

THE POLITICAL SIDE OF BRAHMANISM.

BY

JOGENDRA CHANDRA GHOSH,
AN INDIAN POSITIVIST.



Brahmans who have become Positivists, (should seek to) modify
their Theocratic milieu.—*A. Comte.*



PRIVATELY PRINTED FOR THE WRITER
AT THE SECULAR PRESS,
No. 163 KALIGHAT ROAD, BHOWANIPORE ;
CALCUTTA.



AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONTENTS.

—:0:—

| | |
|--|-------|
| ✓ Morality and Smriti. Politics and Brahmanic Politics. A classification of the Indians : Destructionists, Westernizers, Revivalists, Government, and the dumb millions with our Pandits. | 1—5 |
| Certain verbal questions. ब्रह्म and ब्रह्म ; God and Synthesis of Man Earth and Space. (also p. 65). Dharma, Religion and Civilization. Priest and Brahman. | 5—9 |
| Another classificatem for the Indians. Brahmans and Brahmanists. Patricians and Proletaries. | 9—10 |
| ✓ Destructionists condemned. Advantages of English Rule as against change into French or Russian. | 10—15 |
| ✓ The Westernizers. Their Parliamentary policy. Why it is unavoidable. | 16—17 |
| ✓ The British Indian constitution, a bureaucratic puzzle. Evolution of the Congress policy. Its one initial mistake : the claim to British Citizenship. | 18—25 |
| Democratic methods disclaimed. Indian Proletaries and Women. Their theocratic culture. (also p. 46) | 25—29 |
| The Indian Patriciate : its constituents, Hindu and Musalman. | |
| ✓ Anomalies about the Anglo-Indian Patricians and Proletaries. A general view of the class-relations. | 29—33 |
| ✓ English Education. (also p.43) | 33—34 |
| ✓ The Question of Civilization in the East. Continuity of Brahmanic action. | 35—38 |
| Brahmanic Exclusiveness ; its relation to foreign peoples. | 38—41 |
| Modern Industrial guidance, not beyond Brahmanic each. China. Anatomy and astronomy in Bengal. | 42—45 |
| Brahmanism and Smriti or the Hindu Law. Review of Jogendra Nath Siromani's <i>Commentary</i> . Five points : | 45—51 |
| (1) The Theocratic policy. Utility and Altruism. Wanted a history of the Brahmanic Religion. | 51 |
| (2) Scope of the Hindu Law. Ethics of Public service. Eastern and Western standards need to be distinguished and reconciled. | 52—54 |
| (3) Politico-economic questions for Smriti. Caste and village community. Communal Property with Indians and Western Socialists. Partitions. Custom and Competition, their working in East and West. Banking and ethics. Indian Bankers in Famine time. | 45—60 |

| | |
|---|-------|
| (4) Brahmanic Penances. (also p. 69). The art of moral education. Impulse and Habit. The Sea voyage question. Reclamation of erring Women. | 61—64 |
| (5) Brahmanic church-Government. Its theoretical side as to the facts, in three divisions : | 64—65 |
| (a) Denominational differences. The Dik'ha and the Tantras ; how it solved Polytheism and non-conformity. Further facts about the capabilities of Tantras. (77). The Esoteric and Exoteric. The Sanskrit and the Indian vernaculars. Universal Popular Education. | 65—67 |
| (b) Finances. Fees, Presents and Endowments. Temple priests and other Purohits. The Tols and their burdens. | 67—69 |
| (c) Functions. Worship, Self-culture, Education. Triple Sacerdotal Authority. Vedas, Rishis and the Council of Brahman Legists. Three orders of Priests: (1) Gurus, Gosains and Chief Mohants. (2) Purohits, Mohants and corresponding Gosains. (3) Pujaris, Chelas of mohants (menidicants), and inferior Gosains. | 69—72 |
| Celibacy of some priests. Changes in favor of married life. (73) Changes in the rule of hereditary succession. Succession by Nomination. Comparison with modern forms of Testamentary succession. Tammany Hall. Naib Purohits. Election of Mohants. Proposed developements. | 73—75 |
| Reforms. Tols and Temples to be combined and placed under the Parishads. Government and functions of Parishads. Naib-gurus. A Hindi Sraddha ritual. Katha. Vrata katha. Sermons. Yatra. | 82—85 |
| The Guru. Domestic morality. Absolution. Reclamation. Dals. | 85—86 |
| Responsibility of the Westernizers and Revivalists ;Musalmans and Christians. | 88—90 |
| Concluding remarks. | 91—94 |

THE POLITICAL SIDE OF BRAHMANISM.

BY

JOGENDRA CHANDRA GHOSH,
AN INDIAN POSITIVIST.



Brahmans who have become Positivists, (should seek to) modify
their Theocratic milieu.—*A. Comte.*



PRIVATELY PRINTED FOR THE WRITER
AT THE SECULAR PRESS,
No. 163 KALIGHAT ROAD, BHOWANIPORE ;
CALCUTTA.



column




PREFACE.



The following pages are privately printed in the hope of an exchange of views with a few of my personal friends. The matters presented here are for consideration in the closet. I do not believe in the Press having become a social factor with us Indians. But consensus of opinion has become a prime necessity nevertheless, from our Western relations. I have spoken with the large freedom which only a friend may command. If I have said anything strong, I offer to take as much and more in return.

1. Nemak Mahal Road.
Garden Reach, Calcutta.
• *April 6th 1896.*

J. C. G.

 The personal friends to whom in particular I submit these pages are Messrs. K. M. Chatterji, W. C. Bonnerjee, and R. C. Dutt; Sir R. C. Mitter and Justice Gurudas Banerjee; Babus Krishna Kamal Bhattacharya, Syama Charan Ganguli, Nagenra Nath Ghose, Umakali Mukujee, Nilkantha Majumdar, Nakuleswar Bhattacharya and Hara Prasad Sastri. I should add that I shall depend upon Dr. R. Congreve and the Honble H. J. S. Cotton in deciding whether these pages will at all be published.

I.

Positivism offers, then, to the regenerate Brahmins the reorganization of the Brahminical body, but it offers them besides, and nothing else does, the gratification of the noble wish they have ever cherished to free their theocratic country from all foreign dominion. Appealing in fitting terms to the English nation, it will peaceably remove a yoke which, under whatever veil of illusion, justly inspires more antipathy than that of the Mussulmen. As it will have rendered this service prior to the introduction of the Positive faith in its true form, that faith will be readily welcomed as the consequence of the provisional doctrine, the great object of instituting that doctrine being to enable the Brahmins who have become Positivists to modify their theocratic milieu.—*System of Positive Polity*. Comte. Vol. IV. p. 441.

II.

What are these dangers? The first, though it need by no means be the most formidable amongst them, is that of war with France.

But the greatest of all these dangers that confront us is that of mutiny or rebellion in India. For two things, at least, are certain.....The first is, that.....the maintenance of our Suzerainty is possible only if it is based on a general conviction among the princes and peoples of India that this Suzerainty aids, rather than hinders, their prosperity and progress. And the second fact is, that it is more than questionable whether any such general conviction exists.

Possibly with this danger we might again be able to cope, as we have already done, had we, as then, only this danger to encounter. But if any thing in the political future is certain it would seem to be that, if there were rebellion in India, there would be also war with France, and probably also with Russia; and that, if there were war with France and Russia, there would, if we do not see quickly to the preventing of it, be rebellion in India.

But whether this would be so, or not, would depend on the other measures.....as for instance, the assumption of Protectorates of Morocco and of Arabia, with the Shereef of Mecca as Khalif.

Let her face these confronting perils heroically, and with just regard to the rights of others, and particularly of the Indian peoples; and the Federation.....under the hegemony of Great Britain.....is assured. And with this is or ought to be, assured an immense advance towards that Federation of peoples and of Races, all with varying capacities, but each with its indispensable function in that organism of Humanity, the constitution of which is the goal of Civilization.

J. S. Stuart-Glennie, in the *Fortnightly Review*,
for December 1895.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONTENTS.

—:0:—

| | |
|--|-------|
| ✓ Morality and Smriti. Politics and Brahmanic Politics. A classification of the Indians : Destructionists, Westernizers, Revivalists, Government, and the dumb millions with our Pandits. | 1—5 |
| Certain verbal questions. ब्रह्म and ब्रह्म ; God and Synthesis of Man Earth and Space. (also p. 65). Dharma, Religion and Civilization. Priest and Brahman. | 5—9 |
| Another classificatem for the Indians. Brahmans and Brahmanists. Patricians and Proletaries. | 9—10 |
| ✓ Destructionists condemned. Advantages of English Rule as against change into French or Russian. | 10—15 |
| ✓ The Westernizers. Their Parliamentary policy. Why it is unavoidable. | 16—17 |
| ✓ The British Indian constitution, a bureaucratic puzzle. Evolution of the Congress policy. Its one initial mistake : the claim to British Citizenship. | 18—25 |
| Democratic methods disclaimed. Indian Proletaries and Women. Their theocratic culture. (also p. 46) | 25—29 |
| The Indian Patriciate : its constituents, Hindu and Musalman. | |
| ✓ Anomalies about the Anglo-Indian Patricians and Proletaries. A general view of the class-relations. | 29—33 |
| ✓ English Education. (also p.43) | 33—34 |
| ✓ The Question of Civilization in the East. Continuity of Brahmanic action. | 35—38 |
| Brahmanic Exclusiveness ; its relation to foreign peoples. | 38—41 |
| Modern Industrial guidance, not beyond Brahmanic each. China. Anatomy and astronomy in Bengal. | 42—45 |
| Brahmanism and Smriti or the Hindu Law. Review of Jogendra Nath Siromani's <i>Commentary</i> . Five points : | 45—51 |
| (1) The Theocratic policy. Utility and Altruism. Wanted a history of the Brahmanic Religion. | 51 |
| (2) Scope of the Hindu Law. Ethics of Public service. Eastern and Western standards need to be distinguished and reconciled. | 52—54 |
| (3) Politico-economic questions for Smriti. Caste and village community. Communal Property with Indians and Western Socialists. Partitions. Custom and Competition, their working in East and West. Banking and ethics. Indian Bankers in Famine time. | 45—60 |

| | |
|---|-------|
| (4) Brahmanic Penances. (also p. 69). The art of moral education. Impulse and Habit. The Sea voyage question. Reclamation of erring Women. | 61—64 |
| (5) Brahmanic church-Government. Its theoretical side as to the facts, in three divisions : | 64—65 |
| (a) Denominational differences. The Dik'ha and the Tantras ; how it solved Polytheism and non-conformity. Further facts about the capabilities of Tantras. (77). The Esoteric and Exoteric. The Sanskrit and the Indian vernaculars. Universal Popular Education. | 65—67 |
| (b) Finances. Fees, Presents and Endowments. Temple priests and other Purohits. The Tols and their burdens. | 67—69 |
| (c) Functions. Worship, Self-culture, Education. Triple Sacerdotal Authority. Vedas, Rishis and the Council of Brahman Legists. Three orders of Priests: (1) Gurus, Gosains and Chief Mohants. (2) Purohits, Mohants and corresponding Gosains. (3) Pujaris, Chelas of mohants (menidicants), and inferior Gosains. | 69—72 |
| Celibacy of some priests. Changes in favor of married life. (73) Changes in the rule of hereditary succession. Succession by Nomination. Comparison with modern forms of Testamentary succession. Tammany Hall. Naib Purohits. Election of Mohants. Proposed developements. | 73—75 |
| Reforms. Tols and Temples to be combined and placed under the Parishads. Government and functions of Parishads. Naib-gurus. A Hindi Sraddha ritual. Katha. Vrata katha. Sermons. Yatra. | 82—85 |
| The Guru. Domestic morality. Absolution. Reclamation. Dals. | 85—86 |
| Responsibility of the Westernizers and Revivalists ;Musalmans and Christians. | 88—90 |
| Concluding remarks. | 91—94 |

The Political side of Brahmanism.

I write this for the coming New Year's Eve and New Year's Day. The occasion is a religious one to Positivists, and the two days are respectively called the Day of All the Dead and the Day of Humanity. I am trying to observe the sacred occasion in my own humble way. But practically speaking, I shall be dealing only with our local politics of India, and the mention of my religious creed has nothing to do with the discussions here taken on hand except as an invocation to the Great Being whom I adore. I am but too conscious of my literary deficiencies and should not write at all, but that I want to be in touch with a few personal friends with something like an explanation for my opinions. To most of them Positivist reasons are of no avail.

I have got to say that the Brahman Question, upon which I have been harping from before 1885 when I wrote my little pamphlet on Caste-Reform, has a political side of its own, apart from its obvious religious bearings. I thought formerly that my countrymen understood the political aspect of the question at least as keenly as our Anglo-Indian fellow-subjects. But I have seen my mistake and I am trying to make amends. There are several difficulties in my way. I run the risk of being charged with exciting religious fanaticism. But considering that I am opposed to many who think Brahman politics as beneath contempt, I should be pardoned even if I happened to magnify a little the political importance of Brahmanism. I hope however to show that mine is a very moderate scheme of political progress for India. Neither the Government Officials nor the sober portion of our fellow subjects, none but those who desire the Indian question blotted out altogether, need apprehend any such

political strife. I wish I could speak from the simple and lofty stand-point of Morality. But the prior question, that politics must be governed by morality is as yet no better than an argument of perfection even with the most advanced men of Europe. I owe the principle to Positivism ; I find it rooted in Brahmanism also. But it is western politicians who avoid enquiries about the morality of their policies and politics. For practical purposes to proceed upon that principle is inconvenient for two reasons. (1) The moral principles of Brahmanism as at once a religious and a political system are as good as unknown. (2) The Government would not recognise them. The exclusive habits of the Brahmans render them so unacquainted with Christianity in the concrete, that they fail to show where and how in regard to the abstract truths of morality they are at par with philosophers of Christendom. Hence, with the local politicians of the day, Indian or other, morality lies too far off, either above or beneath their notice. The current western models of the diplomatic craft have on them something like a blinding effect. And they are not without shifts of their own in the line of expediency, in order to deal with burning practical questions of the day. Thus it happens that though I ought to speak as a Positivist, I have to turn my eyes away from Positivist audience. Nay, I have to proceed as if the ultimate basis of universal scientific morality might pass as an open question. With my countrymen I know I had better follow the deductive method of argument. But deductive minds are generally averse to other people's deduction ; and deductions from Positivism are apt to fail as derived from Comte ! Perhaps also it is owing to a similar bias of my own that I do not like to deduce my morality much less my politics from Vedantism or the Bhagabatgita. It would lead me into a vicious circle. All dual standards are a perplexity. Besides, I am at a loss to trace any logical connection between morality whether Positivist or Vedantist, and another more complex principle bearing on my subject, viz, international justice.

