawful opposition. Bloodshed, massacre, burning of villages and farms, and other atrocities have in the world's history often been perpetrated in the name of religion or of order by professing Christians on co-religionists as well as on Jews and other non-Christians; in quite

recent times examples have been reported from Morocco, Tripoli, Persia, and China; and they pass without comment or are deemed legitimate methods and excusable tactics of warfare: but, if any such practices be indulged in by Eastern soldiers, even in the heat of battle or of retaliation, they are unhesitatingly denounced as barbarities. When Western troops are fighting Eastern, good care is taken to report such practices as may rouse the sympathy of the civilized world on their side: the East rarely gets a correspondent who has the courage to proclaim the actual facts in the teeth of the prevailing atmosphere. Eastern religiousness is called superstitious weakness; Western religiousness is designated humanitarian Christianity. In Easterns politeness and anxiety to avoid contradiction becomes sycophancy; in Westerns it is known as high breeding. The great virtue of the spirit of Eastern resignation becomes an object of Western ridicule, as it appears to a great lady in Shakespeare when anxious for vengeance:—

"Call it not patience, Gaunt; it is despair."

What in Westerns would be patience is in Easterns described as timidity.

So long as the same mental or physical attitude or attribute becomes an object of praise or of blame according to the latitude or the longi-

tude where it appears, cordial fellowship or even bare association cannot be expected. Uniformity in outward appearance or costume is, in the opinion of some people, needed for mental harmony. These amiable people may think that by the extensive, if not universal, adoption of the European "bowler" hat Japan came into line with the West, and that the rest of Asia will have to do the same—as Young China, with the dread of the Empress-Dowager's edicts withdrawn, seems bent upon doing. Others may think that conversion to Christianity will have the same effect on Asia as it has had on Europe. Yet others are of opinion that, as the skin of the great nations of Eastern and Southern Asia cannot be as white as that of Northern European races, no meeting is possible. Colour and other superficial prejudice is a plant of comparatively modern growth: it does not appear to have existed among the great races of ancient times, among whom there were lords and slaves of all complexions and costumes.

A scientist has recently expressed the view that primitive man was of a dark colour, and that the evolution of the lighter-skinned races was, biologically speaking, a comparatively recent event. If this theory is correct, the human skin, like the hair on the body, undergoes a change by time, being in the early stages light, as in infancy,

then more and more dark-coloured with growth of body, and becoming gradually colourless as one advances in years. In some cases, under acute agitation of mind, it turns grey in a few hours or days. The human skin has hitherto been known to undergo changes according to its exposure to the sun; but, if it changes its colour by time and training, the present disqualification of dark complexion from which Asiatics suffer in international relationship will gradually disappear with the disappearance of their comparatively primitive nature and methods. As, however, some Asiatic races are anything but primitive, and had at one time (if ancient tradition may be believed) a high degree of culture and refinement, as well as a fair complexion, it is worth while for scientists to inquire whether races, when they decay or revert to a primitive stage, lose lightness of skin and become gradually quite black like the negro. If it is so, the West, proud of its white skin, ought to be careful not to fall into decay or to recede into the primitive stage, as it is in danger of doing by contact with backward or inferior races. If, however, it is the case, as some Europeans assert, that white skins are alone amenable to civilization, and if science can show that the colour of the skin is influenced by the cultivation of the mind—not individually but racially—mankind need not fear an extinc-

tion of its civilization, for there will always be some race with a comparatively high culture and a white skin.

The appearance in the streets of London and Paris of an increasing number of Africans, and the apparent fancy taken to them by some of unimperialised European womanhood, seem, from writings in the Press, to have the same disturbing effect upon the soft brain of a certain type of imperialist as the presence of British Indian students has upon a similar type of retired Anglo-Indians. While such imperialists advocate an indefinite expansion of empire, hoping thereby to ease the financial stress of friends, yet with strange inconsistency they cannot bear the sight of the people over whom power is to be exercised, and in whose country men of their type seek opportunities of fortune and fame. They appear to imagine that they will advance imperialism by applying in Britain, as is done in South Africa and in some parts of India, the tyrannical process of preventing the people over whom imperial sway is exercised from using the public roads and conveyances on equal terms with the modern privileged complexion.

East and West have through Colonial influence also come to stand in the eyes of European democracy for black and white, and what is called the "colour problem," before the solution

of the "blood problem," has begun to exercise considerable influence on modern human relationship. It did not become acute so long as only the higher and more cultured classes of Europe, who were conversant with the origin of races and with the antiquity of Asiatic races, came in contact with people of non-white complexion, and so long as only a very few of the latter, and those of the better-bred class, were visible in Europe. Democracy, steam, electricity, and competition have let loose all classes in considerable numbers all over the world, many of whom, not having heard or read the names of other races or not being able to distinguish one from another, call them by the complexion, which strikes the eye. When the complexion is the same, but feature or language is different, "furriner" is the term applied in Europe and "feringhi" in Asia, half in fun and half in contempt; and when complexion, as well as language and feature, is different, the term is changed to black, red, yellow, brown, or white. As before the fall of Aryanism in India the Brahmins succeeded in placing all other castes in one subordinate category, so the triumphant "white" man appears to be succeeding in dividing mankind into coloured and colourless.

The terms white and black as applied to skin may be suitable in the United States. Citizens

there of whatever origin, being all Americans and Christians, have no other distinguishing name than white or black; but the importation of this distinction into the Old World, or into the British Empire with its wide variety of races, nationalities, and religious persuasions, is a triumph of Colonial rudeness, which, if continued, will considerably influence the relationship of Asia and Europe. In the United Kingdom the separate nationalities are called English, Scottish, Welsh, and Irish; and, to be consistent, the other races that make up the Empire may, by cultured people at any rate, be described as Canadians, Australians, Indians or Asiatics, and Africans. The use of any other designation or form of expression is simply a wicked means to perpetuate animosities and to nurse the seed of disruption.

Asia, having been in its dormant state a field of amusement as well as of exploitation for non-Asiatics, is now in for a period of bad treatment at the hands not only of Colonials but of Europeans also, simply because bad example is more contagious than good. That treatment ought to develop all the finest qualities of Asiatic nature, and will, it is to be hoped, not infect Asia with foreign manners, nor lead even the more revengeful Asiatics to rejoice at the untoward consequences to Europe of succumbing to Colonial example. The influence of that

example is apparent in the changed manners of the aristocracy and of the middle class, and it is bound sooner or later to infect the toiling masses.

As a matter of fact it is noticeable in daily life that the vast majority of men and women are above these frivolous prejudices, and that such prejudice is aroused only when an individual instrument of evil sets to work to inflame passion and hatred. There have been cases where the attempt to excite animosity has been nipped in the bud by a single just and resolute individual, who has put his foot down on such insane behaviour. When, therefore, it is announced that British Indians are receiving unkind treatment either in the Colonies or in Britain or even in India itself, it is ominous evidence that just and resolute individuals are becoming scarce in the present dominant sections of mankind. Such being the case, the oppressed peoples have the game in their hands if, instead of imitating the intoxication and vanity of the oppressor, they set themselves to cultivate the humane, just, and generous sentiments that raise existence to a higher atmosphere. Unrest continues and leads to progress in Europe because all the races and classes inhabiting it have not yet secured justice. In Asia it has commenced with racial privilege, and it will develop as in the West into a struggle with class domination. The first Trade Union

has just been started in China among silversmiths whose employers have had to give in to their demands of an eleven-hours day and a 40 per cent. rise in wages. How recent is the triumph of toleration in Europe is apparent from the fact that Jews were not long ago excluded from membership of the London Stock Exchange, and had more recently on applying for admission to pay a heavy fine or premium, which is now abolished.

The prejudice that fair skins have always entertained against the dark is comprehensible on the ground of handsome men treating ugly men with indifference and scant courtesy, especially because they do not become formidable rivals for the favours of the gentle sex. That prejudice, although modified and supplanted by the introduction of caste, still prevails in India, imported probably by the white-skinned Aryans. It appears in matrimonial alliances, when parents prefer (within caste rules) a light complexion and handsome match for their son or daughter. The principle in such match-making is explained in the couplet—

Kanyá barayate rúpam mátá bittam pitá srutam
Bándhaváh kulam ichchhanti mishtánnam itare janáh.

Bride prizes handsome husband; mother prizes wealth for her son-in-law; father seeks learning; friends prize good family, and others a feast.

The prejudice, however, is never carried to the extent of animosity.

In several departments of life there may lie a difference between the East and the West, as differences exist in the dispositions, idiosyncrasies, and natures of individuals and of classes in the West itself. People are naturally indisposed to commit crimes or even to assail and kill enemies with or without provocation, unless the brain is intoxicated and the mind loses its balance. In the East, intoxication of the brain has hitherto been produced, as it used to be in the West and is still among the more bigoted, by religious fanaticism. In the West, with the decay of fanaticism, the intoxication is produced by liquor. In both the East and the West, the balance of mind is lost and conscience is blunted among the more selfish by greed of gold. Animosities in the East will grow less in proportion to the advancement of education and toleration; in the West, people will become more humane and dutiful with greater observance of temperance as well as of religious toleration; while in both, crimes will be less frequent with improvement in the social conditions of the poorer classes and with more disparagement of the worship of mammon.

In the West, personal insults to individuals for obscurity of birth have almost disappeared, owing

to progressive and democratic teaching; in the East, they thrive like weeds, especially at the hands of natives of the West, some of whom find there the chance of asserting their aristocratic or divine attributes, and regard all natives of the East as occupying a lower category than domestic animals, for whose protection against cruelty societies are instituted. Retaliation for unkind treatment by superiors or by foreigners is almost unknown in the East; in the West, scarcely a man or woman would stand offensive or even unmannerly conduct on the part of any person however highly placed in life, while everybody deems it prudent not to provoke stronger muscles to action.

In the West, the educated people that care for public life are joyfully welcomed into the circle of rulers; in large portions of the East, they are still regarded as intruders into the preserves of those that have hitherto monopolized all power. In the West, Governments exist for the advancement of national well-being, and thrive so long as they secure popular support by convincing the people that their aim is to make the people happier; in the East, anything tending to foster national consciousness is deemed objectionable as likely to increase and to complicate the problems of government. When revolutions break out in the West, monarchs have to fly into

exile for fear of being beheaded, and may always count upon support from a portion of the people in attempts to regain their thrones; in the East, monarchs, when dethroned, quietly walk out of their palaces, like Sultan Hamid, the King of Burmah, and deposed Indian chiefs, and live in retirement in their own country, or, as has happened in China, they set up by their own edicts a different form of government and nominate their successors. If Western monarchs had always been as wise and liberal as King Alfonso XIII of Spain has shown himself to be, owing probably to his relationship with the Royal House of Britain, they might have saved not only their heads but their thrones as well. Who would have thought it possible that a European king would, like King Alfonso, receive in audience at his palace the leader of the Republican Party?

In the West, fear of or respect for monarchs, rulers, noble birth, or authority in general has disappeared, and in its place monarchs, rulers, and authority have to mould their conduct and policy and even their words according to the will of the pushful and organized sections of the people. In the East, veneration for authority and seniors is still a cardinal principle of life, but it is being undermined by contact with the Western teaching of equality, while in the place of individual despotism the tyranny of thousands of

persons and of whole races, so long as they are of European descent, is being encouraged. In the West, impatience of control, as well as absence of consideration for others, has come to be deemed independence; in the East, the thoughtful and cultured classes still think that it is impossible to live in society without dependence on others in one form or another, and that independence or freedom can be achieved in life only by asceticism or by complete control over the passions and appetites, since so long as man has wants to satisfy he has to depend upon others, even when the wants can be satisfied by coercion or by unfair exchange.

It is human nature to judge others by one's own standard. In the West, in spite of its high culture and its advancement in various departments of life, mankind is deemed incapable of shaking off its brutal selfishness; and for that reason every State has to drain a great deal of its life-blood and resources in preparing to slaughter its potential enemies and to avoid being slaughtered by them. The sensible course of training all individual entities in a nation to be honest, resolute, and self-reliant, and to have a horror of all forms of crime and treason, is as yet far from being attained. The East always believed, until recent times when the West shattered its belief, that mankind could be made saints and philo-

sophers, and that to live in placid self-complacency is the way to secure peace. Hospitality to strangers is almost unknown in the West: with the selfishness characteristic of muscular development, with the opulence and luxury of the wealthy classes and the comparative poverty of the lower classes, and with the wide diffusion of the notion of equality, which presents the contrast in a glaring and provocative manner, every stranger has to be regarded with suspicion until he proves his trustworthiness. In the East, to refuse hospitality to one that comes to the door —even were he an enemy—is considered as heinous an offence as disrespect towards superiors. In the East, authority deems itself so infallible that even the slightest attempt to criticize it or to question its absolutism is met with stern repression—the eastern countries of Europe being in that matter like the East—and, in addition, it is part of the business of some guardians of law and order to concoct false charges for personal advancement as well as for discouraging the development of a spirit of independence. In the West, authority is so afraid of Demos that, even when Peers and Privy Councillors incite to rebellion and revolution, when combinations of labourers break their contracts and resort to violence, when strikes take place to force the reinstatement of railway servants

dismissed for drunkenness, it hesitates to use the strength of the State to assert law and order. The West does not tolerate individual despotism either of a monarch or of a minister, but it acquiesces in the imposition of the despotism and tyranny of thousands of its "kith and kin" over backward fellow-creatures of the East.

In the East, women have been trained to think that it is immodest to associate familiarly with or even to be stared at by men. In the West, women have gradually been taught to be the rivals of men and to oust them from their monopoly of political power, and have taken to assault ministers of the Crown and to commit other outrages in order to prove their fitness to be the rivals of men. On the other hand, the non-Christian East has hitherto been notorious for unchivalrous treatment of the gentle sex; but the savage ferocity with which suffragettes are being treated in public places and at political meetings in the most tolerant and advanced of Western countries seems to indicate that ideas of chivalry prevail only so long as its objects remain meek, forbearing, and unpushful.

In political government the East still continues to believe in personal rule and class domination, not only because authority has by tradition been exercised by individuals and a few families, but

also because, Eastern life being still based on religiousness, fear of and reverence for temporal regulators of society appear to be as necessary for the preservation of order as veneration of Godhead is an indispensable condition of religion and humanity. As a consequence of successful revolutions, the West is attempting to shake off the idea of personal and unquestioned authority and to base it on popular sanction—and caprice, but it has not yet wholly shaken off the tradition of the importance of birth in human affairs. The democratic principle can conduce to the welfare of human society in proportion as individual and class selfishness is controlled, and the possible despotism of an organized and wilful mob, in place of the old form of tyranny, is avoided. Authority has to be vested in a few individuals, whether by birth, election, or nomination, and the risk of its demoralization both in the East and in the West can be minimized only by a high sense of duty and of responsibility. In the East, States decayed because despotic authority, being irremovable, ceased to be dutiful, while the levelling tendency in the West runs the risk of taking away initiative from leadership. Both East and West are at the present day proving for the benefit of mankind that it is possible for non-elected authority to be patriotic and dutiful, while democracy has yet to prove its efficacy in main-

taining order and in imparting to a State the moral and material strength based on unity, discipline, sense of duty, and, above all, originality.

In what is called the East—that is, among the ancients who invented and enjoyed the glamour of Imperialism—this consisted in conquering, torturing, and finally exterminating those that were weak and helpless. In the West, or in modern life generally, Imperialism, from which the idea of conquest, torture, and extermination has not altogether vanished, has added an additional injury both to itself and to its victim, rejoicing in abuse and vituperation and the trumpeting of its own excellence, in which the removal of the shackles of the Printing Press enables it to indulge. Imperialism in the West has advanced to the stage when it is difficult, if not impossible, for any one to expect to render service to his country or to humanity without profession of opinions that flatter national vanity and intoxicate the brain. Some holding lofty principles nevertheless seek popularity by such opportunism, hoping to assert their principles after securing a position on the ladder, but, success being slow, constant practice of smothering innate tendencies weakens the principles. Others, high-born and high-bred, are obliged for personal usefulness to offer the simulacrum of patronizing companion-

ship to the lower orders, for whom they feel at heart a supreme contempt. These phases are as yet unknown in the East.

In the West, the aristocracy and plutocracy find their position so helpless that they are led to claim to be the bulwark of democracy, while among the proletariat combinations have been legalized as being necessary to defend their interests and to secure a happier life. In the East, the upper orders are still too proud and unintelligent to attempt to conciliate the workers, while conspiracies are confined to the realm of authority, and, being hatched in the Council Chamber by holders of power, are deemed, so long as no foreign invader is at the gates to test their efficiency, master-strokes of statesmanship for the retention of existing prerogatives and for the demoralization of fellow-men. Those of the West that are opposed to the barbaric wickedness of war, and are in favour of humanized public life, no sooner come in touch with the East than they tend to become instruments for promoting forces that make for evil. Thus does the East help the West to retain in a corner of its heart antiquated traditions and methods that would otherwise be extinct.

In political life ideas of propriety are different, not merely in the conventional East and West, but also in the east and west of St. George's

Channel. The Tory Press enunciates the right policy in Ireland as follows:—

"It is impossible for Ulster to submit to Home Rule, because under Home Rule Ulster would be in a permanent minority. A Catholic Nationalist Government would rule Ireland permanently. It could never be turned out. The Opposition could only protest; it could never take over office. Thus a minority of one religion, one race, one industrial interest would be permanently under the heel of a majority of another race, another religion, and another set of economic interests."

Another important Tory organ recently published in large type a letter from "An Irish Whig" objecting to obedience to law as law and saying that "legalized oppression does not cease to be oppression, and that in that case the Inquisition in Spain and the Tribunal Révolutionnaire in France were regular and legitimate institutions." This implies that the Crown and Parliament of Britain have no more moral authority to pass Home Rule or any other controversial measure than the institutions named had to act as they did.

A prominent leader of Irish Toryism has also recently said:—

"I say that to ask any man to adopt and live under a Constitution which he has never had an opportunity of expressing his views upon amounts to a tyranny which is unparalleled in the history of civilization. (Cheers.)"

From the above extracts and from the speeches and writings of other Tory leaders of opinion in the Press and on the platform it would appear that there is some considerable tendency in the West to return to the old idea still prevailing in the East, that a minority has the right to rule the majority, but not vice versa. Under the scheme of "reform" it has been adopted in recent British Indian policy, which has declared the minority composed of Moslems to be entitled to a larger voice in the Councils than the majority. The apparent object of this statesmanship—or at any rate its obvious result—is the same in both Ireland and India; namely, to foster the intoxication of a minority with a false idea of its importance, and to paralyse combined action in matters affecting the vital interests of the whole country and people.

To cool observers that favour human progress it must be a sad sight to notice the development of the new Western style in journalism as well as in political and social life. One could understand the difference in the old policy—on one side, protection of property and prerogative of birth, and, on the other, demand of equal opportunities and happy conditions of life for all classes alike, high and humble. But when persons of light and leading, instead of teaching and trying to lead and to form public opinion, appeal and pander

to passion and prejudice and wish to follow the imperfectly educated mass, civilization in the West does not set a good example to the East.

While it is very much more the exception than the rule to find in the public life of Europe a generous feeling for races of non-European descent, Asia, typical of the East, looks upon all races and creeds with absolute impartiality, however much each race or creed may cherish a natural preference for its own self. In the West, the Press has become a power in forming individual opinion, but owing to the advance of democracy its appeal has been transferred from the leisured and well-to-do classes to the toiling masses that possess votes. In the East, the power of the Press is as yet meagre or non-existent.

In the West, food and clothing are regulated according to climate and to physical needs: by foreigners visiting or temporarily residing there they have to be adopted in order to avoid the unpleasant attentions of unsophisticated street boys and of uncouth men and women, as well as for physical reasons. The East has hitherto flourished on its own prescriptions; but, as Paris fashions have come to dominate Europe, Western fashions in food and clothing, however unsuitable to the climate and environments, are now deemed necessary, not merely that one may pass for a civilized being, but also to command ordinary

politeness from the lower official and labouring classes, who have been taught to show respect to the wearers of outlandish costumes, and indifference, if not positive disrespect, to those that prove themselves by their garb to be their own countrymen. This is so because Westerns residing in the East prefer to undermine their health and vigour by retaining customs suited to a different climate, rather than to adopt outward forms that have come to be associated with an inferior stage of society and of life.

There is a notion among some persons—due probably to their own habits or experience—that a meat diet is necessary for physical development and well-being and also for moral courage. The greater portion of the East being dependent on rice, wheat, fruit, and vegetables, its dormancy was attributed to diet. After the display of singular courage, dash, and endurance by the Japanese—whose staple food is rice—in their war with a great Western Power whose people thrive on meat, and more recently (October, 1912) by the Servians, whose diet consists principally of wheat, rye, and maize, with oil and dried fruit, and who have been victorious over the meat-eating Turks, it would scarcely now be asserted by the most muscular meat-eater that his strength is due to his food, or that the dormancy of the East is due to its abstention from meat.

The East, through many of the principles of theology it originated, has been prone to preach peace, patience, and forbearance. The West teaches that, while force cannot be dispensed with in human affairs, martial qualities play a vital part in the life and the honour of nations, and that traditional antipathies and antagonisms cannot be adjusted, any more than selfish instincts can be smothered, by the shrewdest diplomacy. The stakes for which rulers play—rulers despotic or democratic, in the East or in the West—are not only national wealth and the lives of their subjects, but also the permanent moral and physical welfare of their peoples, which is moulded by the policy pursued by the State. East and West, like the brute creation in all climes, are equally endowed with fighting qualities, but, while the West has gone ahead in the art of organization and is bent upon beating rivals in inventing instruments of slaughter, the perfection of which in modern life is the only means of self-preservation, the East generally has remained stationary and has thus lagged behind, with the result of being unable to guard against assault its honour and its life. In modern warfare an important and decisive battle is fought on ground extending over tens of miles and by enormous masses of combatants. Victory, therefore, depends, not merely upon superior numbers

or on the spirit, impetuosity, and dash of the rank and file, but also upon scientific generalship, upon the training of the officers, upon the intelligence displayed by each combatant, upon the arrangements for reinforcements and for supplies of ammunition and stores, upon medical help for the wounded, and, above all, upon superiority of artillery. With these valued possessions any country, whether in the East or the West, will come out of a war victorious.

In Turkey premature democracy and the consequent weakening of authority undermined even the traditional fighting qualities of the Turks, and the *débâcle* witnessed in the last Balkan War in the autumn of 1912 led the enemies of the East to moralize on the incompetence and inefficiency of the Oriental. When Japan vanquished Russia, or when the German Confederation conquered France, or when the United States drove Spain out of Cuba and the Philippines, the defeats were not ascribed by Oriental publicists, who would have been justified by Western example in so doing, to Occidental incapacity. Victory in war and success in civil life will, in East and in West alike, always attend those that are convinced—and act according to the conviction—that avoidance of self-indulgence is the secret of retention of virility.

In both East and West traditional ideas of

vengeance still prevail in the treatment of crime, varying from positive brutality to comparative humanity. There are humane and far-seeing individuals that believe in justice being seasoned with mercy, and that are persuaded that ferocious punishments brutalize the legislator that sanctions them, the judge that inflicts them, the warder that practises them, as well as the criminal that endures them, however much the nature of his offence may deserve them. Humanity would be advanced and society would be benefited if, when punishments (which are in the nature of torture) are deemed necessary, the offender were sent to the gallows or the electric chair or the guillotine. Neither West nor East has yet been able to shake off all its brutal instincts and the taste of the sweetness of vengeance.

The West hopes to reduce human miseries by curbing the power of monarchs and rulers, and of the upper class generally, and by infusing into all classes the spirit of equality; but, in spite of the general impatience of authority and of privilege, the appetite of moneyed people for titles (which were suitable in feudal times) and for inclusion in the privileged orders continues as insatiable as in the East, where the ambition of the well-to-do is to be dubbed *Raja* (King), though they may have neither the possessions nor the attributes appropriate to the title. Even

in up-to-date republics and democracies across the Atlantic, where men are debarred from the acquisition of titles, not a few display eagerness to get naturalized in a European country to secure them, or are gratified when their sisters or daughters find titled European husbands.

To a dispassionate observer differences in moral and material characteristics between the Eastern and Western parts of the old world would appear no greater than between the East and the West of the European continent, between the East and the West of the Atlantic Ocean, between the East and the West of the New World, or even between the East End and the West End of London. In the matter of marriages and births, while the East retains its old ideas and tradition of unrestricted progeny, the West is thinking of easing the problem of human miseries by withdrawing from matrimony or by diminishing the numbers of people by exile to distant shores. Domestic service in the West being considered degrading, residence in flats and hotels is becoming widespread, and family life or housekeeping is being gradually given up, while the annoyance caused by the presence of children is considered so great that, in addition to the increasing difficulty of securing dutiful nurses, whose assistance will alone permit evening enjoyments away from home, the objection of intending tenants to the

contiguity of children is leading landlords to refuse tenancies to persons that have young children in their party. It looks as if people that are not their own landlords must make up their minds not to have children. In the East, children live and move with their parents day and night, however high the station in life of the parents may be ; in the West, the higher the position the greater is the segregation between parents and progeny. This isolation, by smothering tender feelings, leads to the development of independence witnessed in Western character. Marriage in the West is based on love, which is so deep that, as soon as the slightest incompatibility arises, it is annulled by separation or dissolution ; among the ancient races of the East marriage is indissoluble even by death, and, although men may legally marry after the death of the first wife, her moral position and authority can never be attained by her successors.

In the East, beggars, being physically weak for want of sustenance, are cringing and miserable and keep at a respectful distance, although by religious ordination and long usage a householder never refuses what help he can render to such unfortunate persons ; in the West, open begging is an offence, and beggars are sturdy and strong and display towards those of whom they beg as much independence as servants or other

employees towards their employers, brush against ladies as well as gentlemen from whom they seek alms in the streets, and, except for the sight of a policeman, appear ready to snatch something unless their demand is met.

In the East, the higher castes have got into the habit of looking down upon the other strata of their community as inferior beings made by Providence to serve their betters as hewers of wood and drawers of water. Many members of the higher castes treat their humbler countrymen kindly, but they cannot, owing to social tradition, get rid of the notion that the proper place of the latter is just where they are. In the West, birth and wealth take the place of caste, and those that are endowed with these possessions regard their humbler compatriots as similarly made to toil away all their life without any hope of ease and comfort or even of satisfaction of necessary wants. In the West, however, the higher orders are by circumstances compelled to profess considerable interest in the amelioration of the condition of the labouring class, though all the time opposing any measures for such amelioration. In both the East and the West a considerable amount of charity is often expended by those that do not take life to be intended only for pleasure and enjoyment, and that are impelled by motives not always

of reward here or hereafter. In the West, both the high and the humble are now drifting towards a fresh re-arrangement of human society, a new caste composed of persons of European descent, who are to be in the position of Celestials to the rest of mankind—the mere *homines*—who have to live like the lower castes in the East or, like courtiers attending on the high and mighty, only to minister to the wants of the heaven-born Westerner and to intoxicate his brain with adulation.

The West, whether under autocratic or democratic rule, has developed ardent patriotism, but as yet this is confined to a part, not extending beyond the circle within which its sympathies are bred. As in the eyes of aristocrats nobility is a gift of "high" birth alone and patriotism of the toiling class consists in devotion to them, so in the view of the West the East has no right to be patriotic or public-spirited, its proper rôle being, not dutifulness to the motherland, but devotion to the foreigner. The East, however, has recently commenced to imbibe the spirit of patriotism, and is, on account of its humanitarian instincts, bound to develop it to a wider sphere than the West seems disposed to do. In the West, retired Army and Navy commanders with distinguished service behind them deem it patriotic to attack their own Government, to proclaim

national weakness, and to instigate international animosities; the East has not yet arrived at this stage of civilized development.

The denial of justice turns people of the West into revolutionaries, who by violent methods extort from their rulers the rights they claim; in the East, such denial is expected to make people loyal and law-abiding. A long peace and its attendant luxuries, combined with the absence of rivalry, led the pushfulness and virility of the East to slumber; the West, in its anxiety to secure everlasting peace from those it dreads, is getting to be afraid of war and showing its keenness to conciliate rivals from whom danger is apprehended. It does not yet recognize the inconsistency of that attitude with riding the high horse before mortals that cannot do physical harm, or with courting the mockery of enemies that it wishes to pacify, thus proving to mankind that strength and power to hurt continue to be the passports to consideration. The East has for some centuries appreciated, in preference to toil, a life of ease, which all classes and races of the West are now so anxious to secure.

It is the fashion among a certain type of Western politicians and journalists, now that there are no longer subject classes in their own country, to speak of "subject races." They are the analogues of the extreme social bigots among

the Hindus, who feel so proud of their obstinate orthodoxy and so anxious to prove their social importance as to be the most inveterate opponents and persecutors of those Hindus that display any courage or initiative in social reform. Except in those colonies where recent statesmanship has set up—with what results time will show—a dominant or enfranchised section and a subject or voiceless portion of the community, dominant and subject races have hitherto been unknown in the East, even in parts under the political sway of the West; for the voiceless portion consists of all races and creeds, some enjoying greater freedom of expression than others, and some having greater privileges as criminals than others, but in the matter of enfranchisement, or political or social domination, all are in the same boat. People, when they talk of dominant and subject races, do not give a thought to the real position. In some countries political institutions are more or less despotic, in others they are more or less democratic. In India they are still despotic. The enfranchised European, the arrogant Colonial, and the "free-born" American have all on arrival in India to belong to the "subject race," while the British Indian and other British subjects enjoy in Britain the privilege of being electors on the same terms as those born or naturalized in the country. The

people of India may with as much reason be called a subject race, because they do not elect their rulers, as could thirty-seven millions out of the forty-five millions of the inhabitants of the British Isles be included among "subject races" because only eight millions are on the electoral roll.

Osculation in public is not considered genteel in the East, and even a shake of the hand is rare, but a physical embrace, such as is indulged in by continental sovereigns and nobility, has from immemorial time been the symbol of friendly salutation. In Russia, which stands between the East and the West, kissing in public even by engaged couples entails punishment by fine. In the West, public display in various ways by couples in affectionate relationship is common, and in the transatlantic West has become so pronounced, without due regard to time and place, that notices have begun to be put up at cemeteries—the latest being at Germantown, Pennsylvania—that "Flirting is prohibited." With a denial of matrimonial bliss, the desire to ignore observers when opportunities present themselves for indulgence in happiness seems to be becoming rather strong.

How infectious an atmosphere of love or hatred may become is proved in the matter of lynch-law, which originated in the far West and is slowly

extending elsewhere. In its home it is no longer confined to negroes, nor even to men; but lynching a girl for tempting a man's affection seems to display a peculiar phase of Far Western enlightenment. It was recently reported that at Darson City, Georgia, a clerk of the Supreme Court with the help of a friend forced a young woman into a motor-car, drove her to a lonely spot, bound and gagged her, and horsewhipped her almost to the point of death for having fascinated his son and enticed him away from home. Criminal Law Amendment Acts will shortly need further amendment in every Western country so as to bring under the law girl "criminals" that entice away and tamper with the dutifulness of young hopefuls.

There is a common notion that superstition is confined to the East, and especially to "idolaters." It does not appear to be generally known, as was declared recently by a professor, that one-fourth of the school children of London wear amulets under their clothing. At a public meeting a distinguished peer of the realm confessed to carrying a mascot in the shape of a golden swastika—a custom which is said to be common nowadays. The general use of the horseshoe as a sign of luck is well known. Superstition may be observable in the East oftener and in more numerous affairs of daily life, but it is scarcely

consistent for Westerners to point the finger of scorn when the difference in this matter between West and East is one in degree and not in kind.

In obstinacy and pugnacity the West may hold the palm, while in tenacity the East may boast of its strength, as shown in withstanding the attempted obliteration of its civilization and tendencies. Both may, like old and new creations in the peerage, or like old and fresh school-children, hold aloof from each other for a time, but acquaintance, contact, and sympathy based on the great productions of virile minds of the past, present, and future cannot, any more than the advance of knowledge, be prevented. Many more strange miracles have been performed among mankind than the cordial understanding of East and West, or of rival nationalities in Europe, which reactionaries consider impracticable. East and West commenced their acquaintance when the spirit of adventure led European discoverers and merchants to the "gorgeous East." The acquaintance led to flirtation when European scholars in the eighteenth century took up the study of Eastern literature. The flirtation developed into an engagement when the Sovereign of Britain assumed direct sway over India; and the tie was strengthened when in recent years Britain formed an alliance with

victorious and Imperial Japan. Whether the engagement will end with a solid matrimonial relationship or with a breach of promise depends upon the men and women that may for the next generation or two guide the destinies of the East and the West. The influence for good upon those men and women will be the perception of the unity of the higher thought that has always pervaded Asia and Europe.

With the "imperial" vision characteristic of worldliness, with the incapacity to understand human motives that is natural to the unsympathetic mind, and with the intoxication generated by success, non-Asiatics are, as a rule, unable to grasp Asiatic nature, character, and aims. Long peace unfits individuals and nations for wars; long disuse of any faculty sends it to sleep. Asiatic nations, owing to immunity from foreign invasions for centuries, lost their pugnacity and pushfulness, for which there had ceased to be further occasion. The arts of peace and good nature were cultivated, with the result that when invasion came the people and their rulers were found to have lost their combativeness. As in society and every-day life the presence of would-be criminals, thieves, and robbers necessitates caution and alertness, so in national life vigilance is indispensable for progress. If people wish to tackle the vultures that in

individual and national existence are always prowling about for prey, they must cultivate the vulture's eye. Asiatic nature, getting fond of peace and ease, lost its vulture's vision, and became the target of foreign invasion and foreign taunts.

Wars are not among the desirable things of life, owing to the miseries they bring upon innocent people and to the diversion of human energies to the perfection of the art of slaughter; but, until human selfishness and animosity are entirely uprooted, misery and desolation for a time—and extermination, if need be—are preferable to the eternal torture of foreign invasion or of antipathetic domination which bluntness of warlike faculties causes. Until, therefore, mankind as a whole becomes peaceful and divine, any nation that wishes to retain freedom of development and to receive courteous treatment has to continue prepared for war, and even to seek occasion to make war on and, if possible, to cripple such rivals as threaten its security and independence. A great war used to be undertaken once in a generation in the East, when a new sovereign ascended the throne, in order to keep the nation in a state of military efficiency. Various European States have proved in modern times that it is a desirable policy, and that even a disastrous war may do a country

good in some direction, as disaster leads it to awaken from self-complacency and to initiate reforms. A successful war that crushes an enemy out of existence is scarcely desirable, since it takes away the need for continuous development of virility and sends the victor to sleep and self-indulgence, to which Asia was sent by success and peace.

In important centres of thought appeals are now and again made for the growth of sympathy between the East and the West, between Asia and Europe, between the ruler and the ruled. The very need for such appeals proves that there is something wanting in the relationship and mutual intercourse which the highest authorities cannot make good. Sympathy can only follow knowledge; knowledge is possible only where there is intercourse; intercourse can take place only where there is mutual respect; mutual respect results from good manners. For a generation or longer good breeding and manners have been slowly disappearing from the demeanour of the foreign residents, and have also been discouraged among Asiatics by taunts of servility and sycophancy. It is strangely rare to find a foreigner, even when he is liberal-minded and professes anxiety for the advancement of the Indian people, who does not at times show by his words or acts the low opinion he holds of

the people, whose standards of life and conduct are taken to be different from his own.

Gentleness and consideration are the peculiar characteristics of the East, as overbearing and rudeness, miscalled independence, and not unfrequently deserving to be called insolence, are products of the West. If East is to remain East, the only way to compass this would be to prevent the evil products of the West from being imported into the East. If there is anything in the East that the West does not like to have introduced into its domain, then there must be avoidance of contact. There exist, however, both in the East and in the West, or in either, qualities that may profitably be retained or that one or the other would like to acquire. It would be a splendid achievement of the human mind if the best men and women of both East and West, both North and South, could combine to found an organization in which, without sacrificing national interests and traits, only the good qualities of all the races of men would be displayed and fostered for the benefit of mankind, and the evil instincts of the mind would be unknown, or at least held in subjection. The policy initiated by some new States of excluding "undesirable aliens" may in such an organization be so developed as practically to extinguish all chance of evil contact. The members of such

a body would easily perceive that Providence devises human instruments for rewarding virtue and punishing wrongdoing, however much the instruments may indulge in the conceit of believing in their own capacity for meting out the deserved reward or punishment. Both East and West furnish proofs of such action. To curb the conceit of the East, priestcraft and religious bigotry came into existence, with the result of dragging the Eastern man to destruction. In the West, apart from national calamities and disasters occasioned by conceit, labour unrest, as the result of the greed of gain and desire for monopoly of the capitalist and well-to-do classes, combined with the ascription of divinity to European birth, appears to have been devised by Providence for curbing Western conceit, unless the virile portion of the West wake it up in time to save itself from ruin.

In one matter there is a specially noticeable difference between the East and the West. A great historical character in Shakespeare says :—

> "The hearts of princes kiss obedience,
> So much they love it."

But in Asia generally, and in India specially, the hearts of "princes" love obedience so much as to find amusement in kicking and killing it,

and non-Asiatics catch the contagion on arrival in Asia. It would be a blessing for mankind if in both East and West obedience to duly constituted authority and worthy mastery could be retained without intoxicating the holder of power and deadening his sense of humanity and justice.

In the West, when homicidal maniacs or organized conspiracies, like that of militant suffragettes, make a target of prominent individuals—of Kings, Emperors, Presidents of Republics, or Ministers of State—they do not upset the even course of administration and legislation; reactionary venom deems it prudent not to assail the race or even the family out of which the assassins spring, and, after regular trial, they meet with their deserts. In the East, where hitherto such mania has been unknown until its recent importation from the West, attempted or successful assassination of officials, high or low—the East being still in tutelage, the target, happily, is generally missed—entails serious consequences for the entire population, all of whom, if not taken to be abettors or connivers, become fit subjects for reactionary ridicule and suspects for failing to catch the offender. Eastern people may inquire why they are dragooned and pilloried for the acts of miscreants when the shades of Charles I, Louis XVI, Alexander II, Abraham Lincoln,

Humbert, Carnot, Carlos, Lord Frederick Cavendish, and a host of other rulers of men, not to speak of noblemen in the dark ages of English and other European history, do not express surprise that the peoples from whom their assassins sprang have suffered no evil consequences for their atrocious crimes.

In some traits of character East and West retain a similarity. Persons in want, who find it difficult to make ends meet, are always ready to run into debt and to pledge their little possessions in order to be able to conduct a marriage ceremony or a funeral in grand style—or style unsuited to their means. If it were a matter merely of display—of attempting to be taken by neighbours as richer than the reality—it could be understood; for that is an impulse characteristic in human intercourse. But people that in other matters do not hesitate to admit their financial difficulties become in certain social functions extremely imprudent and extravagant. There are, of course, natural and historical considerations; but, after all, the explanation may lie in the fact that marriages and funerals are functions where female influence preponderates and where theology and priestcraft play a part—woman being by nature generally religious, and by habit unused to calculate financial ways and means, while priests take care to exact

ceremonial dues. Thus in some matters of life East and West are at one in admitting the right of the gentle sex—and of the priest—to rule.

Fondness for gorgeous raiment is another weakness common to East and West. In spite of Nature's law that, while beauty and grace are the attributes of the female, the male kind in the winged species is more brilliantly adorned with plumage, and in the animal world is made more handsome than the female, gorgeous sartorial decoration for man has almost gone out of fashion in the West. It has now for a few generations been mainly confined to women and military officers and functionaries in State service on ceremonial occasions, and when worn by these it is deemed admirable. In the East, decoration of the male form is as common as that of the female; but there Westerns represent it as a sign of effeminacy. Acts were passed in Scotland in the reign of King James II, and in Spain in the reign of Alfonso X, to penalize extravagance in dress. No such law has yet been deemed necessary in the East, but if, owing to increase of wealth and to inability to find a suitable use for it, luxuries and vain display become general, thoughtful legislators in both East and West may wish to find the means to control extravagance, not only in dress but also in food, marriage, and funeral expenses.

Whatever differences between East and West may exist in the present-day ideas of life, the differences in the ideas of a future life would appear to be very little. Both believe in a Hereafter in which punishments have to be undergone for evil acts and thoughts, and rewards will be gained by a life of virtue. Paradise and purgatory exist in both. Different schools of thought have explained them in various ways, but the central idea in both is that the enjoyment of heaven or suffering in hell is regulated according to the measure of virtue or of sin. Some believe that the processes of enjoyment and suffering are undergone in human life by transmigration; others place them in another existence. The Aryan notion has explained the idea by placing the different stages of reward and punishment in seven heavens and seven hells, rising higher or descending lower according to the nature and degree of one's acts in life. According to both Eastern and Western notions man is endowed with freedom to do good or evil —to choose the course he wishes to follow. It would be a curious creation—not of the Author of all good but rather of the devil—if for deliberate evil acts for which no punishment is received in this life no suffering has ever to be borne.

The human mind from its peculiarly inquisitive

and restless nature seeks diversion from its daily occupations in oral or mental discussions, at first playful but gradually becoming serious, which for the sake of self-glorification take the form of insistence upon the correctness of one's own view. Such insistence leads in social life to dissension for short or long periods. The discussions become common in the absence of more useful and urgent occupation. In the East, great stress was laid in the intellectual sphere on these discussions, and they often led to mortal enmity. Recognition of capacity was made by authority through conferment of the title of *Tarkaratna* ("Jewel of debate"). In the politics of the West, the edge of harmful discussion is blunted and civil strife is averted by the circumstance that international differences necessitate the direction of all national energies to keeping the foreigner in check and to subduing him in the moral, intellectual, and economic spheres as well as in physical strength. Both in the East and in the West, in disputes and discussions when argument fails or the brain gets heated, people without sufficient self-control, and anxious for retaliation, resort to abuse or physical violence. There is often a mixture of both these, but when physical violence is deemed risky abuse in a form not to incur legal liabilities is the weapon of the weak. Wise men in both the East and the West well

know that until the function of the mind can be scotched, nationally as well as individually, it will have free scope for discussion and difference either abroad or at home, and that each nation, under the guidance of competent leaders and rulers, has to regulate its training and conduct according to what it deems beneficial.

There is a period in every nation's life when Aristos finds pleasure in encouraging the rise of Demos, but as Demos grows and displays unruly tendencies Aristos feels sorry for having lent him a helping hand. If Aristos, instead of being disconcerted by the waywardness of a healthy fellow-creature whose growth he has promoted, were to keep his head cool and do his duty by his youthful comrade by taking Demos into gradual partnership, all would go well and Demos would continue loyal and grateful to his patron. But as in badly trained households natural changes bring into being a new generation both of Aristos and of Demos, the former becomes jealous of the growth of a rival, and the latter forgets his origin, and a struggle ensues threatening a war of extermination, which, whether successful on one side or on the other, can end only in disaster. Continentally Europe and Asia now stand towards each other as Aristos and Demos in the West.

To avoid inanity and to perpetuate friendly

emulation, without which human life is degraded to the brute creation, there must by the law of nature be two classes in every community and two great rival States among mankind. In ancient times there were Persia and Hellas; next, Carthage and Rome; later, Gaul and Saxon; then, Spain and England; and, in the nineteenth century, France and Britain. In all these cases the first named in each couple may be said to have represented the East or Oriental ideas, and the second the West. For Britain the tables are now turned. Long association with Asia and a world-wide Empire make her the greatest Asiatic Power, while another Power has now risen, as England rose in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and is challenging Britain for mastery in human affairs. The rivalry between the East and the West is now represented by Britain and Germany. The latter apprehends danger to the West from the revival of Asiatic races whose championship Britain has, in spite of Germanized colonials, been forced by circumstances to take up. In moral ideas, however, the position is reversed, the Eastern Power standing for human advancement, the symbol of the West representing reaction and selfish greed.

The governments of European and other countries are introducing alien immigration laws, in imitation of the old Chinese policy of excluding

foreigners of a certain type from their States. If Asia were to adopt this policy, it should not only exclude or deport those foreigners that by their conduct or manners prevent the growth of sympathy between Asia and the other Continents, but by suitable education point out to Asiatics the platform on which Asia is one with Europe and with mankind. Asia is learning from Europe that loyalty to any institution or individual can no longer be extorted by force or fear, but will be secured only on the ground of utility. Europe has also to teach Asia that any domination, native or foreign, oligarchic or democratic, is equally undesirable, unless it encourage or help the removal of the shackles of antiquated customs and traditions, which retard free development more than mere physical or political subjection. Apart from unity of thought, Asia has to assert unity with Europe in moral emancipation.

The East at its grandeur imparted to the West what it had to teach. In the whirligig of time it is now the pupil of the West and has a great deal to learn in pushful pugnacity, in the arts of defence and offence, in scientific ideas and investigations, in political science, in precision of thought and expression. The triumph of the West has been secured by nothing so much as by gentleness and humanity towards the gentle sex. Those characteristics are threatened by the

struggle for equality between the two sexes, initiated and prosecuted by a thoughtless type of mind. Before they disappear from the West, the East will do well to learn them, so as to keep these sublime qualities alive among mankind. The West, although at present it has not much to learn from the East, may with advantage adopt the Eastern worship of the Mother in the homestead. In the West, as soon as a son is married, the mother, for the preservation of her self-respect and avoidance of rivalry between two mistresses, has to live apart from her son. The East would do well to reject this phase of Western life, but, as some evil invariably comes with good, India, where Western influence is most potent, is rather following the bad example.

Although the East is now in a state of tutelage to the West, yet on the principle enunciated by a sage—

Yuktiyuktam upádeyam vachanam balakádapi

A reasonable advice from even a child is acceptable

the West among other things has recently imbibed the notion of the necessity for physical cleanliness and health by daily ablution; but not being quite prepared for it the West is placed in some difficulty. In the East, almost every bedroom has a bathroom attached to it. Space being limited in the West, enough bathrooms are not

provided even for the well-to-do—not to speak of humbler classes—either in private houses, clubs, hotels, or on board ship, with the result that considerable inconvenience is caused to those that have got into the habit of a morning dip or wash. Like the problem of street traffic, the problem of baths is becoming acute.

The West is attempting to solve the problem of human happiness by curtailing the powers of rulers and privileged orders and by making the masses feel their importance and know their rights. In the place of despotic rulers peace and order will in future rest on the caprices and prejudices of despotic mobs. It would be a misfortune for mankind if the East tried prematurely to imitate the West in this form of solution of the problem of its miseries. Between East and West, as between North and South, or between Asia and Europe, there are differences caused both by natural and by artificial conditions which the thoughtless brain may deem it impossible to reconcile, as it considers the apparently antagonistic interests of class and mass, of wealth and poverty, of leisure and labour, and of ruler and ruled, to be irreconcilable. The West does not encourage the spirit of abstraction, or total withdrawal of the mind from matter, which the East has always prized, but the East and the West equally admire and revere, what the West has so

often displayed, courage and strength combined with generosity, humanity, and righteousness. In whichever part of the world these qualities prevail, it will be not only the dominant force, but also the leading instrument for good among mankind.

Enemies of human brotherhood, disruptionists and separatists, wish continents, nations, races, classes, and individuals to be morally as well as physically aloof from each other. One can be wholly apart from or uninfluenced by another only if, like the Gods in heaven and men on earth, the two were so separated as never for a moment to come in contact morally or physically. With the advance in speedy means of communication, with the anxiety of the adventurous and the inquisitive to discover and to know all about their fellow-men, and with the desire of the needy to find where their needs can be satisfied, continents and countries can no longer, any more than individuals and classes, be separated from each other, or avoid influencing each other for good or for evil. Misanthropes will always wish the evil to be communicated and the good to be hidden, as philanthropists wish the contrary. There are Asiatics that perhaps would like insolence, impertinence, and disrespect for authority to remain confined to Europe, as there are Europeans that would like Asiatics to be ignorant and submissive. The aim of the

thoughtful idealist is to bring about a state of things in which contact will lead each side to reject the evil traits of the other and to blend the best characteristics of both. In past ages the light of wisdom, like the light of the sun, was the only beneficial and unifying factor among mankind. It has, in recent times, been supplemented by scientific discoveries, which are bringing all parts of the world into close moral and physical relationship. Even reactionary blindness cannot for long avoid perceiving the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of keeping apart East from West and man from man; and with such perception will be removed all obstruction to the extension to the physical world of the moral unification now existing in spirit and in the higher regions of thought in all lands.

While retaining its own peculiar characteristics inseparable from natural conditions, each will find, as culture advances and prejudice is overcome, that though East and West may, like North and South, differ in skin-colour, in social customs and habits, or in political institutions, yet East will be West and West East, whatever each term may be intended precisely to signify, when individual and corporate life is lifted above the promptings of self and its unity becomes apparent to mankind.

It is not intended, nor is it necessary, to refer to

the scholarly discoveries of the resemblance between the forms of popular worship, on which conduct of life as well as wisdom was based among the ancient Greeks, Romans, and Hindus, or to the similarity of the religions of these peoples to the religions of countries so far apart as China, Egypt, Persia, Phœnicia, Phrygia, and Syria. The parallel between the gods of the Indian and of the European "heathens" was completely established by Asiatic researchers. These moral resemblances, like the household and warlike implements collected in museums, prove the unity of the human mind at a certain stage of its development. Long separation and want of intercourse caused a strangeness culminating in a complete breach among the different branches of the human family, which modern science by closer intercourse is paving the way to heal. At even considerable distances of time, space, and environments, the unity of thought displayed in the quotations in Chapter III from the sublime productions of Oriental and Occidental sages must be held to be remarkable. Except for differences created by association, climate, and physical needs, all religion and all thought in all parts of the world lead to the same goal—the diminution of human misery caused by selfishness and the advancement of happiness through a feeling of unity.

The East has been associated with contemplation and the West with action: these have been their several predominant characteristics. Without some contemplation or some action it is impossible to live, but the best or ideal life is that in which action and contemplation are evenly balanced. A little more contemplation on the part of the Occident and a little more action in the Orient would bring them nearer together.

The great hindrance to progress in the West is intemperance; in the East—especially in countries which have been under Moslem influence—incontinence. Intemperance in the West is a weakness of a few persons that lose control over themselves by misfortune or bad company, and is mostly to be found among the ill-educated or ill-bred: incontinence in several countries of the East is not confined to the uneducated, and is the cause of all the miseries, moral and physical, which prevail there. Temperance in the West and continence in the East have always been encouraged by the most thoughtful and virile minds, and the more widely these virtues are practised the more will East and West be unified on the basis of duty and righteousness.

What havoc is caused in the West by liquor is indicated by the latest published statistics for France, where 10 per cent. of the total deaths are directly attributed to *alcoholism*—not simple

drunkenness. It is estimated to be a contributory cause of 20 per cent. of the deaths. If similar inquiries could be instituted in India, a much higher percentage of deaths, and, indeed, most of the ills of life, would be found to be attributable to early marriage and incontinence.

How seriously social evils may prevail in the advanced West as in the backward East was recently brought to public notice at the Guildhall Conference on the Health of the City Worker. On that occasion the medical officer of health of a London district was reported to have said

"that the alienation between employer and employed is gradually growing, separating them into opposite camps; that girls on leaving school despise domestic service and take to factories or workshops; that at the early age of eighteen or nineteen they get married, with disastrous results—husband and wife starting quarrels shortly after marriage, wife having no idea of housekeeping or of preparing meals, and, when family arrives, having as mother no idea of how to rear children, the bulk of them growing up delicate or dying in infancy; that there are plenty of unemployed men, yet women do work which Nature has not intended them to do."

Most of the evils mentioned exist in the East owing to early and compulsory marriage.

There are other social evils which are common to both East and West. Crimes of violence are not the monopoly of any land, and they are pro-

ducts of commercialism as well as of want. While the East fell into lethargy and slumber, commercialism enabled the West to go ahead; but, like surfeit producing illness, excess of commercialism threatens to drain modern life of its vitality and stamina. In the East, crimes of violence are generally committed in secrecy: in the West, with the development of greater freedom and fearlessness these crimes are taking place in broad daylight, and their increasing frequency in such centres of enlightenment, luxury, and wealth as London and Paris proves the risks that affluence runs in modern life when it is not shared by all classes. In addition to crime, recruits to the ranks of sin are enlisted through want. The East attempted to grapple with the evil by the institution of universal and early matrimony, but has failed owing to inattention to economic conditions. In the West, where the spread of education and independence might be expected to diminish the pest, recruits are drawn to sin through the disinclination to matrimony encouraged by various social causes, and through inadequate wages paid to women in all forms of labour, and especially in skilled trades. With the rise in the standard of life, distribution of the gains of industrial enterprise has to be regulated more fairly both in East and in West if those evils, as well as the allied faults of

falsehood, theft, and dishonesty, are to be extirpated.

For these and some other vile offences the East used to prescribe torture: the West, after a period of humanity, seems to be relapsing into the state in which mutilation, the stake, and the tortures of bygone ages will alone satisfy the modern craving for vengeance and the refined thirst for blood—a result of contact with the East. Neither in the West nor in the East has the infliction of torture succeeded, nor will it ever succeed, in extirpating crime that the uncultured mind will commit, sometimes by calculation for selfish gain, and at other times by fits of passion when the reasoning faculty becomes dull. Crimes of calculation may be controlled by deterrent punishments, but crimes proceeding from sudden or momentary passion can never be expunged except by high culture.

Law is made, not for the honest, but for the criminally disposed. Without the law-breaker the law would lose its reverence, and, indeed, its very use: if everybody were good and dutiful no laws or courts of justice or even executive authorities would be needed. There is a type of adventurous mind that enjoys the delight of rebellion against law and authority, and it sometimes, like Nelson, prospers by such resistance. Man's nature is to become full of good resolution

at the prospect of seasonable punishment. It is imagined that some day capital will be so plentiful that the lenders, instead of expecting interest from the borrower, will be pleased to be relieved of their superfluous wealth. It should not be difficult to imagine a time when goodness and honesty will be so widespread that the propensity of the mind towards furtive crime will need encouragement by the State, in order to keep alive the faculty to do wrong, which maintains the appreciation of good deeds. At present, under backward conditions of human society and in despotically governed States, whether in the West or in the East, the encouragement proceeds from Agents-provocateurs for their own praise and advancement. In addition to individual crimes, communal crimes under the name of lynch-law have long flourished in the West, where a community impatient for vengeance inflicts punishment upon an offender before legal trial and conviction. This craving for vengeance has not yet appeared in the East, but in its place an equally ominous symptom is visible in the desire to punish, not a criminal wrongly acquitted, but the judge or magistrate that is supposed to dispense injustice. It will generally be noticed that, as extremes of temperature are bearable only in youth, extremes of revengeful ideas are specially palatable to minds not sobered by discipline and

reason. While, on the one hand, the appetite of despotic and inhuman power over fellow-men grows by what it feeds on, on the other hand, perverted political passion adopts secret assassination as its mode of revenge on the wrong-doing of power. Unbalanced minds, whether in power or in insignificance, are notoriously thoughtless in their acts and unprepared for the exigencies of life, and thus they often reap the whirlwind that they deliberately sow.

The quotations in Chapter III would testify that in both temporal and spiritual life the idealism of East and West, as expressed by some of their wisest sons, has been alike and uniform. The East commenced what the West more fully developed, but while the East withdrew more into contemplation the West advanced towards action. The problem for both in the present and in the immediate future is how to control the passions that impede liberty without destroying their usefulness, and how to secure free development without endangering the sense of justice. The solution of the problem depends upon the comprehension and exercise by an increasing number of men and women in every country of the principle enunciated by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans (xiii. 9), "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," and by Oriental sages in the maxim, "Átmavat sarvabhooteshu" (to look

upon all creatures as one's own self), or "Sarvatrotsrija bhedajnánam" (dissipate from the mind the sense of difference).

For champions of the theory and practice of inequality, differentiation, and separation, for beneficiaries from the privileged position conferred by birth or good luck, it must be painful to contemplate the principle of the essential unity pervading life, whatever the phases in which it is displayed—the unity that humane theology in the first instance, and philosophy in the next stage, promulgated for the benefit of man, and that physical science has in recent years by remarkable discoveries been trying to establish. Even if the idea of physical unity be from visual differences deemed absurd and repulsive, the separatist in the moments he can spare from amusements and complacency may cast a glance upon the thoughts of Eastern and Western sages and find in them the spiritual unity that pervades life to eternity. A sober separatist may also contemplate that East and West, being integral parts of one system, must influence each other for good or for evil, and that in the future, as in the past, the race, nation, or class that develops intellectual life, originality, personal initiative, and organizing capacity, will be the dominant factor in moulding human destiny.

MINISTRY OF CULTURE · GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

GSL

CHAPTER II

THE BRITAINS

Of the East and of the West

Whatever irreconcilable differences in particular incidents of life may exist between the East and the West, the twain have, by a strange concatenation of circumstances and by inscrutable fate for good or for evil, met in the Empire of Britain, and no power on earth appears likely to be able to bring about a dissolution of their union or even a temporary separation. Under the circumstances a comparison of the state of things in the different countries composing the Britains must be of deep interest, in the first place to all Britons, and next to all thoughtful observers anxious for the advancement and the happiness of mankind. The relationship of the Britains is of profound concern to Britons that either as rulers or as citizens—as players in the great drama of life—bear a hand in a prominent or in a humble sphere in rearing and sustaining the grand fabric that controls the present and im-

mediate destiny of four hundred millions of Britons, in a somewhat remote degree that of hundreds of millions of human souls, and of perhaps two or three times that number in the future. Britain's connection with India brings her, and with her, owing to her liberal commercial policy, the rest of the West, into close relationship with the whole East, as it brings the East under the influence of the whole West. In spite of occasional misunderstandings and disagreements, which happen at times even in the best regulated households, the relationship cannot, even by pessimists, be described as unpleasant or be condemned as unfortunate. Even if it were unpleasant or unfortunate, the wise course would be to make the best of what is unavoidable and to endeavour to remove the hindrances and to avoid the pitfalls that closely attend human steps and efforts. Despair and panic are phases unknown to the sober and virile mind, which is ever ready to gird up its loins and to display coolness in the dangers and trials that cannot be dissociated from human existence. When dark clouds lower and prospects look gloomy, when enemies rejoice and fools act after their kind, wise resolutions, taken without hesitation or timidity, and resourcefulness, springing from a consciousness of honest and just motives, speedily bring about normal

conditions and lead along right lines to the goal of abiding good.

There are persons in Britain, and these not confined to the ignorant or ill-read multitude, that assert that Britain's connection with India sprang from conquest, and that, having been acquired by the sword, it must always rest on the sword. Apart from the fact that every country originally is conquered by the sword—that the Governments, the ruling families, or the upper classes of the most advanced and powerful States of the present day originally established their sway by conquest and by the might of their swords and had subsequently to take their conquered into partnership—it ought to be apparent to the meanest understanding that physical force cannot in nature be long continued without a breakdown, and that history does not record a single instance in which a successful or conquering class has long maintained its dominance without injury to itself or to the State. In those instances alone where the conquering or ruling order voluntarily shared some of its power with its subjects, or was compelled by circumstances to hold out to the conquered the hand of fellowship, have States avoided civil war or foreign conquest and continued to flourish. The connection of Britain with India began neither by conquest nor by the use of force. It originated

with a few traders setting up factories by the grace of the Government of the day. Wars indeed followed. It was to the victor of Plassey that Shah Alum granted the Diwani (or governing power) of Bengal, which subsequently provided the counsel and the sinews of war that eventually brought the whole tract from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin under one orderly government. When the Mongol empire was crumbling to decay, a fighting Hindu tribe—the Mahratta—began to harass from the south the tottering *régime* and seemed to be making headway in restoring Hindu power and supremacy, while another homogeneous Hindu sect was establishing a powerful state in the Punjab. Rival chiefs contending for mastery found adventurous French soldiers ready to take sides with the combatants. When English adventurers subsequently joined in the fray, the great Revolution and the unsettled position of affairs in France led to the weakening of French power in India, and the English traders, being well backed from home, succeeded in bringing about the discomfiture of French influence. It should, however, be borne in mind that in the struggles for supremacy, whether between French and English or between European and Indian, the combatants were mostly, if not all, Indians with a sprinkling of European officers or gunners. The system of

fighting the battles of a country by its own people, whatever may be the cause for which they were fought, was the invention of French genius, and has since that time governed the policy of European States outside Europe, and even in Europe it was tried by Napoleon. Those that declare India to have been conquered and to be held by the sword choose to forget that the conquering sword was much more Indian than European, and that the sword that holds India for Britain is still in the hands of a larger number of Indians than of Europeans. Even if India had been acquired by the sword, reasonable minds will admit that, with the continuance of the British connection, with the gradual dawn of consciousness which that connection and the example of other countries must bring, and with the growth of patriotism and self-respect, reliance on force in dealing with people who are to be the stepping stones to fortune and fame, but for whom human feelings are but rarely entertained, can scarcely be regarded as safe or wise.

It was fortunate for India that the English side triumphed ; for, although connection with France would after the Revolution have enabled India to send Deputies to the Chamber in Paris—as tiny French India still sends a Deputy and as Asiatic Russia sends Deputies to the Duma—the

unsettlement of France for a century would have continued civil war and consequent anarchy in India, together with neglect of the interests of the Indian people. After a hundred years of struggle between democracy, militarism, and despotism France has obtained a settled government and institutions suited to her requirements; but, as the institutions and the very safety of France herself depend upon the discipline and organization of a conscript army, and as the army itself forms the manhood of the nation, their strength cannot be tested except in war, which, if successful, may make the victorious commander a despot like Napoleon, and, if disastrous, may cause a revolution and sweep away the present *régime*. England is the only country in the modern world that combines the latest ideas with order and stability, and, being free from conscription, has not to depend upon the caprice of an imperfectly educated proletariat for the preservation of her institutions. It is, therefore, fortunate for India to have her fortunes linked with those of the most sober and stable as well as one of the most advanced of the great nations of the day, although her own progress depends upon the influence that Britain and British genius can exercise upon the moral, intellectual, and economic life of her people, encrusted by several centuries of dormancy and decay. At present

India is crushed between imperial democracy and democratic Toryism or separatist imperialism—the one too much occupied with the improvement of conditions at home to be able to devote attention to distant parts of the Empire, and at the same time too afraid to apply Liberal principles to those parts for fear of losing the confidence of electors whose heads have been turned by the prospect of imperial sway and consequent affluence; the other, although inheriting the traditions of high breeding and culture, yet compelled by the circumstances of the day to profess to relinquish the exclusive claim of a class to privilege, and, in order to secure popular support, to propagate the notion that its policy is dictated by the object of enabling the whole nation to play an "imperial" rôle over subject races. The vast majority of the nation have in the meantime to wait expectantly for the day when the support they render to the privileged order will be rewarded with happier conditions of their own existence, and have to be satisfied with seeing a few of their countrymen benefited by the imperial position they occupy in the world.

There are well-meaning progressives that advocate for India the system of popular government that has been developed in Britain through centuries of struggle in gradual process of evolution, though this system manifestly has still to undergo

modification according to the needs of the changing times. There are others professing Liberal opinions in domestic British affairs that would like to see India under democratic government, but the democracy they would place in authority is not the Indian people but the European democracy from which they themselves have sprung. There are Conservatives of the old school, although their ranks are being fast thinned by modern conditions, that would apply to India as to Britain and to the other parts of the Empire the same principles of just and benevolent government, but they claim that they and their class must exercise the main control. Others, who spring from the lower middle class, and for social reasons deem it politic to pass as Conservatives, are influenced by financial considerations to wish that India, and every other country whose policy can possibly be controlled, should have only such institutions as would enable them and their friends to achieve success in life. There are the extreme and unprincipled reactionaries that, finding their voice silenced and their occupation endangered by the awakening of the people at home, advocate in the name of patriotism and of order, of which they pose as champions, the perpetuation of tutelage in the backward parts of the world in order that reaction may still thrive somewhere among mankind.

European barristers practising in India, or appearing in Indian lawsuits in the London courts, generally observe the distinctive tradition of their noble and learned profession by retaining an attitude of independence and impartiality towards the people of the country in which they live and practise. There may be "black sheep" in any flock, and in recent years a few such barristers have found it difficult to fill their bags with briefs or to secure judicial appointments without assailing, in and out of season, the Indian people in order to please those they serve—the planters and other non-official Europeans who, although but temporary residents, believe they have secured in India for themselves and their friends and relations the privileged position of the Orangemen in Ireland.

There are, however, thoughtful and disinterested people, not pushful enough to make their voice heard, who think that, Britain's connection with India having come about, not by regular conquest but by the consent and help of the people, and, even if by conquest, for reasons of lasting good, it is most desirable and would be comparatively easy to place the relationship on a satisfactory footing without any appeal to force, coercion, or domination. It would probably have been so if the rule of the East India Company had been formally transferred to the Crown with-

out the unfortunate incident of the Mutiny. While the Mutiny was the occasion of bringing India under the direct and open sway of the Government of Britain, the necessity of its suppression by force and the excesses reported to have been committed in its course, although the princes and the people generally sided with the Government, put a different complexion on the relationship. Before the Mutiny there used to be periodical inquiries by Parliament preliminary to each renewal of the Company's charter, and eminent Members as well as far-seeing statesmen kept a watchful eye over the interests of the helpless Indian people, and availed themselves of every opportunity to press reforms according to their ideas of justice. Since the transfer such inquiry has been declared to be impossible, as it would mean placing the administration on trial. Holders of power naturally consider existing conditions satisfactory, and will not touch them except under compulsion, while independent Members of Parliament are too much occupied with the demands of their constituents and with their private affairs to have time to study complicated Indian problems. Steam and electricity have brought India closer to Britain, with a corresponding increase in the number of European sojourners springing from classes that have now by enfranchising measures been given a voice

in the government, and that with increasing affluence are apt to discourage or oppose changes that may possibly inure to their own disadvantage. Under the system that now prevails it is all but vain to expect progressive government and needed reforms. A hopeful beginning might be made if the Minister responsible for India were so convinced of their necessity as to threaten to resign unless he had his way (as would be the case in any other department of the State), and if strong men with reforming zeal and with energy enough personally to study the problem without dependence upon the guidance of subordinates cared to hold the position with a single eye to the public good. The Imperial Parliament, considering the size of the Empire and the mass of questions (home and foreign) with which it has to deal, will never have the time or the inclination to interfere with the policy pursued in distant parts of the Empire that have no direct voice in the election of Parliament and no control over its Members. The Press is now a powerful instrument in forming public opinion, but unless a subject is likely to be popular or profitable, journalists cannot be expected to take it up ; and, indeed, there are few in any generation that have the foresight and courage persistently to advocate a policy that they believe will vitally affect the future, when such policy does not catch the

popular imagination of the day or is regarded by any considerable number of constituents and patrons as inimical to their interests.

The assumption by the British Crown of direct sovereignty, the proclamation issued to the princes and people of India by Queen Victoria on such assumption, and by King Edward and King George on their accession, the attachment to the Crown of a separate title relating to India, and the Royal visit to celebrate a Coronation Durbar—these are striking events that have brought the Sovereign into direct and close touch with the hearts of the people. Good government in every country depends upon the conscientiousness as well as upon the dexterity of its rulers. How far such conscientiousness may in ordinary human nature be counted upon is evident from the fact that, although the British Government owes its existence to popular election at intervals of half a dozen years, and is composed of some of the best men in the country, yet the watchful eye of a strong Opposition is needed and has to be constantly exercised in every proposal of legislation and administration as a check on the Government. The Colonies have become practically independent States, retaining connection with Britain mainly for safety from foreign invasion and conquest. If India is to have good and progressive administration, one of three

courses for securing it seems to be necessary: (1) to have a standing Parliamentary Committee specially charged to keep watch and to advise the Government on all matters connected with Indian policy; (2) to have rulers of India whose connection with the country will not cease as soon as they have secured a fortune or a pension; (3) to invest the Crown with full rights of direct rule, with the assistance of an advisory council partially renewable every three or four years, and with a representative assembly without any voice in the constitution or the dismissal of the administration. A form of government approaching that of Germany or of Japan would suit present conditions; but the first plan is most in accordance with present tendencies, and would bring without legislative change a vast improvement in government and administration. So long as none of these courses is adopted, India, however much she may contribute to secure fame or fortune to a number of people, will continue to be a part of the Empire the complexity of whose problems will make even men of light and leading shy of touching them, while all the time remaining the nursery of conceit and reactionary ideas for those that come in contact with her, and occasioning anxiety in regard to her capacity to resist foreign invasion. In the case of the Colonies such complexity disappears, and the Colonials have only

to express a wish to have it realized: they have not to depend for its realization upon the self-denying benevolence of monopoly or of capital.

If Britain's connection with India continues to be what reaction so much desires—foreign rule over a conquered people, or what may be described as imperial separatism—its advantages and disadvantages will counterbalance each other. While on the one hand the intoxication produced by premature concessions will be avoided, on the other hand thoughtless and short-sighted obstinacy, mistaken for firm government, will increase self-complacency and retard progress. The advantages of self-government could be secured in a despotism if the rulers were adroit, patriotic, and unselfish, and proved to the people by acts as well as by words that they feel it to be their duty to advance the welfare of the country whose interests they have undertaken to serve. They have to recognize that it is too late to lament the effects produced by British teaching and example, the natural effects of the British connection—such lamentation only proving their degeneracy from the old British spirit and their untrustworthiness; that it is possible for administrators to be able yet narrow-minded; and that they have to guide education and administrative policy in such a manner as, without raising suspicion, to avoid the evil results of premature democracy, and at

the same time to give effect to the British Liberal principle of respect for nationalism and of trust in the people. It is human to err or to appear to be unjust; but, so long as the error or the injustice does not proceed from deliberate mischievousness, it will not be irremediable.

British education has caused a great revolution in the moral tone of the Indian people, as it has done in the people of Britain; but it has been deficient in strengthening the feeling of reverence that was characteristic of Aryan teaching. That deficiency is due to the free spirit imparted by British teaching, in which fraternity combines with dutifulness to take the place of obedience; but in the first stages the two often become disjointed. It should be observed by those subject to that teaching, however, that its purpose is not to increase self-love, from which to self-deception is but a step, but to train the mind to liberty going hand in hand with loyalty. On the other hand, British education and example have not, except in a few individual cases, produced any widespread desire for or sane ideas about urgent social reforms—as to child marriage, sanitation, pilgrimage to shrines, caste exclusiveness, and such matters, for which licence is claimed by bigots on the ground of their being based on religion, with which the Government rightly abstains from interference. British teaching has stimulated the

reasoning faculty, which, however, owing to the neutrality of authority, continues under the domination of tradition, superstition, and bigotry; and men of light and leading, whether European or Indian, do not encourage change, as such encouragement would be a condemnation of the system that they have hitherto acquiesced in and supported.