Supposing that it was possible to derive from Sanskrit philosophy what ought to be done by Brahmanists in the sphere of politics, we could not get out of Brahmandom into international matters. The principles of morality afford no help at all to put the Indians in line with other Asiatic nations, in settling the question of our common relations with the English and other Western nations.

I therefore simply vote for our *Smriti* scriptures. I do so as well because it offers itself as a golden mean between *Sruti* and *Darsana*, as for the reason that as long as I stand by *Smriti*, I may not be shaken off by the Brahmanist society. I am bound to it by birth for all my Positivist ties, or in spite of anything I may think or say about the obsolete *Sruti* or of any *Darsana* gone out of date. I am bound also to submit to it for all its shortcomings, as to any superior Power which holds a living control on my daily conduct. I may not ignore it: I may not do so as a British subject, nor if, for an ethical trial I had to call a jury of Positivists or, for the matter of that, one of my democratical antagonists. I have said that I vote for *Smriti*, and hold to the Brahmanist society. And I think the inference is plain that my *Smriti* is not like the Protestant Bible or the Hebrew Decalogue. It is something which lives and works in our midst. Though a written law, it depends upon especial human exponents, and its human expounders work by means of the Brahmanist social organization. I once thought that these were quite obvious matters. But it has become necessary to state them in so many words.

As in Europe so even in India, the spirit of Positivism is making its way though only in small and invisible channels. Many things which seemed strange and novel some ten or fifteen years ago, are now assented to without question. In some matters, people seem to be even trenching beyond our Positivist limits. No body in India knows of Positivist objections to the imperialism of England or France, and to our subjection to a foreign power. But Government

policy in India is now confronted by a more serious and even unreasoning antagonism. The discord is settling into the feelings. The Government itself has been incontinently mixing up its commercial with territorial aims ; it is going back to militarism and conscription ; and it has even taken to concealment and equivocation. These are however only comparatively later manifestations of its immoral politics, matters which are not yet clearly before the country. But the alienation between sovereign and subject has largely grown in magnitude since the eye of the Indian Positivist was opened to the radical distinctions. We could foresee the present evils although Government has never been willing to utilise our reasoning, and although our own countrymen have not seen anything peculiar in our position. Take another case. The old school of Indians formerly saw nothing but good in Western life and were bent upon complete revolution against Brahmanism. But the days of David Hare, Derozio, and Drinkwater Bethune are gone by. Their memories may be living. But their teachings and the traditions of their life have vanished for ever. English-reading Indians now come under three sections who may be designated as (1) Destructionists, (2) Westernizers, and (3) Revivalists. They are all slowly realizing what was known to us from the very beginning. Only the Government acts as if it thought us premature, or worse still, mere faddists. Our countrymen however now see that the Eastern question means a serious struggle between widely different kinds of civilization. But progress is hindered for lack of human providence. The scientific side of Positivism is not unnaturally slipped over by all. No one is much concerned about the histories of East and West as having a strictly scientific bearing upon their respective civilizations. No one is aware that Eastern history has to be constructed from logical sources for want of suitable evidence. Prof. Max Müller's later views about Constructive History do not appear to have been even noticed yet. And it would be too subtle to speak of nice distinctions

between authentic and constructive History. No less a man than Mr. R. C. Dutt omits to look into the subjective side behind Max-Muller's historical constructions, and the Revivalists are doing endless injustice to Mr. Dutt's patriotism as an Indian historian. Positivism would make allowances for both parties. Only, it could not work without history. Time I hope is working for our Progress. But I confess, I do not see my way to discuss why Western history must be turned to, in order to construct for us such Oriental history as could be utilised for our own political needs apart from Christianity, but along with Europe.

What I have got to say concerns the above mentioned three classes, and in a collateral manner also (4) the Government of the day, and (5) the pure Brahmanists comprising the Pandits at their top and the so-called dumb millions at the bottom. Among these five or six classes, my appeal is offered generally to the Destructionists and Westernizers, but in particular to the Revivalists. I speak it is true for the Pandits, but I do not belong to their section. My own antecedents do not entitle me to speak out except as a Positivist. To the Positivists, I have only to mention that the name of Comte usually acts as a deterrent; and to many of my countrymen it often becomes a source of sad disturbance. We may not help to swell the ranks of unbelievers and anarchical people by lending to them only the destructive instruments of our school.

But I express my feelings of sorrow to the Great Being whom I worship, and for those who ought not to be repelled from the study of Comte's writings. I do hope that the untenable conception of a personal God, disseminated either through Musalman notions of Khoda or through an erroneous translation of the words God and Jehovah, will quietly pass away. Alexander Pope's vague generalization about "Jehovah, Jove or Lord" may have had something to do with the illusion. But it is patent that for a Sanskrit word, Brahmā ब्रह्मा is nearest to God, whereas Brahma ब्रह्म is fairly prox-

mate to our subjective synthesis about Space, Earth and Man. Both the words are etymologically and historically connected with Brahman—the name of the important class of men to whom, as priests, I attach the greatest importance in this country. The Brahmanists avoid our books because they take us for atheists. The Musalmans have a like objection to—logic and logicians! But Positivists are not atheists for all the insinuations of the Christians; and our books should not be shunned as the Bible is shunned by Brahmans and Brahmanists. I therefore, appeal to Humanity to touch the heart and mind of my countrymen.

Howsoever the difficult questions about Brahmans and Brahmanism may be answered, I think I have taken no unwarrantable liberty with the English language in designating the Brahman as the typical Priest. We Brahmanists have nothing to do with the question whether Jehovah did appoint a vice-gerent for himself, whether that same authority vanished for ever on the *Sula* or Cross at Jerusalem, nor whether he is still represented by duly constituted successors at Rome and Constantinople, Canterbury and Edinburgh. If the Brahman as the ministering officer who has ever been in exclusive possession of our Vedas,—those texts or scriptures believed to be of unbeginning origin,—if he may not be classed with the prisoner at the Vatican, or with the immediate subordinate of the British Crown at Canterbury, it does not matter anything at all with us. He will always be contented with his own honoured Sanskrit name; and western people will have to understand and employ the word Brahman from the Indian and not the European view of his history. No distortion of Eastern history may disturb the supreme rank and functions of the Indian Brahman. However low he may fall at times from his personal blemishes, his office as spokesman for Humanity will always be associated with the pulpit, and rank higher than the office of those who hold the scepter or wear the crown.

One more word on this part of my subject. For us Positi-

vists the word Religion has been derived from a root which is said to warrant its use for a cult or worship like that of Humanity. Others (and some of them trace the word to another root) hold that Religion signifies nothing more than a particular creed : the knowledge and formal acceptance of it. That creed starts with the Mosaic account of revelation and of the world. But that account will never go down with Hindus. If Positivists are at issue with the Christians as regards the word religion, the Brahmanists also are in far greater degree. It is only of late that the truth seems to be dawning upon many that neither a number of propositions like the thirty nine articles, nor the act of church-going, constitutes religion. And upon this view of the question, it has been said that the life of Hindus shows more of what has been termed 'religiousness' than is visible in any claimants of the name Religion. It must also be owing to their Hebrew antecedents that Christians so fail to escape from their sabbatarian views of religious life. To us however, the Smriti or Dharma Shastra supplies the word Dharma in place of Religion ; and I do not see why we should not avoid this verbal controversy much in the same manner as that relating to the questions as to God and Brahmā ब्रह्मा, or as to Brahma ब्रह्म and Humanity. By using the word Dharma we could also avoid another difficulty. It is in fact a more comprehensive term than *religion* and would include much of what we Orientals associate with the word Civilization when we study western languages. Instead of running into bootless wrangling, it would be harmless to employ the word Dharma for our own peculiar standard of life, and hold it distinct from what Europeans associate with Roman history, Civilization, Christian life and Religion.

I have already said that I question the ultimate moral basis of the political system of the reigning Government. It is also pretty well known that I am not given to much adulation in criticising Government policy. But it will be seen as I proceed, that the Government has really to reckon

with critics far more hostile than any who can announce himself as a Brahmanist or Positivist.

My attitude towards Brahmanism does not call for any explanation. I certainly belong to Brahmanist society. I am not socially cut off from the Pandits because I am a Positivist. I am entitled to co-operate with them like any other Indian. And as I do not see why I should not do so, I am free to discuss the political side of Brahmanism. I hold that in spite of the age and decrepitude of Brahmanism, we Indians should try to carry it on our shoulders out of the fire around us. I fail to see any other rational course. The work of creating a positivist polity and creating it in India first of all, among all the countries on the globe is I confess, one which I must shrink from. I also deem it hopeless to appeal to Government officials or to any Christian philosophers or priests to whom those officials ought to submit from moral considerations. I really claim to address myself to the Revivalists and through them to the Pandit class. And I may also mention that I have as a positivist, an advantage over all the classes named before, in as much as I follow a definite guidance in order to look beyond our Pandits to my Brahmanist countrymen. These millions may have been voiceless from the beginning or they may have been made dumb by the Brahmans. The question is irrelevant, though it is not devoid of logical and historical interest. But the fact cannot be gainsaid that these millions have now to be reached in some way both by Government and our leading men. And if I vote for trying to reach them peacefully through the small number of truly qualified Pandits, it is for my opponents to prove the utility of trying to attain that end through efforts of a westernizing kind. The Brahmans have ever kept the peace of the country and the presumption that they will continue to do so lies all in their favor.

The Revivalists have grown up in the course of the last few years, and I do not see why I should exclude our own

✓ Positivist propaganda from all share in their growth. From the very beginning, we Indian Positivists have been generally opposed to the destructive influences of the West and in particular to Mr. Mill's teaching about Liberty. At the present moment it is only necessary to point out to the Revivalists, that their important labours run the risk of being frustrated by reason of undue enthusiasm. It ought to be moderated because it is only in their energies that our last hopes for the Brahmans and pure Brahmanists must be centred. I hope also, that the Destructionist class will see their way to join with the more moderate of the Westernizers. And, for these last, I think that as they grow wiser about the hopeless politics of that bureaucratic puzzle which constitutes the Government for India, they will regulate their energies so as at least to leave a way open to Revivalists, for a system of Brahmanist politics. There is absolutely no reason why ✓ the Revivalists should not have their own politics, and the responsibility lies entirely with the other party to avoid a conflict with them. ✓ The action of the Revivalists is censured ✓ as political defection. But the mistake arises from the groundless assumption that politics is a mystery unattainable to ✓ Brahmanic intelligence. A cooler consideration will show that the divergent ways of the two classes are traceable to the initial anomalies of the British Government. And true wis- ✓ dom must see the importance of reasonable cooperation between the Westernizers and the Revivalists, in their common efforts to advance the country's cause with the Reigning power.

• For my part, I do not like that my countrymen should be cut up into the five classes mentioned before, so as to be marked by political difference and driven into still profounder difficulties as between the East and the West. I prefer to divide them instead, first into Brahmans (i.e. the true Pandits) and Brahmanists; and then I would divide the Brahmanists again into Patricians and Proletaries. By this means I hope to see a corresponding division also in the Indians of Musalman persuasion. And it will then be a question for the

Anglo-Indians, or at least the Romanist section among them, to consider whether they should not put their own priests into line with our Brahmans and the Musalman Imams. It will no doubt be found difficult for them to place the soldier, the civilian and the Sovereign under their Bishop. That however is none of our Indian concerns. We shall be quite consistent in assigning a Patrician rank to the upper ten thousand of all Indians—Brahmanist, Musalman and Christian. But there would be one great advantage which even the Government officials must recognise for all their antagonism to Comte and his disciples. Under the proposed classification, the Proletary classes may be spared from all political disturbance. Perhaps also, there may even be a faint chance that the Government will see its way to re-organize the country so far as possible, upon the basis of a confederacy for India, of Brahmanist, Musalman and Christian States, and thus afford to us some hopes, however remote, of attaining a political independence for India. I have only to add, that the question of such a policy may no longer be shirked by any sensible man.

Turning back however to my former classification, I shall first speak of the Destructionists. It is a very small class. Perhaps I exaggerate their importance by calling them a class at all. But I have in my mind their serious political views, rather than the few men who deliberately entertain them, or give utterance to them at moments of irritation. These views are equally erroneous and noxious. But they may not be put down with a high hand as perhaps some might wish. These men must be quietly reasoned with, before their opinion spreads among Brahmanists living in blissful but pardonable thoughtlessness. The Destructionists are so dissatisfied with the British rule that they pretend to wish for a change of masters. They have no hope in their own countrymen or for a national Government, and their bad opinion about the British rule appears to be magnified into excited admiration for the Russian or the French.