It is a singular dispensation of Providence that two countries and races so differently constituted, so widely apart by distance, history, traditions, and worldly fortunes, should have been linked together by a union destined so strongly to influence both of them for good or for evil. When two human forces meet, one humble and the other proud, one observant and the other intoxicated, one receptive and the other self-sufficient, the advantage must in the long run lie with the more sober and gentle force. It is as in the relationship of a married couple: the husband may seem powerful and dominant, but the wife moulds his conduct and his destiny. In the connection between England and India the advantage could not but be on the side of the latter. Some persons who value gewgaws and unsubstantiality may deem what England gained by the connection something worth having—prestige and wealth. Among the short-sighted, the uncultured, and the mercenary these things are

always of value, but in the eyes of the cultured and thoughtful both are often useless and sometimes mischievous. Prestige is a deceptive thing, and without the support of solid elements it cannot long succeed; while wealth, being a gift of the goddess that is proverbially fickle, appears, unless pretty equally divided in a community and endowed with stability, to cause as great evils as want: for, if want of competence in any large section leads to violence and revolution, superfluous wealth leads its possessor to luxury and self-indulgence, which undermine manhood, life, and happiness.

English statesmen and other great Englishmen of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century did not attach much value to the acquisition of dominion in India, and so they left the government in the hands of a corporation of traders, who on their part were so jealous of intruders that every foreigner wishing to try his fortune in India had to take out a pass, as Asiatics have now to do in some of the British Colonies. The only real gain to England—a gain that it is the ambition of every idealist to achieve—was that she was installed in a position to influence for good one-fifth of the human race, at that time in a state of decay, the different parts suffering from internecine feuds and jealousies, tyrannized by local authorities that had passed

beyond the control of the central Government, and possessed of no organized party strong enough to form a Government capable of maintaining order within and of resisting aggression from outside. The leaders of the people welcomed the English as divine messengers sent to relieve them from oppression and to bring them peace and rest. How prophetic was their vision was proved by the succession of wise rulers and able soldiers sent out from England, who, by a career of administrative capacity and of conquest rivalled in recent times only by Napoleon, while unaccompanied by the weakness which caused his downfall, step by step brought all India under orderly government and laid the foundations of that policy of education and freedom that had made the British race the greatest liberal force among mankind. Some of the modern successors of those great rulers and conquerors find fault with that policy because it has "awakened" the people of India—or certain classes and individuals, as it pleases them to say—and has made them clamorous for full British citizenship. They may as well blame those great Englishmen that, after a long struggle, secured education and enfranchisement for the toiling masses of their own countrymen, who have thus been enabled to develop their manhood and to render to their King and country service that

would otherwise be restricted to a small class and a few families. The condemnation of the policy of education and freedom by men that would themselves not be educated or free if their rulers had not been liberal and wise—this is one of the most curious phases of modern life, and proves how the mind under evil influence is apt to forget itself and its antecedents.

The advance of democracy in Britain has produced one notably undesirable feature. When a small class and a few families held power, their good manners and their concern for the welfare of the people of India, as well as for their own humbler countrymen, were proverbial. Nowadays, whether the shortening of distance by steam and telegraph, colonial influence, and the frequent visits home are responsible for the apathy and even antipathy displayed by both the official and the trading classes in India, which King George (then Prince of Wales) lamented on his return from his Indian tour, or whether the keen struggle of existence at home takes men and women out before they have formed their character and have had opportunities of acquiring good breeding and British ways of life and thought, the men that are sympathetic or even outwardly polite are becoming so rare that, when an Englishman braves the prevailing atmosphere among his own countrymen, he is worshipped as

a hero by the people of India, and receives proportionate condemnation from the reactionary camp in all parts of the Empire. Similarly those Indians that are found on the side of reaction or of the existing order are lauded as the true representatives of their race and country.

The present "imperial" idea is to regard the founders and consolidators of the British Empire as fools for having initiated a liberal policy in any part of the Empire. It may be "imperialism" to denounce the people for their faults, real or imaginary, but it is scarcely statesmanship to avow incapacity to mend them. It may be "imperial" policy to try to stifle at their birth infant nationalities in different parts of the Empire, bound like the four parts of the United Kingdom ultimately to form a solid whole, but it is scarcely British to regard patriotism, although it may for want of proper guidance be erratic, as synonymous with disloyalty, sedition, and anarchism. That phase of the mind which at a certain stage of its development finds pleasure in being strong to the weak and deems it prudent to be weak to the strong is responsible for the sham imperialism which is ready to concede every demand of those parts of the Empire that are practically independent of Britain, yet tries to assert all its reactionary strength in India, which is in need of sympathetic guidance to

fall into line with the progressive sections of the Empire and of mankind. The charge of sedition levelled against men that wish simply to have fair play and to participate in the rights of British citizenship can hardly be sincere in men whose ancestors attained freedom by successful rebellion against oppressive authority, and who themselves at the present day labour to vilify his Majesty's Government in order to oust it from power, and even threaten on behalf of a small minority in Ireland armed rebellion against authority should self-government be granted. In the British Empire (outside India) "anarchism" cannot be a crime, since (as Lady Dorothy Nevill records in her "Reminiscences") Mr. Gladstone himself was regarded by Conservatives as a "Satanic Anarchist."

In self-government rulers may think or act as they like, since a wide-awake people would in case of incapacity or undutifulness soon relegate them to oblivion. True imperialism, like Rama in the Aryan epic, when he discarded his virtuous queen to conciliate his subjects, would lead its advocates to be even more anxious than when under popular control to encourage criticism and to make the most liberal concessions. Timely and adequate concession is one of the most difficult problems of life. Too long delayed concession fails to remove bitterness and grievances, while intoxicating power and rendering it un-

generous; premature or too ample concession generates pride and complacency in the people. The turn that the "imperial idea" has taken in Britain by its success in India is to proclaim the British people to be unfit for self-government, the House of Commons to be unqualified to legislate without control, and peers and their supporters to be the natural leaders of the people.

It is often asserted by a certain class of minds that some races of men are made "imperial" by nature, and that some individuals in each race are born to rule. The one statement is inconsistent with the other. If a race is made by nature imperial, every member of that race must be imperial too and equally able to rule. Those who in Britain profess to hold that the "British race is imperial" should be the first to admit that every Briton is a born ruler of men. If they were sincere in their conviction, they would not abuse the men in power, who are as much Britons as themselves, and laud a few families as alone gifted with the capacity to govern the Empire without election by the people. If capacity to govern is inherited there should be much more governing capacity in India than in any other country, since Aryans there organized a system of government and society long before the greater part of Europe emerged from barbarism; and, if the germ of capacity and

culture is retained in the blood, as is often stated in the case of successful men that have had a few great ancestors, that germ, dormant though it is bound to be after such a long sleep, ought to exist in every member of the higher castes in India. Theories are advanced and statements are made by people as suits their dispositions and momentary interests, and it is a matter of no consequence whether self-government or Crown-government prevails so long as the rulers are anxious to advance the interests of the people under their care.

The ideal at which all sane people in Britain, even in the privileged classes, had previously aimed, the ideal that must be steadily maintained in order to preserve British character and institutions from decay, is to extend British institutions and freedom as quickly as possible to every country after its conquest and annexation, as has been done in the Colonies by Liberal administrators with such remarkable success. If that wise policy were sincerely, even though slowly, followed, and not permitted to degenerate into the hypocritical pretence of holding out hopes and disappointing in action, as in some quarters it is deemed shrewdness to do, the heart of every patriotic Briton would rejoice at the prospect of the political unity of the Empire and of the triumph of British principles. New India,

although preserving all her sacred and time-honoured possessions, is a creation of British statesmanship of the days of old, the statesmanship that held it a greater honour to mould graciously the destinies of fellow-men than to pose as divine and infallible, and that thought it nobler and more chivalrous to raise from the mire an ancient race and to lead it towards self-government than to let it slumber for the sake of momentary advantages. What statesmanship and sympathetic official leadership can do for ancient peoples possessing the germs of culture is shown by the remarkable rise of Japan and by the events that are taking place in China. India was awakened by British statesmanship while those countries were still in sleep. Now that they have commenced to show dazzling lights, the brood of blind self-seekers deem it advisable to send India to sleep again. It is difficult to believe that, at the instigation of this interested gang of conspirators, whose chief weapon is appeal to prejudice, the authorities that speak in the name of England will be induced to divert British statesmanship from its traditional career of emancipation, and to attempt, as despotism has apparently done in Poland and Finland without strengthening itself, to smother an infant nationality at its first sign of awakening. Should the conspiracy succeed, the growth of the new

nationality may be deferred, and India may at the instance of un-English Englishmen continue to be the moral and material plague-spot of mankind, but she will not suffer alone. A chain cannot be strong so long as it has a weak link; the British Empire cannot be invulnerable so long as India continues to inspire fear and does not become as strong as any other link in the great chain forged by Providence for the good of mankind.

Reverence for authority and love of order are inherent in human nature. In India and in the East generally, where the Sovereign is regarded as the vicegerent of God and as the embodiment of impartiality, justice, and righteousness, and where personal power associated with mercy is still worshipped, it is not difficult for rulers, speaking and acting in the name of the Sovereign and displaying some of his attributes, to evoke loyalty and devotion to the Throne. How much greater would be such loyalty and devotion if the Sovereign were known to be personally watching over the welfare of his subjects! No more profoundly impressive sight has ever been presented in the streets of Calcutta than when hundreds of thousands of Hindus, headed by their leaders, marched with bare feet and in mourning garb, as in a funeral procession for a father or a mother, to express

their loss at the demise of King Edward VII. In the royal progress through India in 1911-12 no scene was more thrilling than when King George, to the dismay of his entourage and of his body-guard, went among the crowd on the Maidan at Calcutta and made them wild with loyal delight.

A happy augury for the future, unique in British-Indian history, was the desire of King George and Queen Mary to proceed to India and to hold a Coronation ceremony. The presence and personal influence of the embodiments of sovereignty were bound to have a beneficial effect on the attitude of both rulers and ruled towards each other, to promote greater harmony among all classes, and to bring about a sense of the unity and solidarity of the Empire. The Coronation Durbar would have been beneficial if it did nothing else but demonstrate the King's anxiety for the welfare of his subjects there as elsewhere, the importance attached by the Sovereign and his advisers to that part of his dominions, and the "eternal" nature of the city that was selected as the scene of what in ancient Hindu times was called the Rájasúya Yagna—the celebration in the presence of sub-ordinate rulers of the assumption of supreme power by the Sovereign of the whole country.

The most potent hindrance to a happy relation-ship between England and India is the tendency

of people to be swayed by the impulse to take up a cry or a sentiment expressed by a forward or outspoken comrade. The Colonials have claimed and been conceded generous treatment owing to a white skin making them "kith and kin," although human history does not show that jealousies and rivalries among kith and kin have been less fierce than among races and classes not connected by blood. Nor do the Colonials show any great consideration for the interests of the Mother Country to which they owe their existence and their security. The evil influence of the cry of "kith and kin" can be counteracted only by action in the spirit of the declaration on the part of the Sovereign, proclaimed before the Colonies assumed such importance, that in his eyes all his subjects are alike and that one part of the Empire is as important as another.

In India, as the Sovereign cannot be personally present to discharge the functions of the supreme ruler, the system of Viceroyalty was instituted. A Viceroy is sent out every five years in order that the head of the Government, who, like the Prime Minister at home, is responsible for policy, should carry into the administration of India a fresh English mind, free from prejudices and prepossessions, and impartial to the needs and aspirations of all classes, creeds, and races. Having to deal with a subordinate staff,

mainly composed of timid or lethargic Conservatives, and being unable to hear any Liberal sentiment, much less to receive support for Liberal tendencies, the Viceroy, even when a sturdy Liberal at home, becomes in a short time —generally within two years after arrival—the resigned tool of the cleverest of his Conservative colleagues, and forgets that he is not, like the Prime Minister, a party or racial leader, but the representative of the majesty of the Crown. If he associates much with non-official Europeans, these manage to convince him of their importance as representing "British" interests which, like corresponding interests at home, are in need of special protection against popular demands. If he displays impartiality in any matter, he becomes the object of Anglo-Indian suspicion. If he tries to be liberal, generous, and English, like Lord William Bentinck, Lord Canning, or Lord Ripon, he gets nicknames like "Clemency Canning," and runs the risk of being insulted, or even kidnapped, an experience with which, it is well known, Lord Ripon was threatened. How difficult it now is to satisfy the foreigners in India who, having tasted the blood of privilege, are always asking for more, is apparent from the attitude they assumed towards Lord Minto. In spite of his repressive measures and of "deportations" without trial,

because he made some attempts to conciliate the people he was threatened, as a correspondent of a London Conservative organ wrote from Calcutta, with the same fate as Lord Ripon! Reactionary threats, after Lord Ripon's fate, prove efficacious in hindering reforms.

Whatever motive leads young people to go and seek their fortunes in India, the step involves a loss for Britain; because, in the first place, owing to their inability to colonize or to stay long in the country, their energies are lost to their own country, or to a favourably placed land where they would not decay; secondly, because, as there is no opening in India for the display of originality or exceptional cleverness, the opportunity for the development of virile faculties is lost; and thirdly, because, after a long residence under a burning sun in the midst of pleasure, lethargy, and a meek and docile population, the temper is soured, the nature becomes conceited, British instincts are undermined and gradually lost, and with the inevitable return home comes the appreciation of high-handed methods and the leaven of reaction, which threatens to enfeeble the love of freedom and fair play in Britain and to hand over her future to an oligarchy.

The temper of the party of privilege and monopoly with regard to India is apparent from

the declaration of such a cultured and responsible person as the late leader of the Tory Party that India's position in the Empire precludes her from having a voice in the policy of Protection. Thus even India's rulers are denied the right of doing what they believe to be good for her in matters affecting British interests—a denial not for a moment entertained in the case of the Colonies—while in matters affecting Indian interests alone they are given a free hand to do as they like without any control from home. According to this school, India is an opening for the sons and daughters of the educated impecunious classes—the sons being handicapped at home by increasing competition, the daughters finding the marriage market more and more closed owing to prevailing ideas of independence and thriftlessness—and an outlet for British capital. Even so, British capital will gain more by advance in the happiness and prosperity of the people, by feeding and nursing the goose than by cutting it open to extract all the golden eggs at once. In this controversy of Protection against Free Trade it ought to be remembered that India is largely a self-contained country, like the United States and the British Colonies, and that her new industries (being in their infancy) and some old ones (defunct or dying) need encouragement. As labour is cheap,

she ought to be able to produce at a cheaper cost price than foreign countries many articles she now imports. Guidance, sound methods, and co-operation, as well as capital, are needed; and if Britain provides these, with humane treatment in other ways, India is not, like the Colonies, so ungrateful as to forget her benefactor or to do anything to injure his interests. Until, however, India can produce all articles needed for her wants, her interest lies, like that of Britain, in Free Trade, so that raw material and manufactured articles may not rise in cost by a tariff, and her products may not be subjected to duty in other countries.

The very fact of discriminating between the interests of the people of England and of the people of India, of opposing any administrative or legislative reform because it will benefit the one or injure the other, is a disruptive force that ought to be discouraged by far-sighted statesmanship. The temper of "damn the consequences," enunciated by a recent addition to the peerage and adopted by the House of Lords in November, 1909, is not so harmful in Britain, where the electors can guard their own interests, as it is in India. That temper had led reactionaries connected with India to instigate the human mind to malice and uncharitableness, and to make a distinction in the matter of rights and duties

between his Majesty's European and Indian subjects. If such distinction is to guide the policy of the Empire, it is vain to expect peace or goodwill among the different races and classes that combine to constitute the British Empire. It is a common occurrence in families for the children to fight with each other over trifles, to wish to monopolize any toy or sweet placed before them; but if the parents or guardians favour some children and deny liberal treatment to others, the deprived children not only feel a grudge against their favoured sisters and brothers, but gradually come to dislike their parents as unkind and unjust. They cannot be expected when adolescent to stick to the parental household, or to feel through life any great inclination to help each other in danger or difficulty, which is bound at times to crop up in human affairs.

The bold and courageous policy followed by the Government of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman towards South Africa, by granting it self-government five years after its conquest and annexation, and enabling the whilom commanders of the enemy's forces to be the first Ministers of the new British dominion, is not palatable to the average statesmanship, whose prominent characteristic is excessive caution and hesitation, with occasional expression of patronizing benevolence. To such statesmanship it seems safer to blunder

with timidity, to retain the right to domineer over people that may be placed under its power, to continue the dominance of might over right, and to encourage the nursing of the feeling of revenge, than to be courageous with generosity, to extend the hand of cordial fellowship, which might under conceivable circumstances be misunderstood and might possibly not leave a feeling of gratitude behind. An attitude of confidence and respect towards a vanquished foe, or towards people who would be foes but for such confidence, is the essence of the ideal relationship between man and man. It has always been displayed by great heroes that have left their mark in history, but it cannot be expected of every politician that may happen to gain prominence in a State, and whose humane and progressive ideas and strength of conviction may lack the courage to brave the ridicule of petty minds and to run the risk of failure. It is possible to conceive that a great leader will at the proper time arise in England to do for India what the Government of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman did for the conquered Boer States and what the Government of Mr. Asquith proposes to do for Ireland. The chief difficulty lies in the fact that, while in the case of the Boers no traditions had to be sacrificed and no bureaucracy had to be conciliated—no time being given for their

existence—and in the case of Ireland 85 votes in the House of Commons have considerable influence on policy, in the case of India 150 years of bureaucratic traditions, monopolies, and vested interests, combined with absence of Indian voice in Parliament, stand like an impregnable bulwark, which a masterly stroke by an exceptional giant can alone carry by assault.

The issue that divides India from the rest of the Empire is whether she is to continue outside British Dominions while remaining a field for exploitation by natives of those Dominions, or whether her aspiration to be included in those dominions is to be satisfied, so that she may become as strong a link in the chain of Empire as any other Dominion. If, because the people are of a different religion or complexion, India is to be *of* the Empire but not *in* it—in other words, if she is to remain a mere dependency—and if her people are to continue to be treated, not as human beings, but as worse than cattle in human form (cattle being cared for by societies), it seems unreasonable to expect from them such hearty loyalty to the connection with Britain as can be conciliated only from an attitude of fairness and goodwill. The position of British Indians at the present time is peculiar. In foreign States and by international law they are of British nationality, but within the Empire

they are neither British nor alien, and are debarred from serving their Sovereign and Empire in many of the important spheres open to their fellow-subjects of other parts of the Empire. The weak or reactionary brain may demur to the policy of fair play and goodwill, because it cannot conceive a state of affairs in which all classes and races within the Empire should have equal legal rights and equal opportunities of distinction and of service to the State. Monopoly and privilege are what the "imperialist" understands best and would like to perpetuate, until the complete demoralization of the privileged order itself by the intoxication of irresponsible power and the degradation of the rest to a state of servitude, or until civil war and a resulting foreign invasion and conquest, cause his effacement. Consistency is a virtue that cannot be expected of the "imperialist" brain, otherwise it may be asked why in Britain monopoly of patriotism and power is claimed by the landowners, while in India it is claimed by and for those that have no such stake in the country and are a constantly changing body.

It is impossible for despotism and freedom to flourish side by side within a State without producing unfortunate results. If it were possible to exterminate the whole population of India, as the aborigines in some of the Colonies have been

extirpated, peace and progress might ensue, and India might conceivably in course of time come to be in the position of the other daughter States with self-governing institutions, and not be a source of weakness and danger to the Empire. As matters stand, she not only lays Britain open to the taunt of hypocrisy and inconsistency in advocating freedom and liberal institutions in foreign countries, in standing as the champion of oppressed nationalities struggling to be free, while following a different policy within the Empire, but also communicates to Britain, through those retiring after service in India or returning from a visit to India, the reactionary ideas they imbibe during their stay. If a reactionary policy is successful in India, their minds get accustomed to it, and they naturally conclude that it should be equally useful to Britain; while, if it is not successful, a patriotic impulse prevents them from condemning the acts of their countrymen, acquaintances, and friends, and such condonement of wrong weakens principles and degrades the mind. Thus evil is perpetuated; Britain gets more and more leavened by reaction imported from India; and it looks as if even English Liberalism might soon sink to a pious tradition antiquated by the glory of imperial sway, in which a few families and a small class will again play in Britain the parts which a handful

of men find so captivating and dazzling in India.

How matters have drifted may be gauged from the Press, in which a few years ago a considerate spirit towards India, such as is now displayed towards the Colonies, generally prevailed, whereas now but few even of the journals that are Liberal in other matters can refer to India and Indians otherwise than in tones of supercilious contempt. India will not suffer alone by the encouragement of the tendency, as is evident from the language often used towards political opponents in Britain by the class claiming a monopoly of good breeding. The responsible leaders of the Tory party have already put into plain words the firm belief of the peers that the Liberals have no right to be in power at all, that even when they are in office the Tories ought to rule, and that the only proper advisers of the Sovereign are the Conservatives—roughly, the holders of land, the possessors of wealth, and their supporters—whom the toiling classes by a vote of confidence every six or seven years are to maintain in office until, as in autocratically governed countries, the vote of electors becomes of no consequence, and ministers remain in power at the will of the Peers. Until, however, these opinions come to be generally held in Britain, when the choice will lie between oligarchy and

revolution, no reasonable man would argue that the Sovereign should proscribe his Indian subjects as advisers on the needs of his government in India or as defenders of his throne and power.

The struggle that has in recent years been initiated in India by the British connection is not between "British rule" and any other rule; it is not between British and Indian interests; nor is it to subvert the Government, as enemies of conciliation and of human advancement would fain lead people to believe, in order to have the brutal satisfaction of tyrannizing over rivals or victims that are in their power; it is the perennial struggle between reaction and progress, between monopoly and justice, between despotism and freedom. As the permanent victory of the Peers in the constitutional conflict brought on by their rejection of the Budget of 1909 would have meant the destruction of self-government in Britain, the continuance of race domination in India tends to carry with it, what reactionaries so much desire, the discomfiture of Liberalism within the Empire, the effects of which must inevitably be far-reaching, affecting the heart as well. If Indians are to remain the pariahs of the outskirts of the Empire, if birth in a particular circle or locality is to be the passport to service to the State, the real British people will be the descendants of the Norman conquerors

and their relations and henchmen; the others will be the outcasts, whose self-government will consist in recording an occasional vote for their rulers.

The interests of Britain and of India, and for that matter of all other countries and races with which Britain or India may be brought into close contact, are identical: what is good or bad for one cannot but have the same effect on the other. An idea has sprung up, mostly in "imperialist" circles, that India is being Westernized by English education, and that such education should be either stopped or modified. No greater want of the faculty of observation has ever been displayed by man. It is easy to note signs that prove that England has been more Easternized by the connection with Asia than India has been Westernized. India has certainly been brought into contact with modern Western thought, and has been inspired by the modern Western ideas of progress and of nationalism—ideas that carry into practical life the Aryan conception of spiritual brotherhood, the corner-stone of which is sacrifice of self for the general good, because self is by education felt to be only a part of the whole. The "imperialist," who found extant in Asia the political conditions which after long struggle and much bloodshed have disappeared in Europe, and which it gladdens his heart to

call "Oriental" because they assure the irresponsible domination of a few over the rest, naturally wishes to perpetuate these conditions in Asia and to bring them back to Europe. When two dissimilar forces come in contact, unless one is quickly overcome and destroyed, each is bound to exercise some influence over the other. The influence is not less if there is contempt, hatred, or indifference than when love and sympathy exist. One may brutalize and the other humanize, one may harden and the other soften the heart, but which is more potent in moulding life and conduct can be known only to each person exposed to such influence, or to impartial observers of the behaviour and tendencies of such person. The influence of Europe and Asia on each other is manifest in every country on both continents, and both are being brought nearer in ideas, each communicating to the other at the initial stages what may appear to be more evil than good, because in nature good is more difficult to communicate and to absorb than evil. The inevitable result of the contact cannot be evaded, although there are many persons in India who, exasperated by European bad manners, wish to boycott everything European, as there are persons in Europe who, instigated by Colonial example and prejudice or resenting the foolish acts of some undesirable

Asiatics, despise everything Asiatic, while imbibing all the time Asiatic ideas and thriving on Asiatic gold and jewels.

How the contact with Asia has undermined the virility of Europe is evident from the fact that it is so difficult to find in European public life any expression of sympathy for, or encouragement of, the aspirations of Asiatic peoples, apparently because selfishness prompts that such sympathy does not pay. After a long sleep, induced by the same accession of self-complacency as seems to be taking possession of Europe, Asia is showing signs of waking up and of taking her place among the prominent forces of human progress. Those at any rate who profess progressive principles might have been expected to help actively the attempt of Asia to be a progressive force. But, as in the decaying days of Asia the best class of minds, seeing the triumph of selfishness, preferred an obscure and secluded life to association with the forces of evil, so the best minds of Europe, seeing the futility of trying to stem the rising tide of selfish greed and not liking to be called unpatriotic, seem to be relapsing into silence and letting the vultures have their way. A feeble voice here and there is occasionally heard, but it is drowned by the deafening din of self masquerading in the garb of patriotism. This din of democratic imperialism is preaching the

new gospel of patriotism, which is to keep others in darkness in order that some may enjoy light, and to sacrifice eternal principles at the altar of momentary selfish gain—a curious patriotism that imitates the burglar and murderer when he has the victim in his grasp. Europe would run the risk of succumbing to selfishness and of declining as Asia declined owing to the selfishness of her ruling classes; but Asiatic nations went down because for centuries no rival powers threatened them. The safety of European nations lies in the presence of rivals all on the alert, each awaiting a suitable opportunity for flying at another's throat. So long as this rivalry continues and every nation is threatened with subjection or extinction if it goes to sleep, virile energies, although drawn away from more peaceful pursuits, will be kept alive for the preservation of life.

The danger of following in India a policy different from the traditional British policy of freedom and fair play—a policy recalling measures deemed necessary in the days of counter-revolutionary terror under Castlereagh and Eldon—is that "British rule" would, in the estimation of the people, be brought down to a lower level than the autocratic rule prevailing in Russia, Germany, and some other continental States. In those countries the system of Govern-

ment, although autocratic, is national, and is based on the notion that a change from militarism would endanger the safety of the State, and that popular government would undermine its strength and facilitate foreign invasion and subjection. The struggle of mass against class is more acute in these States than in Britain, but there can be no racial oppression. Cases of individual oppression no doubt happen at times, but, being devoid of racial prejudice or privilege, as should be the case in India, the wrong-doers meet with punishment. In India, punishment of a public servant abusing his authority, or even of a criminal European, is considered injudicious as likely to weaken prestige and to undo the reign of terror on which order is believed to rest. The capacity or the disposition to regard both sides of a question is rare, and the view to which people are accustomed is naturally given greater prominence; but absolute power must be singularly destructive of the reasoning faculty if it leads to the conclusion that authority commands more fear and respect when its holders or its professing partisans can commit wrong with impunity.

Many well-intentioned people in Britain wish India to be outside Party politics. To be outside Party would mean for India worse than the cold shade of neglect: for if it is no Party's duty to champion the cause of any part of the Empire,

that part must be made over to Satan, or retained, like a convict settlement, for the breeding of "imperial" ideas. It is a plausible dodge of triumphant reaction to hoodwink the progressive forces, and it too often succeeds when Liberal Governments hold office. How far India is from being out of Party is evident when Liberal Ministers are, in matters relating to India, more anxious to conciliate the Opposition than to satisfy their own supporters. The end of it all is that, although Britain may get at times a Liberal administration that tries to advance the welfare of the masses, India is almost always under the control of Conservatives, to whom any proposal of change, unless it be to make their power stronger, is scarcely less than sacrilege. The Government is called British when the object is to give Europeans the best posts in it, but it becomes Indian (or Asiatic) when an excuse for not applying European principles of administration has to be found, or when financial liabilities have to be incurred. Similarly, in administration when efficiency is praised the credit goes to the European staff, and when any fault is found the censure falls to the lot of the hard-working and ill-paid Indian subordinates. This spirit of racial antagonism must be subversive of impartiality and efficiency in the administration and of loyalty in the Indian staff. The policy of fat pay, ease,

perquisites, and praise as the share of the European officers, and hard work and blame as that of the Indian rank and file, may be lauded to the skies by reaction—but scarcely by sensible persons—as ideal statesmanship.

The threat of Colonial secession hangs like the sword of Damocles over every British Government. Hence no demand made by the Colonies is considered too unreasonable or impolitic to concede. People profess great jubilation and profuse gratitude when a colony offers to construct one or more Dreadnoughts, manned by its own sons, and to *lend* them to Britain, not without consideration, but in return for participation in the Cabinet discussions on Imperial Defence and on Foreign Policy. On these terms even Germany, whom everybody is so anxious to conciliate, would, if properly approached, perhaps agree to lend to the British Government, in case of need, some of her own warships. India contributes annually nearly a third of her revenue towards the defence of the Empire, and sends her troops to whatever part of the world they are required to fight in, and yet, if the slightest concession to popular sentiment is asked by or for India—not to speak of a voice in Imperial policy—reactionary forces in Britain at once assert their full strength, to which even advocates of progress succumb, and all hold up their hands in horror

for the safety of the Empire. It is no wonder that under these conditions the strongest Liberal minister cannot do much during his tenure of office, and India is left to drift to her doom. The history of mankind shows that, wherever and whenever the conflict between progress and reaction has become slack, decay and ruin have set in.

In one matter the Colonials receive, even at the hands of the party that profess undying love for them, scant consideration, and this, unless remedied, will interfere with the development of their ardent loyalty to the Empire. While the titles of Raja (king) and Maharaja (great king) are showered upon private British Indian citizens, and Indian Chiefs receive also salutes of guns as if they were independent Princes, the democratic Colonial appetite for titles and honours is but sparingly satisfied, as if through dread that its satisfaction would enable Colonials to intermarry with the British nobility. It is a slur on Colonial honour and antecedents to deem Colonials unfit to be placed on social equality with the Peers of the realm.

The latest policy enunciated by the present Colonial leader of Opposition is that when and if the Tory Party attain office the Colonies, and not the British people, will be afforded the opportunity of deciding the sort of commercial preference they desire and the amount of taxes

the British people are to pay on their food. This is bending the knee at Colonial altars; it is quite the other pole to the policy that lost Britain her great American colonies. If sanctioned by the voters at the next (or any other) General Election, the new policy will probably have the same result, though in the opposite way to the other: it will make the British people anxious to cast off the "Colonial millstones round our necks."

Not all Europeans are spoilt by the conditions of life in India, so different from what they are accustomed to at home. Those that are blessed with the spirit of toleration, those that are able to retain their balance of mind in spite of unaccustomed adulation and of the possession of unwonted luxuries in the shape of hosts of servants, carriages, and honours, and those that refrain from applying strong drinks as an antidote to the effects of grilling heat—these get acclimatized to Indian conditions, come to like India and its people, and are even sorry to return home when they cannot at an advanced age revert to the conditions from which they have been separated during the best part of their lives. It is the men and women whose balance of judgment is upset that aspire, on the strength of difference of race or complexion, to play an imperial rôle, and that pretend that the safety of "British"

rule depends upon the recognition of their claim to infallibility and inviolability. It is these that cause the growing estrangement between Asia and Europe, and are sowing the seeds of disruption of the Empire.

A potent cause of the "unrest," or dissatisfaction with the Government, has been the miscarriage of justice in cases where an Indian has been brutally done to death by a European. This generally happens when an employer, after perhaps imbibing a drop too much of liquor, finds some fault with his servant, who, if he is so stupid as to face his master and not to run away, receives blows and kicks which "enlarge his spleen" and end his earthly career in a few minutes, hours, or days, according to the vigour with which they are administered. Indian servants get high wages from foreign masters, higher than from their own well-to-do countrymen, and, in addition, are supposed to be able, like the same type in Europe, to bamboozle foreigners to their hearts' content; hence, in spite of kicks and blows and tragic ends, the foreigners find no difficulty in getting servants. Neither better-caste Hindus nor Bengalis of any caste would serve foreigners in any menial capacity; but the low-class Hindu and Moslem are always available, and these may, by their timid and unintelligent ways, perhaps rouse the

foreigner's ire. Beating of servants is so common in European society outside Presidency towns that an employer that has been an exception to the rule is sometimes heard to brag that he has never thrashed his servants. The thrashing is indirectly encouraged by the judiciary and local police, who, on account either of backstairs influence or of fear of incurring the displeasure of superiors, let a culprit escape justice, except in very grave cases that cannot be hushed up, and even then the murderer is generally let off with a fine of twenty or thirty rupees (£1 5s. to £2), because European juries, composed of clerks and shop-assistants, cannot be persuaded to convict of grave offence a member of their "own race." It is, as a London paper once remarked, "cheap homicide." It is doubtless cheap for the criminal; but it is far from cheap for the Government, for every such case undermines its authority and prestige and shakes the popular faith in its capacity to protect its subjects. By law the Government has power to appeal against acquittals or inadequate punishment to the High Court, and when this power is exercised in the more advanced provinces a conviction with a term of imprisonment generally satisfies the claims of justice. In these cases the poor witnesses, being of the class to which the victim belongs, are so browbeaten and frightened when giving evidence that they

often contradict themselves in details. Such contradiction is made the excuse for acquittal or for a nominal punishment when a European is the offender; but on much flimsier evidence Indians charged with similar offences are severely punished or sent to the gallows. Similar things happen when outrages on women take place on railways and in plantations. Common assaults on and insult to travellers and others by "imperial" or drunken foreigners, and even by foreign policemen, are of such frequent occurrence that people have come to regard them as inevitable when they stir from home.

It is not unusual to find in every community, class, and race members that are disposed to wickedness and crime, so as to bring discredit on the whole body. In a well organized and disciplined body such members are excommunicated, with deserved punishment. There is as much wisdom in condemning a community because a few are wicked as in spotting a few of the best men in it and calling it an angelic body, or in ignoring crime when committed by one's friends or relations. The moral atmosphere of a community may be imagined when crime and wickedness are not only not condemned but positively condoned by the general body as prerogatives of a superior civilization. Such condonation has the threefold disadvantage of demoralizing the

community itself, of degrading it in the estimation of other communities, and of setting a bad example to inferior classes and races by leading them to think that impunity for wickedness is a privilege and a sign of superiority. When a community encourages crime and harbours criminals it injures itself more than others; and nobody need complain of the freedom claimed by individuals and classes to do what they like, so long as no injury is caused or bad example is set to others. The example of criminality is stronger than the teaching of virtue, and people that do not themselves possess angelic virtues ought to be the last to find fault with the weaknesses of others. Assaults and insults, even murders and outrages, when committed by foreigners on Indians, are not deemed worthy of notice in the columns of "imperialist" newspapers in Britain or in India, or, if noticed, they are minimized, whereas any offence committed by an Indian is magnified and distorted to serve the purposes of "imperial" ascendency. This, according to Occidental natures, may be fair in political warfare; but, as the Indian masses, for whose welfare the reactionaries profess so much concern, are not yet cognizant of enlightened European methods of dealing with opponents, they take a primitive view of such matters, and regard the silence in one case and

the distortion in the other as proceeding from an innate love of untruth and of wickedness.

A few cases may serve to illustrate the state of affairs.

In the first week of February, 1911, a Mohammedan member of the Viceroy's Council was travelling in the only first-class compartment of a train. A European military officer, joining the train, felt himself too exalted to travel with a "native," and asked the Indian gentleman to leave the compartment. On his hesitating to move as there was no other first-class carriage, the officer forced him, by the threat of using his sword, to get out and to go into a second-class carriage. The Anglo-Indian papers did not report the promotion, usual in such cases, gained by this officer for his "imperial" attitude towards an Indian gentleman. This is by no means an isolated instance. There is scarcely an Indian judge, Raja, or Councillor (not to speak of humbler mortals) that has not had, when travelling by rail, similar experience of this rude imperialism. In answer to a question in the House of Commons in April, 1911, the Under-Secretary for India stated a case in which a Mohammedan Councillor had left his servant in charge of his luggage in a first-class compartment while he was in the restaurant-car. A European sub-engineer of the railway turned the

servant out, and forced him to travel to the next station (43 minutes) on the footboard. It was stated that the "imperial" engineer was made to "apologize" to the Mohammedan Councillor, but it was not stated whether the apology was tendered in the presence of the servant, who was arrested by the police for breach of railway regulations by travelling on the footboard and for failing to commit suicide. The engineer doubtless became a hero in his community and received promotion for his "imperial" bearing. The treatment of third-class passengers by the lower type of Europeans, as well as by the railway servants generally, may be imagined.

One would have thought that after the beneficent influence produced by the Royal visit cases of assault at railway-stations on Indian gentlemen would be unknown. In January, 1913, a case is reported to have been heard in the second magistrate's court at Bombay, in which an I.M.S. was charged with pushing and insulting at the Grant Road station a Hindu gentleman, who with his wife wished to get into a first-class compartment next to the one in which the I.M.S. was travelling. Hitherto "high-born" personages in East and West have objected to travel with smaller fry in the same compartment, but matters are advancing fast, and humble individuals must

not wish to travel in the same train with the "imperial" breed. In this case the Hindu gentleman happened to be an ex-sheriff of Bombay. Although, being an athlete, he was strong enough to knock his assailant down, he preferred to lay a charge, at the hearing of which the culprit was let off with an apology. One may imagine what would have happened if the position of the parties had been reversed. Europeans of the type of the I.M.S. are better recruiting-sergeants for the extreme Nationalist Party than "seditious" preachers and writers, and yet the authorities proclaim their helplessness to control them or to protect the people under their care.

While Europeans in India indulge in these pranks, Indian gentlemen, however exalted their rank, receive grudging obedience from their servants and scant courtesy from policemen and subordinate officials, who regard every European "tag-rag" as a greater personage than even Rajas and Nawabs. At the racecourse at Calcutta the writer once witnessed the Chief of a Tributary State—an honoured guest at the King's Coronation—refused admission to the paddock by the European policeman at the entrance—probably because he was dressed in ordinary Indian costume, while every foreigner was being admitted without showing a ticket. A steward, luckily seeing from a distance the Maharaja

turned away, rushed to the spot and took him in. These unfortunate incidents are more frequent on railways, and the authorities, instead of punishing the offenders, seem by their inaction and by the approbation of the foreign Press to encourage rudeness in the same way as Colonial harsh treatment of Indians is condoned by the Imperial Government. It is a strange nemesis that so many Moslem gentlemen have recently experienced such rudeness, as if to prove to Moslems generally the falsity of the anxiety of reactionary officialdom to conciliate them at the expense of Hindus. Perhaps the "apology" is tendered when the offended party is Moslem, while no notice would be taken of insult to a Hindu. Reaction would display greater wisdom if it were to issue private instructions to the "imperial" breed to display their "high-born" manners towards Hindus alone and to conciliate Moslems at every opportunity. So long as this attitude continues, Indian Nationalism has a substantial ground for its propaganda, and with increasing strength its cry will grow louder that the only security against foreign outrage is to deport the offender. There are people in Britain who object to travel in the same railway compartment with their humbler fellow-countrymen not so well groomed as themselves, and who object to go up in lifts with servants or postmen.

Similarly there are foreign residents in India who object to travel with Indians, although some of the latter so objected to are wealthy enough to employ the former in service, and are personally much cleaner, much more sober and genteel, than the objectors to free travel. They do not object to live in the same town or country with the "natives," nor to pass along the streets and other public places with humbler folk, nor to breathe the air and to eat the food into which the wind has brought the dust from the road on which those "natives" tread. There must always be in every part of the Empire a few superior persons of this class, who seize every opportunity of proving the nature of the stuff of which they are made.

This sort of exclusiveness does no harm in India because the people objected to would like nothing better than to be left alone where no intruding, unclean, and unmannerly foreigner may disturb their peace. The mischief arises when a compartment already occupied by the "outcast of the Empire" is sought by a foreign "princeling"; the occupants are turned out by force, or the female passengers are insulted, and no authority intervenes to stop or to punish the outrage. The railway officials, when they are Indians, on being appealed to, declare their powerlessness to interfere with European travellers who may break the law; and European

railway employees, unless exceptionally strict or fresh importations, generally refuse to entertain complaints against fellow-continentals, who must be above the law, or, having the ear of authority, may bring them into trouble. Matters in India have not yet come to the pass described in a book reviewed in a London Liberal journal in July, 1910, where it is stated that in parts of the United States, when a "white" man takes a dislike to a negro and shoots him dead, a false charge against the negro of attempting to kill him is pleaded as his excuse; that such charge is certified by other "white" men that were never near the place of outrage; and that on such evidence the murderer is acquitted, and the judge comes down from the bench to congratulate the accused and to express regret for putting him on trial. In India, the people being meek and disarmed, the excuse of threatened assassination or outrage is not available; but pretexts for assaults are often found and the criminal goes scot-free.

Impartial justice is of prime importance in advancing contentment and national well-being. In the Britains of the West no judge or magistrate would remain long in office if he did not hold the scales of justice evenly between one individual and another, however high or low the position in society of each might be. In India,

when a Liberal Viceroy wished to equalize the powers of judges and magistrates without distinction of race, a howl was successfully raised by those that occupy in India the position of "peers of the realm" objecting to such equalization, on the ground that a peer cannot be tried by an Indian commoner, but really because they thought that a "lordly" culprit would not have the same chance of escape that he has hitherto enjoyed. After that experience no Government would again venture to introduce changes in the law that might secure impartial justice in criminal cases where Europeans are accused of offences against Indians. It may be politic that a "peer" should be tried by his peers—such privilege would relieve Indian judges of considerable anxiety and worry—but to secure justice a commoner should in fairness be tried by *his* peers alone; and to cast a slur on his Majesty's judges and magistrates because they are of a certain race or nationality is scarcely the way to secure respect for law and justice, or to make that class of public servants devoted and contented. If any judge—"peer" or commoner—is habitually guilty of partiality or injustice, he should be removed, but so long as he remains a judge he should represent the majesty of the Crown. As a matter of fact, one never hears of the removal of a "peer" judge who dispenses

injustice—as civilian judges and weak barrister judges selected in India for social reasons generally do—and whose judgments are upset by the High Court on appeal, but Indian judges have been known to incur displeasure in high quarters for expressing opinions unpalatable to the "peers." It is said that a judge or magistrate condemned by the High Court is generally promoted. A commoner or Indian judge that did not please the authorities that appointed him would not long continue to dispense justice. Judges, magistrates, or other officers of Government when they act foolishly against public interests should be as easily removable from their posts as chiefs are deposed when they incur the displeasure of the residents at their Courts. Jury trial is still confined to Presidency towns and certain districts with restrictions, but it has been so manipulated and made so different from the British system of "Trial by Jury" that in cases where a conviction is deemed necessary a jury is empanelled which is sure to convict—a majority deciding the issue, while in case of acquittal by a majority the judge may accept or reject the verdict at his option. Recently secret trials have been introduced, in which evidence is taken against an accused person without his presence.

Indians are being prosecuted and imprisoned

for trying to "bring the Government into contempt" by their criticism of the acts of some of its servants; but the foreigners who by their manners are bringing the European races into contempt, and the officials who by their partiality are the prime cause of bringing the Government into contempt, are granted free scope for the play of their evil instincts. Instead of trying to make the European more polite and humane, the reactionaries instigate the punishment of the aggrieved. It is well known to scientists and other observers how even ants and worms when hurt try to bite or sting, and it is strange that human beings should be expected not to resent ill-treatment. To discourage such resentment, the reactionary device is, not to avoid treading on a worm, but to crush it. To crush three hundred millions of human worms is no joke even for the modern almighty "imperialist." If they could be crushed out of existence, the opportunities for the development of imperialist conceit would be considerably decreased.

The average European Briton is said to be able to stand any amount of rudeness at the hands of "my lord," so he naturally thinks that, being himself "my lord" in Asia, his bad manners will be equally palatable to the Asiatic. Circumstances being different, Asiatics do not quite appreciate "lordly" behaviour, and they cannot be justly

expected to feel honoured by such behaviour when they see no patriotic services rendered among them by "my lords," such as the lords render to their own country. Army men, too, show contempt enough for mere civilians at home, but, being unable (as under continental military despotism) to wield irresponsible power, have to be content with fretting and fuming and swelling the ranks of the reactionary party. In India they are said to be more contemptuous of the "natives" who, although fellow-subjects, are not "brother-officers," and with the better classes of whom they never come in contact. Navy men must be still more haughty, because, while Indian Christians and Eurasians with dark skins are admitted into the volunteer ranks of the land forces, no dark-skinned man is enrolled among the naval volunteers. Thus army and navy men, who have not the opportunity that their civilian brethren possess of making the acquaintance of Indian gentlemen and ladies, become self-complacent; and, being convinced that the safety of the Empire rests with them, become instruments in widening the breach between the European and Indian Britons, and thus weakening the State of which they are the defenders.

The welfare of civilized communities is based on mutual respect between the rulers and the ruled. What respect the present rulers of India

have for the people is indicated by the following administrative procedure. The finger-print system prevailing in some countries for the identification of criminals was introduced into a province even in civil life by its then reactionary Governor, who appears to have taken everybody to be a potential criminal, and it has since been extended to the whole of India. In registering any document, the executant, whatever his position in life may be, if unknown to the Registrar, although identified by somebody known personally to him, has to dip his thumb in thick ink and impress it on the document in addition to his signature. A European, however, although he be unknown to the Registrar and have no one but his flunkey, a stranger to the Registrar, accompanying him, is not required to press his thumb in ink. The reason is said to be this: that, when the system was first introduced and applied to Europeans, a European asked for a washbasin to wash his thumb, and, on being told that the Government did not provide such a thing, wanted to wipe his thumb on the Registrar's white *chudder*. The real reason, of course, is that while the authorities did not venture to impose upon Europeans a method of identification suitable for criminals, they did not deem it too degrading for the people whose destinies were in their hands. Another governor laid down a rule that Indians of what-

ever position in life and for whatever purpose leaving India for foreign countries would have to get a certificate of fitness from the "coolie" emigration agent—the governors evidently deeming it a great honour and celestial statesmanship to drag all the people under their sway down to the level of coolies. Is there any other country on the face of the globe where the officials think so meanly of the people whose interests are in their charge? And should they complain if the feeling is beginning to be reciprocated?

Aryanland flourished so long as caste, which originated with hereditary occupations, did not become stereotyped so as to make it impossible for a member of one caste to get into another by change of occupation, business, or knowledge, and thus to engender caste animosity. The safety of modern Britain lies in the welcome given to persons of humble birth when by service to the State, intellectual attainments, or acquisition of wealth, they are raised by Royal favour to the highest grades of society. The decline and downfall of Ancient India commenced when caste rules became rigid, when the caste of priests succeeded in monopolizing learning and in degrading the warrior caste, and when the Brahman was so consumed by conceit as to imagine himself equal to the "gods" and to look down upon the other castes with contempt. While great Englishmen

of days gone by proclaimed and followed a policy of humanity and justice throughout the British dominions, the self-governing ungovernables of the dominions beyond the seas have in recent times been permitted to revolutionize British notions by a claim to white-skinned divinity, with the result that there has been set up an invidious distinction of continent and of complexion as the basis of political rights and social justice, which has commenced to lead even the hitherto down-trodden masses of Europe to succumb to the weakness of looking down with contempt upon every product of Asia—except its gold. It seems to be but a question of time when Europe will be induced by its colonies to renounce Christianity because it came from Asia.

A generation since, bad manners towards Asiatics were unknown or rare in Britain, except among some gutter-boys in London streets. Pigment prejudice against the "yellow" race seems to be disappearing among the better-class Europeans, perhaps owing to its display of martial and patriotic virtues; but among other classes such bad manners are rampant in all parts of the country. The only means of stopping the further spread of such manners is to avoid the contact with Asiatics, not merely in the colonie but in Asia or any other part of the globe, unti they are placed on an equal footing and abl

to hold their own. Should no such step be taken, good manners and high breeding will become as rare in Britain as in the Colonies and in the United States of America, towards all classes and races, dark or fair. Already the Colonial habit of addressing a stranger as "mister" has supplanted the old-world polite epithet of "sir." It is not yet too late for the enfranchised masses of Europe to avoid the poisonous leaven that Colonial example has introduced. Cultured and humane persons in all classes have not yet succumbed to these demoralizing influences, but signs are not wanting that such influences, if continued much longer, may, like incessant dripping of water on the hardest stone or continuous hammering on the firmest substance, have the usual effect of bending or breaking the most upright and Christian disposition. The difference between the Old and the New World, between Europe and its oversea products of mixed races, was recently exemplified at the annual Reception of a well-known London club where a negro lady and gentleman were invited. An American guest remonstrated with the secretary for permitting the presence of negroes, "whom we would not admit to our social functions." The secretary coolly replied, "We in Europe make no such distinction." The appearance of an increasing number of Africans in the streets of

the metropolis seems from writings in the Press to be having a disturbing effect upon the soft brain of a certain type of Londoners.

It is difficult to understand why the Colonials who have been granted self-government have taken such a dislike to Asiatics. Asiatics never thought of thrusting themselves on Europe or on the Colonies. Europe encouraged them to shake off their exclusiveness, and the Colonies—notably Natal, the most shameless offender of all—sought them as labourers; then, having got what they could out of them, they wanted to send them away. They are quite justified in trying to do without Asiatics, but is it necessary or politic to make enemies of them—and of their countrymen—by insults and inhuman treatment? The Colonials may stand to the Asiatics in the position of peers to the humble classes in Europe, or of the higher castes to the "pariahs" in India. They may not intermarry or take food or have social intercourse with the Asiatics; but why deny them political justice, when in aristocratic Britain men and women scarcely able to read and write or to understand what they read have been given the vote, and scions of noble families and men with the bluest blood "condescend" to sit, discuss, and vote on equal terms with Labour Members in the House of Commons? Or is it because, unable to maintain distinction of blood, blue or

yellow, and debarred from claiming the distinction of being European, they have invented a new distinction based on the "colour" or "colourlessness" of skin as their instrument for perpetuating human animosities and miseries? Besides, there are among Asiatics persons quite as "white" as Colonials, and in such cases the continental bar and not the colour bar is invoked for the assertion of privilege. It may be desirable to discourage illiteracy and ignorance, and the qualification may be made as strict and as high as practicable, but to disfranchise men of education—some of whom are certainly not less educated and less civilized than many Colonials —simply because they are of Asiatic origin, or because their skin has a darker shade, is a curious procedure on the part of men that still profess the religion promulgated by an Asiatic.

Still more curious is the statesmanship that connives at this policy of insults and pinpricks and sows the seeds of disruption within the Empire. It is fit that a Tory administration should sanction the introduction of inequality in legal privilege, which is the principle of Toryism, because it would like to have precedent for reintroduction of inequality into Britain; but it is strange that Liberals should be forced to sanction such policy. It is somewhat odd to speak of

peace and of Empire while enmity and inhumanity

"under the smile of safety wound the State."

Japan by a slaughter of a hundred thousand of her white-skinned enemies has put a stop to the use by the European Press of the insulting epithet of "yellow man," and she has made herself strong enough to be "granted" an alliance, as the Tory Foreign Under-Secretary expressed it in the House, with the British Empire. The "grant" was before she proved her prowess against Russia. But Japan has not yet been able to secure fair treatment for the complexion of her sons in the Colonies, and will probably not succeed in doing so until circumstances enable her to teach the Colonials a lesson in good manners. It would be well for the British Empire if the Colonials would suggest to his Majesty's Indian subjects what they can do to merit some of the fair treatment which British aristocrats have vouchsafed to the Colonials, in order that all who own allegiance to the British Crown may stand shoulder to shoulder in defence of the best interests of the Empire and of mankind. It is doubtless clever statesmanship to try to conciliate the Colonies, but it is a strange fatalism which denies to India anything like the same liberality,

and which prevents her rulers from being anxious to raise in the estimation of the world the country they administer.

It is said that the Colonials are "kith and kin." Intermarriage, which is the sign of kinship, does not appear to be common between the better classes in Britain and the Colonials. As regards kinship by race, the Aryans of India may claim to be kin, although on one side

"Minds swayed by eyes are full of turpitude";

and on the other the proud and self-complacent castes would hardly like to admit kinship with the foreigner, however "bleached by northern blasts" his skin may be, or whatever political power he may exercise. Such kinship is irrefutably proved by similarity of physical features and supported by linguistic relationship. European nations will be tumbling over one another to claim kinship if India, like Japan, can again place herself in the front rank of mankind.

"One touch of nature makes the whole world kin";

and kinship at any rate may with advantage, like nationality, be extended to all persons that own allegiance to the same Sovereign, unless a new doctrine of "imperialist" Christianity be promulgated, declaring the different branches of the

human family to be the creation of rival Creators, in which case, as with rival nations, it should be permissible to the creation of one Creator to try to injure or annihilate a rival. There is shrewdness in the desire to extend kinship only to those from whom favour is expected or danger is apprehended.

Partiality on the part of authority, not being in accordance with the old idea of British statesmanship, is called by expatriated Europeans "statesmanship of the British race." British statesmanship without distinction of party is well known to be guided by the highest principles of justice and fair play (note the statesmanship of Sir Stafford Northcote, the first Earl of Iddesleigh), and of freedom from any bonds that retard the development of human faculties. The triumph of these principles has been witnessed in the education and enfranchisement of the humbler classes in Britain, in the dissipation of religious intolerance, and in the grant of self-government to the Colonies. British statesmanship has always endeavoured to act up to the liberal traditions that "God never made one nation good enough to rule another," and that "good government cannot be secured without self-government." It recognizes that it is not enough to desire power over fellow-creatures without deserving it by their admiration, and

that the administration of justice has to inspire confidence in its impartiality. It knows that among nations, as among individuals, it is impossible for one to understand another if no fellow-feeling, sympathy, or affection subsists. British statesmanship is inspired by the traditional aspiration to unify the Empire by the bonds of affection and common interest in its welfare: it is only recently that it has showed hesitation at the loud barking of reaction and the consequent response of weak-kneed Britons in every party; but, even in times of timidity and hesitation, it does not renounce its concern for all classes of the people. Statesmanship of the "British race," on the other hand, is the product of its connection with other races in the Colonies and in India; it lacks the good breeding and manners of true Britons, insults the people it is exercised upon without having the courage to exterminate them, displays its shrewdness only by fomenting discord between classes, creeds, and races forming the Empire, and, failing other methods, condemns every reform as undermining its prestige. Statesmanship of the "British race" will never care to understand India or Asia, because the faculty or feeling that helps to understand and sharpens reason does not exist in that race. Failing other qualifications, the new statesmanship bases its claim to consideration and

power on the possession of a particular skin colour or want of colour. It is unable to comprehend the teaching of history that dominion and authority are not secured by skin, but by display of faculties that evoke reverence. In the view of this statesmanship, a fair skin, although reared in the despotic atmosphere of continental governments, is better qualified to be of the "British race" than Indians born British subjects and bred in the moral atmosphere of Britain, merely because these have a shade in complexion.

The action of the Colonials in showing their contempt and want of consideration for his Majesty's dark-skinned subjects, although it may stand in the way of the solidarity of the Empire, would be comparatively harmless if the effects of such action were confined to the Colonies themselves. Their example, however, spreads abroad, and operates most injuriously among the Europeans that reside in India, who, although debarred from privileges (except when they commit crime), expect the same sort of preferential treatment from the authorities and assert their claim to treat their Asiatic fellow-subjects with brutal contempt. The example does not even remain confined to India, although the most harm is doubtless done there: it is infecting all classes in Britain, who naturally feel hesitation to side with people that submit tamely to such treatment.

From the moment, however, that such action and policy receive the sanction or connivance of the rulers of the Empire at its heart, and his Majesty's Ministers, while indulging in half-hearted expressions of sympathy with the sufferers, express their inability to interfere with the self-governing Colonies or to permit retaliation against Colonials in the directly governed dominions, a racial struggle is initiated which can end only with the exclusion of one or the other of the contending factions from the Empire, and which is bound to introduce other conditions detrimental to its stability.

The excuse put forward by some bigots, that Asiatics are not Christians, is scarcely borne out by the treatment meted out to Asiatic Christians, who fare no better than their non-Christian brethren. It may be true that the manners and habits of the mass of Asiatics are somewhat different from the better class of Europeans, but they are not more different than are the manners and habits of the classes out of which the Colonials spring from those of "gentle" folk in Europe, between whom there is little in common except the skin complexion. Besides, to contend that no Asiatic can be equal in manners to any European is not only rebellion against the reign of Jesus Christ: it would be no more just than it was for the upper classes in Europe to deny to

any European of the humbler classes equality with their order. However manners may differ, and however desirable it may be to avoid each other's shadow, nothing is gained by nursing a feeling of animosity. The Colonial claim is nothing but an arrogant assertion of superiority of a petted and pampered portion of the Empire, and of their ability to dictate to its rulers. The attitude of British statesmen is incomprehensible, since there is nothing to show that in the hour of need the Colonials will be more helpful to the Empire than Indians, or that they will claim no return for any service they may render to their Sovereign. In any case, if this civil strife is permitted to continue within the Empire, or to grow as it has been doing for some years, it is vain to expect peace and prosperity under the existing political conditions. Asiatics, if not permitted to give blow for blow, which alone will bring the uncultured Colonial to reason, will be driven to seek other means of rousing his conscience and of advancing the happiness of mankind. The British Empire or Dominions or Possessions—by whatever name it may please people to call the British territories in Asia—cannot be safe under present conditions. Until the people of India are fully trusted, and bold statesmanship removes all barriers from their paths of service to their Sovereign and country, the British

dominions will owe a good deal of their security to foreign alliances or to the goodwill of foreign nations. Political arrangements are shifting from day to day, and any policy which drives Japan from the British alliance, or alienates Russia, can hardly be conducive to the safety of the British Empire. If the policy of the Colonies towards Asiatics is not speedily changed, the day will arrive when Britain will have to choose between her Colonial independencies and her Asiatic dependency. The British alliance at a critical period has been of considerable service to Japan, and proverbial Asiatic gratitude will induce Japan to be always on the side of Britain if British statesmanship does not yield to Colonial prejudices so as to show that they consider the interests of Colonial tradesmen greater than the honour and self-respect of the Japanese nation and the safety of the Empire. The Colonies occupy the most favoured position imaginable. They have in their legislation or administration no fear of the veto of the Peers. They enjoy the protection of Britain against foreign invasion without adequate contribution to its cost. They tax British products as much as suits their purpose of protecting native industries. They can exclude even Britons from their soil on the plea of their being "undesirable aliens." In spite of cloudy and questionable antecedents, they have

become so respectable as to ask Europe to send them immigrants from "among the best" and "of the right sort," not being loyal enough to their ancestry to doubt any European to be otherwise. That is not all. The human mind is so constituted that the more it gets the more it asks. Some of the Colonies, like persons in railway and domestic service objecting to the name "servant" as degrading, refuse to be called "a British Colony," and claim the right to make commercial treaties with foreign States without the intervention of the Central Authority, and to control the Foreign and Defensive policy of the Empire. Their only remaining step is to proclaim independence of Britain, or to declare Britain to be subordinate to them, as soon as they find that the security of her Empire in any way depends upon the help of the dominions beyond the sea.

If the Colonies are sincere in the wish they at times express to be partners in the trials of Britain, they should place themselves, as India is placed, under the complete control of the Home Government in military and naval as in foreign affairs. The defensive and offensive strength of the Empire should be so organized as the British Cabinet may direct, and on a footing of strict co-ordination, for it can be effective only if all the forces are subordinate to the supreme military

and naval authority of the Empire—the Army Council or the Defence Committee of the Cabinet. A complete and uniform plan of naval and military inter-connection is absolutely essential for the defence and welfare of his Majesty's dominions all over the world. Until this is done, professions of friendship and promises of help by communities that cannot help themselves will not contribute to the safety of the Empire.

Although at present the Cinderella of the Empire, without any voice in administration, legislation, finance, or defence, receiving from her co-partners not merely scant courtesy but positive rude treatment, India has to discharge a duty in the performance of which she should rise above petty considerations or even selfishness and set an example to the rest of mankind. After twenty years' dictation to British statesmanship, the Colonies have obligingly condescended to contribute towards strengthening the Imperial Navy, on which their own security depends, *in return* for a voice in Imperial policy. India has not, nor is likely soon to have, a Minister that will secure for her any voice in shaping even her own destiny; but, with her high breeding and noble traditions, she should display not merely generosity but self-sacrifice in offering her scanty life-blood at the foot of the Throne in order to have a share in strengthening the Navy. It is

true that she contributes nearly twenty million pounds sterling annually to the Army, and the Princes pay for Imperial contingents. Recently there have arisen naval Powers that may place the British Navy in difficulties and assail India's commerce and coasts. Even if India were free from fear of attack, it is her duty to do what she can to guard the heart of the Empire from danger. From the policy hitherto followed by India's rulers, it may any day be announced that "the Government has decided [of course without India's knowledge or consent] to levy an annual contribution of so many hundreds of thousands of pounds [the amount depending upon what it is deemed safe to extort from the wretched underfed taxpayer] towards the cost of maintaining in Indian waters a squadron strong enough to guard India's interests." The state of affairs regarding British India being so, it is not for British Indians to offer their mite. There is, however, a large and influential class of India's sons on whom devolves the privilege of offering on behalf of their Motherland what would really make no difference to them, towards strengthening the Imperial Navy, on which their safety as well as that of the Empire depends. Like "the idle rich" elsewhere, they squander annually in luxuries and frivolities huge sums of money, besides hoarding up jewels, gold, and silver of

immense value. A contribution of a few millions (without adding to the burdens of their subjects or tenantry) from the Princes, Chiefs, and nobles of India to strengthen the Navy is for them a duty, and it is to be hoped that they will discharge it without any pressure being put upon them, and without heeding the separatist ebullitions of reactionary politicians. The world advances in happiness because there have always been in every age great minds that have known to place duty and right above temporary selfish gain. By making such a contribution without conditions, and possibly without any return, India will prove to mankind that there is one part of the Empire of Britain—of which Britain may seem heartily ashamed, without knowing how to get rid of it—that is above selfish considerations or dictatorial moods, and that knows how to sacrifice itself at the altar of duty. People may laugh or taunt at such "folly," but the day will come when India will reap the reward for noble deeds that her sons may now render to the Empire.

England's capacity to mould human destiny for good is in no matter better proved than, as a Professor of Minnesota University recently expressed at a Congress on the subject of the "Criminal Born," in sending her sons—certainly not of the criminal class in recent years, what-

ever might have been the case in bygone times—"to America to become founders of the first Virginian families, and to Australia and New Zealand to become Ministers of State." Unless that capacity is diverted to other channels, it may be trusted to convert India from a weak link to an equal importance with the Colonies in the chain of the Empire of Britain. How the human mind may at one time be humane and at another time cruel, at one time generous and at another time parsimonious, at one time just and at another time partial, is exemplified by Britain's present attitude towards different portions of her Empire. She paid heavily for the liberation of slaves in the New World; she pays in Britain almost all expenses connected with the self-governing Colonies; she compensates inn-keepers when their licences are extinguished; but when any help for India is hinted at, all her generosity and wealth vanish, and grave but inexpressible reasons of public policy are invoked to cover the appearance of miserliness and injustice.

While Britain during the Revolutionary period underwent the grand transformation from a mediæval to a modern State, what a change has come over the policy that governs India! Only compare the first half of the nineteenth century with the last. The statesmen of the first half of the century never once dreamt of preferential or

exclusive rights for any class or race, and were anxious to give the people English education in order to make them British in thought and feeling and qualified to serve the State in every sphere. Europeans were not given a voice in the government from which the people were excluded, as is the fashion at the present day in some parts of the Empire; nor were British subjects, owing to skin complexion or nativity, denied in Britain the right of education, or of franchise, or of serving their Sovereign in the Army, Navy, or Volunteers, as is now being attempted. Equal rights for all British subjects: that was the policy that governed the Empire when a Liberal wave was sweeping over the country and bringing emancipation to the Catholic, the Jew, the Colonial, and the householder. The policy of equality ruled the Empire in days when men of courage and liberal ideas were at the helm of affairs. The long period of Tory domination and the closer communication with Asia and the Colonies have changed all this, and the separatist policy of inequality has triumphed. At the end of the South African War a deliberate insult to Asiatics was permitted to be inserted in the Treaty, in order to save the self-love of the conquered enemy, on the ground that otherwise the war would not terminate. If the enemy could have continued the war, he would have done so

for other reasons than the question of the franchise; but to permit a defeated enemy to dictate terms of peace, to change the policy of the State, and to introduce distinctions unknown to the British mind, could only have been the act of an agent that had his revenge on the Mahdi—like Charles II on Cromwell—by desecrating his grave, and of Ministers that thought of conciliating Germany by the surrender of a strategic base like Heligoland, and that afterwards concluded an alliance with an Asiatic Power to guarantee the safety of the Empire, while the subjects of that Power, as well as other Asiatics, were denied the rights of humanity in dominions of the Crown. One can imagine the howl that would have been set up by the "imperial" press and party if these acts had been done by a Liberal Government; but Liberals in opposition are generous and patriotic, and do not follow the example of their opponents by attempting to weaken the Government and the State by a display of disunion within.

Responsibility for a particular policy is often thrown upon the electors, who are more concerned with their own local interests and grievances, and vote for the Party that will pay the most attention to them. Wars abroad influence their votes because they have to provide the sinews of war in blood and money. About

the policy with which a distant portion of the Empire is to be governed they are less intelligently concerned than about the appearance of a comet or an eclipse. Matters affecting distant countries are left to the judgment of men whose business it is to attend to them, the average British elector having too much to do with his own affairs to find time to study them. The policy pursued abroad thus depends wholly upon the Minister in charge and upon the Cabinet as a whole. When those who attain the position of Ministers of the Crown are alive to their responsibilities, not merely for the moment but for the future, the lasting interests of the State are well guarded. If, however, personal or local considerations influence a Minister, or if he cannot control the conservative instincts of his permanent subordinates, his slack rule sows the seeds of disruption. The responsibility of the British elector, who has the opportunity of selection at certain or uncertain periods, is comparatively remote: the will of the British people is as it is expressed by the Minister in charge, and that will determines the destiny of the Empire. The best of Ministers, if he cannot carry with him the permanent staff of his department, cannot help becoming their tool.

It is strange that the same Minister who initiated the policy of alliance with Japan should

also have sanctioned in the Colonies a policy that cannot but make the Japanese enemies of the British Empire. The people that had the cleverness to secure the British alliance, and, in possible contingencies, the support of the British Navy when they were contemplating the war with Russia—an alliance that precluded the interference of France in the duel—are not likely to rest content with an arrangement whereby, while Japan gives open hospitality to the foreigner, the foreigner does not reciprocate, but keeps his door barred against intrusion. Following the example set by the Colonies, all Western Powers are beginning to refuse to Asiatics reciprocity of treatment in trade and intercourse. This shows how evil example taints the mind, while good is regarded with apprehension and suspicion. Strength may, in the view of some people, justify wrong-doing, but to persist in doing wrong when it injures the doer himself is a curious consequence of a sense of infallibility, for which mankind has had and will always have to pay heavily; and Japan and Asia cannot be blamed for following the example, and for adopting, when strong enough, the policy of retaliation.

The animosity of Europe against Asia engendered by the Colonies has taken a turn in Europe which is a menace for the Great Powers that have large possessions peopled by non-white

races, and it has been created in their own interest by those Powers that have no such possessions. It is now declared to be wrong to employ Asiatic troops to fight a non-Asiatic enemy, which means that England and France and Russia should not utilize their Asiatic or African forces to fight a European Power. What a difference between present imperialism and the imperialism of a generation ago, when, to prove to a European Power the inexhaustible source of Britain's supply of troops, several thousand Indian sepoys were brought to Malta by his Majesty's Government of the day! The growth of American and Colonial influence has made such a move at the present time unthinkable. If the principle be generally established, it will perhaps be a good thing for Asians and Africans not to be called upon to fight the battles of races that have made themselves their natural enemies; but then the corresponding principle must come to be recognized, that European troops should not be employed to fight in Asia. Much more harm to Asia is done by the presence of European mercenary troops, whose excesses with the advance of democracy their officers are unable to control, than is likely to happen in Europe by Asiatic or African troops led by English or French officers, or by officers of high Asiatic birth and breeding. The growth of the feeling

should be noted because it is bound ultimately to lead to the demand—when the time comes for making it, and that will be the time of retaliation for the treatment and example set elsewhere—that nations of each continent, civil or military, should confine their activities to their own continent, and should be debarred by international law from setting foot on any other continent. This is the brotherhood to which the teachings of Jesus Christ are leading European races after a career of equality and freedom!

The antipathy and prejudice against parts of Asia have undergone some change by the victory of Japan over Russia, and the change shows how the European mind values the bloodthirsty propensities much more than humane activities, and accords greater respect to successful slaughter of fellow-men than to pursuit of the arts of peace and goodwill. It was also recently shown by the war in the Near East, where Balkan races that had been condemned by newspaper correspondents for their "astounding laziness, repulsive filthiness, and lack of humour," were, owing to their generally unexpected victory over the Turk, lauded to the skies as the makers of a new Great Power in Europe. The exhibition of worship of military prowess will, it is hoped, wake all Asia from its slumber, and stir it to guard its household against intrusion. China is re-

ported to be introducing universal conscription as one of the principal measures in the policy of its new Republic. Such a measure would scarcely be beneficial for mankind or for Europe itself, if Asia were to imitate Western pugnacity and pushfulness, and, casting aside religious and humane tendencies, enter into competition with Europe in the arts of slaughter, warfare, conquest, and military glory. For such a result the responsibility will lie with Europe.

The weakness in the relationship of India with Britain lies in the manifest desire of Europeans generally in all spheres, high and low, official and non-official, to treat India as separate from the rest of the Empire, and in the corresponding desire of Indians to secure the recognition of their country as an integral part of the Empire. Wise Indians do not claim at once the political institutions that Europeans have gained by a long course of struggle and training, the value of which in advancing happiness is not yet always perceptible in Europe; but they deem themselves entitled to just and generous treatment, and to full opportunity of developing without the bitterness of strife and with the advantage of the experience of other nations such institutions as may be conformable to their traditions and requirements. Opposition to this ideal is the source of all discontent; and discontent is not allayed by the

indulgences that tend to make foreign residents a privileged order like the Peers at home. The Peers have in days gone by sided with the people and extorted rights from the Crown, but now, having found out their mistake, they are trying, too late, to reverse their policy and sympathies. The "Peers" in India have done likewise: when any measure directed against their privileges has been suggested, they have threatened revolt, and proposed, like Irish Ulstermen, to set up a Government of their own independent of Britain. Having had their way for a quarter of a century, they now pose as "ardent loyalists" and upholders of Government! Even so they do not conceal their fangs. When small measures of conciliation have in recent times been proposed, the "Peers" in India have not been slow to proclaim through their organs that the Government was rousing their suspicion.

Under these adverse circumstances the task of impartial government has become most difficult, while any advance towards concession of popular rights is bound to meet with the opposition of the privileged order. Despairing of any improvement in the situation, there have sprung up a generation and a school that consider the Government as partial and undutiful, and therefore deem it no wrong to boycott or stand aloof from it. The maintenance of peace and order on the one

hand and the march of progress on the other have been jeopardized; and unless this mad antagonism between Government and people is deemed to be desirable, or to be justified in the interest of a particular section, it is time that sober and reasonable men should devise means to end the strain. Compulsion in any shape is hateful to all thoughtful people even if it may be momentarily desirable, but no compulsion can unite antagonistic interests into harmonious peace. So long as issues that divide Indian interests from European remain unsettled, bitterness and race-hatred are bound to be kept alive, and peace —true and lasting peace, the peace that proceeds from recognition of mutual rights and duties, and from mutual respect and sympathy—cannot be expected to come. These issues have to be settled in India, as they have been settled in other parts of the Empire, by statesmanship, character, and strength of will, with faith in the principles of right and justice, and without humiliation to the inferior party or forced concession from the superior. The most intense conviction of superiority cannot help, because, when that conviction comes into play, mutual respect, without which all human relationship becomes bitter, vanishes in a struggle for mastery. It is easy for European Britons with a history such as theirs to remember the continuous struggle for

freedom, to appreciate the strength and the meaning of a national consciousness, to cultivate sympathy with people that happen to be weak and helpless for the time, and to place themselves in the position of a nation struggling for the realization of its aspirations.