I therefore recommend to them a systematic and if possible dispassionate comparison between the the imperialistic policies of England, France and Russia. Such an examination would not be new in so far as it was presumable, from the effusive eulogies of the real or pretended loyalists of the British Crown or the East India Company. But such eulogies only serve to maintain a ceremonious disguise which is offensive to some people and productive of no good result to anybody. Consequently some plain-spoken words may not be avoided, and that has I fear to be braved even by us Indian subjects. Speaking for myself however I feel bound to say, at the very outset, that no political revolution which would end only in a change of foreign rulers could ever be desirable for India.

In the first place, I am as a Positivist not only opposed to violence, but as a Brahmanist I am connected with the *Sanatan Dharma* or the Everlasting religion. Accordingly, I deprecate all such Change. There is need for us to develop our capacity for political self-rule ; and Change of any kind would be as detrimental to our needs as Permanence is to be desired on more than one account. Revolutions are opposed to common sense, to say nothing of the Positivist view taken of European history since the days of Luther ; and permanence has been the aim of Brahmanism in all that has exposed it to the sweeping charges of being stereotyped and effete. As a Brahmanist I see also, that until we have some practicable political system of our own wherewith to carry on the administration of affairs on this vast continent, all changes whatever must be noxious to a degree. Be it said once for all, that no rule which is foreign to the Indian people can ever possess the virtues of a national Government. Nevertheless, before we can wish to dispense with the present British rule, it is necessary that some political system should be peacefully reared up. And to that end Brahmanism has to be tried along with any other policy that Indian history might render available to us. Apart from these considerations, the British Government with all its numerous blemishes has one important

recommendation for us. It is that Destructionists, Westernizers and Revivalists have all become Anglicised in a manner and to an extent which puts the Destructionists' idea altogether out of the region of practical politics. It is true that the Brahmans and the proletary classes have not gone under this change. But that does not improve the case for the Destructionists. These people advocate what can only be called a suicidal policy, considering that they want the Anglicised Indians to go and seek out a non-English western ruler. Because the mass of our countrymen are erroneously supposed to have been untouched by any influence that could be brought to bear upon them, we cannot hope for any satisfaction from the rule of another western power. Our policy must be to make the best of our present lot ; and the utmost we could propose would be to educate ourselves so that when the time comes, our posterity may be of some service to our country. It is the fashion to say that England will retire from India, as also from Egypt, as soon as time favours the grand renunciation. Such sweet words like all others of the kind ought rather to turn away wrath than give rise to foolish cursing. And I would not mind the polite vacuities, but that serious consequences are traceable to them in our society. Some credulous people actually believe in such speeches ; and some again of the credulous set are also angered by seeing that they were so misled. And then they run into the well-known Indian vice of foul-mouthed fisherwomen's speeches which only irritate the political sores in a dangerous manner. However, the whole of this credulity and irritation tends only to a drifting policy of letting things alone ; meantime, the evil of anarchy must be impending somewhere very seriously in our society taken altogether.

The evils of foreign rule may be roughly divided into abuses in the exercise of force and abuses of taxation. Russia I suppose, has to be positively feared on both these accounts, whereas France fails to present any special attractions. France has never shown that financial wisdom which in Englishmen, for all their

recent errors, still commands the fullest confidence of Indian wealthy men. No foreign ruler could seek to conquer India from motives of chivalrous devotion to our welfare ; but France has the evil reputation of being inferior to England in foreign enterprise and superior to her in frugality. And on both accounts French rule would be undesirable for us. French capitalists are also too much hampered by the national feeling of Frenchmen for France. It seems to me, that the revolutionary excesses of the French might be traced as much to the strength of this feeling as to congested population and general impoverishment of the masses. It seems that they quarrel between themselves because they cannot manage to get out of their homes to establish Colonies when otherwise it would be desirable for themselves to do so. The facts are put as if the misconduct of the French aristocracy had to answer for everything, and as if nothing was due to the social economy of the French proletaries. The colonial policy of the Europeans, however bad for Asiatics, Africans and Red Indians, and however unsupportable for the ends of morality or even of Christianity, has the merit of sparing the Fatherland the dangers of internal commotion from people who rise above their average countrymen in making felt their struggle for existence. France, it seems, does not understand this sort of pruning so well as England, and her home-loving character may after all have to answer for her frequent bloody revolutions. In any case, we are not warranted in associating much philanthropy for us with the French national sentiment. Again, when they have colonies, the French central Government is apt at times to fall back upon nationalism and universal generosity. And then the colonies are left alone to themselves and they fail. So far their exuberance of feeling for the country, state, mankind or equality, may be of some little advantage to any conquered subjects that the French may have ; and those subjects may have some slightly better advantage over us in the matter of political privileges. But instability of central control is a great drawback. It is calcu-

lated to throw a dependency into anarchy at very inopportune moments. If the shop-keeping nation have to answer for the tradesman's conscience in much of their conduct, the chances also are that French frugality and parsimonious habits would carry them into proportionately worse extortionateness and reckless behaviour in their colonial financial policy. And as for political perfidy, we have no more reason to clap our hands when the Frenchman is pleased to abuse the Englishman, than to do so in the converse case. I am afraid if we were to remove ourselves to Tonquin or Madagascar, we should have to entertain some rueful yearnings for British Milordism. The commercial virtues of Englishmen first made them acceptable to us ; and for all the subsequent changes on both sides, those virtues must form the backbone of all our present efforts at self-developement. It is our own submissive character which has given an imperialistic training to our British rulers. But we are just waking to see that they may not retain the virtues of both Commercialism and Territorialism. It is for them to consider how the vices of both may not be the only sediment left from the noxious compound. But for ourselves we have to utilise foreign rule as best we may ; and it is for pecuniary considerations if for nothing else, that our preference must be given to the rule of the English, above other western nations. Even Americans are more restless and slippery, and less attentive to customs and traditions ; while their greater proneness to violence and the Lynch law may not be overlooked.

As for the Russians, it is true that if they have not gained, they have also not lost as much as the Franks, Teutons, and Celts, from Roman contact. Now for all that our Westernizers may say against Brahmanism, we are not free from vanity about our national virtues as compared to those of Europeans represented by the Englishmen. We may not lay claim to civilization in the Roman and European sense of the word. But we have our claims to *Dharma* ; and we do not see much of it in these western people. And making all possible allowances for disfigurement in the English pictures drawn

of the Russians, I think, we may take it as a whole, that their civilization, and *à fortiori*, their *Dharma*, is inferior to those of England and France. Consequently a change into Russian domination must be all the less acceptable to us. The fact of territorial continuity may be a recommendation for Russian domination. And we are paying most dearly from British fears on that head. But the chances are that Russia will by and bye be broken up into fragments, and then the continuity between St. Petersburg and Calcutta will be no better than that of the ocean route. Meantime, if Russia succeeded in developing the satrap form of Government for her vast Empire, and thus rendered herself acceptable in the East, England we may take it, would follow suit, and do so in much less time than the Destructionists must require for consolidation of the Indian satrapies under Russia. But I should rather hold to the financial test. And I think that the general impecuniosity of Russia must turn the balance entirely against her. Hence without laying claim to any particular attachment for the English rule I am free to hold upon the whole, that a change of masters for us would, in every case, be like the proverbial change from the frying pan to the fire. It is bad enough to have to feel that the errors of Anglo-Indian rulers threaten to drive the people into desperation and rebellion, it is worse to have to lodge our complaints to the British Democracy, if not the loafers and lower orders of the nation. Let us at least have the satisfaction that we do not help to inflame the worst passions of our own countrymen—passions which from my point of view have been laid by Brahmans with so much labour. Rebellion, I fear, may come; but if it does, let it be noble rebellion which seeks to raise the country's load. Let us patricians bear the brunt of the existing misrule. Let us not drag the dumb millions, the peaceful proletaries, into the fire. And above all, let us prevent a repetition under fresh conquerors, of those evils which we Brahmanists have taken three long generations to understand and discover.

In Indian Politics "the Congress Party" has grown into a fairly significant class-name. But its members are not all equally loyal to the cause. Hence I have chosen the name '*Westernizers*' for their best representatives. They are so entirely devoted to the British Constitution that they concentrate all their energies to have it fully extended to India. Consequently it is the British Parliamentary policy which first comes in for examination in judging of the relations between Brahmanists and Westernizers.

The question of Parliamentary Government has to the Indian Positivists an academic side which unfortunately puts them out of the ranks of all English-reading Indians. In England, and even to some of our Anglo-Indians who may or may not be acquainted with Comte's writings, its weak points are better known than to our own Westernizers and Revivalists. But this ignorance is excusable. For practical purposes, all Parliamentary institutions must pass here as uniformly modelled on a homogeneous political system of the West. Such must be the case as well in India as in Japan. The British Parliament stands forth as the type of Western political mechanism. The European continent no less than America has followed the British lead in this respect. Consequently our Positivist objections to the parliamentary institutions fall flat before the towering magnitude of the West. They serve only to strengthen the hands of our political opponents in a manner which Positivists will naturally deprecate. When Anglo-Indians are voluble about parliamentary misgovernment, they seek only to get rid of all Indian politics by throwing a Parliamentary shroud upon the methods of the Congress. But their example teaches our countrymen in the Parliamentary evil-ways far more than the precepts of English literature on the subject. It lies out of my way to go into the academic question, and I shall offer a few observations only from a common-sense view of our affairs.

For reasons of convenience I shall first mention that the Congress party have been called "nefarious conspirators"

I do not mean to run hereupon into personal recrimination, but I take the utterance to be typical and as disclosing the mind and feeling of the English portion of our fellow subjects. And my view of the matter is, that it is only those who fully understand the essential weak points of the Parliamentary system, but who have also been born and bred into it so as to be incapable of working any other policy among themselves, it is only such people who could employ the expression in giving vent to a natural feeling against their irrepressible political opponents. The temper shown discloses only the inner workings of their mind. Political stratagem, jugglery of speech, secret wire-pulling, and canvassing for votes constitute almost the life-blood of Parliamentary policy. These things are also the chief stock-in-trade and the indispensable instruments of all Western politicians. It is also true that our Westernizers are taking to this craft. Wherein lies then the difference between the craft of conspirators and the skill of a parliamentary hand? I am afraid the Congress policy would become truly Parliamentary, the moment the institution came to be legalised. And it may be called all sorts of names so long as it is not legalised. The British Parliament has given to a certain portion of the Congress programme the glow of a faint legality. And that feeble light has to be shaded in our Cimmerian political darkness to suit the optic irritability of the class adverted to. Thus I am inclined to concur with those by whom the Congress policy, with all its fondness for constitutional agitation has come to be regarded as a most intolerable spoliation in the domain of the conspirator's craft. I think however that the truth underlying the fact mentioned above deserves to be carefully studied on all sides. The Government officials have the least to gain by any such sweeping and ill-tempered charges flung at the Congress and its Parliamentary tactics. The action looks like soiling the Englishman's own British nest. But I object to it as it sets a bad example to my countrymen, and serious damage is done to the cause of Brahmanist education.

The political constitution of India is one of great intricacy. At the outset we find a series of close councils or bureaus. There is the British Cabinet, the Council of the Secretary of State for India, the Executive Council of the India Government, the several Legislative Councils of India and of the Indian Provinces, and lastly, the Councils of the Indian Protected States. In the next place, there is a chain of autocratic or personal authorities to check any possible parliamentary excesses in these bureaus. The Prime Minister, the Secretary of State for India, the Viceroy, the provincial Governors, the departmental heads who constitute the Viceregal Council, and the Governor-General's political agents in the Protected or Feudatory States, are like so many oriental satraps obviously intended for brakes upon the Indian bureaucratic wheels. Only these British satraps are wanting not only in oriental vices but also in oriental virtues ; and hence this gradation of councils and autocrats presents altogether a strange composition. Not the least significant feature of these institutions—they do not make a system I fear—is a Dictatorship vested in the Indian Viceroy. It would make of him a good Great Mogul were the office made hereditary. But our quinquennial Kaisers are quiet people and never exercise their prerogative. There has also been the financial device of what was called the Decentralization policy. It serves to keep this non-parliamentary mechanism from the money question, when our make-believe satraps hypnotize the parliamentary volition of their councillors. More recently we have had the benefits of a growing military system and an unmistakeable trend for conscription upon the continental lines of unparliamentary Government. It is of course confined to that strange misnomer—the caste of military Brahmans, born for Great Britain, in order to protect the Indians. At the top of all these many centres of power, stand the Parliament or the House of Commons, and that minus quantity the British Crown. And an unwritten law also points to the British Electorate as to a cock on the spire. Indians may see plenty of government here but no king.

And how the country lives and works——where the motive power is to be looked for——where I mean, if bayonets be not the most trustworthy agents,—is a question which has now to be examined and answered by and for our countrymen, whether or not it be nefarious conduct, or Brahmanist fanaticism. As if this machinery was not sufficiently complex, we have lately been treated to a parliamentary theory of Mandate. The theory was awkward to say the least, having on one side of our Constitution, the fourth estate of the realm, and on the other, an actionable law of secrecy binding ostensibly the officials, but really all who did not belong to a charmed circle. The theory in question laid down that official conscience was bound upon the parliamentary principle of party Government, by the opinion of one or other or all of the many satraps named before. Moreover, it was claimed that as the elective system recently introduced was qualified by a process of Government sanction the conscience of all non-official members of the councils was equally bound over by that same mandate secretly conveyed to those satraps or bureau-bits of India. Finally, it has been advanced on a festive occasion if I remember rightly, that in all measures of questionable import the benefit of the doubt ought to be given to our Government. With such a beautiful political affair to keep up, it is no doubt open to call the Congress people a set of conspirators. But as the proverb says, the jewel is best known by the jeweller! Why with this endless system of wheel within wheel, this awful bureaucratic puzzle, any government official should feel hampered by the Congress, is a mystery which nobody could foresee and very few are in a position to unravel.