It would be a curious sight indeed if European Britons should show a disposition to reverse their history and traditions, to imitate and approve of the methods by which the Russian and German bureaucracy are attempting to suppress the voice of freedom, to declare patriotism to be a crime, and, having got rid of class domination at home, to acquiesce in the setting up of a race dictatorship that may advance or retard human progress as may suit the intelligence and capacity of the dictator for the time being. At certain stages of national history dictatorship is, indeed, beneficial, as where the dictator, like Cromwell or the German Emperor, is intelligently bent upon advancing the national destiny when otherwise that would be imperilled by the incapacity and conflict of sectional groups; but when England, the birthplace of a succession of heroes, has found dictatorship unsuitable for progress, it is not likely to be found suitable elsewhere. A claim to infallibility by any finite being, however circumstances may have exalted him, cannot but be, as human history proves, demoralizing to all con-

cerned and dangerous to the State, and can be justifiable only if it were possible for specially gifted persons to continue their gifts to their successors. As experience has proved the futility of the expectation of such continuance, great religious orders have in ancient times both in Asia and in Europe established the principle of empowering the head of an order to nominate his successor; and this principle is followed in modern life in democratic communities by the nomination or periodical election of the governing body and of the heads of the State.

India is now passing through one of those critical stages of existence which come at times to every individual and to every country. If wisely handled by those in authority, it may lead to cordial and permanent relationship with Britain. It is said that there is "unrest" in India. Unrest is at all times a sign of life, and the great bane of India has for several centuries been an excess of rest and lethargy. Europe underwent unrest during the struggles that ended with the triumph of Christianity, and, more recently, of the principles of liberty and fraternity. What would Europe be even now were all unrest to stop? Letting alone other parts of Europe, the struggle for political and social mastery in Britain is not yet ended. Great minds have now and again appeared at the helm of

affairs to advance national well-being by measures of emancipation liberating the people from bondage and giving free scope to their faculties. In spite of favourable circumstances, the genius of Britain is far too conservative, and the influence of the aristocracy is far too great, to allow the masses to attain the goal of their ambition—fair play and equal opportunities for all individuals and classes. Great measures of reform and enfranchisement, it is true, have endowed the masses with the power to regulate their destiny by their votes; yet too many votes are still cast for monopoly and privilege, so that reaction can continue to pose as the champion of order. India, like Britain, is an essentially aristocratic country, made so by her history, traditions, and religious development. She has, however, the misfortune of being the only great country in the world that has for several centuries been under foreign domination — domination foreign in race and religion; and this makes it impossible for her rulers to regulate her religious and social needs according to time and circumstances.

To cultured Aryans, who do not favour sectarian disputes and rivalry, and whose minds perceive the Fatherhood of God and the unity of Creation, it would have made no difference if the priests had not succeeded in expelling Buddhism, which was at one time adopted by

the Hindu kings, and under which China and Japan flourished; or if the Mongol invasions had converted all India to Islam barring its fanaticism; or if it were possible for the whole people to adopt Christianity—the religion of Jesus Christ, not the glosses of its modern teachers and missionaries, who neither understand nor practise it. In their philanthropic vision they would rejoice if the advancement of India were not barred by any antagonism between her rulers and her people. The process of converting the rulers commenced with the study of Sanskrit by some eminent men among them, but was by circumstances unhappily stopped. The antagonism is becoming more and more acute because, while all other countries show signs of advancement under sympathetic rulers whose interests and glory are identical with those of the people over whom they are placed, in India this identity is impossible; for her rulers cannot be attached to a country that they cannot make their home, whose culture they do not understand, whose climate and conditions are so different from their own, and from which they are anxious to retire as soon as possible. The evidence now being given before the Public Service Commission lays bare the canker in British Indian Government—almost all European officials being opposed to the further advancement of the people. The unrest

in India has therefore not taken the normal course it took in European countries, but is directed into channels from which it is the duty, as it is in the power, of her rulers alone to rescue her.

It is asserted, as if it were a small matter, that the educated class alone is disaffected and wants a change, the masses being unconcerned. This assertion is solemnly put forth by persons who themselves are of the educated class in their own country, who would make short shrift of any rulers that they deemed undutiful, and who would not be in a position to make the taunt if they had not the education that is one of the principal triumphs of a liberal policy in Britain. The educated classes in every country are the pioneers of progress and freedom, and, when they are thwarted in their aspirations, their attempts are naturally directed to change the nature of the rulers that stand in the way of the advancement of their country. Unless Aryan nature in India is different from other human nature, or unless a different standard is to apply to Indians from what is applicable to other men, no sensible man should deem it exceptionally unnatural and wicked to be disaffected. At the same time, it should be remembered that such disaffection as exists is directed, not against the Government but against the non-application or abuse of British principles of rule.

The statement that the masses trust foreigners more than their own educated countrymen is another argument used to dupe the English people as to the necessity of "foreign" control in India. It is on a par with the attempt made by reactionaries to be considered as the "governing class" in England and to frighten the well-to-do classes to side with privilege against progress. The falsity of the statement is proved by the absence of interest of the rulers themselves in the moral and material advancement of the poorer classes and in stopping the infliction of wrong upon them by power, privilege, and wealth. In addition, the Indian masses are so distrusted that they are not allowed to keep a gun, sword, or firearm to guard themselves against robbers and wild animals, while even the men that serve in the army are prohibited from keeping any fire-arms during the period of their leave. It may be desirable to keep a check in every country on the indiscriminate use of dangerous weapons, but when a racial bar is set up it not only intoxicates the privileged race, but also tempts the foreign invader by debarring the mass of the people from helping their Government when in danger. The educated mind of India, whose patriotism in the modern sense is, it must be acknowledged, of recent growth, is anxious to secure for the Motherland the conditions that prevail in other

civilized countries, under which the rulers initiate, encourage, and foster every movement for the moral and physical welfare of the people. A few good and wise rulers in India have always tried to do their duty by the people, but they have been so few that their action has always roused suspicion among those whom they wished to benefit, while among their reactionary countrymen they have been ridiculed as weak or crotchety philanthropists. It has thus been a discouragement to rulers with good intentions who have tried amidst the routine of their official work to advance the interests of the people placed in their charge.

The Colonial ill-treatment of dark-skinned races is having its effect on the status of British Indians in Britain. For there forces of disruption are at work in attempts to exclude Indian students from Universities, engineering establishments, hospitals, and mercantile offices, and to deny the full advantages of University life to the few Indian students that are still admitted. The changed attitude is largely due to the presence of large numbers of Colonial students, some of whom, not having the prestige of birth or social position, are sowing the poison of discord in order to assert their superiority over mere Asiatic fellow-subjects. It is also partly due to the venom displayed by reactionaries against educated Indians

—especially those that have been educated in Europe—owing to their claim to equality of opportunity. While the higher offices, thrown open during the latter half of the nineteenth century to educated Britons of all classes, are by Liberal policy being slowly opened to Indians of character and ability, it looks as if the reactionary bureaucrat, like the proverbial dying insect, is bent, in the less advanced provinces, upon giving its last bite by making rules excluding Indians even from subordinate services hitherto open to them. The latest instance is the subordinate medical service. Continuity of policy is pleaded as the excuse for resisting progress. But this reason never stands in the way of capricious despotism when it means to initiate wrong, for which reactionary courage shows its mettle.

At a meeting of the Moslem League in June, 1911, a retired Anglo-Indian official is reported to have given expression to the view held by the present type of reactionary European Britons in wishing to prevent British Indian students from coming to England to be admitted to the Bar. The chairman of the meeting was an Indian gentleman who has attained high position by becoming a barrister in England. This circumstance did not weigh with the retired reactionary, who is evidently of the type that in India abuses its position by doing all it can to undermine

British prestige, and returns home to propagate the seeds of disruption among different classes of Britons, and who knew no more of what good manners demanded than to claim a right to speak at a meeting of Moslems. Persons of this type attend such meetings because they hope, by displaying sympathy with Moslem against Hindu, to sow dissension between creeds and classes, and thus to continue their evil dominance. The reason assigned by this great retired "statesman" for the undesirability of Indian law students coming to London is that they do not get the advantage of the companionship of English students or barristers. It is scarcely the fault of Indian students if they do not receive fair treatment; but the reason is as cogent as it would be for a reactionary peer to say that, as peers do not associate with the humbler classes of Englishmen, the latter should not be allowed to come out of their homes, or should be deported to the Colonies. As a matter of fact, it is not true that Indian law students are ostracized as alleged, because there are still English gentlemen that have not succumbed to Colonial and Anglo-Indian influence; but some Indian students keep aloof to avoid the risk of coming across "imperial" rudeness. The President, however, gave his reactionary guest a snub by pointing out that if Indian students

are not allowed to come to Britain they will go to Japan, the United States, or the Continent—as, in fact, many of them are now doing—and that such a course would be more fatal to the connection of England with India than the mischief caused by undesirable influences in London. This reactionary type, with its brain petrified by adulation and absolute power, cannot be expected to mind snubs or reason; it can comprehend only that the safety of the British Empire lies in the perpetuation of its own unquestioned sway, and in affording opportunities of distinction to those that have not the strength of character to retain British instincts under all conditions. Reactionary Europeans would display greater capacity and wisdom in achieving their end if, instead of placing all Indians in one category, they would follow the policy recently initiated in India of making a privileged race of Moslems, and would grant to them alone, and not to other Indians, facilities of education, trade, and intercourse in Britain and in the Colonies. In an age, however, when differences are accentuated by skin colour, and religious toleration and the advance of liberal ideas have permitted whiteskins of rival creeds and classes to claim one nationality and all European nationalities to claim (outside Europe) to be of one race, reactionaries have not yet been ingenious enough to devise a means whereby, in

spite of the same race, complexion, and features, Indians may receive differential treatment according to creed. They need not despair, for, if India has to go through the same process of development as Europe has done, it is likely that for a generation or two religious animosities, so sedulously fomented, will prevail before cultured Indians succeed in subduing them and in forming one nationality of all creeds. The process will be quicker in India than it has been in Europe, because Europe had to develop toleration, whereas India has the advantage of the example of Europe as well as of her own ancient teaching. The recent passing of a resolution advocating self-government for India by the Council of the Moslem League cannot but be startling to the enemies of India and of human welfare.

The expressed desire of the reactionary official and the attempts invidiously made to stop Indian students from coming to Britain for education, although prompted by unworthy motives, will not, if it can be satisfied, be so injurious to the students as he imagines. It will be more injurious to the interests of Britain and of her Empire, for which these well-paid functionaries profess so much concern. It is also what Indian enemies of the British connection desire. In recent years many of the young boys, freed from the control of home and of society, have shown a tendency

to go astray in the flywheel of "modern Babylon," and, neglecting their duties, have returned home with ideas and habits scarcely in consonance with Aryan traditions. It would not be a bad thing if this risk could be minimized, and if some wise plan were devised by authorities in consultation with parents and guardians for the exercise of a reasonable control over the young men. The best plan is to bring them in contact as much as possible with respectable society and with the family life of their fellow-students as well as with their teachers and professors, so that they may avoid the demoralizing surroundings open to the stranger in a foreign land.

Social intercourse, however, is desirable only if the men and women with whom the Indian students come in contact would put aside the attitude of patronizing condescension, which rouses a sense of humiliation and leads the students to avoid such society, and would observe the traditional British breeding of putting guests at their ease by conversation and general demeanour such as they would use in the company of British or Colonial students. Character is only habit long continued, and good habits constantly followed grow into second nature. Such society as would warn the students by precept and example against sloppiness in thought, conduct, demeanour, or even in dress, and would

teach them to cultivate the manly reserve that keeps from excessive and redundant speech, would be as beneficial for them as for advancing Imperial unity. Among the endowments of human beings is the power of resistance to injurious influences, moral and physical, and the power depends upon the vitality, inherited or acquired, of each system, individual and national. Indian students abroad should also bear in mind that it will be their rôle, like that of the foreign-trained youth of China and Japan, to guide their country into line with modern conditions.

To be quiet and dignified, like well-bred English gentlemen, and to be polite and helpful even to strangers, like Asiatics and many continental Europeans, may be a combination somewhat rare in individuals; but, if not an impossible blend, it might with advantage be steadily aimed at by those that have the opportunity of helping in the development of the character of the student of both the East and the West. That such blend is not impossible is evident in every age and clime from the conduct of individuals, some of whom gain deserved rewards for such conduct. Another combination, which it is difficult to find but which ought to be fostered from boyhood, is statecraft with religiousness. Cardinals Wolsey and Richelieu, although high dignitaries of the Church, figure

in history as great statesmen, combining astute diplomacy with theological duties. Such a combination in the East has not been unknown. Krishna, although regarded as an incarnation of divinity, as great heroes were in those times, was the greatest statesman of his time and country. Like Bismarck in recent history, he contrived to bring about the destruction of the enemies of the branch of the royal house he befriended, and to make his *protégés* supreme in Aryanland. It was owing to his birth and early training in statecraft that Buddha was able to promulgate a religion combining humanity with sane worldliness.

It may be desirable in particular cases to keep the students in hand in such a way—financially and otherwise—that, as soon as a young man showed any tendency to go wrong, he should be "deported" home. Stopping the advantages of English education to eligible and respectable young men may be pleasing to reactionary conceit as well as to the extreme Nationalist bigot, who would fain boycott everything European, but it cannot promote a loyal or fraternal feeling among people that are so treated, and by fostering racial animosity it is bound to injure the stability and welfare of the State.

Heroic measures such as reactionaries advocate may conceivably keep Aryanland in its present solitary glory as the moral and material plague-

spot of mankind, and save Europe—and Britain in particular—from the untoward consequences of imperial democracy. To combat modernism, the Pope was recently reported to have issued a *motu proprio* prohibiting young students from reading newspapers and periodicals, as by so doing their ideas may be liberalized. In independent Hindu times the holders of power deemed prohibition of learning to the "lower" castes to be the only means of retaining absolute and unquestioned sway. The constitution of the Indian Universities has recently been changed and officialized with a view, it is asserted, to discover whether the Indian youth, instead of becoming clever and patriotic, cannot be *educated* to be stupid and servile. It should not be difficult for the reactionary brain to invent a system of education that would deaden the soul while stimulating the intelligence. If these measures, along with the reactionary device of setting class against class and creed against creed, fail to stop the growth of patriotism or of discontent, the only alternative for Britain, if she wishes to retain India as the hunting-ground for Europeans, is the acceptance of the proposals of retired commanders-in-chief for compulsory military service and readiness to dispatch half a million troops at short notice. The influence of Europe is at present most observable in Asia by the importa-

tion, not so much of other European manufactures as of brusqueness and bad manners (which are associated in Europe with independence) and of bombs. The spirit of anarchism, represented by bombs and Browning pistols, has made its appearance, not only in India but even in Japan and China, which after the services rendered by their present rulers should be, like England, the least likely to need revolutionary methods to rouse the authorities to a sense of duty. It is for prophetic and thoughtful persons to say which of the two parties may boast of doing the greatest injury to the other—Europe, by the introduction of bombs, bad manners, dynamite, and picric acid into Asia, or Asia, by the threatened adoption of militarism by Britain. Human nature appears to be so constituted that, in the absence of good, or along with good, evil is communicated.

No sane man would think it possible for the people of India to come in contact with Britain, to study her history, to watch her struggles for freedom, to note the methods by which the Opposition tries to make the Government unpopular with a view to oust it from power, to observe the patriotic instinct that leads people to subordinate all personal and class differences to the need of presenting a united front when the interests of the country as a whole are at stake, and yet not to learn something from the example

set. At first the effect may only be superficial, but continuance of the conditions is bound by habit to affect thought and action. No reasonable mind would deem it possible for the contact to continue and yet to avoid the consequences, to show to Asiatics the modern methods of justice and equality and yet to deny to them the wish and the right to profit by them. If the expressed desire of the imperialist to let darkness flourish in order that he may personally benefit by it be genuine, the only way to secure the end would be the stoppage of all moral and intellectual intercourse between India and Europe, which from the attitude of prominent personages is evidently in some quarters considered feasible, and towards which affairs would tend if reactionaries were to come to the helm of affairs and retain it for a time.

The matter now stands thus: If the present rulers cannot or will not do for the people of India what they would do for the English people if they were rulers in England, what are the Indian people to do? Surely it is reasonable that they should try to impress on the ruling authorities the need for larger sympathy and dutifulness. In the peculiar conditions of Indian Government the authorities have to be much more cautious and circumspect than in self-governing communities if they are to expect

people to repose confidence in their good intentions. Such confidence can scarcely be expected when measures of repression are, like wicked conspiracies, concocted in secret, and passed in haste without adequate consideration and discussion, while proposals of reform take years to bring forward, mature, and consider, and are delayed by frequent reference to numerous authorities whose assent is held to be indispensable for the introduction and the stages of reform. Should a reform measure after tiresome cogitation be introduced, it is declared to be experimental and cancelled by the first obstinate reactionary that comes to power—Whitehall being then obliged for reasons of public policy to support "the man on the spot." When any reactionary ideas are embodied in a Bill, attempts are made to prove their likeness to some law in Europe with which it is sought to assimilate Indian legislation; and when any proposal wholly opposed to European ideas is advanced, it is based on the difference between Asiatic and European conditions. Such a system of administration may be described as shrewd, but people with their eyes turned to the light of Europe have passed the stage when it might be called statesmanship.

Certain reactionaries endowed with more passion than brains advocate "ruthless re-

pression" as the policy of British statesmanship in India. The tactics of reaction consist of praise of every harsh measure, provided no friend or compatriot suffers by it. Such tactics are often useful in gaining the ear of authority when it is reactionary, and in retaining influence with such authority. It is always desirable to have frank people to deal with, rather than false friends or hypocritical enemies. The remedy for unrest which these ardent "patriots" recommend is just the thing needed to nurse the growth and development of an infant Nationalism. All nations and countries that have had to pass through similar conditions have emerged from them chastened, purified, and strong. Repression has in history done more harm to the repressor by making him less human. The repressed had generally in the darker ages to go through worse experiences than suppression of public speech and meetings, indiscriminate house searches and arrests, imprisonment without trial and Jeddart justice. Men—or at least some with the figure and face of human beings—who have a voice in public affairs in Britain are not ashamed to proclaim their nature by advocating merciless coercion of nationalism, by which they evidently mean violence and torture, which appears to be resorted to by the police in order to extract evidence and confessions, and

to secure convictions, as well as by those in charge of penal settlements. They do not seem to have studied history well enough to know that, when law and authority do not protect the public, the public begins to think of protecting itself.

The educated class in India, being as in other countries the most articulate, have by their claim to represent the views and interests of their countrymen incurred the displeasure—if not the enmity—of the "imperialists" in all the Britains. The "imperial" European, who has at any time in any way been connected with India, or who has by friendship, relationship, or even by passing acquaintanceship breathed the Anglo-Indian atmosphere, pooh-poohs the educated Indian claim; but he himself poses, not only as the best guardian of Indian interests, but also as the rightful and accredited mouthpiece of five hundred millions of Europeans, on whose behalf in connection with public affairs he invariably uses the first person plural. This attitude may be defined as "separatist imperialism."

In Indian affairs, as in other human matters, there are two conflicting voices striving for mastery. One is the traditional British spirit of justice, fair play, and freedom of development; the other, the obstinate will of the prejudiced

autocrat anxious for absolute power, to whose vision appears nothing but suspicion and the duty of suppression of the springs of national aspiration. This is the consequence, on the one hand, of the blind reverence for authority that was the characteristic of Indian thought and habit, and, on the other, of the inculcation by British teaching and example of the duty of independent judgment and of the right of personal self-assertion. The conflict has brought into being New India—the India of British creation. Reactionaries flatter themselves that what Britain has done Britain can undo; but it has passed the stage of human power to destroy the Aryan spirit, although it is still possible for reactionaries to nurse dissension between the Indian and European Britons, or to promote for a time ill-feeling between Hindu and Moslem, by stories of persecution and ill-treatment of one race or creed by another—stories such as proved successful so long in deceiving the British people as to the state of affairs in Ireland. Happily, however, it is still in the hands of generous and far-seeing statesmen to guide the new idea so that without doing anybody harm it may place a fresh laurel on the brow of British manhood. A great statesman, in spite of the warning and opposition of timid Conservatives, had the courage and foresight to concede self-government to conquered

States five years after the conclusion of a cruel and bloody war; and he succeeded because bureaucracy and privilege had not become incrusted in the newly annexed territory. A greater statesman, even after several centuries of such incrustation, risked a temporary weakening of the Liberal forces by the desertion of pusillanimous colleagues, in order to establish the right of Irishmen to self-government, and to disprove their being "Hottentots," with whom a Tory Minister compared them. India has, perhaps, to pass through a long period of unkind treatment before another great statesman arises who will make India truly British by a just and wise policy. In the meantime, British Indians must be content to remain political pariahs, and it is to be hoped that they will not be so exasperated by the insult and unkindness of the privileged races of the day as to render a reconciliation and fraternal union impossible at a later time.

Loyalty to the Sovereign wears in India a different complexion from loyalty in other countries. The Sovereign is the embodiment of the unity of a State, and the fountain of honour, justice, and mercy. The Sovereign in other lands lives and moves amongst his subjects, is a partaker of their joys and sorrows, notes their wants, grievances, and aspirations, and tries to alleviate or satisfy them. For India the Sovereign is

something like the Godhead which Aryan wisdom conjectured—a spiritual Being on whom all matter rests, but who is Himself apart from matter. The last two Sovereigns were gracious enough to visit that portion of their dominions as heirs to the throne. King George and Queen Mary were the first Sovereigns that the Indian people have had the privilege of acclaiming in person. The extraordinary effect produced by their short visit proves that, although the Sovereign may be rarely visible, the Aryan nature is so trained to spirituality that it knows how to be loyal; but the loyalty, being under the circumstances spiritual, cannot be personal, and as God is held to be incapable of doing wrong, the King is similarly regarded as the source of good only. In the physical absence of the Sovereign, personal loyalty in India is claimed, not only by every non-Asiatic whiteskin, non-official as well as official—every one of whom claims to represent the majesty of the "imperial race" whose Sovereign is also the Sovereign of India—but also by every public servant, and most by the village policeman, who represents in his person in remote parts, where no other authority is visible, the majesty of law and the power of the Government. Loyalty has consequently come to be ridiculous, like the worship of the thirty-three million gods of the Brahminical pantheon; and, when it is

not readily conceded, as educated people are unwilling to do, especially when the gods are anything but just and virtuous, the recalcitrants are set down as disloyalists, seditionists, and anarchists.

Owing to the close connection with India and the retirement home of the "gods" in greater numbers, British ideas are naturally getting somewhat mixed. Most of those retiring have acquired sympathy with domination in some shape, and, as Conservatism represents class domination, they swell the already too numerous crew that seek to identify themselves with rank, wealth, and fashion.

The connection with India is thus communicating evil to Britain. Wealth alone is bad enough to demoralize individuals and nations by diverting virile energies to frivolities and pleasure:

> "Worse poison to men's souls,
> Doing more murders in this loathsome world
> Than these poor compounds that thou may'st not sell."

But when to this is added contempt for the toiling masses and struggling races, and the infliction of inhuman treatment on labourers to secure higher dividends, it has the effect of the proverbial beggar on horseback—it divides the nation into

two hostile camps and rides the State to destruction.

The educated Aryan mind of India is placed by partial acts of the authorities on the horns of a dilemma—whether to be loyal to the British connection or to be dutiful to the Motherland. The ideal to which all good and true men, both in England and in India, may usefully direct their efforts is to make it possible for the people of India to be loyal to their country as well as to those who claim to represent their Sovereign. If the Sovereign and the country pull different ways there is chaos, and no one can foresee what will come out of it in course of time. Every sane man will, however, admit that wisdom lies, not in thwarting legitimate aspirations, but in guiding them slowly but steadily along the right channels by the policy of compromise towards the common goal of happiness for Britons of both the East and the West. There cannot be co-operation of the awakened classes of the people with the Government in any country so long as its policy is to encourage or to connive at racial or religious antagonism, and to oppose at the instigation of reactionaries proposals for the advancement of the people. Such co-operation is as impracticable in India as is the co-operation of earnest Liberals in Britain with a Tory administration whose avowed object is to guard the privileges of the

peer and the plutocrat, and to obstruct attempts to improve the health, cleanliness, and sobriety as well as the education of the masses that have hitherto been in their power.

The Nationalist Party in India is declared by the omniscient bureaucrat to be a microscopic minority of the population. The reforming party in every country begins as a minority. At present, no doubt, it is difficult to fix its numbers; yet it cannot but ultimately embrace the whole population, seeing that its object is to raise the Motherland to her pristine position of honour and usefulness. Unfortunately, the original encouragement of the authorities has long since turned to opposition: many of those that have a right to speak in the name of the Government, instead of initiating and fostering a conciliatory policy, are eager to thwart it. Progress in any country is difficult owing to the obstruction of the privileged orders and of the timidity that causes people to shrink from changes the result of which they have not the foresight to perceive, or the honesty of purpose to face with equanimity. In India it is impossible to make a satisfactory, rapid, and substantial advance in any line, owing to the absence of official leadership and direction.

High officials and persons of recognized position are in every country the natural leaders of the people. In India, owing to peculiar circum-

stances, the highest officials have hitherto been of a different race and a different religion, and, except in political matters, unable to advise or influence the people. Even in political affairs, owing to the antagonism of race and religion set up for personal ends by vested interests that call it "imperialism" to foment internal and sectional differences, there is hardly a single officer of high standing—although a few are generous enough after retirement from service—that would take up the attitude of the leaders of the Liberal Party in England and advocate reforms according to the needs and circumstances of the time in order to strengthen the administration and advance the happiness of the people. However just and generous their disposition, the peril of a broken career naturally induces caution. The prevailing atmosphere in the bureaucracy is that any member expressing, even in words alone, sympathy with the aspirations of the people is held to be weak and "unpatriotic" and opposed to the interests of the "Government." His chances of promotion or reward are endangered, if not wholly destroyed, by such sympathy. A sign of "strength" of the ruler in India is the degree of unpopularity he incurs among the Indian people in the discharge of his official duties, with a corresponding amount of praise among the reactionary foreign community. The popularity

of an official mars his prospects of promotion to high posts and opportunities of usefulness. It is no wonder that very few officials can be found with instincts of fair play, and of loyalty to the country they serve, strong enough to withstand such adverse conditions, and that the bureaucracy should have come to be regarded as a mass of invincible prejudice not easily improvable by reason.

It is asserted, perhaps with some truth, that the Aryans of India are not yet fit for self-government. Of course, they will never be considered fit so long as the concession of self-government depends upon the recommendation of persons whose interests are supposed to be endangered by the grant. It is difficult, if not impossible, to prove whether the people of India are or are not fit for taking any steps towards self-government until they are given the opportunity. Should opportunity be given, it is probable that, as one going to the water for the first time runs the risk of being drowned unless a teacher or helper be near by or until one becomes expert by practice, they will make mistakes, as other people have done. It is a human weakness to forget or to ignore the struggle that every individual and every nation has had to go through before attaining freedom; and it is only uncultured or conceited persons that think the

condition of their country has always been what it is. The argument usually put forth, that because the people of India are of different races and religions they cannot be united in politics, is disproved by Austria (where the proclamations of Francis Joseph have to be printed in ten different languages), by Russia, by Switzerland, recently by South Africa, and even by Britain herself. It is comparatively easy for different races, classes, and creeds to be politically united as a nation if they feel an attachment to the land of their birth or adoption, and also feel a greater interest in its welfare than in personal gain. India, owing to the political union under one Sovereign and to the harsh treatment equally of all her races and creeds by non-Asiatics, is being welded fast into a nation. The educated and patriotic class feels most intelligently and keenly the degradation of the Motherland, and believes from what is often said in the European Press and on platforms that "foreign" rulers will not help in its removal. The masses, although not educated enough to comprehend the idea of nationalism, are being daily permeated, especially by the treatment their countrymen receive at the hands of those that present themselves as representatives of authority, as well as of foreigners, in public places.

In connection with the equal treatment of

Indians as subjects of the Crown, the question of the military, police, and other services is of profound importance. British policy was so liberal and impartial in the olden days that the governing service—the Civil Service—was opened to Indians as to all other British subjects. Reactionary authorities have in recent times made indirect attempts to debar Indians from competition for that Service, but they have not yet succeeded in doing so. They have, however, inserted in the rules for the subordinate services, more recently created, the distinction that has introduced racial privilege and has undermined the loyalty and trust of the Indian people. Since the mutiny of some of the troops and their participation in violence along with bad characters, who in every country show their heads in times of disorder, racial distinction has become stereotyped into positive distrust. The class that mutinied continues to serve the Crown, the bad characters could not of course all be exterminated, but the classes that sided with and saved the Government before a single additional European soldier landed in India have come to suffer for their loyalty. It is not only an honour, it is the loyal duty of every citizen, to be ready to defend his Sovereign and country against invasion ; yet the well-to-do classes of India are excluded from that honour, duty, and right, while

even Turkey has become liberal enough to admit her Christian subjects into the army, and China is proclaiming equal rights for all races and creeds within her borders. In addition to the risk of foreign invasion which this distrust entails, it causes yet a further grievance by permitting the section that is allowed to bear arms to treat the prohibited sections as inferior creatures not worthy of being fellow-subjects. All classes and individuals may not have an equal aptitude for war and military life. In Britain nearly 30 per cent. of recruits are rejected every year as unfit for service, and women are wholly excluded. Such rejection or exclusion does not make the whole people unfit for military or naval service and subject the rejected to unkind treatment. Besides, to be secure against invasion by military Powers a much larger trained army than is now maintained is necessary. There cannot be a finer field for recruitment than some parts of British India.

Some people complain of the financial drain from India to Britain; others assert that India does not pay enough for the services received. The tribute that India pays to Britain is to a large extent material, and that tribute is just because and so far as it is in payment for necessary services rendered by the sons of Britain: it is unjust in so far as such service is really unneces-

sary or is capable of being rendered by the sons of India. Along with the payment in money, however, the moral homage paid by mendicancy and sycophancy cannot but be demoralizing to the British character. Europeans even of a friendly type lament the want of manliness in Indian nature and conduct. It would be strange if after so many centuries of coercion by religious, spiritual, and political teachers, and of demoralizing social conditions, any manliness should survive, especially as when any sign of it is displayed by individuals, it is discouraged by parents, teachers, spiritual guides, and political rulers as impertinence and disloyalty; and yet, as has been observed, the Indian is in this respect seriously misjudged. Far more grievous than even the pecuniary toll is the subsidy that India extorts from Europe—a subsidy in blood and in the manhood of men and women that in other lands and under more favourable circumstances would have free play for the exercise of their virile faculties. In the Indian atmosphere they are dragged down to mediocrity and inaneness, and find life's ambition satisfied by enjoyment and vanity.

Something better than verbal loyalty would be needed to undo the effect of the teaching and example of the European community in India and its backers in Britain thirty years ago, when

the opponents of a Government measure proposed to set up, like the shillelagh-armed Ulster revolutionaries, an oligarchy of their own independent of Britain, instigated the European garrison to threaten to rise in revolt (being aware that no Government can be coerced without military support), boycotted the Viceregal levées, and hissed the representative of the Sovereign at the gates of his palace at Calcutta, and when even the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal at a public dinner in the presence of the new Viceroy ridiculed the Tenth Commandment as unlikely to be observed by European Christians in India. A few Indian young men have been charged with conspiring against the authorities and tampering with the loyalty of the troops. If there is any truth in such charges, it simply proves that the accused persons have only imitated the example set by their European brethren, who teach them that revolutions succeed when backed by the army. European reaction triumphed and succeeded in changing Government policy because it possessed backstairs influence, which Indian nationalism as yet lacks.

Separatist imperialism naturally shows itself in the military service. It is notorious that no Indo-Briton is given a commission in the Army. A recent Viceroy announced with a great flourish the formation of an Imperial Cadet Corps for

scions of ancient noble houses, in order to give them training for a military career. The hesitation and timidity that characterize unsympathetic despotism became evident when shortly afterwards the Commander-in-Chief announced, in answer to a question in Council, that the Cadet Corps could not be employed on active service, and yet it was kept up at the expense of the Indian taxpayer to provide bodyguards of noble youth; but the curious character of the imperialism would be evident if it were true, as popularly alleged, that, while on ceremonial occasions under a recent viceroyalty, the bodyguard of nobles was posted behind mercenary European troops, yet in frontier wars the Indian troops have had to bear the brunt of the fighting, the European portion being "held in reserve" and coming up at the end to receive all the glory of victory and the consequent rewards. If this is the imperial way to show confidence in the people, it is little wonder that their loyalty has fallen into doubt and that two ex-Commanders-in-Chief have conceived it their duty to champion the introduction into Great Britain of compulsory military service as the only means of securing the safety of the Empire. It was only during the Royal visit that the rule of placing Indian troops in inferior positions was relaxed by his Majesty's express command, and

European and Indian troops were alternately placed in lining the processional route.

There is scarcely a measure, legislative or administrative, but evokes a difference of opinion between the European and Indian communities, and each community maintains the right and justice of its own view. In the Press, in the Police, in the Law Courts, in Society there is witnessed the curious phenomenon of each community backing its own member—as each party in Britain backs its own member—whether that member be right or wrong. In Society, whenever a difference is observable, one condemns the social customs and conventionalities of the other. On the European side there is the feeling that in a community that has submitted to domination so long nothing can be in order. The Indian view of European customs is tainted by the supercilious European attitude towards the Indian, and nothing the European does is deemed worthy of Indian admiration. Wise statesmanship can alone avail to quench a separatist sentiment in India, by including Indians in the British nation (as they are reckoned abroad), and by letting them share responsibility along with legitimate satisfaction of their demand of rights.

Whether in a democracy or under any other form of government, family and class domina-

tion in social and national affairs cannot be avoided. As authority has to be exercised by and confidence reposed in a few persons, the people, to whichever status they may belong, will always readily follow the men and women that are by birth or other circumstances placed in prominent positions and whose patriotism can be relied upon. The only question that divides people, all equally interested in the welfare of the State, is whether the men that guide policy should be removable, as in Britain, by a vote of the people given at intervals of four or five years, or whether they should hold office for life or during good health, as is the case with permanent subordinate officials. Permanency creates a sense of superiority and omniscience, and is apt to develop impatience of criticism, obstinacy, and blindness towards any view that does not strike the mind of the official fixed in the groove of routine. Constant removability makes the position cheap and uncertain, and tempts the holder of office to use, as in America, his temporary opportunities for personal gain, and prevents him from feeling the security that can alone enable him to think out important State problems. The greatest safety lies in having in authority men that are forgetful of self and of everything and everybody associated with self, and that possess the mental training

and discipline to realize that man is fallible and mortal. As such men are not common like autumn leaves, and rarely place their services openly at the disposal of their fellow-citizens, the next best security consists in the power of removal by the Crown or Parliament, such power being vigilantly but unfailingly exercised when the holder proves himself unworthy of the trust reposed in him.

A few of India's youthful and enthusiastic sons and daughters, anxious to get rid of the indignities attendant on racial subjection yet unacquainted with the circumstances and traditions of their Motherland, talk wildly of independence. Independence is a relative term, not absolute, and it is an end that it is not possible for any individual or nation in this life to achieve. No nation on earth has yet gained it, though many brag of it. Each in its attempt to shake off some sort of dependence that was found irksome has landed itself into another. Life is mutual dependence. In individual life one cannot shake off, although one may to a greater or less extent control, the passions and appetites, and one cannot get on without dependence on associates. The Aryan ascetic, in order to gain individual independence, took to solitude and to residence in inaccessible forests. He found his appetites and passions kept him a

slave, and had recourse to mortification of the flesh to get rid of their tyranny, such mortification coming to mean his own physical annihilation. A nation can similarly be independent only when, like Tibet until very recently, it is self-satisfied and avoids contact with others. What is now understood by independence—not to allow one's country to be the sport of foreign invaders —when gained by a superiority of force, can only be maintained by a continuance of the superiority; and, to secure a continuance of the superiority over other forces, the component parts of a nation have to submit to conditions that are far from a state of independence.

Independence exists in China; but, until the recent revolutionary outbreak that made China a Republic, it would have been rash to assert that the Chinese people were happy in their independence. If the new rulers in China display in all matters the same anxiety for the good of their people as is evident in the recent edicts prohibiting the use of opium and proclaiming the equality of all creeds, she may well boast of the advantage of independence, and will soon take her position by the side of Japan as one of the great Powers of the world. Russia enjoys independence, and has recently got a sort of self-government through the Duma; but it is premature to congratulate the Russian people on

their independence or self-government until the Duma becomes more representative of the people or the rulers become less afraid of their subjects. The United States gained independence by successful revolt; but sensible people recognize that continued connection with Britain would probably have enabled the States to be free from the corruption that is eating into the heart of society, and from the brutalities that are a disgrace to the people, although such connection might have prevented European peers and princes from rehabilitating their fortunes by aid of American heiresses. Even in Britain, where national independence is combined with self-government in an advanced form without leading to anarchy or disorder, the liberties of the people are not safe when the Tory party continues in power for a long period, and a few families control the Government, nor can order be maintained if Tory principles are acted upon in legislation and administration. India would gain little by national independence unless her rulers became as dutiful as are those of Japan and Germany, and she would lose little by want of that independence if her present rulers displayed real anxiety for her advancement.

If fear of the people by the ruling class is independence, England and other European countries have got it: that fear keeps the

official class and the police in order, and makes them the servants and not the masters of the people; but, while the people may be called independent, the Government has to be dependent on their caprices. The want of fear of the people by the governing class in India, and their anxiety to conciliate only the small foreign section of the community, make the Government as well as India dependent, and are the source of all her woes. Her helpless condition of dependence is also proved when isolated acts of violence by fanatics or maniacs is made the excuse for general repression and injudicious homilies, while acts of and incitement to violence by individual Europeans are not deemed worthy of serious notice. The absence of discontent and unrest would give rise to self-complacency in the governing body, and would be used as an excuse for not initiating progressive change. How much India has come under the reactionary thumb was apparent in the threat of Anglo-Asiatic correspondents of Tory papers, when the proposed appointment of a young and able official, associated with a great Liberal Minister of the Crown, to the Viceroy's Council was made in England by the Government, that the Indian Civil Service would resent it. Reactionary journalists appear to know the mind of the governing body better than its members them-

selves. Attempts are always made to frighten the Government to submission to the dictation of the privileged section of the community; and it would be good for India, as well as for the Empire, if the educated class thought fit to support a Liberal Government and strengthen its hands. They have also to remember the struggles, sacrifices, and discipline that nations that in Europe have acquired self-government, or in Asia are trying to acquire it, have undergone or are undergoing before success is achieved. Before the cry for self-government becomes louder it behoves the leaders of Indian thought to recognize that the State is organized primarily for defence—for protection within of the innocent, the peaceful, and the law-abiding against the wicked, and against foreign enemies from without. For both these purposes physical strength and endurance as well as technical knowledge and moral courage are absolutely essential. Southern races, enfeebled by adverse climatic conditions, should seek strength by special attention to social as well as to individual needs: what is required is not only a reversion to the conditions under which ancient Aryans lived and throve, but an improvement of such conditions, according to the principles of modern scientific progress.

It is neither advantageous nor edifying for a

Government to be at the dictation of the people under its sway, unless the people that wish to dictate, or their prominent men, are more clever, patriotic, and far-seeing than those that form the Government; but, if it has to be under some control in order to avoid complacency, it is perhaps less injurious for its prestige and usefulness to be under the fear of a shifting community like the foreign sojourners in India, whose small numbers are a guarantee against their doing any great or lasting mischief, than to be compelled to shape its policy by the caprices of different interests among scores of millions of people. Democracy as it has developed in various European countries and their colonies is a thing that it would be a grievous wrong to thrust inconsiderately upon India, and it is a blessing that there is very little chance of its being done. What is reported to have happened in the second week of April, 1911, at Silsden, near Keighley, in the North of England, and what is of frequent occurrence in more democratic States, ought to open the eyes of people that wish to introduce democratic institutions into India. Because the magistrates convicted a man for assaulting a constable, a crowd of several hundred persons gathered at night by the ringing of the firebell, attacked the police-station with stones, bottles, and other missiles, broke the

windows of private residences occupied by the wives and children of policemen, and assaulted every constable they came across. On November 3, 1912, near Battersea Park, a police-officer who stopped a carman for furious driving was reported to have been thrown down by a mob and kicked on the head by the driver and another so as seriously to affect his brain. If through resentment against the police, just or unjust, a community takes to mob rule, it is a case of falling from "the frying-pan into the fire." The problem for rulers has been, and will always be, how to permit free development without the growth of lawlessness, and how to secure order without oppression. The police would also do well to remember the Attorney-General's dictum that "commendation for some courageous act should not be so coveted as praise for securing the acquittal, instead of the conviction, of a prisoner by giving unbiased evidence." India needs rulers all whose thoughts by day and dreams by night may, like those of patriotic rulers in other States, be directed to making their land the greatest on earth, and to exercising its moral influence on the backward portions of mankind.

There may be a difference of opinion whether self-government or despotism is more suited to present conditions in India. The vital matter is

that whoever governs, whether elected by the people, appointed by the Crown, or born to rule, should feel that his life and duty are placed at the service and devoted to the good of India. In recent times, owing to the rise of a feeling of nationalism in India, it is often claimed that the people should have control over their destinies, and not "aliens" that have no interest in their advancement. On the other side it is declared that "British" interests must always be predominant, and that persons of European blood are the best guardians of those interests. In both views it is ignored that both the people of India and the people of Britain are subjects of the same sovereign and citizens of the same State. Some classes or some sections or some families may enjoy greater opportunities of service than others as a consequence of custom or tradition or timidity, but it ought to be apparent to every observer that the distinction is not racial, but based on birth and class. Under such circumstances it is foolish, if not disloyal as undermining the unity of the State, to object to Europeans serving the Crown in India or to the Aryans enjoying the rights of British subjects throughout the Empire. Individual distinctions and preferences are bound to exist, as Nature herself does not endow all persons with equal brains, capacity, or strength, or every

holder of power with impartiality and discernment, nor can the services of every able man be utilized; but nobody should be preferred or objected to on the ground that he is a European or an Asiatic Briton. If any one in office or in public or private service, European or Indian, displays partiality to any race or class in British territory, he should be forthwith removed, in order to guard the State from injury and disruption. It is the duty of every person of authority or influence to do his best to bring about this state of things, upon which the peace and welfare of the Empire so much depend, and which if secured would effectively check the growth of a desire for self-government or independence.

So far as loyalty to the Crown is concerned, Indian loyalty is known to be blind and indiscriminating, while that of Europeans is conventional and self-regarding. The popular devotion to the throne and person of the Sovereign has been exploited in India for personal and selfish ends by adventurers that take advantage of the progress of so-called democracy to pose as equal to the Sovereign, but whose sovereignty rests on the doctrine of "all rights and no duties." To secure India's attachment the holder of power, whoever he may be, must listen to India's prayer to Britannia, which may be put in a few words

thus: "Grant me, as you have granted your other children, freedom of development; if you do not think me yet, like the others, fit for freedom, because I was adopted by you long before they were born and was spoiled by too much play and too little work, you need not give me the institutions you have granted them, but do accord to me the privilege of feeling a pride in the citizenship of your Empire and sharing in your joys and sorrows. If you deny me that privilege, yet help me at least to stand on my legs by your side in times of danger, and in the meantime give me just, humane, and affectionate treatment, and do see that your sons and daughters that you send to look after me and mine do not in passing the modern waters of Lethe—the Red Sea—forget their British blood and gentle breeding."

The hindrances to a cordial, if not an ideal, relationship between Britain and India are, as indicated in the preceding pages, great; they may, indeed, appear to be formidable; yet they are not by any means insurmountable by wise statesmanship. Attempts have now and again been made by liberal-minded statesmen of both Parties to pave the way for an understanding, but the reactionary forces have been found so strongly entrenched that such attempts have proved abortive. The difficulties have not been made

lighter by the lamentable action of some youthful and thoughtless fanatics who, like suffragettes, have taken to violence as a panacea for the ills of their country, and thus played into the hands of the reactionary forces, which are strengthened by such insane folly. Such ill-balanced youths may think that

> ". . . diseases desperate grown
> By desperate appliance are relieved";

but the alternative—"or not at all"—they are too impulsive to note.

In 1906 his Majesty's Government, backed by the strongest Liberal majority ever returned to the House of Commons, did for India what no British Government had ever done before. It took the first steps towards associating the Indian people in the government of their country by the election of representatives to the Council, by appointing an Indian gentleman as a member of the Viceroy's Cabinet, two Indian gentlemen as members of the Council of the Secretary of State in London, and another to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Its influence in matters of administration, although not obvious to the general public, is manifest from the complaint often heard from reactionary journalists that India has come to be governed from White-

hall. What it has done in India may be very little in comparison with the bold grant of self-government to South Africa, and with the promise of Home Rule to Ireland. But the circumstances are very different, and the difficulties are formidable. Having to deal with a solid mass of unreasoning opposition among holders of power and of indifference among the people, no Government at home, without action in the nature of a revolution, can do more than what "the men on the spot"—the Viceroy and his Cabinet—may be disposed to carry out. It was fortunate for the Government to have a Viceroy who was by family tradition and training liberal enough to resist the blandishments of his reactionary advisers. The reforms introduced are, however, under the circumstances, in the nature of a compromise, and a mixture of concession and repression, as Tory journals called it, is the consequence. Concessions benefit the whole community; repression, judiciously applied, affects only the malefactor; but a step forward has been taken, and that ought to be some satisfaction to every patriot in Britain and in India. The reactionary hand is apparent in the revival of the antiquated policy of attempting to awaken religious animosity and class prejudice. This is the old aristocratic game still played in Britain, where, failing to gain support

from the people for dear food, monopoly, and privilege, the Conservatives employ the device of sowing dissension among the Liberal forces.

The reactionary trick of setting class against class on the principle of "divide and rule" has been introduced in India in the regulations for the enlarged Legislative Councils. Like the proverbial fox preaching to ducks, the peers in Britain profess anxiety for the additional taxation, not because they have to bear a disproportionate or large portion of it, but because it presses on the humble mass of taxpayers! The "peers" in India and their backers in the English Press profess great anxiety, not for their own privileges, but for the poor helpless Moslems and their interests, rights, and representation. The game, even if successful for the moment, cannot be played long. They have to prove their sincerity by giving up to Moslems some of the posts held by Europeans, and by securing for Moslems a more humane treatment on railways and in public places, as well as in the Colonial dependencies of the Crown. India is the Motherland of her Moslem sons and daughters as much as of Hindus, Parsis, and Christians; and all are equally interested in her welfare, as all are interested with European Britons in the welfare and prosperity of the Empire, and especially of its heart, which has to provide

vitality and light for the whole. For a time Moslem Indians may find it personally agreeable and beneficial to be favoured; but, as education and culture advance, they cannot but subordinate personal to patriotic considerations, and feel equally with their countrymen of other persuasions on all matters concerning the Motherland. Besides, Hindus—especially Bengalis—have now, like Englishmen, who do not object to a disproportionate number of Scotsmen and Irishmen serving the Crown, become too advanced and patriotic to resent favour shown to their countrymen, of whatever religious persuasion these may be, so long as they are true to the Motherland. No Bengali will be displeased to see all the posts, from Viceroy to policeman, held by Moslem Indians, and the Councils full of Moslems, provided always that such Moslems are patriotic and otherwise qualified for the posts. They will readily accept the results of free and fair election, and gladly support interests that may appear weak through want of able advocacy.

It is necessary for orderly government that there should be a majority in the Councils to support the Government, and measures are properly taken to provide against its defeat, until the Opposition is able, as in Britain, to take the administration in hand. It is, however,

equally necessary that the Government should not have an overwhelming majority, because in that case a reactionary Viceroy or local Governor might be disposed to ignore the wishes of a strong minority of his Council and to pass measures that would further exasperate the people and make existing "British" rule more un-British and unpopular. If the regulations are suitably framed and the electorate is properly arranged, the Government may rely upon a narrow majority in controversial matters, while upon popular measures it will readily have unanimous support. Before the grant of self-government to the Transvaal, its Legislative Council, partly nominated and partly elected as it then was, and composed, like the Indian Viceroy's Council, of a majority of officials, passed a Bill granting the municipal franchise to Asiatics of education. As the whole of the non-official members voted against it, the proposal, though carried by a majority, was withdrawn. It was a politic proceeding so far as local European opinion was concerned, although unjust and impolitic from the British point of view. Such a procedure is at present unthinkable in the Indian Councils; but, when under a sympathetic administration a strong minority express dissent from any proposal, it should be similarly treated. By so doing the Government cannot fail to conciliate all reasonable minds.

All well-wishers of India, as well as Indian patriots, express anxiety for India's agricultural and economic progress. Such progress rests on two forces—capital and enterprise—which are needed to help each other. The union with Great Britain places at India's service unlimited capital; but it ought to be apparent to the meanest understanding that capital is sensitive and will flow only if it feels secure. Such security will be wanting so long as there is any strain in the relationship between Government and people. As regards enterprise, it cannot be expected from people whose vigour—moral and physical—has been undermined by demoralizing social conditions and habits prevailing for countless generations. Without social reform assuring to the generality of people physical health and moral courage enterprise and strenuousness in life will be lacking.

A suggestion is here submitted for the consideration of the authorities with a view to make the Government more popular and national and better able to take its legitimate share, not only in political but in all social concerns. The authorities at present being alien in race and religion, and statesmen having wisely proclaimed religious neutrality as the basis of British policy (although it has not always been strictly observed, Hindu and Moslem taxpayers having to maintain

the Protestant and Catholic churches, while Christians do not contribute to Hindu temples or Moslem mosques), the Government is practically only a foreign garrison posted to keep peace and order. It relinquishes one of the most important functions of government in abstaining from interference in some matters that vitally affect the welfare of the people under its care. The social rules established in India thousands of years ago by Hindu kings for the Aryans, and hundreds of years ago by Moslem rulers for their Moslem subjects, cannot by any reasonable minds be held to satisfy the needs and aspirations of people at the present day or for all future time. Religion is so entwined with the daily life of the people by the Hindu and Moslem Scriptures that they rigidly follow the old rules as interpreted by priests. Moslems, not having taken much to modern education, are still wholly guided by mediævalism ; but, as they become more educated and patriotic, they may be expected to develop new ideas and aspirations. Among Hindus of the educated class the old rules have lost all their force, and there is practical anarchy in Hindu society because the priests, who are the lawgivers, are more ignorant than many among the laity, and their behests are followed only because a revolt entails social ostracism. If the Government continues to be

neutral in religious and social affairs, and does not deem it prudent to appoint an official authority to regulate such matters, there might be set up by authoritative sanction an elected body that might act as a *consultative* assembly, whose proposals and recommendations might be legalized at the discretion of the Legislative Councils. The body should be wholly elected by the widest possible franchise based upon education and property, with some representation of the humbler classes and castes. Its function should be wholly social and religious, political topics being out of its jurisdiction. In purely Mohammedan matters the Moslem representatives should alone vote, and in Hindu concerns the Hindus alone, although, as each section is interested in the welfare of the other, all—Christians, Moslems, and Hindus—should be permitted to express their views and opinions in the discussion. The plan would have to be carefully thought out and shaped by a representative committee under the guidance of sympathetic European officials. If carried out discreetly, such a plan would not only end the anarchical stage of Indian society, and enable the ablest men under the authority of Government to take up positions of social leadership, but would also bring the Government into touch with the people, and make it the social as well

as the political authority in the country. The installation of such a body, deriving authority partly from the Government and partly from the people, would make social reform eventually certain and bring India into line with the rest of the British Empire.

In the interests of the Government, as well as of the people, it is desirable that the attention of young India should be directed more to social and economic needs of their Motherland than to political agitation, which under present conditions is apt at times to become illegitimate. The only way to secure the desired end is to set up a body as above indicated, and at the same time to revive in an improved form the old *panchayet* system in every village, with the object of providing measures for helping each other in disease and suffering. The authorities will find this an easier plan to allay political unrest than the measures advocated by reaction, and the people should realize that no substantial progress will be made in India until such an intelligent and tolerant social authority, that all classes will respect and cheerfully obey, is set up.

The result of a long course of untoward events is that a Herculean task has to be undertaken to kill the seeds of mistrust and to generate mutual feelings of confidence, respect, and toleration between the Government and the people on

the one hand and between the different classes and creeds on the other. Without this any advance along the road to reconciliation or progress is hopeless. Ardent patriots and vigilant minds on both sides have this great task before them—a task of modest and unobtrusive work—to turn the thoughts of people both in Britain and in India from a suicidal into a beneficent channel. Heroism lies in struggling with difficulties and not in finding a smooth and rosy career in life, and it is to be hoped that, before estrangement goes farther, self-sacrificing heroes will present themselves (for the work cannot at first be popular with all sections), and, undaunted by difficulties, will carry on the struggle for Empire and Humanity.

The interests of Empire and of humanity, like those of Britain and India, are identical with peace, justice, and truth. "Imperial patriotism," as now defined, consists of moral exhortations to progressives on the "un-British" character of their aims and methods, "British" methods in the "imperialist" view being, as a Shakespearean character expresses it,

"My imperial tongue is stern and harsh,"

or, as the son of Cymbeline's queen boasted, "It is fit I should commit offence to my inferiors." This was not even the Tory view

a generation since, when Tory leaders still retained their British character and had not succumbed to the blandishments of retired prancing pro-Consuls and to Colonial dictation. If Empire and Imperialism mean the triumph of retrograde notions and the infliction of insult and suffering on three hundred millions of human beings, to whom it is politic to refer as "his Majesty's subjects," but who, like the proverbial musk-rat in the jaws of a serpent, can neither be swallowed nor let loose, India cannot be a very desirable possession.

Britain and India are now at the parting of the ways; they have to make up their minds whether to journey together or to separate for good. Britain, although determined to hold on to India to the last, is not quite sure whether India's company is desirable, while India is suspicious and is afraid of being led astray. This state of feeling cannot be permitted to continue without injury to the lasting interests of both. If Britain thinks the union conducive to the welfare of both, she ought to be more frank and generous; and, as she is the superior, it is proper for her to take the first step. If she is convinced that India can only be a source of weakness—from imparting reactionary notions in time of peace and from being unreliable in time of difficulty—the sooner she severs the connec-

tion the better for her. In human affairs no relationship can lead to happiness unless a unity of interests is perceived at all times.

Cordial relationship between India and Britain will be possible only with the growth of mutual respect and sympathy. There are, indeed, social barriers against free intercourse between the races, just as there are between different classes in Britain or between different castes in India; but these barriers do not prevent broad-minded men and women of different races or classes or castes from meeting in friendly intercourse and proving to the ignorant or prejudiced mind that physical companionship is only an outward symbol of the meeting of minds on the higher plane of culture or mutual interest. Racial bigots assert that, while the educated Asiatic wishes to be admitted into European houses, he would not open his own home to Europeans. This is a misleading statement, of the same sort as to assert that the aristocracy in Britain would not associate with humbler classes. As regards classes or races, the statement may not be incorrect; but people meet in friendly intercourse, not as representatives of particular races, but as individuals. The only principle to be scrupulously observed in promoting brotherhood is what has been proclaimed by all humane religions, that race can be no barrier to

human intercourse or institutions, since it does not stand in the way of approaching the Godhead. As a matter of fact many European and Asiatic families whose heads belong to the legal profession have cordial social companionship. This proves how culture removes barriers. So long, however, as the seclusion or separation of women is rigidly observed—not merely, as in Jewish synagogues, for purposes of worship, but in all social functions—and so long as the lower-class European, male and female alike, is permitted to insult Indian ladies with impunity, and the judiciary and police do not, as in Europe, deem it their duty to guard from dishonour helpless Indian womanhood, no general racial communion is possible without doing more harm than good. Social intercourse, like political freedom, is a plant of slow growth, and any attempt to force it is as injurious as deliberate obstruction. When Indian ladies shake off their narrowness, prejudice, and vanity, and European ladies find that there are genuine ladies in Asia as on other continents (although these may not consider gambling, dancing, and flirtation as indispensable conditions of civilized society), freer intercourse will not be long in coming. Asian, and especially Indian nature, is, like the Southern European temperament, somewhat familiar and gushing, while British and all Northern European

nature is reserved, cold, and distant. When, however, they come to know each other's natures and characteristics, and to appreciate the value of the difference in each other's physical features, esteem will take the place of curiosity and suspicion.

No greater or equal opportunity has ever before been offered for the attainment of social and political idealism than the connection of Britain with India. The Colonies have been permitted to take their own line of action, and to enjoy in local affairs perfect freedom of development, which they have, unfortunately, for various reasons used to develop greater selfishness, suspicion of the Central Authority, and contempt for fellow-subjects and other fellow-men. Owing to the difficulty of getting out of a particular groove, partly from pride, partly from habit, and partly from fear of change, it is vain to expect that the Colonies will alter their ways, or utilize the shelter and the example given them by Britain to solve great problems and to develop great ideals for the benefit of themselves as well as of mankind. The only part of the Empire where there is still a chance of development of great ideals under the combined advantages of European British guidance, of moral aptitude due to great philosophic traditions, and of the opportunity of trying

experiments without any risk of foreign interference and of changing them when necessary, is India, which has been showing signs of awakening under the magic touch of British thought, history, and struggles. A few years of inaction, or of timidity, or of opposition, at this critical stage of the history of India, of Britain, and of mankind, will mar for good the greatest opportunity ever afforded by a combination of favourable circumstances for the advancement of human happiness. Can it be supposed that European Britons, who have in the course of their history displayed such resourcefulness in times of trial, will now, at the instigation of reaction and short-sighted selfishness, let the opportunity slip and turn for ever India and Indian thought and culture *against* Britain and the British connection? The sacred relationship of husband and wife, not to speak of other relationships in life, becomes intolerable when one of the parties forgets the duties and responsibilities attached to it, develops selfishness, and shows want of due consideration for the other. The relationship may by force of circumstances be continued for a time, although in case of incurable incompatibility it is less disagreeable for both to dissolve the union than to lead a miserable and suspicious existence that may lead at any moment to greater evils. Mutual friends or judicial authority may

attempt to bring about reconciliation, and the attempts may succeed if the parties are reasonable and the bitterness of differences has not gone too far for arrangement. In any case, wisdom lies in making the relationship while it lasts as pleasant as possible by some control of selfishness on both sides. In national relationship, especially under the conditions of Britain's connection with India, no foreign intermediary can bring about reconciliation, which must be essayed, if at all, by the far-seeing and patriotic sons and daughters of Britain and India and, above all, by the impartial holder of the Imperial Crown. It is to be hoped that these will not permit the strain in the relationship to proceed any farther, and will see fit to control the selfish and unwise proceedings of their compatriots, and assure a happy moral as well as material union pregnant with the greatest possibilities of human welfare.

Sane Imperialism is political idealism. Where it seems desirable or inevitable to bring different nations under one sovereign and one banner, it ought to be the aim of civilized statesmanship to discourage racial and class privilege, to repress all acts likely to foster legitimate grievance, to extend to each and every component part of the Empire gradually but steadily institutions for the free expression of its opinions and wants, and

to help in every possible way to raise all to the level of the highest culture and to the happiest existence. In life idealism consists in a sense of the unity of creation, in avoiding conscious harm to a fellow-creature (because, even if he is not strong enough to retaliate, it sets a bad example to others and establishes a grudge), and in trying to do good to all because all existence is a portion of self. In religion idealism consists in feeling the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, which may embrace all mankind in one bond of fellowship and love and end the rule of Satan. In politics idealism leads to the same goal—to draw together in the bonds of brotherhood all that are under the same flag, and to extend legitimately, whenever opportunity presents itself, the dominion of one sovereign, of one spirit, and of one flag, so that national animosities and rivalries may cease and that all men may, under the impulse of fraternal sympathy as fellow-subjects under the shelter of a common banner and one symbol of unity, proceed to realize their destiny without interruption by brigandage or war. It is not necessary for all races dwelling under one flag, any more than for different classes living in one country, to intermarry or to eat together, or to have the same standard of culture and manners. So long as they show mutual respect and toleration, own

allegiance to one sovereign, and that sovereign wields power to prevent one race or class or family from tyrannizing over another, they can all march shoulder to shoulder to proclaim the glory of their worldly father and the greatness of their State, and to achieve the destiny of the progressive mind of man.

GSL

CHAPTER III

EASTERN AND WESTERN THOUGHT

To place before the reader a typical selection of the great thoughts of hundreds of great men that flourished in the course of thousands of years, and in particular to draw a parallel between the sets of expressed thought, cannot but be a matter of prolonged labour. If one could find time, training, and opportunity for such study, one would doubtless discover not merely a resemblance but a remarkable unity in the higher idealism of all ages and climes, illustrating the moral brotherhood of mankind. The few illustrations presented in subsequent pages are intended to exemplify, not only the unity of thought and sentiment, but also the essential humanity, nobility, and loftiness of purpose that pervade the conceptions and the productions of the great geniuses that lived and wrote for their contemporaries and still speak to posterity.

Man at the present day, as at all times, in whichever direction of the mariner's compass he may be born or bred, is the heir of past ages—

of the learning, the wisdom, and the discoveries of the human mind. Material conquests and achievements, however dazzling and glorious, are for the most part comparatively short-lived: they either perish or become matters of history because their benefits are by their nature mostly confined to a restricted sphere. When Nature does not limit her bounties to any class or race, man's attempt to oust any class or section of his fellow-men from the benefits that he may be made an instrument to confer on them is bound to end in disaster. While, however, man's material dominion is by its nature limited, his moral empire, although unlimited, is utilizable only through knowledge of the language in which the thoughts are expressed. Translations fail to convey an adequate impression of the original; but, notwithstanding this drawback, a moral of essential unity may be drawn, and the spiritual origin of all creation may be perceived by the sympathetic mind.

As among individuals in every community some have to watch over the interests of others that are unfit or asleep or otherwise engaged, and as among nations some attain power to mould the destinies of the human race and to keep under control the potentially wicked nations of the day, so do thoughtful geniuses appear and disappear according to human needs to guard

from danger the intellectual and the moral life of their community. Their influence is restricted to the cultured few; but, so long as the cultured few have an effective voice in communal and national life, decay and disruption are averted.

Apart from professed moral and religious teachers, there stand prominent in the galaxy of literary and poetical geniuses that have moulded human thought two men—one in the East and the other in the West, in communities and in point of time wide apart but now united in the Empire of Britain—who are destined to make immortal the languages in which their thoughts were moulded. The one in the East flourished two thousand years ago in the reign of King Vikram, whose era still prevails in India. Being synchronous, like the Elizabethan age, with a period of storm and stress—the suppression and expulsion of Buddhism and the re-establishment of Hinduism on a reformed basis—King Vikram's reign produced many great men, and there flourished in his Court what are called *Navaratna* (the nine gems) in different branches of art and science, whose names were Dhanvantari, Kshapanaka, Amara Sinha, Sanku, Betalbhatta, Ghata Karpara, Baraha Mihira, Bararuchi, and Kalidasa—the first the Æsculapius of India, and the last her Homer and Shakespeare. Kalidasa has left poetical and dramatic works in Sanskrit that

have been translated into other languages and are now appreciated in cultured circles all over the globe. His plays consist generally of love intrigues, and the plots are comedies that end happily, as by Hindu tradition the audience must not go home from a place of amusement with a sad heart. His works do not display the mastery of the broad field of human life or the versatility in the portrayal of human character and passions that distinguish the dramatic works of his great Western prototype of later times—Shakespeare; but the delicacy of touch, the appreciation of the beauties of Nature, the exuberance of creative fancy, the delineation of the casuistry of passion, and elaborate conceits like those of Elizabethan poets, combine with extraordinary descriptive powers to place him in the first rank of the world's poets. Although not equal to Shakespeare in exposition of character, he surpasses the great Western dramatist in lyric power, and he excels in epic poetry, which Shakespeare did not essay. *Sakuntalá* is permeated with the same lyrical sweetness and intensity as *Romeo and Juliet*.

Among scholars there is difference of opinion as to the exact age when Kalidasa lived. Owing to the utter absence from the Indian mind of the historical sense as Western scholars understand it, or owing to the Eastern notion of time

(past, present, and future, life and death being but phases of perception of the senses), it may be difficult to fix the exact date. If more recent, it is yet ancient enough for present purposes, and makes Hindu greatness less remote.

It is also noteworthy that, while the plays of Shakespeare were largely founded on Hellenic, Roman, and other foreign models, no external influence appears to have moulded Indian dramatic art, which was thus purely national, being based on the great Aryan epics, the Mahábhárata and the Rámáyana. Without interest in the problems of the soul it is not possible to be imaginative; without imagination it is not possible to be humane; without humanity it is difficult to be expert in the problems of practical and material life. Poets rarely show the combination, but both Kalidasa and Shakespeare—not to speak of many that flourished in other ages—would appear from their works to have possessed it in flowing measure.

A few quotations, apart from the illustrations of Eastern and Western thought that follow, are here given to show the beauty of Kalidasa's poetry and the loftiness of his ideas.

From the ceremonial observances of the present time there is a notion that the Hindus were idolatrous. The following verses from a prayer to the Creator in one of Kalidasa's works show

how far idolatry prevailed among the cultured class of his day. They also explain the ancient idea of creation.

Tisribhis tvam avasthávir mahimánam udeerayan,
Pralaya sthiti sargánám ekah káranatám gatah.

By the three conditions of creation, conservation, and destruction, of which thou art the sole cause, thou manifestest thy glory.

Streepungsá vátmabhágau te bhinnamoorteh sisrikshayá,
Prasootibhájah sargasya táveva pitarau smritau.

Female and male are parts of thy body divided into two by the desire of creation, those parts being held to be the parents of the creative world.

Svakála parimánena vyastaratrindivasya te,
Yau tu svapná-vabodhau tau bhootánám pralayodayau.

Thy night and day are divided by the measure of thy own time: thy sleeping and waking are the destruction and the creation of thy creatures.

Jagad yonir ayonis tvam jagadanto nirantakah,
Jagadádir anádis tvam jagadeeso nireesvarah.

Thou art the cause of the universe, but thyself without cause: thou art the destroyer of the universe, but thyself free from destruction: thou art the beginning of the universe, but thyself without beginning: thou art the regulator of the universe, but thyself without a regulator.

Atmánam átmaná vetsi srijasyátmánam átmaná,
Átmaná kritiná cha tvam átmanyeva praleeyase.

Thou knowest thyself by thyself: thou createst thyself by thyself: by thy own power thou absorbest thyself in thyself.

Tvám ámananti prakritim purushártha-pravartineem,
Tad darsinam udáseenam tvám eva purusham viduh.

Some call thee Nature (which, according to the Sankhya School of Philosophy, was the first cause of the universe), engaging in creation for the purpose of virile action: they know thee to be the acting force although thyself a looker-on and sitting apart.

Tvam pitreenám api pitá devánám api devatá.

Thou art the Father of the fathers, the God of the Gods.

The following verses describe the Aryan idea of Godhead: they corroborate evangelical truth and Divine Unity in Trinity:—

Ekaiva múrtir bibhide tridhá sá
Sámányam eshám prathamá-varatvam
Vishnor Haras tasya Harih kadá chit
Vedhás tayos távapi dhátur ádyau.

One form divided into three—each in turn occupied the first or lower rank: to Vishnu Hara was sometimes senior, at other times Vishnu to Hara, or Brahmá to both, or they two to Brahmá had priority.

A few general quotations may also be interesting.

Na kevalam yo mahatopabhashate
Srinoti tasmád api yah sa pápabhák.

Not alone he that reviles a great person, but also he that listens to such reviling is sinful.

Yad adhyásitam arhadbhis tad hi tírtham
prachakshate.

Places that venerated persons have resided in are regarded as holy.

Shakespeare puts in the mouth of one of his characters :—

"The self-same sun that shines upon his court
Hides not his visage from our cottage, but
Looks on's alike."

In describing the moral greatness of the Himalaya, Kalidasa gives expression to the idea as follows :—

Divákarád rakshati yo guhásu
Leenam divábheetam ivándhakáram ;
Kshudrepi noonam saranam prapanne
Mamatvam uchchais sirasám sateeva.

He protects from the sun in his caves the darkness which through fear of light adheres to them for shelter; the care of the great is impartially bestowed on inferior and important personages alike.

Shakespearean students are familiar with the advice of Polonius to his son Laertes. According to Kalidasa, the following is the advice that Sakuntalá received from her foster-father when she was leaving him to go to her royal husband's home:—

Susrooshasva guroon kuru priyasakheebrittim sapatneejane,
Bhartur viprakritápi roshanatayá másma prateepam gamah;
Bhooistham bhava dakshiná parijane bhogeshvanutsekinee;
Yántyevam grihineepadam yuvatayo bámáh kulasyádhayah.

Show due reverence to him and to thy superiors: should others share thy husband's love, be an affectionate handmaid to them: should thy husband displease thee, let not thy resentment lead thee to disobedience. Be just and impartial to domestics, and seek not thy own gratifications. By such behaviour young women become exemplary mistresses, but perverse wives are the bane of a family.

There may be a difference of opinion, according to present ideas, as to this description of the duty of a wife; but there can scarcely be any difference of opinion as to the sentiments expressed by Kalidasa in the following verses:—

Sámyet pratyapakárena nopakárena durjanah.

The wicked are controlled, not by favour, but by punishment.

Eko hi dosho gunasannipáte
Nimajjateendoh kiraneshvivánkah.

One fault in a multitude of virtues sinks—is overlooked—like a stain on the lunar disc.

Prayojanápekshitayá prabhoonám
Práyas chalam gauravam ásriteshu.

The regard of masters for dependents is generally unstable according to the need for their services.

Apyaprasiddham yasase hi pungsám
Ananyasádháranam eva karma.

A work even of no importance is for the glory of the performer if it cannot be done by others: how much more glorious an important work must be!

Kriyánám khalu dharmyánám satpatnyo múlakáranam.

Of righteous acts good wives are certainly the fundamental cause.

Bhavanty-avyabhicháringo bharturishté pativratáh.

Devoted wives never oppose the wishes of their husbands.

Na dharma-vriddheshu vayah sameekshyate.

When there is seniority in virtue, youth is not taken into account.

Vikriyayai na kalpante sambandháh sadanushthitáh.

Alliances formed by the intervention of the just do not tend to evil.

Manorathánám agatir na vidyate.

There is nothing to which desire does not aspire (desire does not confine itself to the measure of the aspirant's capacity).

Apathe padam arpayanti hi
Srutavanto-pi rajo nimílitáh.

Even well-educated persons, when blinded by passion, tread on evil paths.

Vipatpratíkára-parena mangalam
Nishevyate bhútisamutsukena vá.

Auspicious acts are resorted to through anxiety to avert evil or to secure prosperity.