But whether we look to the civilian or to the settler among our Anglo-Indian fellow-subjects, we behold a political shiftlessness which in all seriousness, is remarkable in a people who have devised and perfected the British Parliament. No body has advanced for our Indian politics any sort of scheme whatever, in which an Indian could take part with any sort of self-respect. Even the

exchanged by Government officials, work like a political sting and leave a sore behind. There is to my knowledge only one exception, and an exception of the most absurd kind proving all the better, this poverty of political resource. Some have come out with a philological theory of an Aryan^e race from the Sanskrit literature. It is quite unknown to our Indian Pandits and has been encouraged only by a strange section of Indian and European doctrinaires. The practical application of this theory is that India is the land of a race of helots called *Sudras*; that the Brahmans rose into political ascendancy by reason of a military conquest proved by etymology; and *ergo* foreign domination is bound to continue as the normal political condition of our society. As a corollary to this noble and brilliant conception it has also been complacently held, that the Anglo-Indians are entitled to Brahmanic privileges. I have not the scholarship to run down this lingo-historical absurdity, which however now promises to fall under newer linguistic blows. And I have not the space either, to show up the moral turpitude of these philological theorists, or the intellectual imbecility of those Indians who fail to see through such phantasy. But the whole of this paper is intended to show that Brahmanic politics is a reality, though our own Westernizers may fail to recognise the truth. And I must leave it to my reader to make his own inference as to the worth of all Anglo-Indian notions about this military Brahmanism. The Brahman priest by a noble sacrifice has renounced all exercise of force and even material enjoyment. That sacrifice came on at a time which has entirely gone out of memory. But it has been owing to this sacrifice that the *Khattiya* still bows down his head to the Brahman. It forms the essence of our Indian caste system; but it would be waste of time to try to explain it to Anglo-Indians. Beyond their philological theory for the politics of modern India, neither England nor Anglo-India has been able to say one single word to prevent or replace the oligarchical policy of the Congress party.

The history of the Congress with our new departure in constitutional agitation, will show how it could not possibly be averted. The Congress has had for its political predecessors such bodies as the British Indian and the Indian Associations of Calcutta. I am connected with the former, and I am in a position to say that the Westernizing policy of our countrymen began with the exercise of the right of Petitions. Subsequently it was felt desirable to be heard by counsel in support of our paper communications. This would have been in accord with the ancient system under Mogul rule. But the prayer made for that purpose was curtly refused, and a red-tapeism of evasive correspondence was kept up. Finally, in the course of a political discussion it has come to be said with exemplary royal courtesy that "no give and take concessions" can be made to us. Such being the attitude of our Government, I maintain that the people have no other alternative than to go up to the British Electorate with the parliamentary instruments of constitutional agitation, notwithstanding all its shortcomings. Before any people and more particularly our own Revivalists, find fault with the parliamentary policy of our Westernizers, they should make fair allowance for the Parliamentary connections of the Government itself. But on the other hand, it is still more necessary for our Westernizers to recognise the patent fact that if it had been at all possible to construct a decent political system for us with Western assistance, the British Indian Government would not have shown such miserable failure, nor would the Anglo-Indians have indulged in such political jocularities upon a Prof. Max Muller as to talk of "military Brahmanism." One thing however will be clear to every body:—the reason why morality as the basis of politics lies farther from Asia than from Europe, and farther from India than from the rest of Asia. It would be best laid aside by the cant phrase 'logic of perfection,' but that I have to go out of my way to say a word against a moral pretension in our own Westernizers. They seem to be wanting in common sense

when they seek for extension of the British Constitution to India. They really *expect* the loaves and fishes of such a big affair as India to be laid open to equal distribution between Indians and Englishmen. The word *propose* might of course be conveniently put for the word *expect*, except for the moral question before me. And I not only believe but wonder, that some at least of the Congress leaders are so keen about this matter. Nothing short of absolute political equality between British Indian and British-born subjects would come up to their actual expectations. I have been told by a Congress leader that as he was born under the British, and has known no other Government, he can not look upon it as either alien or foreign ; and that therefore Indian patriotism must lie in the direction of establishing our rights to British Citizenship. This may be sound morality but it is I think opposed to any common-sense-view of our affairs. In the first place, there need be no secret that we know of honest Englishmen untainted by Anglo-Indianism who upbraid us when the British Sovereign is claimed by us for our own. In other words, the ethical argument is here presented from a diametrically opposite quarter. Next, and side by side with such contradictory views of Indian political morality, we have the unmistakable fact that the Congress has been called a conspiracy. The point of my argument here lies not in the badness of the language or sentiment, but in the fact that all good faith, the fundamental element in the feeblest of political ties, is here blown out by a single breath. The charge means that the Congress looks not merely to union with England or to a supplemental prayer for Home Rule, but to absolute political independence. Whether a conspiracy could be kept up in this fashion, I do not claim to understand. But I fail to ignore the accusation. Now it may be all very well to be satisfied with the approbation of one's own conscience, and the Congress-leaders may lay claim to honesty of purpose in working only for the British constitution. But when any conduct naturally and actually suggests to

others an uncertainty as to intentions, and when in particular, any good intentions are claimed for a collective body it would I think, be more reasonable to try to see ourselves as others see us. It is almost a sort of idleness to go on expecting anybody to believe in such things as that our claims to British Citizenship are not coloured expressions pointing towards national independence, or that we so honestly ignore a normal self-interest in the British sovereign or the British nation as to be able to sincerely put forward our allegiance to the British throne as being of equal measure with that of the people of England. I am aware that there is a deeper quarrel at bottom. It is no doubt open to question as between the Anglo-Indian and the Indian, which of them is more likely than the other to throw up the British allegiance at a pull. But the facts of our case are not at all calculated to recall the history of the United States or by recalling that history, to win the British people over to our side in preference to the Anglo-Indian party. Consequently I think, the Congress, or in other words our Westernizers, have taken their start in politics with an initial mistake. Every body understands the facts as they are. And nothing is gained by slurring over them. What is really meant by the Congress is that it will try to get whatever political privileges it can succeed in winning from the Parliament. It may not remove the barrier of foreign relations. Its policy is as anomalous as that of the British Indian bureaucratic puzzle itself. Both are creatures of circumstance. Neither India nor England is prepared to act as if the connection was to be or could be permanently maintained.

And this view of the case makes for the conclusion that the Westernizers ought to co-operate with the Revivalists and never lose themselves in the Western snare.

The Westernizers are accustomed to employ the metaphor of the Magna-Charta to characterize the Queen's Proclamation. By so doing I think they only damage their own cause. For they call up what they never intend to do. I mean

the well-known circumstances which extorted from king John his signature to the famous document. The parallel would be really dangerous but that English history, no more than Indian history, is understood by our people. It is usual also to speak in metaphors about the inch and the ell with reference to the Congress programme. But they are bad for an obvious ambiguity. Some people in England are led to believe that in asking for an ell of political rights we seek no more than an inch ; whereas Anglo-Indians we know, are enabled to say that where we ask for an inch we mean to seek no less than an ell. And thus they argue that the Congress is a nest of conspirators working for political independence pure and simple. We know however, that the Congress even if legalized, could not be worked without the headship of the British monarch. And the pity of it is, that our Westernizers are so blind to the Brahmanist character of their countrymen and to the political side of Brahmanism !

It is no doubt open to be said that the honesty of the Congress leaders' purposes ought to pass without comment from their own countrymen. I for one fully believe in their honesty ; and I am therefore a supporter of the Congress for all my objections to their policy. But there is one serious inconsistency. When the Westernizers seek to stand well with the western people they may not blow hot and cold in the same breath. It may not be said by them that western people would not be sufficiently convinced of the fairness of Congress demands without the numeric support of our 300 millions, at the same time that these 300 millions are told that the Congress policy deserves their moral support because it follows the accumulated wisdom and morality of the British nation. The westernizers cannot urge that the Parliamentary policy as an abstract virtue has the support of the British nation, when they also seek the concrete numeric support of the Indian people whose politics are far from being occidental. If the three hundred millions could have any

systematic policy or any politics of their own, apart from Brahmanism, they might be expected to dispense altogether with the help of all outside people.

The weakest part of the Congress policy is not in its parliamentary but in its Democratic methods. The two things may be hard to distinguish, but they must be so treated for the purposes of our Indian life. The Congress-men's appeals are made to an authority which is thoroughly democratic and is accessible only by means of Parliamentary methods. But the appellants themselves are far from being democratic. It is their misfortune that their own national ways of working politics have ceased to be operative in the comity of nations. This is an unusual and unhappy predicament. But Congress people may be pardoned if in their advocacy they sometimes forget their misfortune. In availing themselves of the English language and the English audience they as our spokesmen in England, get more or less lost in the democratic medium into which they are driven by circumstances to move. When one is thrown among democrats to win his cause, he has to make friends with democrats; and if a Congress man forgets that he is a suppliant, he forgets also by whom he has been reduced into beggary. However, from the democratic methods employed by them in pursuit of Parliamentary rights and by means of Parliamentary language, considerable misconception does ensue after all; and the smallest portion of it is the immorality of the false democratic garb put on for a democratic audience. Indian people to whom the spokesmen belong and whom they represent are not democratic, and it should never be intended to palm them off as being democratic. The diving bell and the diver's costume are needed for pearl fishery. But when the democratic sea of England comes to be quitted, they should fall back into rank with the Indians. If there be any shame in having to renounce the democratic ways of life, it has to be borne along with the ineffaceable taint of political subjection. But our Congress leaders may not be blamed if they seek to remove that taint by peaceful

and constitutional means, howsoever hopeless or erroneous their effort may be in my opinion or in that of the Anglo-Indians. The trouble occurs not in the form alleged by Anglo-Indians, but when our spokesmen are led to imagine that for the sake of consistency, they must retain the pearl-fishing costume and carry on or cherish their democratic methods apart from Parliamentary purposes and the Parliamentary arena. I do not at all seek to quarrel with their innocent hobby of uniformity about a European costume. I object it is true, to the expensive standard of comfort which the westernizers are introducing here. But that is irrelevant as being only an economic question. I am now concerned with politics, and I join issue with them about the fitness of democratic principles for our theocratic society. Even if they have misread the Indian facts which make for a theocratic constitution in our politics, they may not proceed as if democratic ideas were innate with the human mind and best adapted to our Indian society.

We have to recall also certain other sources of confusion of thought and feeling. Though the Hindus are a theocratic people, and though both democratic and aristocratic forms of Government are alien to their habits and traditions, yet there are circumstances which give rise to unfounded notions about their politics. The K'hattriyas of old ranked above the third and fourth orders of our caste society. The integrity of a K'hattriya's rank too does not now exist. The Kayets in Bengal, and the Vaisyas and Khettris elsewhere, occupy their place. The old functions of sovereignty have also vanished altogether for them. The common soldier has gone down in the social ladder; and inferior castes have also risen up through wealth and influence. These circumstances I think, justify the use of the word *patrician* for those who now fill the place of the old K'hattriyas; and so also, the next two castes may be fairly brought under the name *proletary* class. But the traditions of our society, dressed up in English language and with English attributions of feudalism, are suggestive of some-

thing like an aristocratic spirit in the richer few of our Patricians. The Bengal Zamindars were once fed with foolish notions of the kind. But the chiefs of the Protected States in India who once claimed to rank as sovereigns now seem glad to have been able to supplant the Zamindars and Taluqdars under British estimates of an Indian nobility. There is also an equality under the caste system, between members of the same social order. But that equality of itself does not make for any sort of government at all, and consequently it is preposterous to look upon it as a mark of any democratic life in us. The so-called aristocrats or noblemen of India have a following though for other reasons than birth, and they may therefore have some faint title to the regulative function. But the equality between any peers of the same caste in our society is an incident of no such significance. Moreover, the so-called democrats or popular leaders are really members of that same patriciate of which only a wealthier portion is pleased to give itself the style or airs of an aristocracy. Now mark the results. The westernizers with their Congress and for a parliamentary movement having had to assume a democratic attitude, have also fomented sorts of erroneous and noxious sentiments which are its normal concomitants. The fiction not only distorts the truth but leads to more substantial injury. Their colleagues in political activity are not dislodged from their aristocratic notions; but a ridiculous strife with them is imported from Europe, which is none the less damaging to our political interests. The Government officials too, once tried to bring upon the stage what was called the "representative" rayat. But I believe that burlesque has now ceased to be paying. The proletary classes are however still being unnecessarily dragged into politics by our own countrymen in order to bolster up the democratic theory; and in that way they are seriously demoralized, as I shall presently show. But oddly enough, they are also charged with want of zeal; whereas their backwardness in democratic action not only ought not to be unintelligible,

but it is in my humble opinion, a most important factor in our politics.

Finally, we have the pleasure of a pretty histrionic display from the opposite camp of Anglo-Indians. When the political atmosphere is so saturated with fictions and figments both verbal and cerebral, it is no great wonder that the Anglo-Indians should also plead for privileges and announcing their 'Military Brahmanism' claim to be a caste among so many Indian castes. Is not there a caste question pretty well understood in England? Why then! their brethren at home should not at all be surprized at their aristocratic airs! India is a caste-ridden country, and John has taken to caste in India: Where is the harm? where, of course! The trouble of it is that there is a caste and a function for our Brahmans, (who are neither military people nor members of a church militant,) and that the Anglo-Indians could not bow down to these fellows.

Our Westernizers seem to me to think that the backwardness of Indian proletaries is similar to the general disregard shown to politics even among the democratic proletaries of Europe. My contention is that there is no similarity between the two proletary classes. On the contrary I should say that there has been a special culture in theocracy among our Indian proletaries which is being thrown into jeopardy by reason of the political action of our Westernizers. The lower classes are superstitious and uninformed all over the world. But I think the Indian proletary is positively religious. Apart from a measure of normal superstition, he possesses certain definite ideas which are traceable only to Brahmanism.