Dayitásvanavasthitam nrinám
Na khalu prema chalam suhrijjane.

The love of men may be unstable towards their wives, but it never varies towards friends.

Asaner amritasya chobhayoh
Vasinas chámbudharás cha yonayah.

Of both evil and good the self-restrained and the clouds are productive causes: the former hurt by their wrath and endow by blessing; the latter hurt by thunder and endow the earth with plenty of rain.

Ka ípsitártha sthira nischayam manah
Payas cha nimnábhimukham pratípayet.

Who can stop a mind resolutely set on a desired object, or water rushing downwards?

Vishabrikshopi samvardhya svayam chhettum asámpratam.

Even a poisonous tree having been reared, one hesitates to cut it down oneself.

Práyena sámagryavidhau gunánám
Paránmukhi visvasrijah pravrittih.

The disposition of the Creator seems generally to be averse to the collection of all virtues in one subject.

Vikárahetau sati vikriyante
Yeshám na chetámsi ta eva dhíráh.

Those whose minds are not perturbed by temptation are truly wise.

Kalidasa in one of his epics calls the North—

Kuvera guptám disam,

The side guarded by the god of wealth,

indicating that the North—and not the West—is the nursery of all that is prized in life. Publicists should therefore drop the distinction between East and West and adopt the more correct indication of human differences implied in North and South.

In the Sanskrit epics and dramas some of the heroines are represented as indulging in the modern European custom of choosing their own husbands (*svayambara*), which was probably discontinued under Moslem influence.

The following verse anticipates the condition of Europe at the present day, when fully armed it fears no external enemy, but only dreads women (suffragettes):—

Bhrúbhedibhih sakamposhthair lalitánguli tarjanaih
Yatra kopaih kritáh strínám áprasádarthinah priyáh.

Where men, anxious for the grace of womankind, fear no other enemies than the contracted eyebrows, the quivering lips, and the uplifted fingers of the gentle sex.

Kalidasa's description of Oshadhiprastha, the capital of the Himalayas, would apply to the metropolis of the British Empire.

Alakám ativáhyeva vasatim vasusampadám
Svargábhishyanda vamanam kritvevopanivesitam.

As if the capital of the gods, the seat of wealth and plenty, has been transplanted on earth and peopled by the redundance of the population of heaven.

A general difference between the East and the West is exemplified in the verse—

Viniyogaprasádá hi kinkaráh prabhavishnushu.

Servants feel favoured when employed by their masters to do some bidding. (In the West, whatever servants do is to "oblige.")

Kalidasa's chivalry and, perhaps, suffragist tendencies are implied in the couplet—

Tám agaurava bhedena munins chápasyad isvarah
Strípumán ity anásthaisha vrittam hi mahitam satám.

On the lady (the wife of one of the Rishis) as well as on the Rishis themselves, the Lord looked with equal regard: whether male or female is of no consequence, since the character of the good is honoured without distinction of sex.

The king in *Hamlet* speaks of his inviolability thus :—

There's such divinity doth hedge a king,
That treason can but peep to what it would.

Manu explains royal divinity thus :—

Ashtábhis cha surendránám mátrábhir nirmito nripah,
Tasmád abhibhavaty esha sarvabhútáni tejasá.

With eight elements of the gods is a king made; hence, by his lustre he subdues all creatures.

Kalidasa describes a king of the House of Raghu, who went about without attendants thus:

Na chányatas tasya sareera-rakshá
Svavírya-guptá hi manoh prasutih.

The race of Manu needed no bodyguard, but relied for safety on its own prestige and prowess.

Of royal attributes, such as King Henry V. defined and Cranmer prophesied of the infant Elizabeth, Kalidasa speaks in referring to a king of the solar line thus :—

Byúdhorasko vrishaskandhah sálapránsurmahábhujah
Átmakarma kshamam deham kshátro dharma ivasritah.

Broad-chested, strong-shouldered like a bull, long-armed like a pine-tree, his physical frame was suited to the task of his royal birth: he was the embodiment of the virtues of the warrior caste.

Tasya samvrita mantrasya goodhákarengitasya cha
Phalánumeyáh prárambháh sanskáráh práktaná iva.

Uncommunicative in state affairs, his deep purpose,

guessed by hints, could be measured only by successful accomplishment: as the instincts of a previous birth are known by acts in this life.

Jnáne maunam kshamá saktau tyáge slágha viparyayah
Guná gunánubandhitvát tasya saprasavá iva.

Silence with knowledge, forbearance with strength, modesty with sacrifice: antagonistic qualities were joined in him as brothers.

Artatránaya tat sastram na prahartum anágasi.

His arms were for the relief of the oppressed, not for hurting the innocent.

Prajánám vinayadhánád rakshanád bharanád api
Sa pitá pitaras tásám kevalam janmahetavah.

For his wise guidance, shielding from danger, and provision of necessaries of life, the King was the true father of his subjects, whose own parents were only for giving them birth.

Aham eva mato mahípateh
Iti sarvah prakritish vachintayat
Udadher iva nimnagásateshv-
Abhavan násya vimánaná kva chit.

Every one of the king's subjects thought to himself, "I am the especial object of Royal care," for, like the ocean that receives without differentiation countless rivers, the king neglected the interests of none.

A ruler's qualification has been described thus :—

Mridus ched avamanyeta tíkshnád udvijate janah
Tíkshnas chaiva mridus chaiva prajánám sa cha sammatah.

If too lenient, a ruler does not command obedience; if too harsh, he is regarded as a tyrant: a mixture of leniency and strictness in rulers is desired by subjects.

Saptángáni—the seven conditions of kingship—are described as—

Svámyamátya suhrit kosa ráshtra durga baláni cha

Master, minister, ally, exchequer, dominion, fortress, and army.

With the unity of high thinking observant minds will discern a sameness of the "lower thought" of both the East and the West. The trick adopted by antipathetic separatists to engender animosity between Asia and Europe, to which many just but incautious persons succumb, is to set off the lower thought and acts of smaller men against the thoughts and acts of leaders of men. A study of the higher thought and of the acts of good men will prove the truth of Coleridge's remark that "the great book of Nature has been the music of gentle and pious minds in all ages."

MINISTRY OF CULTURE · GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

GSL

PARALLEL ILLUSTRATIONS

Sarvasya bastujátasya jagatonyasya te mama,
Deho hi chetanákásam paramátmaiva netarat.

Of all created things, of the world, of everybody, of thee as of me, the body is the holder of the supreme spirit—the ether of consciousness.

Deho deválayah prokto jeevo devah sadásivah.

The body is called the temple, and the soul the eternal divinity.

Yatah pravrittir bhootánám yena sarvam idam tatam
Svakarmaná tam abhyarchya siddhim vindati mánavah.

From whom the capacity for action of all creation springs, and by whom everything is pervaded, by His worship through righteous acts does man receive sanctity.

Sarvasyaiva janasyásya vishnur abhyantare sthitah,
Tam parityajya ye yánti bahir vishnum narádhamáh.

The Omnipresent exists in the heart of every person; unconscious of Him, those who seek Him outside are the worst of men.

Etad eva param dhyánam púja ishaiva pará smritá,
Yadanáratam antastha-suddha-chinmátra-vedanam.

This is true contemplation, this is real worship, which is incessantly conscious of the holy spirit within.

Your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which ye have of God: therefore glorify God in your body.

1 CORINTHIANS.

Behold, the Kingdom of God is within you.

S. LUKE.

In every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him.

THE ACTS.

A good conscience is to the soul what health is to the body: it preserves a constant ease and serenity of mind.

ADDISON.

When thou goest out to battle against thine enemies, be not afraid of them, for the Lord thy God is with thee and goeth with thee to fight against thine enemies.

DEUTERONOMY.

Drisyate lokasámányo yathá práptánuvrittimán,
Ishtánishta phalapráptau hridaye náparájitah.

To appear like ordinary mortals in the varied affairs of life, but in heart unaffected by good or evil.

Love is life. With love one is truly rich; without it one is poor indeed. Life with love is eternal.

BHÁGABAT.

Manomátrena suhridá sadaiva sahavasiná,
Saha kinchit parámrisya bhavatyátmá samuddhritah.

With mind, the constant friend always living with you, commune a little, and the soul will be uplifted.

Átmaiva hyátmano bandhur átmaiva ripur átmanah.
Átmátmaná na chet trátas tad upáyosti netarah.

Self is the best friend of self, and self is its worst enemy: if self does not rescue itself, there is no other means of its safety.

Yasya násti svayam prajná sástram tasya karoti kim,
Lochanábhyám biheenasya darpanah kim karishyati.

What would Scriptures do for one that has not sense of his own? A mirror is useless to one who has no eyes.

Some will hate thee, some will love thee,
Some will flatter, some will slight:
Cease from man, and look above thee,
Trust in God, and do the right.

MACLEOD.

Let us love one another, for love is of God: and every one that loveth knoweth God.

S. JOHN.

Learn to commune with your own heart and know what noble company you can make it.

GOLDSMITH.

Life is but short, therefore be just and prudent, and make the most of it.

AURELIUS.

The reverence of a man's self is, next religion, the chiefest bridle of all vices.

BACON.

Nos plus grands malheurs viennent de nous-mêmes.
(Our greatest evils come from ourselves.)

ROUSSEAU.

The fearful unbelief is unbelief in thyself.

CARLYLE.

Samsayád bhrasyate svárthát samsayátmá vinasyati.

Hesitation bars the road to fortune: he that hesitates is lost.

Sandehastu parámártir áhur ártivido janáh.

Doubt is described by the sages as the greatest mischief.

Ajnánaikahato bálye yauvane madanáhatah,
Seshe kalatrachintártah kim karoti kadá jadah.

Childhood is weighted by ignorance, youth is affected by Cupid, age is full of family anxieties; how can the poor mortal's happiness be secured?

Pitá dharmah pitá svargah mátá hi paramam tapah
Pitari preetim ápanne priyante sarvadevaták.

Father is the emblem of virtue, father is heaven: mother is supreme holiness; when parents are propitiated all the gods are pleased.

Jananee janmabhoomis cha svargád api gareeyasee.

Mother and motherland are more venerable than heaven itself.

There is a tide in the affairs of men
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows and in miseries.

SHAKESPEARE.

Our doubts are traitors
And make us lose the good we oft might win
By fearing to attempt.

SHAKESPEARE.

Wouldst thou know thyself?
See how others act and sin.
Wouldst thou know others also?
Look to thine own heart within.

SCHILLER.

Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.

EXODUS.

Smile a little, smile a little,
As you go along,
Not alone when life is pleasant,
But when things go wrong.
Care delights to see you frowning,
Loves to hear you sigh;
Turn a smiling face upon her—
Quick the dame will fly.

ELLA WILLCOX.

Mátá bhoomandalád gurvee pitá svargád uchchatarah.

The mother is weightier than the earth; the father is higher than the heavens.

Átmavat sarvabhooteshu yah pasyati sa panditah.

He that regards all creatures as himself is a wise man.

Ekasmin vidyamane hi ripavah kutra santi vai.

When all existence is one, where are enemies to be found?

Práná yathá-tmano-bheeshtá bhootánám api te tathá
Átmaupamyena bhooteshu dayám kurvanti sádhavah.

Life is as dear to other creatures as to oneself; by one's own standard one should behave towards others.

Thy Lord hath ordained that ye worship none but Him; and kindness to your parents, whether one or both of them attain to old age with thee: and say not to them, "Fie!" neither reproach them; but speak to them both with respectful speech: and defer humbly to them out of tenderness. And to him who is of kin render his due, and also to the poor and to the wayfarer.

AL KORAN (*Rodwell's translation*).

Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets.

S. MATTHEW

Say, what is honour? 'Tis the finest sense
Of justice which the human mind can frame.

WORDSWORTH.

I consider the most enviable of all titles the character of an "honest man."

WASHINGTON.

Whatever good there is in man is in itself divine. Nobleness of life depends on its consistency, clearness of purpose, quiet and ceaseless energy.

RUSKIN.

A gentleman,
Valiant and wise, remorseful, well-accomplish'd.

SHAKESPEARE.

Gentleman denotes good nature or benevolence: manhood first, and then gentleness.

EMERSON.

"If you do what is displeasing to your father and mother you shall not see heaven, and instead of good spirits you shall see evil beings. Behave with honesty and with respect to the great, and never injure the lowly. Hold not poor relations as a reproach to you. Imitate the justice and goodness of the only Creator. Whatever would be unpleasing to yourselves, think not that pleasing to others, and do it not."

PERSIAN ZEND AVESTA.

Be gentle, and you can be bold; be frugal, and you can be liberal; be humble, and you can become a leader among men.

CHINESE SAGE.

Ayam nijah paro beti gananá laghuchetasám
Udáracharitánán tu vasudhaiva kutumbakam.

To discriminate between mine and not-mine is the work of small minds, but of the generous all mankind are relations.

Taravopi hi jeevanti jeevanti mrigapakshinah,
Sa jeevati mano yasya mananena hi jeevati.

Trees live, so do animals and birds; but he truly lives whose mind lives in thought.

Satyám drishtim avastabhya leelayeyam jagat kriyá,
Kriyate-vásanam yena jeevitam tasya rájate.

That life is beautiful which, based on true vision, discharges worldly duties without selfish desire.

Lives God hath not thought
Unworthy Him to make we ought not deem
Unworthy of our care.

P. J. BAILEY.

To be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace.

ROMANS.

Life is measured by action, not by time.
Its length depends upon others; on one's own power *how well.*

SENECA.

Care is an enemy to life.

SHAKESPEARE.

That life is better life, past fearing death,
Than that which lives to fear.

SHAKESPEARE.

Our empire built on hell's coeval, fear.

SHELLEY.

Tushára karabimbábham mano yasya nirákulam
Maranotsavayuddheshu sa sánta iti kathyate.

One whose mind retains its coolness, like the light of the Moon, in death, festivity, and battle, has attained peace.

Yatráste bhayasansargo jeevitam tadapi mrityabe.

Life associated with fear is the same as death.

Janayantyarjane duhkham tápayanti bipattishu,
Mohayanti cha sampattau katham arthá sukhávaháh.

Causing trouble in acquisition and anxiety in danger, and generating pride in possession, how is money a source of happiness?

Átmadoshán upekshante parachhidreshu tatparah.

Overlooking one's own faults, but anxious to note the weak points in others.

Drishtvá striyam devamáyám tadbhávair ajitendriyah
Pralobhitah patatyandhatamasy-agnau patangavat.

At the sight of woman—the divine illusion—a man without self-control rushes to the deepest abyss like a winged insect at the sight of fire.

Ah! What a sign it is of evil life
Where death's approach is seen so terrible.

SHAKESPEARE.

Our praises are our wages.

SHAKESPEARE.

He most lives
Who thinks most, feels the noblest, acts the best.

BAILEY.

Prefer a noble life before a long.

SHAKESPEARE.

Believe not that the dribbling dart of love can pierce a complete bosom.

SHAKESPEARE.

Many a man his life hath sold
But gold's outside to behold.

SHAKESPEARE.

Ye cannot serve God and Mammon.

S. LUKE.

Tuchchho-pyartho-lpasatvánám gachchhati prárthaneeyatám.

By petty minds even little things are coveted.

Nánarthabuddheh sphurati poorváparavicháraṇa.

Reasoning and foresight cannot be expected in one bent on mischief.

Yadabhávi na tad bhávi bhávi chen na tad anyathá.

What is not to happen cannot come; what will come cannot be otherwise.

Násato vidyate bhávo nábhavo vidyate satah.

Of the unreal, existence is not possible: of the real, there can be no decay.

Arthasya purusho dáso dásas tvartho na kasyachit.

Man is the slave of money, but money is nobody's slave.

Na narasya naro dáso dásas tvarthasya sarvada.

Man is not the slave of man, but always of money.

Saint-seducing gold.

SHAKESPEARE.

Of all base passions fear is most accursed.

SHAKESPEARE.

Money is described by the latter-day sage as that which attracts a man before he has it, distracts him after he has it, and detracts from his worth when he happens not to have it.

* *

Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?

S. MATTHEW.

He that is giddy thinks the world turns round.

SHAKESPEARE.

Little things are great to little men.

POPE.

Small things make base men proud.

SHAKESPEARE.

Bhayam krodham athálasyam atisvapnátijágaram,
Atyáháram anáháram nityam jnánee vivarjayet.

Fear, anger, laziness, too much sleep, excess of wakefulness, too much food, and starvation are avoided by the wise man.

Dheemanto na nishevante paryante duhkhadám kriyám.

Clever people do not care for anything of which the ultimate result is pain.

Baram pránatyágo na tu pisunaváky eshvabhiruchih.

Death is preferable to indulgence in backbiting for personal gain.

Sabdamátrán na bhetavyam ajnátvá sabdakáranam.

Do not be frightened by a noise without knowing its cause.

Shaddosháh purusheneha hátavyá bhootimichchhatá
Nidrá tandrá bhayam krodha álasyam deerghasootratá.

Six failings should be discarded by one that wishes prosperity: long sleep, drowsiness, fear, anger, lethargy, and procrastination.

If it be now, 'tis not to come; if it be not to come, it will be now; if it be not now, yet it will come; the readiness is all.

SHAKESPEARE.

Marks descried in men's nativity
Are nature's faults, not their own infamy.

SHAKESPEARE.

I hold the world but as the world, Horatio,
A stage where every man must play a part.

SHAKESPEARE.

To persist
In doing wrong extenuates not wrong,
But makes it much more heavy.

SHAKESPEARE.

Bad men excuse their faults, good men leave them.

BEN JONSON.

Dosha bheeter anárambhas tat kápurushalakshanam.

Want of initiative through fear of failure is the mark of a coward.

Távad bhayasya bhetavyam yávad bhayam anágatam
Ágatantu bhayam beekshya pratikuryád yathochitam.

The cause of fear is to be dreaded so long as it is away, so that precaution against possible danger may be taken: when it has approached, it has to be remedied in the best possible manner.

Adandyán dandayan rájá dandyáns chaivápyadandayan
Ayaso mahadápnoti narakan chaiva gachchhati.

By punishing the innocent and by not punishing the guilty a ruler becomes infamous and goes to hell.

Manasvee mriyate kámam kárpanyam na tu gachchhati
Api nirvánam áyati nánalo yáti seetatám.

The high-spirited joyfully sacrifices life, but never shrinks from distress. Fire may be put out, but while it exists it never gets cold.

Asevitesvaradváram adrishtavirahavyatham
Anukta kleebavachanam dhanyam kasyápi jeevanam.

That life is glorious which has never approached the door of the wealthy, which has never felt the pang of separation, and which has never uttered the language of distress.

Fearless minds climb soonest unto crowns.

SHAKESPEARE.

He who the sword of heaven will bear
Should be as holy as severe.

SHAKESPEARE.

To the timid and hesitating everything is impossible, because it seems so.

SCOTT.

Cowards die many times before their death,
The valiant never taste of death but once.

SHAKESPEARE.

Not fearing death nor shrinking for distress
But always resolute in most extremes.

SHAKESPEARE.

Aháranidrá bhaya maithunancha,
Sámanyam eshám pasubhir naránám;
Dharmo hi teshám adhiko visesho
Dharmena heenáh pasubhih samánáh.

Appetite, sleep, fear, and passion, men have in common with the brutes; virtue alone distinguishes them, and when virtue is wanting they are the same as the animals.

Udyoginam purushasinham upaiti lakshmeeh.

Fortune favours the resourceful and lion-like man.

Na tadasti jagatkose subhakarmánupátina
Yat paurushena suddhena na samásádyate janaih.

There is nothing in the world which cannot be achieved by men with honest and courageous effort.

Ajarámaravat prájno vidyám arthancha chintayet.

A wise man devotes himself to the acquisition of learning and of other desirable objects as though he were not subject to illness or death.

Na muktir japanád homád upavásasatairapi
Brahmaiváham iti jnátvá mukto bhavati dehabhrit.

Counting of beads, sacrificial fire, or hundreds of fasts bring not holiness, but the consciousness of God within.

What is a man,
If his chief good and market of his time
Be but to sleep and feed? A beast; no more.

SHAKESPEARE.

Dull not device by coldness and delay.

SHAKESPEARE.

Never anger
Made good guard for itself.

SHAKESPEARE.

Pour accomplir de grandes choses on doit vivre comme si on ne devait jamais mourir.

(To do great things a man must live as though he had never to die.)

VAUVENARGUES.

Bodily exercise profiteth little, but godliness is profitable.

TIMOTHY.

Manasá kalpitá moortir nrinám chen mokshasádhanee
Svapnalabdhena rájyena rájáno mánavás tadá.

If an image devised by the mind can secure for mortals holiness, then ordinary men may become kings by the acquisition of kingdoms in dream.

Váyuparna kaná toya prásino mokshabháginah
Santi chet pannagá mukták pasu pakshi jalecharáh.

If by physical asceticism, such as living on air, dried leaf, and water, people may attain religiousness, then insects, birds, and beasts that so live would be the most religious.

When based on self-knowledge, self-restraint, rectitude, and truth, is the soul truly secure.

THE MAHÁBHÁRATA

Ayam átmá sadá mukto nirliptah sarvavastushu
Kintasya bandhanam kasmán muktim ichchhanti durdhiyah.

The soul is ever free, and unaffected by material substances: of what nature is its bondage, and from what do fools wish to liberate it?

Na tasyáhvána mantrádi kinchidevo-payujyate,
Nityáhútah sa sarvastho labhyate sarvatah svachit.

Of him neither invocation nor incantation nor anything else is of any consequence; ever invoked, present in everything, and available everywhere is one's own spirit.

Godhead is not like unto gold or silver, or stone graven by art and man's device.

THE ACTS.

For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body, and have all been made to drink into one Spirit.

1 CORINTHIANS.

Rien n'est beau que le vrai.

(Truth alone is beautiful.)

FRENCH PROVERB.

Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control,
These three alone lead life to sov'reign power.

TENNYSON.

Perish policy and cunning!
Perish all that fears the light!
Whether losing, whether winning,
Trust in God, and do the right.

MACLEOD.

Svakarma dharme hrasati hrasatyáyur nrinám iha
Vriddhe vriddhim upáyáti samam eva bhavet same.

With a weakening of the sense of duty, man's life is shortened: with its strength, life is prolonged; and, with the ordinary disposition, life runs its normal course.

Vrittyartham bhojanam yeshám santánártham cha maithunam,
Váksatyavachanárthája durgányapi taranti te.

Those that eat to live, that observe continence, and whose speech is only for the expression of truth, subdue all obstacles.

Prastávasadrisam vákyám sadbhávasadrisam priyam
Átmasaktisamam kopam yo jánáti sa panditah.

He is a clever man who knows how to speak according to the point, how to secure desirable and sympathetic friendship, and whose resentment is regulated by his strength.

Mánábhávas tathá dambhahinsádi parivarjanam
Manovák káya dandas cha sarvatrávakratá tathá
Etáh prájnenáhartavyáh sodyogam bhootim ichchhatá.

Surrender of arrogance, vanity, and cruelty; control of the mind, body, and tongue; straightforwardness at all times—these have to be strenuously acquired for prosperity.

Harmony of aim, not identity of conclusion, is the secret of the sympathetic life.

MORLEY.

Jesus astonishes and overpowers sensual people. They cannot unite Him to history, or reconcile Him with themselves.

EMERSON.

They should seek the Lord, though He be not far from every one of us.

THE ACTS.

Our purses shall be proud, our garments poor,
For 'tis the mind that makes the body rich,
And, as the sun breaks through the darkest clouds,
So honour peereth in the meanest habit.

SHAKESPEARE.

Káchah kánchana sansargád dhatte márakateem dyutim
Tathá báhyabhooshanena moodhah samyáti hrishtatám
Dehálankáram eveha param ajnatvalakshanam.

Crystal in contact with gold takes a golden hue: so ignorance rejoices in outside ornamentation. Physical decoration is a sure sign of essential emptiness.

Akasmád ágato jantuh sauhárdasya na bhájanam.

A creature accidentally met is not fit for intimacy.

Ramyavastu kshayáyaiva moodhánám jrimbhate padam.

The energy of the stupid is displayed in the destruction of beautiful things.

Poornah poornam jagat pasyet kámukah kámukam jagat,
Ártopyártamayam visvam lubdho lubdham svachitvavat.

Perfection regards the world as perfect, lust looks upon the world as lustful, misery deems the world miserable, and greed deems it covetous, each according to its own disposition.

Kimapyasti svabhávena sundaram vápyasundaram
Yadeva rochate yasmai bhavet tat tasya sundaram.

What is there in nature pretty or ugly? What is agreeable to one is pretty to one's self.

The first spiritual want of a barbarous man is Decoration, as indeed we still see among the barbarous classes in civilized countries.

CARLYLE.

Do not dull thy palm with entertainment
Of each new-hatched, unfledged comrade.

SHAKESPEARE.

Wisdom and goodness to the vile seem vile;
Filths savour but themselves.

SHAKESPEARE.

Suspicion always haunts the guilty mind.

SHAKESPEARE.

Nothing is unclean of itself, only to him that accounteth anything unclean is it unclean.

ROMANS.

Svabásanánusárena sarvah sarvam hi pasyati.

Every one regards things according to his own inclination.

Yayá vásanaya jantur neeyate bhavapanjare
Tad vásanánuroopena phalam samanubhooyate.

By whatever desire a creature is impelled in the coil of life, according to that desire is existence influenced.

Poto dustaravárirásitarane deepondhakárágame
Nirváte byajanam madándhakárinám darpopasántyai srinih
Ittham tad bhuvi násti yasya bidhiná nopáyachintá kritá
Manye durjana chittavrittiharane dhátápi bhagnodyamah.

Ship for crossing difficult expanse of water, light for darkness, fan for heat, calamity for curbing pride; there is nothing for which Providence has not devised a remedy, but of repressing the disposition of the wicked even the Creator has despaired.

Sthánam viviktam yaminám vimuktaye.

Solitude helps the progress of the self-controlled.

Janasamvádharahita suddha desa nishevanam
Prákritair janasanghais cha hyaratih sarvadá bhavet.

Residence in a clean and solitary place and disinclination to associate with the ignorant multitude characterize the sage.

Evil minds change good to their own nature.

SHELLEY.

The love of wicked friends converts to fear,
That fear to hate, and hate turns one or both
To worthy danger and deservèd death.

SHAKESPEARE.

An habitation giddy and unsure
Hath he that buildeth on the vulgar heart.

SHAKESPEARE.

In life man must be either anvil or hammer.

LONGFELLOW.

The man who does not look up will look down, and the spirit that does not dare to soar is destined perhaps to grovel.

DISRAELI.

What viler thing upon the earth than friends
Who can bring noblest minds to basest ends?

SHAKESPEARE.

It is certain that either wise bearing or ignorant carriage is caught, as men take diseases, one of another: therefore, let men take heed of their company.

SHAKESPEARE.

Durjanah parihartavyo vidyayálankritopi san,
Maniná bhooshitah sarpah kim asau na bhayankarah?

A wicked man is to be avoided even if adorned with learning: a serpent is not less venomous when wearing a precious jewel in its head.

Heeyate hi matis sadá heenaih saha samágamát.

By association with the base the mind becomes vulgar.

Woe to every backbiter, defamer.

AL KORAN.

Subhásubhábhyám márgábhyám vahantee jeevaneesarit,
Paurushena prayatnena yojaneeyá subhe pathi.

The river of life flows in two streams—of good and evil: by virile effort it should be made to flow in the good channel alone.

Mano hi dvibidham proktam suddhan chásuddham eva cha,
Asuddham kámasamparkam suddham kámavivarjitam.

Mind is of two kinds—good and evil; it is evil when associated with desire, and good when desire is vanquished.

In every situation powerful rogues know how to save themselves at the expense of the feeble.

ROUSSEAU.

Too much lenity makes robbers bold.

SHAKESPEARE.

The web of life is of mingled yarn, good and ill together.

SHAKESPEARE.

They are as sick that surfeit with too much as they that starve with nothing.

SHAKESPEARE.

Things sweet to taste prove in digestion sour.

SHAKESPEARE.

Sankshubdham akshubdham iti dviroopam
Samvit svaroopam pravadanti santah,
Sreyahparam yena sameehase tvam
Tadekanishtho bhava mámatir bhooh.

Anxiety and serenity are the two forms that wise men attribute to consciousness: whichever you consider desirable, assume it, but do not be stupid.

Apriyasyápi pathyasya parinámah sukhábahah,
Baktá srotá cha yatrásti ramante tatra sampadah.

The consequence of unpalatable counsel is happiness; where the speaker and the hearer of such exist, fortune smiles.

Sukham duhkhan cha manasi tile tailam iva sthitam
Tad desa kálavasato ghanam vá tanu va bhavet.

Happiness and misery are as natural to the mind as oil in rapeseed: each becomes strong or weak according to time and circumstance.

Apriyasya cha bákyasya baktá srotá cha durlabhah.

Of unpalatable expressions the speaker as well as the hearer is rare.

Sunirmalápi visteerná pávanyapi hi yauvane.
Matih kalushatám eti právrishíva taranginee.

In youth even a pure, clear, and broad mind is apt to become muddy, like a stream during the rains.

They are slaves who fear to speak
For the fallen and the weak;
They are slaves who will not choose
Hatred, scoffing, and abuse,
Rather than in silence shrink
From the truth they needs must think;
They are slaves who dare not be
In the right with two or three.

LOWELL.

As surfeit is the father of much fast,
So every scope by the immoderate use
Turns to restraint.

SHAKESPEARE.

All delights are vain, but that most vain
Which with pain purchased doth inherit pain.

SHAKESPEARE.

In the sweetest bud
The eating canker dwells.

SHAKESPEARE.

He tires betimes that spurs too fast betimes,
With eager feeding food doth choke the feeder.

SHAKESPEARE.

Remember thy Creator in the days of thy youth.

ECCLESIASTES.

Yauvanam dhanasampattih prabhutvam avivekatá
Ekaikam apy-anarthâya kimu yatra chatushtayam.

Youth, wealth, mastery, and unreasoning impulsiveness: any one of these is mischievous enough; how much more when the four are joined together!

Ye hi sansparsajá bhogá duhkhayonaya eva te
Ádyantavantah Kaunteya na teshu ramate budhah.

Enjoyments proceeding from contact with matter having beginning and end are causes of pain; a wise man does not take pleasure in them.

Na so-sti purusho loke yo na kámayate sriyam
Parasya yuvateem ramyám sádaram nekshate-tra kah?

There is no man that does not desire fortune: who does not gaze at the pretty young wife of another man?

Muktim práhus tadiha munayo vasanátánavam yat.

Freedom has been described by the sages as the regulation of desire.

Naishkarmyena na tasyárthas tasyárthosti na karmabhih,
Na samádhánajápábhyám yasya nirvásanam manah.

Neither action nor abstention is of use to one whose desire has not been curbed by contemplation and reason.

Be wary, then; best safety lies in fear;
Youth to itself rebels, though none else near.

SHAKESPEARE.

Our own precedent passions do instruct us
What levity's in youth.

SHAKESPEARE.

A sin prevailing much in youthful men,
Who give their eyes the liberty of gazing.

SHAKESPEARE.

Keep you in the rear of your affection
Out of the shot and danger of desire.

SHAKESPEARE.

Let no man talk of freedom until he is sure of governing himself.

GOETHE.

Kámádi klesa bandhena yuktasya na hi muktatá.

Freedom is not for him that is in the coils of desire.

Upadeso hi moorkhánám prakopáya na sántaye.

Moral teaching excites the anger of the foolish, and is not for their benefit.

Sreemán ajananindyas cha sooras chá-pyavikatthanah
Samadrishtih prabhus chaiva durlabháh purushás trayah.

A fortunate man not subject to the blame of others, a warrior that is not self-complacent, and a master that is impartial to all servants alike: these are three types difficult to find.

Kotibhárah samarthánám kim dooram byabasáyinám,
Ko bidesah savidyánám kah parah priyavádinám.

What is too hard for the capable, what is too far for the enterprising, what country is foreign to the cultured, who is a stranger to the polite?

Sambhavaty-uttamah prajnah sástrato vyavaháratah,
Yo yatra náma tatrásau panditas tam samásrayet.

The best and wisest man is distinguished by knowledge and behaviour: wherever he may be found, associate with him.

Happy are they that hear their detractions and put them to mending.

SHAKESPEARE.

Let us put our trust in the Almighty God of Justice, who has ordained the principles of right, equity, and freedom to be the guides and masters of our lives.

GLADSTONE.

The love of mankind is nothing but the love of justice.

ROUSSEAU.

True men of all creeds are brothers.

CARLYLE.

As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.

ROMANS.

Yatah kutas chid anvishya savirágam amatsaram,
Janam sajjanam átmajnam yatnenárádhayed budhah.

Seek everywhere the good and wise man devoid of desire and envy, and diligently propitiate him.

Na hi satvavatám kaschid abandhur iha vidyate.

Of the virtuous there is nobody that is not a friend.

Játimátrena kim kas chid hanyate poojyate kvachit?
Vyavaháram parijnáya badhyah poojyothavá bhavet.

Should any one be condemned at first acquaintance? After experience of one's behaviour can one be known to be either objectionable or praiseworthy?

Na bhoopradánam na suvarnadánam
Na gopradánam na tathánnadánam,
Yathá vadanteeha mahápradánam
Sarveshu dáneshv-abhaya pradánam.

The gift of land, of gold, of cow, or of food, does not come up to the great gift—relief from fear and sadness.

Yasmán nodvijate loko lokán nodvijate cha yah
Harshámarsha bhayodvegair mukto yah sa cha me priyah.

One that does not annoy others and does not feel annoyance from others, that is free from joy and sorrow and from fear and anxiety, is beloved by God.

The son of God I also am, or was—
And if I was, I am: relation stands:
All men are sons of God.

MILTON.

The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God: and if children, then heirs—heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ.

ROMANS.

Character is best nurtured on life's tempestuous sea.

GOETHE.

The gentle mind by gentle deeds is known:
For man by nothing is so well betrayed
As by his manners: in which plain is shown
Of what degree, and of what race he's grown.

SPENSER.

Abandhur bandhutám eti naikatyábhyásayogatah
Yátyanabhyásato doorát sneho bandhushu tánavam.

A stranger becomes a friend by nearness and association affection for friends diminishes by distance and long separation.

Samagránandavrindánam etadevopari sthitam
Yat samána mano vritti sangamásvádane sukham.

Of all joys the happiness of association with those that are of the same mental disposition is the highest.

Visrámánám anantánám seemánto bandhudarsanam.

The sight of a friend is the acme of all bliss.

Satyam sauryam dayá tyágo nripasyaite mahágunáh.

Truth, prowess, mercy, and restraint are the great qualities of a ruler of men.

Prabhutvam samadrishtitvam tachcha syád rájavidyayá
Tameva yo na jánáti násau mantree na so-dhipah.

Mastery consists in impartiality, which should co-exist with the highest learning: its non-existence unfits a man to be either king or minister.

They best can serve true gladness
Who meet most feelingly the calls of sadness.

WORDSWORTH.

Kind hearts are more than coronets,
And simple faith than Norman blood.

TENNYSON.

There is no beautifier of complexion, or form, or behaviour, like the wish to scatter joy around.

EMERSON.

We are gentlemen
That neither in our hearts nor outward eyes
Envy the great nor do the low despise.

SHAKESPEARE.

Sarvadravyeshu vidyaiva dravyam áhur anuttamam,
Aháryatvád anarghatvád akshayatvách cha sarvadá.

Of all things knowledge is the most precious, being unstealable, stainless, and imperishable.

Jnánaván eva sukhaván jnánaván eva jeevati
Jnánaván eva balaváns tasmád jnánamayo bhava.

Knowledge is happiness, knowledge is life, knowledge is strength: therefore be full of knowledge.

Vidyá dadáti vinayam vinayád yátipátratám
Pátratvád dhanam ápnoti dhanád dharmam tatah sukham.