To keep out of biased contention let me recount some of the most notable among these religious ideas: There is for instance the belief in punishment after death, and in its most complicated supplement, the theory of re-incarnation. There is also a mystified notion that there is no difference between Indian polytheism and monotheism. These I claim, are

important religious ideas; and they are based on Brahmanism. Hence, it is demoralizing to people to seek to shake them off from such-like ideas. Take a fourth example. The ascetic basis for the last stage of human life, I mean the life of retirement, is firmly accepted by all Brahmanists. This part of the Brahmanist creed should not be treated to an unfair comparison with what ideas of happiness have become prevalent in the West. Authoritative opinion about man's conduct of life in a state of retirement, that is, when old age draws him off from active life, really governs the rules of human conduct in all societies and in all departments of activity. To the European, man goes into retirement to enjoy the just returns of a life of industry; for him, ideal happiness is of collective kind, and collective happiness is inseparable from the so-called good things of life. To the Brahmanist, the rule of life which has been laid down for the anchorite and the mendicant, works as a concrete source of education in ethics. It is not easy to show the links or to unfold all bearings of these facts. But one has to feel his way into the workings of this Brahmanic ideal of life, whereas any Western man would be shocked by an apparent lack of abstract principles for personal, domestic and public morality in the Indian proletariat. I consider all these features of our life as results of intellectual culture rather than sentimental bias in our unlettered classes. They are present in our proletariat classes in the same measure with the Indian womankind. Now couple with these facts, the feeling of reverence and deferential conduct which is so manifest in our women and proletariat classes, and it will become impossible to ignore the organic nature of their joint relation to the hierarchical control of our sacerdotal and patrician castes. And what I feel bound to declare is that the democratic methods of our westernizers have a noxious effect upon our countrymen from this view of our national morals and Brahmanic politics.

On the other hand, the Anglo-Indian has no claim whatever to rank with Indian caste society according to the views

presented above. Perhaps the Musalmans might lay some claim to this peculiar system of Indian polity. Mahomet was a theocrat. It is true he had not the advantages of St. Paul under the *pax Romanica*, nor are their priesthood so nicely organized as our Brahmans. But they submit to their Imams and Mollahs; and the morals of their Pirs and Fakirs have an important influence. And lastly, the Indian Musalmans have been largely Hinduised. Consequently they consort with Indian caste to no small extent. The Anglo Indians however belong to a very different political system. They might wish to rank here as our own patricians. But there are difficulties. Apart from the false position they should have to hold owing to their disregard for any sort of sacerdotal supremacy, a proletary section for their own community is quite out of place in India. They might move for some sort of assimilation with our Indian political system, by renouncing the Anglican church and introducing some distant imitation of the Romanist clerical order. But the British sailors and soldiers in India could not I suppose be given any patrician functions in spite of the most sanguine desires of our Anglo-Indian fellow subjects. We all know how the Chinese proletaries have come to be a great trouble in America and Australia. A question is also looming before us with the Indian proletaries in Africa.* A non-democratic people would be a disturbing element among democrats everywhere; and in equal measure the democratic proletaries of the Anglo-Indian race are destined to be an insoluble problem in India. The East India Company held important rights to deal with the problem. The success of the interlopers and the assumption of the Indian Government by the Parliament has to answer for much of our troubles. But the facts are all plain before us. And my point is that it is the democratic principles of the West which are repugnant to Indians and our

* While these pages are going through the press, the question has almost become a burning one, along with the Transvaal imbroglio.

Brahmanic politics. And hence I consider the action of our westernizers to be so noxious.

Our proletries are said to be servile; but the charge comes only from avowed enemies of Brahmanism, being also coolly extended to the fiery Brahman, no less than to the proud Rajput. The theocratic nature of our social relations however, supplies a rational explanation for all our conduct and known history. However that may be, the supremacy of the Brahman stands unquestioned, and at the same time his privileges of birth never pass uncriticised in the estimates made for the character of each individual. No pandit of real eminence has ever to solicit or canvass any clique in order to advertise his superiority. Reverence is yielded to him without any asking; while considerable discrimination is shown for superior learning, disciplined life or external purity, and excellence of character. The Brahman it is true, enjoys the honours only of a hereditary priest. But any real elements of merit in his character are never lost sight of. And the same truth applies in equal measure also to distinguished individuals among our patriciate. It is only by a misuse of terms that any members of the Indian patriciate can put forth claims of an aristocratic or democratic kind. And if our popular leaders are disappointed in their efforts at organization, or if Government officials have to wince under the effects of a free Indian Press, they have both to review their own judgments of the people's character rather than to waste their energies in questionable efforts. Anglo-Indians of good sense too, will do well to get out of the circle of those who give themselves the airs of an Indian aristocracy. By such trappings they can only bring down upon themselves the ridicule (however concealed,) of those with whom the lowliest men have to count a pedigree of several generations at each sraddha or marriage, and all of whom suffer from a sense of humiliation if anything is said against their ancestors up to the fourteenth generation. To have any legitimate claims to the Indian patrician privileges, one is bound to acknowledge

the subordination due to the Indian theocratic discipline. No rights have ever been allowed in human life without corresponding duties. And in Indian society the privileges of their respective priestly orders are so fully acknowledged by both Brahmanists and Musalmans that the claims of Anglo-Indians to racial superiority can only produce, as I fear they are doing, dangerous tendencies to breach of the peace.

Clear ideas on this subject are needed on all sides. For ourselves, all feelings of jealousy between the so-called Aristocracy and *soi disant* Democratic leaders of the Congress ought to vanish at once. It becomes painful to examine the sadly destructive nature of the action which has hitherto governed our political life. The richer portion of our patriciate by forgetting the real constitution of our society have first helped to undermine the powers of the Brahmans. And now, that moral feeling of reverence in the community which has hitherto served to maintain for us a wonderful solidarity, is fast fading away under the preachings of our popular leaders, about equality, competition, and change. The temporal superiority of the Indian patriciate over both priests and proletaries was of course bound to be damaged by the revolution which has led to the political ascendancy of the Anglo-Indians. That misfortune, it is now too late to bring forward for purposes of political action. But it was shameful that we ourselves should have so played into the hands of our foreign rulers as to make the subversion of Brahmanism more exhaustive under them than during the rule of the Mogals or the Pathans. If the extreme Destructionists who would replace the English by some other European ruler deserve to be repressed by the utmost plain-spoken arguments, it is also necessary that the Westernizers should not shrink from their own share of the blame. If it be necessary to advance our political interests by laying hold of the Queen's Proclamation or by any other constitutional means, it does not follow that we should seek to belittle the Brahmans and stultify our wo-

men and proletaries by giving ourselves any false airs of democracy or aristocracy. An adequate appreciation of the position and functions of the Indian patriciate would advance the cause of Brahmanism, prevent unfortunate issues in respect of the proletaries, and above all, it would tend to a better understanding between the different sections of the Indian patriciate. In the first place, the considerations of wealth, of birth, and of social influence according to modern ideas, will come to be put upon a clear basis. In the next place, the relation between Hindus and Musalmans will be adjusted by a due regard for the theocracy of each of these two classes. And in the last place, the anomalous position of the Anglo-Indian section of Indian patriciate will get defined or isolated as the case may be, for the purposes of any politico-moral amelioration that may be their concern.

The supposed penchant for democratic forms of Government in some of our countrymen has been rightly traced to our access to English literature. We see here only one of those numerous examples which show the essential difficulties of education. The political gulf which separates the Indian mind from the European has not been as it could not be, bridged by Macaulay's device of English instruction. It might be desirable that our University should grasp the great problem. But it is remarkable that certain absurdities should require to be resisted with any instruments other than sarcasm. The people are indeed at a loss now all over Asia to judge, which way the ancient civilizations of Japan, China and India would move after the impact upon them of Western life and ideas. Setting aside this large question, and confining myself to the Westernizing Indians I am painfully struck by what I can call only an awkward ambition to make a mother-tongue of the English language. They seem only to want to get into Western civilization by their favourite metaphor of "leaps and bounds." And they seem to think that to change one's own mother-tongue and to

✓ ment are as easy as to write an essay, make a speech, conduct a newspaper, or advertise about public meetings. On the other hand some of our Government officials have gone to the opposite extreme as they were bound to do. They have seen strange short-comings in the school-books patronized by the Indian universities, if not also in the English literature itself. They would like perhaps to have their sappers and miners to write an English History minus its Pym and Hampdens, and issue an edition of the Paradise Lost purging out Satan's speech in Pandemonium. Last not least, the large class of Revivalists who have broken loose from the Westernizers are anxious to get out of the revolutionary effects of Western literature and of even our Western Government by—the Brahman's art of *yoga* and mental concentration ! Some of them have judged and decided that Shakespeare as an artist is not up to the Brahmanist mark ! They threaten to revive the sports of Radha and Syam for our morals, to say nothing of a neo-Sanskrit grammar for the Bengali language. Such erroneous notions can be met as I have said, only by sarcasm and must be left to vanish without serious argument. But I mention these matters only to prove one important fact : Nobody is prepared with any decent constructive scheme for our social and political life.

No doubt the Government is anxious for stability of the Empire. But I do not see that it has done well to maintain that end ; and many of us are aware that the Government really believes itself to be seated on the top of a volcano. This portion of my subject must be left to European writers. It is for them to show why the Anglican Episcopacy and Catholic Priesthood have been at fault to regulate public and political morality in Europe, and how their failure has ushered in our new school of religious Positivists. But until this truth is understood and appreciated, the Anglo-Indians out here may not succeed in doing better than they have been doing. In any case, their short-coming

ought to be duly recognized, because the mere desire to provide for it would have a wholesome effect on our Government even now.

The civilization of the East and that of the West are severally prized in such high degree that it is hardly fair to expect in British India a repetition of the histories of Roman domination, in Greece on one hand, or in Gaul or Britain on the other. The medieval struggle in Europe between Christians and Saracens would perhaps present a nearer comparison. But the world's information is confined to Western historians; and my opinion is shaken by what is patent in respect of the British records growing from day to day, of our contemporary Indian History. In spite of such drawbacks, it may be said that though the sexual vice of Musalmans has been exaggerated, their lust for violence could not perhaps be denied. The failure of the Saracen in Europe does not therefore prove that Christendom prevailed owing to the debilitating effects of sexual vice in the Musalmans or to their inferiority in military talent. On the other hand, the superior power of organization which is shown in the Christian countries is directly traceable to the Church of Rome and indirectly to the great Apostle of the gentiles. But as compared to that church, the Brahmanic caste-organization has presented to the world an unique example of human solidarity. Consequently the problem remains simply unsolved, why Christianity has not succeeded in making Christendom attractive from its moral character; and why the Indians and the Chinese are found to be so unwilling to betake themselves to the civilization of the West. The converse question why Euro-Asiatics too would not or could not profit by borrowing from Oriental civilization is never broached by the thinking portion of those who have been successful in war. And thus the varied examples of Rome over Greece and Gaul remain untouched in the search for any solution of the Indian political problem. Comte approached the question of universal solidarity with far greater preparations than St. Paul or Salvaterra. But

the Positivists of Newton Hall seem to be shy of the Positivists of Chapel Street when anything is said about trying to fuse the civilization of the East with that of the West. * Thus the Indian Positivists have had to approach this gigantic problem simply by force of circumstances. They could not endorse the patent immoralities of domination and subjection in Indian politics ; nor could they move for a war of independence even when it might be justifiable as a purely defensive measure. But still the British Indian Government was found to have been alarmed by our condemnation of the conquest of Burmah. And that and certain other events have served to throw the question into a drift even within our little body. All of a sudden the question has revived and in magnificent proportions too. For, from last year Japan has caused a great flutter among Western politicians. Japan it is true has followed the western political methods, and that fact after some more experience may go to justify the Westernizing tendencies of our Congress party. But I am not quite satisfied about the exact bearings of the case. After all, Japan gets her western influence from America on the *East* ! Her greatness is not deducible from insularity or smallness of superficial area, as if 'Great Britain's history had furnished us with a natural law. If again China catches the Japanese influence it would not only not prove that European civilization had moved towards the East, but show in the clearest manner imaginable that American civilization could not touch China except through a filtering medium like Japan. If however any transformation of China through Japan favours the non-Positivist forecast of Mr. Pearson, the movement of civilization would be literally speaking Oriental and might even prove a whirling course painfully suggestive of the story of the wandering Jew howling in Siberia : Barbarians pursuing. Latins, the Latins and Teutons marching into America, Yankees touching up Japs,

* When going through the proofs, I have read of a Turko-Positivist movement in Paris which I hail with pleasure.

Japs pursuing the Chinese, and possibly the Chinese again running upon the heels of Europe. The prospect is painful to a degree; and I reject it because I love Comte's conclusion and through him the optimism of St. Paul, that the human race is capable of brotherhood. In any case I hold to the fact of my own judgment that my countrymen do not wish to be Westernized. For aught I know, the Chinese will prove no less staunch than our own Brahmans, and they may not have to abandon their history in the fashion which has been attributed to Japan, or proposed for us by our Westernizers. I look in fact for as great things from Brahmanism as I do from Positivism. I look upon the verification afforded for each other by these two social systems as an all-important truth, and powerful enough to shake off all sorts of Western pessimism. And my only prayer is that Brahmans may be spared the fate of the Red Indians as well from the violence of Anglo-Indians as from the suicidal influence of our Indian Westernizers.

The upshot of this discussion is that the British Indian rulers, the Anglo-Indian settlers, the Mogal and Pathan colonies in India, and our present generation of Indian Westernizers have all naturally failed to find a solution for the Indian political problem. This problem forms but a part only of that larger problem of fusion between the East and the West which has more than once shaken human society in its very foundations; and which ought to concern the Christians and Musalmans no less than it concerns the Western Brahmans led by Comte, and even the Brahmans and Buddhists of the East. The great gap which is thus shown to occur in the constitution of the world has to be filled up. And it can only be done by concerted action of the two orders of Brahmans belonging to the East and the West. If our position as Positivists be not recognized, we do not desire to quarrel with any such patent fact. But I may be permitted to render this public explanation. I hope it will furnish an adequate warning both to the Revivalists and the Westerni-

zers. In any case an answer is given to the question which has been flung at me by one of my most intimate friends, viz., what could possibly have been for me the attractions of Brahmans and Brahmanism. The Revivalists will do well to think of Japan and China when criticising the Westernizers. And to the friend referred to, my answer is that the Brahman's political system is the only scheme that is at all available to solve the problem which has presented itself over and over again to the noblest minds. It is a most knotty problem into which we find ourselves thrown, by circumstances of the most unfortunate kind. I quite understand the objections to Brahmanism ; but I can only regret if people without studying the facts as they stand around us would account for other people's judgment from emotional bias. If I have any bias for Brahmanism I should, in order to discuss it, have to run into metaphysical investigations as to what are the tests of dispassionate examination, and my friend too may have to answer for his Westernizing bias. I prefer however to meet him by the query why one who has been a Brahmanist by birth should seek to divest himself of all his antecedents, when the question is one of politics and of politics considered apart from morality and religious principles. The Westernizers are in fact simply running mad with a secularism which however is too tender to be probed.

The real errors of Brahmanism could I think be summed up in one word: Exclusiveness. The history of Brahmanic exclusiveness is unrecorded and unknown. Some of us seem to follow the lead of those Christians and Protestants who can see nothing good in the *achar* of Brahmanic morals, and therefore seem to delight in slaying a supposed effigy of what is to them an unknown Pharisaism. I am inclined to co-ordinate Brahmanic Exclusiveness with that of the Chinese. Only China has had the anti-Brahmanic influence of Buddhism. And the knowing portion of Brahmanists unfortunately still retain a bias against Buddhism. But as a matter of history

that most important question, separation between the two powers of the Church and the State, has been approached by the Chinese, the Burmese, the Siamese, and the Thibetans on the one hand, and by the Hindus on the other, much in the same fashion as by the Protestants on the one hand and by the Roman Catholics and Positivists on the other. I therefore hold that Brahmanic exclusiveness does not argue any Pharisaism as the Protestants may pardonably say, but only a certain Foreign Policy of ancient India, or rather a deadlock in that Foreign Policy. I may be mistaken, but I see in it also something like Brahmandom sitting Dharna before the comity of nations. It may all be due to my imagination; and it may seem preposterous to International lawyers that any question of morals or good sense was involved in the matter. But I cannot help thinking that the Brahmans were trying to propagate their principles of international duty by stopping the egress of all Brahmanists out of India, whereas in respect of ingress into India their policy certainly became the reverse of that of China. And I think that though sitting Dharna has been prohibited, the spirit of it lives in our society and in our Brahmanist hearts. It was also something like this other case. When a *Mlechha* came to us as *atithi* or guest, we should not treat our homes as castles, even if we had to go through the most wearisome rites of purification. But none the less, the Brahman would keep himself aloof from the *mleccha* from unmistakeable purposes of purity; and he may also feel injured to have to be lectured for such conduct about morality. I should not however run any farther into what I feel is an introspective method of argument though I find myself forced into it from my triangular duel with the Westernizers and the Revivalists.

It is necessary that the Revivalists should re-examine what I look upon as Brahmanic foreign policy. And it appears to me also that the Indian relations with the outside world should in future take that basis which in Western

language can be signified only by the term International. But for ourselves, we have got to bring it under *Dharma* as a compound for religion and civilization, natural law and human law, ethics and cult. I am but too painfully aware of the facts that the International system of Christendom does not recognize a moral basis for politics such as the Positivists uphold; and that with all our Westernizers it is the fashion to condemn as foolish, as well the claims of the Pope for an International arbitrator, as the sentiments of the Brahmans regarding *Dharma* and *achar*, *Dharma* and political exclusiveness. The Brahmans themselves would not give heed to my position that they were theocrats, that they had gone through a cleverly devised separation between the temporal and spiritual powers, and that there must have occurred a serious deadlock in their political history. And my Revivalist and Westernizing friends would accept of neither the democratic spirit for subordinating themselves to their own countrymen, nor the Positivist principles to put Brahmandom in India on a pedestal similar to that of Popedom in Europe. Against the enticements of a Max Muller, an Olcott or an Edwin Arnold, of a Gladstone or a Salisbury, the opinions of a Congreve or a Bridges, a Hutton or a Quin fail to count for any thing with them! But after all truth is truth, and matters seem too to be drawing to a close. It was a destructive policy of the Government which originally reared up the present destructionist tendencies of some of our own countrymen. But the constructive part of their work has not unnaturally departed from them. The so-called mission to raise the East up to the level of the Western conquerors is now treated as an old pleasantry or a clever stroke of business. Christianity and Christian Justice are regarded with a coolness which is characteristic of the rationalist spirit of the day. But abstract Justice as a principle of ethical unity is also treated as moonshine; and charity is confined to home. A tissue of intrigues with or in regard to parties and factions is the besetting sin of most

of our Government officials. To the Roman ethic of Divide and Rule, they have added—Hush! the Parliament! It has been openly said, and it remains uncontradicted, that their policy or wish would now be best met by an Indian rebellion such as might help them to a free hand, for more and more repressive measures, from the supposed fair-play-loving democracy sleeping in England. I am afraid it is true, that they are now moving Heaven and Earth to run us into a Gadara. The Revivalists and the Congress party must come to see all this, and therefore they must also appreciate the importance of peace. And thus I can foresee that they will of necessity learn to understand each other. A compromise must be arrived at. The Westernizers cannot even wish for a renewal of the Irish problem by an act of Union for India. They cannot seek for British Colonial relations, with the facts about Red Indians and New Zealanders before us. Even the Dutch polity in Java has now become unacceptable to us. The Revivalists too cannot go back to Brahmanic Exclusiveness even if so minded. Therefore, for the coming compromise, the Westernizers must modify their Congress policy so as to converge with the Revivalists and the country at large. The Revivalists must also consent to accept of any of the least advantages which their supposed opponents may succeed in securing for us through petitions and agitations. For themselves, they must also pass from mere speculations in Brahmanic theology, philology, or rhetoric, into practical politics. And their action can and ought to be only upon the Brahmanic basis. The scriptures and traditions of Brahmanism can never fail them. Such things never fail. For, the past history of a people cannot possibly fail them for future guidance. Both classes must also quietly shake off the objection that our living exponents of Smriti may not be found to be worthy of their hire. In politics, people may not wait for milleniums; men must work with the tools they possess.

Another defect of Brahmanism is its apparent inequality to develop our Industry on modern principles. The question however is mystified by admixture with the admiration of our Westernizers for European cultivation of the Sciences. There are at bottom two several questions in this matter : one of general education in scientific information, and the other of practical skill in what are called the applied sciences. I do not think for all my confidence in the growth of Positivism that the Western nations have been making steady progress in scientific general education. As followers of matters theoretical, I think they are all far behind their practical aptitude. If they were not so, the question of theology would not still continue to be mystified under the forms of Rationalism and Agnosticism, and drive our own Westernizers into such perilous secularism. Western philosophers might ere this have seen their way to some fitting co-ordination between their scientific knowledge and their religious views. I mean that if the sciences were being taught in the West as part of encyclopædic education, some synthetic views like those of Herbert Spencer, not to mention those of my Guru Comte, would visibly gain in ascendancy in Europe. The present craze for Buddhist synthesis to the exclusion of Brahmanism is simply amusing to me ! But I dare not speak of telepathy, table-rapping and the border-land speculations which Europeans seem to be toying with, in their pursuit of the literary trade. The truth seems to be that in Europe, the serious men are at present very much pre-occupied with the recent science of Sociology, and that therefore they are trying to work out the Dignity of Labor by the normal course of social experiments. They must take time in order to go upon Ethics as a science and into its practical applications in life. Thus the social and moral relations between the Regulative and Operative sections of society, and those between the two branches of the Regulative class comprised in the Church and the State are all in a flux. To scientifically recast the human obligations, all their conventions

shall have to conform to a practicable Synthesis. But this lies some distance off in the future. The Brahmans of old however did attempt to form certain syntheses to go upon in life. Their constructions had of course the imperfections of contemporary knowledge; and the social organization framed by them has become a little out of date. But to do any sort of justice to Brahmanism, to examine it with reference to Theory and to appliances thereof to the Rule of Conduct in life, now that its claims to absolutism are gone, we should have to compare the syntheses of the Vedanta, Nyaya, and Mimansa Doctrines with those of Comte and Herbert Spencer. I confess myself unequal to this great task. But I think that from this point of view the question of our general scientific education must be deliberately postponed for a time.

Education is a matter which comprises both politics and morals. If we could possibly take our start from any system of morality which was unanimously acceptable to the world or even to all sections of our own community, including, sovereign, subject, and the Westernizers, then we could without any great difficulty apply them as well to solve our political problem, as to lend to our educational needs our undivided attention and interest. But it is not for us Indians at least, to entertain any such grand ambition. Our present circumstances will mar all our noblest wishes in the matter of sound general education, and consign us into the hands of mercenary designers or reckless enthusiasts. This conclusion is I think amply verified by the fact that with all our westernizing tendencies and with all the labours of our University authorities we fail to carry our college pursuits in science into life-long work. We have no specialists in Law, Medicine, or Engineering, let alone the departments of Mathematics, Astronomy, Chemistry, Biology and History. We have in fact far greater need to be able to live. We need money. We must go into labour for money. And it follows that we have to betake ourselves to the

branch of education, I mean, the applied sciences, not with a view to furnish an inexpensive staff of teachers to feed the exotic universities, but with a view to develop our industries. And we have to draw out capital and win the confidence of capitalists who are far from being Westernized. But in developing our capabilities in the applied sciences we stand in need also of political stability. And thus I have once more to urge that the British Government for all its defects may not be disturbed to our benefit. The applied sciences and the industrial methods of the West are certainly beyond the reach of our Brahmans. But there is no great chance either, that parliaments, speaking assemblies, and formal votings will add to our capacity for thrift, industry, or industrial organization. We shall have to learn not from precepts and books but from example of the Western Industrialists in our midst. And for this important requirement the maintenance of the British rule is an unquestionable advantage. But in our expectations in this matter too, great caution and political insight are needed on our side considering that in Europe, cosmopolitan free-trade now seeks to attain the ends of protection, by means of unconscionable Territorialism. When morality is at a discount even in Cosmopolitan commerce, the struggle for existence among Brahmanists must be woeful all round as a matter of course.

Nevertheless, I cannot conceive that by the time China takes to the Industrial methods of the West, the most exclusive of the Brahmanists could possibly remain behind, and wrangling about sea voyages and like other matters, which may be needed for a sound Industrial policy in India. Take these instances: Every body knows how the Brahmans were opposed to dissection of the human body. They were denounced as fools. We now find that on this particular point the Brahmanist sentiments have been strangely in common with those of Comte's.* In the West and within

* "The dissection of the human body, a practice coeval with the modern revolution, ought by this time to have done its work of preparation. But if five centuries of illiberal education have not done so, it is because the dissection of the human body is a practice which is not only a part of the modern revolution, but also a part of the modern civilization." — Comte, *Positive Philosophy*, vol. I, p. 100.

living memory, the question has run into controversies about the morality, utility or scientific need of vivisection. But our Brahmans have staunchly kept to their theory, at the same time that they have quietly submitted to postmortem examinations to meet the demands of Westernizers in both law and anatomy. I do not therefore see why if the means had been similarly favourable, Brahmans could not be attracted to studies like Astronomy upon Western methods. (2) Astronomy itself has been exercising their minds not a little of late, in connection with the Indian calendar. And though the Universities have been characteristically apathetic, it is just the time for our Westernizing politicians to take it up, provided they would consent to carry the Brahmans with them. (3) Again, the fitness of our Musalmans in the cognate art of Navigation is pretty well-known. The Lascars among our Indian proletaries have been promised wholesome devotedness from our Western patricians. And as other political obstacles might be removed with tact and foresight, the same instruments are needed in our Westernizers in order to secure the co-operation of the Mollahs also, in the causes of Industry and Scientific education in India. But to return: In the face of these facts it cannot be hopeless for Brahmans, once more to take charge of the theory and practice of our Industry, by turning their attention to Western Science, for a re-organization of the industrial system of Indian caste.

To the political interests which may be centred around Brahmanism the worst damage has no doubt come from the British rule of administering the Hindu Law. But at the same time I have not the slightest hesitation in gratefully ac-

Positivism will enforce an universal respect for the dignity of the poor, which Catholicism in its decline was unable to protect. In the hospital, as elsewhere, none will be subject to the outrage of an autopsy without his own free consent, ratified subsequently by his family." Pos. Pol. IV. p. 380. See also pp. 66 and 199. As I am going through the proof sheets I have to suppress a smile in according my support to the anti-Vivisectionist demonstration in Calcutta headed by Mrs. Besant and backed by many of my personal friends.

knowledging that the important concessions formerly made in that particular matter by the British Government now furnish the only foundations for any feasible and honest political activity which are available to the Brahmanists. In this matter I must strongly deprecate any thing like religious fanaticism. We ought to know that the interests thrown into stake in India by England have grown into enormous magnitude. And anything could be done against the Brahmanists if they sought to muster up any physical strength to rally around their religio-political cause. All these three several considerations are of serious import. A treasure still exists: it has been mercifully left to us: and we may be easily robbed of it. Hence there is obvious reason for cautious behaviour. But in wishing to bury our religio-legal concern from the public gaze we have come also to run the risk of ignoring it altogether, and of ceasing to set any store at all by that same buried treasure. Though some of us may not see any political attractions in Brahmanism, our Anglo-Indian fellow subjects are wide awake; and already the growth of Revivalism in the track of the Congress has aroused suspicions in their minds. It could never be otherwise with politicians who know equally well to employ the art of public demonstrations and to pull the strings from behind, as for instance, for the spread both of Christianity and Rationalism in India. Our exertions must not only accept of the peaceful policy inculcated by both Brahmanism and Positivism, but we must dive deep into the requirements of peace. And to that end I might even point for a model to the homeliness of the Hindu Woman. She, we must carefully remember, can die for the sake of preserving her chastity: But still she appreciates her seclusive life in order to avoid contaminations of masculine society. The Brahmans who have taught her and our proletaries in this peculiar line must now consent to borrow from her in working at politics. This model may seem to some of us strange if not ridiculous. But I mean not only to deprecate the implicit appeal made by our Westernizers to the physical

strength of numbers; I seek also to suggest, the lofty spiritual functions of woman in general as well as the fully recognized fact that it is by the Hindu woman that Brahmanism now continues to be best cherished. And neither she nor her prototype the Brahman, may be profitably improved off our society.