Knowledge gives humility, from which springs distinction: from this comes wealth, which should produce virtue: and virtue brings happiness.

Perish the liars, who are bewildered in the depths of ignorance.

AL KORAN.

Mokshopi chetaso dharmas chetasyeva sa tishthati
Na dehe dehadharmastu na dehád vinivartate.

Freedom is an attribute of the mind, where it is to be found: not in the physical frame, which cannot live without its own functions.

What a fair world were ours to paint
If power could live at ease with self-restraint.
WORDSWORTH.

Remorse and fear are the checks of men.
SHELLEY.

The abuse of greatness is when it disjoins
Remorse from power.
SHAKESPEARE.

By knowledge we do learn ourselves to know,
And what to man and what to God we owe.
SPENSER.

Meekness is the cherished bent
Of all the truly great and all the innocent.
WORDSWORTH.

Baram sarábahastasya chándálágára beethishu,
Bhikshártham atanam sreyo na maurkha hata jeevitam.

Rather beg for food in lanes inhabited by pariahs than live in deathlike ignorance.

Na vyádhir na visham nápat tathá nádhis cha bhootale
Khedáya svasareerastham maurkham ekam yathá nrinám.

Neither physical malady, nor poison, nor misfortune, nor mental worry is so grievous to human beings as ignorance alone.

Ye hi rájnám arájnám vá-pyayathá sástrakárinám
Rane mriyante chhinnángás te vai nirayagáminah.

Those that die in battle fighting for kings or others, that are unjust in their behaviour, go to the lower regions.

Sadácháravatám arthe khadgadhárám sahanti ye
Te soorá iti kathyante seshá dimbháhabáhaták.

Those that receive sword-cuts in the cause of the just are real heroes: others are mimic warriors.

Vishamám hi dasám prápya daivam garhayate narah,
Átmanah karmadosháns cha naiva jánátyapanditah.

On meeting with misfortune to blame fate and to remain unconscious of his own failings and faults characterizes the uncultured man.

Ignorance is the curse of God,
Knowledge the wing wherewith to fly to heaven.
SHAKESPEARE.

If we live habitually in contact with what we know to be the best, we cannot yield to meaner things.
STOPFORD BROOKE.

Every fool is a slave: the wise man alone is free.
CICERO.

The sovereign principle of British rule is the union of freedom and responsibility.
ASQUITH.

We make our fortunes and call them fate.
DISRAELI.

Endeavour to be good, and better still,
And best. Success is naught, endeavour's all.
BROWNING.

Manah sarvam idam dhruvam tasmin nantas chikitsite,
Chikitsito vai sakalo jagaj jálámayo bhavet.

Mind is everything; its proper inner treatment alone can alleviate the ailments and miseries of the world.

Sástrato gurutas chaiva svatas cheti trisiddhayah
Sarvatra purushárthasya na daivasya kadáchana
Kalpitam mohitair mandair daivam kinchin na vidyate.

There are three ways of knowledge—from the Scriptures, from preceptors, and from intuition: every way is attainable by effort and never by fate: there is no such thing as fate, which is devised by lethargic stupidity.

Paunah punyena karanam abhyása iti kathyate
Purushárthah sa eveha tenásti na viná gatih.

Repeatedly doing a thing is called habit; that is virile effort, and without it nothing can be gained.

The poet's sweetest song is never seen
Frozen on printed page in black and white.
Poems are made of heart-throbs, not of ink;
And the sweet words that are the world's delight
Are but sad echoes of the "might have been."

PERSIAN POET.

Let a man overcome anger by love, evil by good, greed by liberality, untruth by truth.

BUDDHA.

Talents are nurtured best in solitude.

GOETHE.

Men at some time are masters of their fates:
The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars,
But in ourselves, that we are underlings.

SHAKESPEARE.

Our remedies oft in ourselves do lie,
Which we ascribe to heaven; the fated sky
Gives us free scope, only doth backward pull
Our slow designs when we ourselves are dull.

SHAKESPEARE.

A golden mind stoops not to shows of dross.

SHAKESPEARE.

Of every noble work the silent part is best,
Of all expression that which cannot be expressed.

STORY.

Be not as extreme in submission
As in offence.

SHAKESPEARE.

Whoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.

S. MATTHEW.

Yat karoshi yad asnási yaj juhoshi dadási yat
Yachcha hridyanubhabasi tat kurushva madárpanam.

What you do, what you eat, what you sacrifice to the fire, what you bestow, and also what you feel in your heart, dedicate all to God.

Yathá lohamayaih pásaih pásaih svarnamayair api,
Távad baddho bhavej jeebah svakarmabhir dushtásubhaih.

Chains made of gold are not less irksome than those forged in iron; so does man chain himself by his own momentarily pleasant but wicked acts.

Annabhootá hi mahatám laghavo yatnasálinám.

Of the great and enterprising the weak ones become the prey.

Tvad uttaptena he duhkha sanmárgam cheshtitam mayá
Tasmát tvad upadishtoyam márgo mama namostu te.

O Adversity, touched by thee, I tried to find a better way: hence my present course is due to thy teaching; so I salute thee.

Tribidham narakasyedam dváram násanam átmanah
Kámalobhau madirácha tasmád etattrayam tyajet.

The doors of hell and of self-destruction are of three kinds—lust, avarice, and liquor; so avoid all three.

Commit thy way unto the Lord.

PSALMS.

Whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men.

COLOSSIANS.

L'homme ne peut mettre une chaine autour du cou de son frére sans que Dieu attache l'autre bout au cou de l'oppresseur.

(Man cannot fasten one end of a chain round the neck of his brother without God fastening the other end round the neck of the oppressor.)

LAMARTINE.

He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity.

REVELATION.

Fishes live in the sea as men do a-land; the great ones eat up the little ones.

SHAKESPEARE.

Sweet are the uses of adversity,
Which, like the toad, ugly and venomous,
Wears yet a precious jewel in his head.

SHAKESPEARE.

Behold a man gluttonous and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners.

S. MATTHEW.

Chijjyotsná yávad evántar ahankáraghanávritá
Vikásayati no távat sadvichára kumudvateem.

Spiritual light, so long as it is clouded by pride, cannot open out in bloom the lily of true reason.

Pánipádádimátroyam aham ityesha nischayah
Ahankáro durátmásau satrur eva parah smritah.

The conviction that self is this body with arms, legs, and other limbs, generates the wicked pride which is the great enemy.

Duruchchhedá hi bhootánám ahankára chamatkritih.

Of creatures the vanity attaching to self is difficult to obliterate.

Svarnaháree kritaghnas cha Brahmahá gurutalpakah
Streehantá bálaghátee cha surápee vrishaleepatih.

Thievery, ingratitude, disbelief in God, disrespect to superiors, killing of woman, killing of child, liquor-drinking, adultery, are the great sins.

Angeekritártham adadat ka ivásti loke
Doshena sankshaya karena na yujyate yah.

Who is there in creation that, failing to keep his word, does not become a victim of decay ?

I am strong and lusty,
For in my youth I never did apply
Hot and rebellious liquors in my blood,
Nor did not with unbashful forehead woo
The means of weakness and debility.

SHAKESPEARE.

He that is proud eats up himself.

SHAKESPEARE.

What the weak head with strongest bias rules
Is pride, the never-failing vice of fools.

POPE.

Pride out of daily fortune ever taints
The happy man.

SHAKESPEARE.

Conceit in weakest bodies strongest works.

SHAKESPEARE.

Jeevitam yáti sáphalyam svam abhyágata poojayá
Devád apy-adhikam poojyah satám abhyágato janah.

One's life becomes happy by attention to strangers: more than even an angel is an accidentally arrived guest to be treated with hospitality.

Kilopakurute yatnát trinamátrávagopane
Katham sidhyaty-ayatanena trailokya-ganagopanam.

Effort is needed to guard even a plot of grass: how without assiduity can life be freed from the anxieties of the material universe?

Waste not wastefully, for the wasteful are brethren of the Satans, and Satan was ungrateful to his Lord. Have naught to do with adultery; for it is a foul thing and an evil way. And touch not the substance of the orphan, unless in an upright way, till he attain his age of strength. And give full measure when you measure, and weigh with just balance.

AL KORAN.

Mátá satruh pitá vairee yena bálo na páthitah.

Mother is an enemy and father a tyrant by whom a child is not properly trained.

Korthah putrena yátena yo na vidván na dhármikah?

What is the good of a son who is not learned and virtuous?

But most it is presumption in us when
The help of Heaven we count the act of men.

SHAKESPEARE.

Thou knowest the commandments, do not commit adultery, do not kill, do not steal, do not bear false witness, defraud not.

S. MARK.

Where you feel your honour grip,
Let that aye be your border.

BURNS.

Though they can outstrip men, they have no wings to fly from God.

SHAKESPEARE.

Strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.

S. MATTHEW.

Be not forgetful to entertain strangers, for thereby some have entertained angels unawares.

HEBREWS.

Parokshe káryahantáram pratyakshe priyavádinam
Barjayet tádrisam mitram vishakumbham payomukham.

Outwardly sweet-tongued but secretly inimical, such a friend is to be avoided like a jar of poison covered over with cream.

Na sá sabhá yatra na santi briddháh
Briddhá na te ye na vadanti dharmam
Dharmah sa no yatra na satyam asti
Satyam na tad yach chhalam abhyupaiti.

That is no meeting where the elders are not present; they are not elders that do not ordain duty; that is not duty which is devoid of truth; that is not truth which has recourse to deception.

Yad ati subhagam árya sevitam tach chubham anusritya manojnabhávabudhyá
Daivam nihatya kritvá paurusham átmasaktyá adhigamaya padam anuttamam.

Whatever good is accepted and done by the most revered follow it with an unselfish resolution, conquer fate, and by your own virile strength attain the highest position.

Mahájano yena gatah sa panthá.

That alone is the path which the great have trod.

Moodhottáranam eveha svabhávo mahatám iti.

To rescue the ignorant is the nature of the great.

Be given to hospitality.

ROMANS.

A priest who has forsworn the God he serves;
A judge who makes Truth weep at his decree;
A friend who should weave counsel, as I now,
But as the mantle of some selfish guile;
A father who is all a tyrant seems,
Were the profaner for his sacred name.

SHELLEY.

Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And departing leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of Time.

LONGFELLOW.

He that wants money, means, and content is without three good friends; he that hath learnt no wit by nature or art may complain of good breeding or comes of a very dull kindred.

SHAKESPEARE.

Cull from every faith and race the best
And bravest soul for counsellor and friend.

TENNYSON.

Etávaj janmasáphalyam yad anáyattavrittitá
Ye parádheenatám yátás te vai jeevanti ke mritáh?

That life is worth living which is not dependent on others; if dependence is life, what then is death?

Tátasya koopo-yam iti bruvánáh
Ksháram jalam kápurushah pibanti.

Unintelligent men drink hard water because it comes out of an ancestral well, although soft and sweet water is available.

Bhoomir mitram hiranyam cha bigrahasya phalatrayam
Yadaitán nischitam bhávi kartavyo bigrahas tadá.

Land, ally, and gold are the three fruits of war: when these are certain, then war is desirable.

Yatráyuddhe dhrubo náso yuddhe jeevitasamsayah
Tameva kálam yuddhasya pravadanti maneeshinah.

When in not fighting is sure ruin and in fighting the result is uncertain, that is the time for battle prescribed by the Sages.

Bahih pichchhágrataralá antar merur iváchalah.

Outside gentle and pliable like the end of a feather, but inwardly firm like a mountain.

So, when a great man dies,
For years beyond our ken
The light he leaves behind
Lies on the paths of men.

LONGFELLOW.

What custom wills, in all things should we do't,
The dust on antique time would lie unswept,
And mountainous error be too highly heapt
For truth to o'er-peer.

SHAKESPEARE.

The longest line of human ancestry must hide its diminished head before the pedigree of the snake's-head lamp-shell (*Terebratulina caput serpentis*) which lives in our English seas. We are proud to have an ancestor who was present at the Battle of Hastings. The ancestors of the Terebratulina may have been present at a battle of Ichthyosauria in that part of the sea which, when the chalk was forming, flowed over the site of Hastings.

HUXLEY.

Let us have war, say I: it exceeds peace as far as day does night: it is spritely, waking, audible, and full of vent.

SHAKESPEARE.

Dharme yoddhá bhavech chhoora ity evam sástrani-
schayah.

A fighter in a just and rightful cause becomes a hero; such is ordained by the Scriptures.

Yo yam artham prárthayate tadartham yatate tathá
So-vasyam tamavápnoti na chech chhránto nivartate.

Whatever object is ardently desired and effort is concentrated upon is bound to be achieved, unless given up through fatigue or impatience.

Sarvam adhyavasáyena dushprápamapi labhyate.

With perseverance even the most difficult objects may be achieved.

Yogasthah kuru karmáni sangam tyaktvá dhananjaya
Sidhyasidhyoh samo bhootvá samatvam yoga uchyate.

In union with the spirit and without mental absorption or heeding success or failure, discharge your duties; sameness in results is called "union."

Paurusham svam avastabhya dhairyam álambya sásva-
tam
Yadi tishthaty-agamyosau duhkhánám tad aninditah.

If one with endless patience strives with all one's strength, one is unaffected by sorrows and miseries.

It is war's prize to take all vantages;
And ten to one is no impeach of valour.

SHAKESPEARE.

The mailed fist in a velvet glove.

KAISER WILHELM II.

Things without remedy
Should be without regard.

SHAKESPEARE.

Be still, fond man; not ask thy fate to know,
Face bravely what each God-sent moment brings.

KINGSLEY.

Turn not faint of heart:
What doest thou, let not weariness overcome thee.

ÆSCHYLUS.

A noble aim faithfully kept is as a noble deed.

WORDSWORTH.

Svah káryam adya kartavyam poorbáhne vá paráhnike
Na hi prateekshate mrityuh kritam asya na vá-kritam.

The work which has to be done to-morrow should be done to-day, in the forenoon or afternoon; death does not wait to inquire whether any work remains unfinished.

Kálah srijati bhootáni kálah sambarate prajáh,
Kálah supteshu jágarti kálo hi durati-kramah.

Time brings creatures into being; time destroys them; time is awake even to those that are asleep; time cannot be evaded.

Práptam kartavyam eveti tyakteshtánishta-bhavanah,
Pravartate yah káryeshu na sa muhyati kutrachit.

He that engages in the acts of life with the conviction that the duty devolved upon him has to be discharged without consideration of its pleasantness or otherwise never becomes dull or useless.

Mayyeva sakalam játam mayi sarvam pratishthitam
Mayi sarvam layam yáti tad brahmádvayam asmyaham.

In me everything is created, in me everything exists, n me everything disappears; hence I am the all-pervading unity.

Samo-ham sarvabhooteshu na me dveshyosti na priyah.

I, Vishnu, am the same in all creatures: there is no one that is beloved or not beloved by me.

On our quickest decrees
The inaudible and noiseless foot of Time
Steals ere we can effect them.

SHAKESPEARE.

Defer not till to-morrow to be wise,
To-morrow's sun to thee may never rise.

CONGREVE.

Our advantages fly away:
Gather flowers while ye may.

OVID.

Do the duty which lies nearest to you.
Every duty which is bidden to wait
Returns with seven fresh duties at its back.

KINGSLEY

I am the owner of the sphere,
Of the seven stars and the solar year,
Of Cæsar's hand, and Plato's brain,
Of Lord Christ's heart, and Shakespeare's strain.

EMERSON.

Endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

EPHESIANS.

Cogito, ergo sum.

(I think, and so I am.)

DESCARTES.

Kshanam áyáti pátálam kshanam yáti nabhastalam
Kshanam bhramati dikkunje trishná hrit-padmashat-padee.

At one moment going to the lower regions, at another soaring to the sky, at the next moment roaming in all directions is desire—the six-footed bee of the lotus of the heart.

Arthágamo nityam arogitá cha
Priyá cha bháryá priyavádinee cha
Vasyas cha putro-rthakaree cha vidyá
Shadjeevalokasya sukháni manye.

Competence, health, affectionate and sweet-tongued wife, obedient son, and useful learning: these are the real sources of joy in life.

Baram vanam byághragajendra sevitam
Drumálayam pakvaphalámbubhojanam
Trináni sayyá paridhánavalkalam
Na bandhumadhye dhanaheenajeevanam.

Rather be in a forest infested with tigers and lions, have abode in a tree, live on fruit and water, sleep on grass, and wear bark of trees, than live among friends devoid of competence.

Vipadi dhayryam athábhyudaye kshamá
Sadasi vákpatutá yudhi vikramah
Yasasi chá-bhiruchir byasanam srutau
Prakritisiddham idam hi mahátmanám.

Patience in danger, humanity in victory, conversational skill in society, prowess in battle, desire for fame, and devotion to Scripture characterise great men.

Borné dans sa nature,
  Infini dans ses vœux,
L'homme est un dieu tombé
  Qui se souvient des cieux.

(Finite in his nature,
  Infinite in his wishes,
Man is a fallen god
  Who remembers heaven.)

LAMARTINE.

The aim of all is but to nurse the life
With honour, wealth, and ease in waning age;
And in this aim there is such thwarting strife,
That one for all, or all for one we gage;
As life for honour in fell battle's rage,
Honour for wealth, and oft that wealth does cost
The death of all, and all together lost.

SHAKESPEARE.

Heaven doth with us as we with torches do,
Not light them for themselves; for if our virtues
Did not go forth of us, 'twere all alike
As if we had them not.

SHAKESPEARE.

Good, the more
Communicated, more abundant grows.

MILTON.

Divasasyáshtame bháge sákam pachati yo narah
Arinee chá-pravásee cha hyarogee cha sa modate.

One that at the end of the day cooks vegetable food, not being in debt, not in a foreign land, and not suffering from illness, is truly happy.

Saurabham kusumásangád eva satsangamách chhubham
Vartate hyarkasamparkád vikáso-mburuhámiva.

As perfume comes from association with the flower, so welfare springs from the company of the good, like the sun's rays opening out the water-lily.

Udáragunayuktá ye viharanteeha dehinah,
Dharátalendavah sangád bhrisam seetalayanti te.

Persons with generous and noble qualities who go through this life are like moons on earth that spread coolness and peace around.

Rájá hy-áchára káranam.

The King is the maker of manners and custom.

Gorarthe sádhorarthe vá mitrasyárthe cha sanmate
Saranágata yatnena sa mritah svargabhooshanam.

If in the interests of a cow, of a good man, or of a friend, one dies in order to give shelter, one becomes an ornament of heaven.

As one lamp lights another, nor grows less,
So nobleness enkindleth nobleness.

LOWELL.

Reason's whole pleasure, all the joys of sense,
Lie in these words—health, peace, and competence.

POPE.

Those that I reverence I fear, the wise.

SHAKESPEARE.

That country is the richest which nourishes the larges number of noble and happy human beings.

RUSKIN.

We are makers of manners.

SHAKESPEARE

Yathá pradeeptam jvalanam patangáh
Visanti násáya samriddhavegás
Tathaiva násáya visanti lokás
Tavápi vaktrány-anisam hi vishno.

As winged insects vehemently rush into a lighted lamp for their own destruction, so are people incessantly killing themselves in the grip of the eternal destroyer.

Rogasoka pareetápa bandhana byasanáni cha
Átmáparádha brikshánám phalányetáni dehinám.

Illness, grief, regret, bondage, and misery are the fruits of the tree of one's own evil acts.

Jáyate darsanád eva maitree visadachetasám.
Sauhárdam sujanánám hi darsanád eva vardhate.

Among the pure-minded friendship springs from mere sight: intimacy of the good increases with association.

Áditysya gatágatair aharahah sanksheeyate jeevitam
Vyápárair bahukáryabhára gurubhih kálo na vijnáyate
Drishtvá janmajarávipatti maranam trásas cha notpadyate
Peetvá mohamayeem pramádamadirám unmattabhootam jagat.

By the rising and setting of the sun every day life nears its end.
Through various preoccupations the passing of time is not perceived.
The sight of birth, senility, danger, and death does not awaken sense.
Mankind is maddened by the intoxication produced by the wine of delusion.

From hour to hour we ripe and ripe,
And then from hour to hour we rot and rot.

SHAKESPEARE.

True love believes everything, and bears everything, and trusts everything. Have a heart that never hardens, and a temper that never tires, and a touch that never hurts.

DICKENS.

Some rise by sin and some by virtue fall.

SHAKESPEARE.

Good nature and good sense must ever join:
To err is human, to forgive, divine.

POPE.

Merely, thou art death's fool;
For him thou labour'st by thy flight to shun
And yet runn'st toward him still.

SHAKESPEARE.

Na devá dandam ádáya dandayanty-aparádhinam
Buddhim tasyá-pakarshanti tenásau dandyate svatah.

The gods do not punish an offender by stick or cane, but withdraw his reasoning faculty, and so he punishes himself.

Na sukháya sukham yasya duhkham duhkháya yasya no
Antarmukhamater nityam sa sadaiva hi rájate.

He to whom pleasure causes no joy, and sorrow brings no misery, whose intelligence is always turned towards the heart, is ever glorious.

Bhogás tyaktum na sakyante tat tyágena viná vayam
Prabhavámo na vipadám aho sankatam ágatam.

For the preservation of life enjoyments cannot all be given up: without sacrifice of enjoyment misery cannot be avoided: it is thus an acute problem how to reconcile life with sacrifice.

Na kuryád bhogasantyágam na kuryád bhogabhávanam
Stháthavyam susamenaiva yathá práptánuvartina.

Not to abjure enjoyment that may be available, nor to desire what is not: but to be equable and serene, happy with whatever may transpire.

Yasah prabhritiná yasmai hetunaiva vina punah
Bhuvi bhogá na rochante sa mukta iti kathyate.

One who discards enjoyment without any thought of applause or reward is said to be free.

Quos deus vult perdere prius dementat.

(Whom God wishes to destroy He first deprives sanity.)

NAPOLEON.

Nae treasures nor pleasures
Could mak' us happy lang;
The heart aye's the part aye
That makes us right or wrang.

BURNS.

Not enjoyment and not sorrow
Is our destined end or way,
But to act that each to-morrow
Finds us farther than to-day.

LONGFELLOW.

The art of life is to know how to enjoy a little and to endure much.

HAZLITT.

The true worth of a man should be measured by the objects he pursues.

AURELIUS

Whoso chooseth this quickly passing life, quickly will we bestow therein that which we please—even on him we choose; afterwards we will appoint hell for him, in which he shall burn—disgraced, outcast: but whoso chooseth the next life, and striveth after it as it should be striven for, their striving shall be grateful to God.

AL KORAN.

Na játu kamah kámánám upabhogena sámyati
Havishá krishnavartmeva bhooya evábhivardhate.

Desire is never satisfied by enjoyment, but, like butter in fire, it flares up the more.

Duhkhe kálah sudeergho hi sukhe laghutarah sadá.

In misery time is prolonged: in happiness it passes quickly.

Chhidreshvanarthá bahulee bhavanti.

On getting an opening, misfortunes become numerous.

Santo-teetam na sochanti bhavishyach-chintayanti no
Vartamánam cha grihnanti karma práptam akhanditam.

Wise people do not lament what is past, nor are anxious about the future, but accept the present duties with a resolute heart and discharge them fully.

The secret of success is to do all one can without thought of fame.

ADDISON.

The sea hath bounds, but deep desire hath none.

SHAKESPEARE.

Pleasures and action make the hours seem short.

SHAKESPEARE.

When sorrows come they come not single spies,
But in battalions.

SHAKESPEARE.

One sorrow never comes but brings an heir
That may succeed as his inheritor.

SHAKESPEARE.

Ádisarge hi chitsvapno jágrad ity-a-bhisabdyate
Adya rátrau chiteh svapnah svapna ityapi sabdyate.

In the original creation the dream of the Eternal Spirit is called the wakeful life: to-night the dream of the finite mind is described as a dream.

Jagad bhramam parijnáya yad avásanam ásitam
Virasáseshavishayam tad hi nirvánam uchyate.

With a knowledge of the delusion of the world to pass through life without desire or hankering for anything is called (nirvana) Peace.

Manomoham upádatte yasyásau moodha uchyate
Sareere moham ápanne na sabo moodha uchyate.

Delusion of the mind is called stupidity: one is not called stupid when the body is inactive in death.

Asansaktamater yasya tyágádáneshu karmanám
Naishaná tat sthitim viddhi tvam jeevanmuktatám iha.

Indifference to the happening of agreeable or disagreeable things constitutes a peaceful and free life.

Samároodham dasádolám ahoratram idam jagat
Kreedyate shadvidhaih prenkhaih sakhe kim iti khidyate.

What cause is there for anxiety since mankind is made by Time to ride on the wheel of joy and sorrow and is incessantly whirled round by the appetites?

Trust no future, howe'er pleasant,
Let the dead past bury its dead,
Act, act in the living present,
Heart within and God o'erhead.

LONGFELLOW.

We are such stuff
As dreams are made on, and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep.

SHAKESPEARE.

For truth hath better deeds than words to grace it.

SHAKESPEARE.

On trouve la paix dans la vie non en étant exempté des choses désagréables mais en s'y résignant.

(Peace in life springs from acquiescence even in disagreeable things, not in an exemption from them.)

FÉNELON.

Deho-ham ityeva jadasya buddhir dehe cha jeeve vidushas tvaham dheeh
Vivekavijnánavato mahátmano brahmáham ityeva matih sadátmani.

The material body is by the ignorant deemed as self; the educated regard the combination of body and soul as self; but the truly learned feel themselves to be *brahm*, or parts of the omnipresent essence.

Taranti mátangaghatátarangam
Ranámbudhim ye mayi te na sooráh
Soorás ta eveha manastarangam
Dehendriyámbhodhim imam taranti.

They are not heroes that successfully cross the ocean of a battlefield with its waves of elephants and cavalry; but those are real heroes that can calmly ride over the waves of the mind in the ocean of the senses.

Ateete byasane kále svalpam tishthati sarvaree
Kuru chittasamádhánam ma dehi kulakálimám.

Most of the bad time having gone, a little of night remains: be reasonable, and do not cast a stain on your race.

Alpánám api bastoonám samhatih káryasádhiká
Trinair gunatvam ápannair badhyante mattadantinah.

Combination of even insignificant things becomes useful: grass turned into rope fastens mad elephants.

By human excellence is meant not that of man's body, but that of his soul.

ARISTOTLE.

Empty triumphs turn to dust:
All their glitter blinds not Time;
Tinsels tarnish and swords rust;
Ageless is one Thought sublime.
CHRIST'S COLLEGE (CAMBRIDGE) MAGAZINE.

Beware of desperate steps; the darkest day,
Live till to-morrow, will have passed away.
COWPER.

L'union fait la force.

(Union is strength.)

BELGIAN MOTTO.

Upáyam chintayan prájno hyapáyam api chintayet.

A wise man thinks of both *pro* and *con*.

Ko-rthán prápya na garvito vishayinah kasyápado-stam gatáh.

Who is not elated by gain, and who in the enjoyment of worldly prosperity is not subject to danger and annoyance?

Dhanena kim yo na dadáti násnute
Balena kim yas cha ripoon na bádhate
Srutena kim yo na dharmam ácharet
Kim átmaná yo na jitendriyo bhavet.

What is the use of wealth if it is neither given in charity nor enjoyed? What is the good of strength if it does not subdue enemies? Of what use is learning if it does not lead to virtue? What is the use of life if one has not self-control?

Kshamá satrau cha mitre cha yateenám eva bhooshanam
Aparádhishu satveshu nripánám saiva dooshanam.

Pardon to enemy as well as to friend may be admirable in ascetics, but to the proved guilty it is reprehensible in rulers.

Paurusham na parityájyam daive vá viroope sati
Paurushenaiva roopena niyatir hi niyámika.

Manly endeavour is not to be relinquished even if fortune be unkind; by virile effort does fortune regulate success.

Security is mortal's chiefest enemy.

SHAKESPEARE.

Priests pray for enemies, but princes kill.

SHAKESPEARE.

I earn that I eat, get that I wear, owe no man hate, envy no man's happiness, glad of other men's good, and content with my harm.

SHAKESPEARE.

When fortune means to men most good
She looks upon them with a threatening eye.

SHAKESPEARE.

Durlabham trayam evaitad devánugraha hetukam
Manushyatvam mumukshutvam mahápurushasamsrayah.

These three things are unattainable except by the grace of God: human birth, moral freedom, and association with great minds.

Kas tvam siso kasya kuto-si gantá
Kim náma te tvam kuta ágatosi
Etad vada tvam mamásu preetyartham
Sishyáya gurur yathopadisyate.
Náham manushyo na cha deva yaksho
Na bráhmanah kshatriya vaisya sudráh
Na brahmacháree na grihee banastho
Bhikshur na cháham nijabodharoopah.

Question to the soul: Who and whose are you, my child? Where are you going? What is your name? Whence do you come? Tell me all this to please me, as the preceptor teaches the pupil. Answer: I am not a man, nor a god, nor an angel, not of the four castes—priest, warrior, merchant, and servant—not a religious mendicant, not a householder, not a dweller of the forest, not a beggar, but I am the emblem of intelligence.

Into the universe, and *why* not knowing,
Nor *whence*, like water willy-nilly flowing,
And out of it, as wind along the waste
I know not *whither* willy-nilly blowing.

OMAR KHAYYÁM.

What a piece of work is man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculty!

SHAKESPEARE.

De ta tige détachée
Pauvre feuille desséchée
  Où vas tu?
Je n'en sais rien,
L'orage a frappé le chêne
Qui seul était mon soutien;
  Je vais où va toute chose,
  Où va la feuille de rose,
  Et la feuille de laurier.

VICTOR HUGO.

But in that sleep of death what dreams may come,
When we have shuffled off this mortal coil,
Must give us pause.

SHAKESPEARE.

Yam yam vápi smaran bhávam tyajatyante kalevaram
Tam tam evaiti kaunteya sadá tadbhávabhávitah.

Whatever ideas are remembered when one relinquishes this frame are retained in another existence owing to their constant association.

Desakálatirodháne moodhopi marane narah
Kim vibheti mahábáho neha pasyati kaschana.

In the disappearance of time and place, what is there in death to frighten even an ignorant man, since he cannot see his own end?

Nirdhanena dhanam prápya trinavan manyate jagat.

A poor man getting rich regards the world as straw.

Tameva dheero vijnáya prajnám kurveeta bráhmanah
Nánudhyáyád bahoon chhabdán vácho viglápanam hi tat.

The patient worshipper knowing Him develops intelligence and has not recourse to many words; for talk is useless.

Pujá kara mane, bane, kone.

Pray in your own mind, in the forest, and in solitude.

Well, whiles I am a beggar, I will rail
And say there is no sin but to be rich;
And being rich, my virtue then shall be
To say there is no vice but beggary.

SHAKESPEARE.

La victoire appartient au plus perséverant.

NAPOLEON.

Perseverance and tact are the two great qualities most valuable for men that have to step out of the crowd and to mount.

DISRAELI.

When ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathens do; for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking.

S. MATTHEW.

Without him was not anything made that was made.

S. JOHN.

Allah, Allah, phukarteho Allah tera vaira hai re,
Chittime gumra baje ovi saheb sunta hai re.

Why are you shouting Allah, Allah? Is God deaf? The sound of a jingle in an insect is heard by the Lord.

Na tadasti viná yat syát tena bhootam charácharam.

In all creation there is not that which exists without Him.

Kenápi devena hridisthitena yathá niyuktosmi tathá karomi.

I act as some divinity in my heart prompts me to act.

Eeswaras sarvabhootánám hriddese nanu tishthati.
Bhrámayan sarvabhootáni yantrároodháni máyayá.

God exists in the hearts of all creatures, driving them to action by the instrument of delusion.

In the name of the God, the Compassionate, the Merciful: Lord of the East and of the West! No God is there but He! Take Him for thy protector.

AL KORAN.

Yasmin sarvam yatah sarvam yat sarvam sarvatas cha yah
Yas cha sarvamayo nityam tasmai sarvátmane namah.

In Him is everything, from Him everything springs, He is everything, He comes from everywhere, He is all-pervading and imperishable; to Him, the soul of everything, let us bow.

Without me ye can do nothing.

S. JOHN.

How God in all His creatures works!

SHAKESPEARE.

Words without thoughts never to heaven go.

SHAKESPEARE.

The same Lord over all is rich unto all them that call upon Him.

ROMANS.

That God, which ever lives and loves,
One God, one law, one element,
And one far-off divine event,
To which the whole creation moves.

TENNYSON.

If gratitude is due from man to man, how much more from man to his Maker?

WORDSWORTH.

Raise the stone and there thou shalt find Me; cleave the wood and there am I.

SAYINGS OF JESUS.

UNWIN BROTHERS, LIMITED, THE GRESHAM PRESS, WOKING AND LONDON.

GSL

A STUDY IN IDEALS

GREAT BRITAIN AND INDIA.

By Manmath C. Mallik. Demy 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d. net.

SOME PRESS OPINIONS

ABERDEEN FREE PRESS

"Mr. Mallik is an Indian by birth, an Englishman by education, and an idealist by temperament. His views, therefore, on British and Indian institutions ought to be of considerable interest to English readers. British character and British institutions are, in his opinion, the finest in the world."

REYNOLDS'S WEEKLY NEWSPAPER

"Under this title is published a very able book by Mr. M. C. Mallik, which takes a generous and statesmanlike view of the relationship between Great Britain and India. Mr. Mallik's book should create the interest which is so dreadfully lacking in India and its wonderful people. Mr. Mallik is never dull, and some of his chapters read like a romance."

JOURNAL OF EDUCATION

"The value of the book lies in its dispassionate handling of the subject on principle by a highly educated writer that belongs to both countries more than any other living Indian, and that has the interest of both countries equally at heart."

WESTMINSTER GAZETTE

"This book, written by Mr. M. Mallik, a most accomplished Indian lawyer and philosopher, argues that the British and Indian temperaments and their respective civilizations are uniquely ordained by Providence to supplement and correct each other, and throws out a golden vision of a future in which the British and Indian races working together will be a new and powerful influence in the world."

LEEDS MERCURY

"The book is more than a study in ideals in Great Britain and India. It is a study in the principles of government and the practical application of political principles to the government of India. As a careful and enlightened study of social and political life in both countries, this book is well worth the attention of every one who realizes that the British people have still to face the gigantic problem of securing the peaceful, contented, and progressive development of India."

WESTERN DAILY PRESS

"Under the title . . . Mr. Mallik has written an exceedingly thoughtful and suggestive book. He has evidently studied both countries at first-hand, and as evidently loves them both. The book should be widely and thoughtfully read."

THE DUNDEE ADVERTISER

"The author of this comprehensive book has made a thorough study of the characteristics of the peoples of these two great countries, with both of which he appears to be intimately acquainted. . . . This book is a mine of information on the subject treated."

THE SCOTSMAN

"Mr. Mallik, in this book, gives us the impressions of our own civilization formed by an educated Indian resident in our midst. Even biassed as he is in favour of everything which he conceives to be 'Liberal,' his survey is still instructive. His work has a distinct value as setting forth in moderate language the views of a cultured Hindu mind on the relations existing between Great Britain and her great dependency."

INDIA

"Mr. Mallik is well known in England as a writer and a politician who has twice offered himself as a Liberal candidate for Parliament. To Indians he stands in need of no introduction. The task he has now set himself is a congenial one."

THE TIMES

"Mr. Mallik is a cultivated Indian barrister who has been a candidate for Parliament in the Liberal interest. He deals first with Britain and its ideals, of which he is a great admirer. . . . English readers will find him more profitable on the subject of India. . . . He pleads for increased sympathy between the Government and the people, and between the British and Indian sections, the minimizing of racial differences in official and social life, education, security for British capital, and the discouragement of material ideals."