I shall now pass on to our political stronghold in the Hindu Law, and say a few words about an important book, *The Commentary on the Hindu Law*. * The author's name is Pandit Jogendra Nath Bhattacharya, and he holds as a scholar in Smriti, the Pandit's title—Smarta Siromani. I do not know if he is not also a practising lawyer. He certainly holds the diploma of Doctor of Laws from the Calcutta University. His book was first published in 1885, and it has been recently enlarged in its second edition. It has become an important text-book in our local law literature, and is said to be highly prized by the profession as a book of reference. Being written in the English language, it also presents important facilities of examination to the Revivalists and Westernizers. I did not know of it until very recently, and I have to hail it as very important for my own purposes. Pandit Siromani my great name-sake, is however not a Positivist; and I earnestly wish that for his next edition he would examine our Positivist books to find fresh arguments in order to develop his noble ambition of re-establishing the Hindu Law. I look on him as a powerful coadjutor. He is neither a Destructionist, nor apparently a Westernizer; nor even does he seem to be a Revivalist. I am glad that he has taken up the cudgels for the Pandit class to show what a mess has been made of Hindu Law by the English and Westernized lawyers of India. Be that as it may, the following extracts from his book, gleaned by skipping over the first few pages seem to me to disclose the Political side of Brahmanism in the clearest manner, though I am far from saying that the author at all meant to deal in politics.

"It is true that our Codes [of Hindu Law] do not embody the commands of any sceptred monarch.....The authors of our Sanhitas were Brahmans, who neither occupied the throne, nor were vested by any king with the functions that are at present discharged by the Law Member of the Viceregal Council. But it must be conceded by every one, who knows any thing of the mechanism of our society, that the Brahmins were the real rulers of the country, so long at least as Hindu kings occupied the throne." * * * *

My own position is that it was no casual machinery at all; that it was the most essential feature of the political system of the four-caste-Brahmanists; and that according to that system the Brahmans from one point of view stood above and directed the temporal rulers of the country, and from another point of view, they loyally acknowledged the sovereign as the temporal lord over the entire community. This they did by virtue of what is technically called the theocratic constitution of society. It has really grown with their religion and political life.

"Even when the Mahomedans were in the zenith of their power, the Brahmins exercised some of the most important functions of sovereignty [spiritual supremacy] without any molestation. It was during the period of Mussalman ascendancy that Jimutavahana effected a complete change in the Hindu Law of Inheritance in Bengal.....It is only the influence of British rule that has well-nigh deprived the Brahmins of those powers which they enjoyed from time immemorial.

* * * *

"Such being the theory, it might seem that the Brahmins could not change the law. But practically they modified the law from time to time. It is true that they never assembled together to pass new laws or to modify old ones. But what they did practically amounted to the same thing." [After, dwelling on how a new text-book on Hindu Law would grow into life and vigour in the past the author says:] "The rules and precepts enjoined in it [the new book] were generally obeyed; and those who wilfully violated them were punished by being required to perform some penance or other, according to the nature of each case.] pp. 2-3.

* * * *

"From the earliest times, the Brahmins attained a very high degree of culture.....They not only aspired to but actually succeeded in having themselves revered as representatives of the Divinity on earth. [Theocracy=God-rule]..... Motives of policy, as well as real love of letters, led the early Brahminical writers to lay down the rule that the cultivation of letters was the only proper avocation of their class." p. 7.

It was no policy at all. On the contrary the Brahman theocrats exceeded in their self-denying arrangements, the priests of Egypt, the theocratic kings of Palestine like David and Solomon, the Archons of Athens, the Lawgivers of Sparta, the Prætors and Emperors of Rome, and even the successors of St. Peter at the Vatican with their royal insignia and important temporalities. Theocracy is a matter of spontaneous growth. In primitive society men naturally fail to distinguish between concrete fact and a rule of law to be enforced for its own sake and in order to shape any facts of life and history. The renunciation of power by the Rishis, when Parashuram after subjugating the Kshatriyas by physical force had to retire to South-India with what might be called his peculiar policy, was no less grand than the subsequent labours of Viswamitra and Sakya Sinha against the hereditary and other political privileges (but not policies) of the Brahmans. It is policy which retains for the British Crown, the title of Defender of the Faith and constitutional supremacy over the spiritual peers of the realm and the Anglican Church. It is policy which governs divers other Church matters of Scotland, Ireland, France, Germany, and Italy. And it is policy which has kept the United States without a national Church since the Declaration of Independence. But to impute motives of policy, and that in an evil sense to the Brahmans is hardly consistent even with the Brahmanic modesty of our author! But to go on with the extracts:—

"Motives of self-interest, as well as wise statesmanship, confirmed the general belief...that their Codes were of

dimly recognized now and then. But very few ventured to question the infallibility of the Vedas or to place the rules of law and morality on any other foundation than the sacred scriptures. (p. 7.)

* * *

The orthodox belief is, that the Vedas and Smṛitis are infallible. The Hindu lawyers never openly set up the standard of revolt.....But, in practice, they never hesitate to get rid of the authority of the sacred Codes when they deem it necessary to do so. Instead of following the authority of the sacred Codes, they would, by the [instrumentality of their peculiar] logic and grammar, make the sacred Codes follow them...In effecting such change, they very often take the principle of utility as their guide, though they never openly acknowledge it as such. pp. 7-8.

* * *

"The binding force of a very large portion of our laws is not dependent entirely upon the power or inclination of any temporal sovereign or administrator to enforce them: they work very often like a self-acting machinery. [A most noteworthy fact, which suggests volumes in reference to the ancient Brahmanic art of educating our women and proletaries without the aid of books or even letters. It is impossible to explain how (to speak in Positivist technicology), the logic of Feelings was cultivated by the logic of Tantric Images, keeping the logic of Signs *i.e.* of ideas and language, in undue exclusion.] It, therefore, happens that, in spite of all the changes in the political condition of the Hindus, their law still retains to a great extent that vitality which it had in the days of Brahminical ascendancy. (p. 9.)

* * *

"Direct legislation must, in some cases, be quite as undesirable as direct taxation. The Rishis had little or no temporal power.....They eradicated the barbarous institutions of primitive society, not by high-handed measures of enforced reform, but by a kind of legislative tact, which, when clearly understood, cannot but elicit the admiration of every reflecting mind. (p. 10.)

* * *

"According to their conception of religion, its function is to regulate the action of men in all things where they require to be guided." (p. 11.)

I must not however multiply these extracts. The book

also others whose interest may be confined only to the history and sociology of India. My observations will be directed to five points.

1. In the first place, Pandit Siromani might have, as already shown, spared his own class any detractions, against their motives. The Brahmans are and have been theocrats. The question of priestcraft has nothing to do with the subject. Self-interest as a human foible may not have been overcome even by the Rishis. But I am not aware that any dispassionate critic has ever charged the Indian Sacerdotal classes with great efforts at self-aggrandizement either in their material concerns or in their ambition for power and fame. Even Sakya Sinha has exonerated the Brahmans from any such blame. They are now more apt to be lost as beggarly-looking people than to be appreciated like "the rigid Cincinnatus nobly poor." The sanctity associated with the sacerdotal office, however tainted by theological beliefs and emotions has its own value. In any case the privileges of birth and the divine honours attached all over the world to kings and priests, have no more to do with systematic policy of self-interest in any theocracy or aristocracy, than the distinctions shown to, and the eminence attained by demagogues for reasons of Merit have to do with many of the deficiencies of king Demos in our own contemporary history of the world.

I think also that in the present decade, Pandit Siromani might as well pass over the principle of Utility as a human basis of morality. I do not say that the ethical doctrine of Bentham, Austin and Mill has been or requires to be exploded. But I believe it is growing out of date. A social sanction of morality or what is called altruism, has been founded upon newly discovered traits (or natural laws) peculiar to all human society. It would be quite sufficient to account for how the Pandits and Rishis of old naturally worked for the greatest good of the greatest number. After all, utility is only good of mankind, the very same blessing which is contemplated even by Hebrew, Christian, and Musalman

believers in a divine *ahankar* (Jehovah) from such widely different stand-points.

But the heaviest supplemental labour for Siromani's work lies in ascending from ethics into religion so as to furnish us with a carefully executed comparison between the nature and history of the two religious systems, Brahmanism and Christianity. There need however be no hurry about it; particularly as Siromani has laid such an excellent foundation for that work. I mention it only in order to suggest that our Revivalists may see their way into the minor question of Church Government as a necessary part of Brahmanic Politics. But as a Hindu and a Positivist I feel bound to say that our Pandits must now earnestly address themselves to study the nature of Church Government as it has worked under the Roman Catholic and Anglican forms of the Christian Religion.

2. In the second place, I have to observe that the discussion of Hindu Law must now take a basis still more comprehensive than what has been claimed for it by Pandit Siromani. The subject of Smriti must be taken up as a whole. When the British Government solemnly declared not to interfere with certain Hindu Laws, namely, those regarding Inheritance, Succession, Marriage, Caste and other religious usages and institutions, it was certainly left to future to consider as an open question how far a good understanding might not be arrived at between sovereign and subject in other departments of Legislation also. The Government in the days of Warren Hastings was anxious more for cosmopolitan commerce than for territorial aggrandizement: more for peace and industry than for domination or control over the heart and mind of the Indian people or peoples. Later on, commerce had to be consigned to the Interlopers; and for the Government itself, the question of patronage with reference to the Civil Service rose into importance. In the earlier stages of that question, the links were not lost which kept the administration by officials chained to the history of Mahomedan India.

It is only now that representation in the Legislative bodies of the country has acquired an absorbing interest. Without stopping to criticise these events, it may be safely said that our progress has been seriously affected by a certain neglect to Smriti and its authoritative expounders. What I am anxious about is, how the matters in question would be viewed from the stand-point of the ancient Brahman legists. They could never confine Hindu Law to the particular portions of it enumerated above. They could treat of Inheritance and the other matters of Hindu Law only as parts of the whole of Smriti. And to deal in Smriti itself, they could proceed only with due deference to the Vedas on one side, and on the other with no small cognizance of several other matters, such as the orthodox Darsanas, actual usage, and even heterodox sects. But this may be considered a very large order.

I therefore ask only what public functions of to-day should have belonged exclusively to the Pandits of old type? Which of these functions could never be taken up by them? And how the Indian portion of our public functionaries might in this way be enabled to distinguish between the Brahmanic and anti-Brahmanic features of their official work. My question is no more nor less than one of ethics. I want to learn or understand the Brahmanist ethics about the functions of public office, with an eye to our modern requirements. I believe that some such study is requisite to enable Brahmanist officials to judge of their responsibilities to the Sovereign who bestows upon them their respective offices, and to the People and the Pandits who have to be severally reckoned with according as a democratic or a theocratic basis is accepted for our society. Indian functionaries ought to recognize where the public duties are non-Brahmanic, anti-Brahmanic, or simply new and indispensable in our present circumstances. Attention deserves to be directed to the subject in order to judge of what divergence must occur in Brahmanist life under the present Western rule. In some cases our officials have

been given a large measure of independence, in other cases the control exercised over them by the British ruler may be stricter than what would be conformable with the Brahmanic order of life. It is generally understood that public business is regulated by the letter of the law and the officials' private conscience. I should prefer if we could have our written laws and rules of to-day distinctly conjoined with that unwritten law which is really derived from English Society, and as such is more or less distracting to the Indian mind. I think what is called "conscience" is mystified not only by reason of an uncertain secular basis for it, but also by what are called the principles of liberty and independence. Liberty is often apt to run into license without a large measure of discipline. But the question of discipline as prevalent in Western society becomes a variable factor according to the Brahmanist and Musalman points of view. In any case, Western discipline is for us a most uphill work, even as a mere study. I suppose that after a century and half of Western contact, we ought to have considerable materials to institute a comparison between Western discipline and that prescribed under the Hindu Law so far as it has not become obsolete. The functions of Indian officials require at least to be carefully analysed and studied from the Western as well as the Brahmanic points of view. I call for it because it is the only course available to lead us to an improved understanding of official ethics. The fusion of the East and the West has to be effected for all the obstacles which lie in our way. And I do hope and trust that it is being effected surely though slowly in the heart and mind of our Indian public functionaries. It is however necessary to examine that wonderful process which is going on in our midst. And what I mean to say to Siromani and the Revivalists is only this that the question belongs to Hindu Law by reason of the comprehensive view which the former has justly taken of his great subject, Smriti.

3. There is a third question which to my mind calls for an opinion from the Pandit class but I confess, it is if possible

one of greater comprehensiveness than the last-mentioned one of official ethics. Nay, it is a question which is just now beyond the comprehension of the greatest thinkers of contemporary life in the world. None the less it comes within the scope of Brahmanic politics, for the subject must have engaged the attention of Brahmans in the past. If it is startling to any one to hear Pandit's opinion called for on the Industrial problems of the day, I fear, the fault lies less with the Brahmans themselves than with us who do not know how to lay the question before them. However, our Hindu Lawyer is both a Pandit and a Doctor of Laws. And I may charge him to listen to the story of the Ancient Mariner. It is for us Westernized Indians to trace out what connection lies between any industrial problems of the West and those Brahmanic institutions under which we live and have been born and bred. Siromani has gone partially into the subject but it requires more extensive research.

Hitherto Hindu Lawyers have approached certain questions of property such as those regarding Partition and Religious Endowments, as they occur only in contemporary life, and almost apart from the sphere of Smriti. But these questions have much to do with our Caste in particular, and with the ethics of our Smriti in general. And a moment's consideration will show that the existing state of affairs is due to the mistaken notion that caste as it prevails in India is an absurdity and a consequence of absurd conduct of the Brahmanists. Caste however has its industrial side quite as much as Brahmanism has its political side ; and both these questions come within the purview of Smriti as also of Pandits in their spiritual functions. A monopoly for the temporal autocrat or democrat in all these questions may be firmly challenged. The subject is so vast that I must be pardoned if I confine myself to name only the more prominent divisions of the subject. The politico-economic side of Brahmanism may not be held negligible for all the opposition of Westernizers and Revivalists against Brahmanic reorganiza-

zation. The Hindu organization of Caste is directly connected with our Village Communities; and the Indian village communities ought to be studied with the utmost care from the stand-points of the laws of Partition as developed by the Mitakshara and Dayabhaga schools of Hindu lawyers. On the other hand, it is almost a truism to say that our Communal system in Property in land, as well as in other kinds of Property, presents important economic features. These features are unmistakeably suggestive of the question of Socialism which at present is making such a havoc in the commonwealths of Europe. For obvious reasons our Government for all its Occidental connections is bound not to recognize the new socialistic movements of Europe. But it must be from a lamentable obtuseness in Hindu lawyers if they fail to perceive a parallel between nationalization or municipalization of land and the Bhyachara tenures in the landed properties of India.

With such a break in the logical links between our land tenures and our laws of partition, it becomes easy to understand why the case-law in this country regarding Partitions presents so many imperfections. According to Siromani the Hindu Law of Succession as prevailing under the Mitak'hara School has been developed by Jimuta-vahana for Bengal so as practically to obviate the necessity for a whole class of law-suits which go under the head of Partition. Litigation of the kind is therefore confined to purposes "of making an actual division and for determining the liability of [coparceners] for contributing to the common expenses." (p. 477.) And in these matters the people are found to be at variance as between their own sense of justice and the views of their legal advisers. Those who quietly submit to the hardest requirements of Smriti are found to revert to anarchical conduct under the fears or temptations of what we have for our Court of Justice.

From communal relations in the ownership of land and other kinds of property it is but a step to the questions of

Labour and Capital and to those of Banking, Contract and Sale. Perhaps I am only inviting ridicule to say that these questions have anything to do with Brahmanism. But the misfortune arises entirely from the commercial ways of thinking peculiar to writers on Political Economy. Henry George has of late thrown a bomb-shell in their midst. But our Indian lawyers are still going on in a spirit of unconcern which can recall only the unsophisticated ways of our antiquated Brahmans. Political Economy as a branch of Sociology may be complacently passed over as a Positivist fad. Nevertheless what is said about Competition being the basis of all economic relations between man and man may not be accepted as axiomatic truth by an Indian with any pretensions to culture. There is another side to the question of Competition which all Political Economists assume as the basis of social order, I mean what comes under the head of *Custom*. And if it is not pardonable in any lawyer to overlook the question of custom in dealing with those of competition, I may be allowed to call upon the Hindu lawyer to come forward and render us his assistance on the subject. But the difficulty does not terminate here. As by some men the etymology of the word Communism is neglected in consequence of divergent facts about Indian Family-communities and Village-communities, and about the Communistic questions agitating the West, even so the word Custom as opposed to Competition often fails to furnish the requisite politico-economic suggestions. Every thing with us is so much a matter of custom that we fail to see anything peculiar with us in the matters of economic custom. And when we are told anything of Competition by English political economists, politicians, and even philosophers, we pass uncriticised their silence and evasions about Custom as a natural product of social life, and as the result of organized social or political effort. Nevertheless the fact is not to be gainsaid that Brahmanism with its settled decision in favour of permanence (sanatana) is consistently partial to the

customary basis of Industrial relations. The partiality is not due to rashness although it may be an outcome of deeply permeating sentiment. But the sentiment in question is suggestive of many ideas regarding the origin, the conditions, and the future of our Indian life. In the West it is yet too soon to disturb the social conditions of Competition with speculations about the worth of Custom. But in India, that blindness would be culpable which might seek to indiscriminately replace all Custom with Competition: which could overlook the sweating system brought about in the West through unwholesome developments of Competition. I confess that I feel myself at abysmal loss to discover a golden mean between Free trade and Competition on one side, and Custom, Protection and Reciprocity on the other: between commerce and what has been aptly called international Darwinism on one side, and on the other, that love of purity, austerities, exclusive life, unconcern, contemplation, inactivity, and tranquility, which constitutes Brahmanism. But that is no reason to neglect our Smriti, Brahmanism, and the Brahmans as factors of our thought and life. Indeed if a logical basis to govern the divergent requirements of Custom and Competition be hard to attain, it becomes all the more necessary to proceed with cautious conciliation between the rival advocates of the two systems of social economy. Granting that Brahmans are as unreasonably wedded to economic custom, as the Western people seem to be to economic competition, it is for our own Westernizers and Revivalists in Anglo-India to try to bridge the gulf between these two sections of the human race.

There are two questions of a relatively incidental nature which may also be mentioned here. I have already said why the scientific branch of our public education must for the present be confined to the applied sciences and to industrial ends. This view suggests that we must win over the Brahmans as in fact they are being won over, to accept of the labour-saving appliances of Europe. But it is for the Western-

nized Indians to realize how by this means the Brahmans would be withdrawn from their deep-rooted and by no means unreasonable leaning towards economic custom. The matter is thus mature enough to be taken on hand in Brahman politics. Again, if as I have said already, they have to review the question of ethics, in other words, of *achar*, দেহভক্তি and চিত্তভক্তি for our public servants, they have to enter also upon the still more complicated questions about those humbler people, the industrialists. With these people caste-rules have now to be violated in many ways. And on more than one account, it is also desirable that Brahmanist capitalists should embark in new lines of industry. These are serious changes which Brahmanism can not and will not resist. But a moral pressure from Brahman priests ought to be welcome to repress the normal cravings for material aggrandizement. Those who have directed the performance of Brahmanist *yagnas* and fostered the maxims of দীযতাঃ ভূযতাঃ are also the best qualified to turn Indian charity into economic channels, provided we could enable them to see the charitable ends of Industry and industrial Dignity. And, who but our Westernizers are responsible in order to utilise the ancient policy of Brahmanism.

Moreover in so far as the political side of Brahmanism is bound to present at least to the Indians, an aspect of Brahmanic foreign policy or international law, the whole question of International Industry and International Exchange and Currency is unfolded for Brahmanic consideration. It may be too much to wish that Brahmans should look up their Smriti in order to unravel the mysteries of bimetallism, or even to study the more proximate question of ethics, in the hope to regulate the conduct of capitalists when they furnish the sinews of all Wars. But in any case I do not see why some of the conflicting notions of banking should not be laid hold of by Brahmans or Brahmanists in order to remove certain misconceptions and vague ideas of our fellow citizens.

purposes only serves to meet the noxious wants of improvident spendthrifts ; and capitalists and money-lenders are not unjustly regarded as sworn enemies of the impecunious. But Western Banking has another basis. It attains the confidence of society for deposits of money and then serves the community in return by advances from other people's money to enterprising industrialists. Mutual help, commercial honesty, and utility are its most important features. On the other hand Indian Banking is allied with certain Brahmanic ways of life. Those ways are hostile to accumulation of capital ; and they promote the distribution of wealth in a fashion which is bewildering to the Western views of life. Nevertheless in this fashion, many politico-economic social disorders are obviated, while the cause of Religion or Dharma is not a little advanced. Indiscriminate charity, alms-giving, and certain modes (pujas and yagnas) of gratifying the vanity of ostentatious people have been laid hold of in Brahmanism for a distribution of wealth and control over avarice and money-grabbing. I do not at all intend to exonerate the Indian capitalists or their unfortunate constituents from the blame which is justly due to them. But it is not reasonable to forget the original principles of an institution because we are now confronted by its numerous abuses. From my admiration for a certain Positivist ideal, the Government by a bureau of bankers, I was landed upon strange disillusionment when I saw that morality as a guiding principle of, for instance, the Bank of England or those of Paris and New York, lies farthest from any of the practical needs of the hour in Europe. But I know that in dealing with Indian famine, Anglo-Indian administrators have found wonderful co-adjutors in our Brahmanist capitalists. Facts and experiences of this kind cannot, I know but too well, count for any thing because India has no place in the comity of nations. But I think I am justified in stating my doubts as to whether our countrymen might well jump from Indian into European Banking, with "leaps and bounds".

4. It has been seen that the Ethics of public service and those of industrial and social economy in India are at bottom connected with important questions of Brahmanic and universal morality. And later on, I shall have to turn to the question of Religious Endowments and Brahmanic Church Government. The connecting link between these two branches of my subject is morality. But as I have shown before, that matter may not be conveniently taken up for a discussion in the abstract, or even in general connection with Hindu Law and Smriti. I have to dwell in its stead on the question of the Brahmanic institution of Penances. Penances I know are out of the way things with Westernized Indians. Even Siromani has passed over them. But after all, they form an important link in the chain of devotional matters associated with penitence and prayer. We cannot possibly appreciate the moral scope of Brahmanism, much less develope its policy on all practicable sides unless we make up our minds to fully enter into the Brahmanic spirit underlying their Penances. The subject is complicated by two sources of disturbance. Westernized Indians by their hostile attitude towards both Christianity and Brahmanism, and by their apathy for an ultimate human basis of Morality, are placed at a disadvantage to appreciate any system of morals at all. And Protestant Christians have done not a little to confuse the Indian mind by their well-known attitude in the controversy regarding justification by Faith and by Merit. I am afraid very few of our Indian Christians have a grasp over the subject. Matters might perhaps be simplified if Protestant Christians would undertake to present in India and China something like a rational side in this long-standing, but peculiarly Western controversy. They have tried to rationalise the question of Divine revelation, no matter with what success. But they have never tried to show what they really mean by Faith, and how from their point of view, and on other than dogmatic grounds, the emotional factor in the Christian's Faith is calculated to effect a general improvement in his character.

However that may be, human conduct has two different levers to move it. There is first of all the Emotions, which from within directly impel the man to good or bad conduct. But for a second lever there is also such a thing as Habit. It serves to regulate conduct even where the spontaneous forces of emotion may be feeble. Habit as contrasted to the spiritual force of Feeling may be likened to matter working under the Law of inertia. It may be supposed also to possess three several dimensions : length, breadth, and depth. The *length* of time during which a habit grows tends to its continuance. Again, a certain principle of habit may sink so *deep* into character in governing all the minuter concerns of a man's life that the principle will work on, and in diverse matters too, with or without a corresponding emotional impulse in him; and the motive power would be only the depth of habit permeating as a principle into the man's life and conduct. Moreover when the very same habits are spread over a wide range of human society, the mechanical effects of example between man and man work as powerfully as the most potent feelings and the strongest public opinion. Here habit shows its *breadth* with no other definable origin. The spontaneous spiritual forces of the heart and mind doubtless promote the agency and instrumentality of the individual man. Superior discrimination tells upon the delicacy of our moral perceptions; and comprehensive views of facts go to excite our courage and firmness. These features of human nature are allied to the self-imposed or self-initiated efforts of the Individual. Let us call them spiritual factors. They are by no means wanting in the teachings imparted to the Brahmanists. Perhaps there is a little too much of this subjective impulse. But for the general run of our people Brahmanism it would seem, has tried to work the coarse but solid material lever of human Habit, rather than the less tangible spiritual forces in our nature. It is not for me to discuss the rival merits of these two important but widely different lines in the Art of Education. I am concerned

only to show that the rigid Discipline imposed under Brahmanism and extended to the minutest affairs of our life without a corresponding attention to the spiritual forces of intelligence and courage is not devoid of meaning. For it should be remembered that their own spiritual culture must have led the Brahmans into very varied experiences. And it is yet to be proved that our illiterate proletaries are inferior in morals to men of the same station in the West who have been made acquainted with reading writing and arithmetic. Brahmanism has outlived many religions in its time, and is by no means a fit object of ridicule for its antagonists who are in fact a little too much occupied with resisting the Romanist doctrines involving justification by Merit. They may not be able to appreciate the Brahmanic system of human control in morality by means of the penances. But that is no reason to avoid the subject, when one comes to deal in Smriti with the appliances of Western method in reasoning.

This question will naturally recall one of the burning questions of the day—the discussions lately set on foot by the Sea-Voyage movement. I cannot yet willingly take part in obtaining Brahmanic sanction for sea-voyages. But I may suggest that the one-sided treatment applied to this discussion is not calculated to satisfy the heart and the mind of a true Brahmanist. It is even desirable for the purposes of this agitation alone, to go into the question of penances as a whole. I do not see how in any other way any reasonable man can endorse the opinion that the Brahmanic objections to sea-voyages are to be accounted for only by their perversity and blindness. I have however another question in my mind which will show the same bearings as that of the sea-voyages, but which would also commend itself to favourable notice of all men, both Pandits and Brahmanists.

We all know that the Brahmanic system of penances is calculated to drive erring women into desperation and hope-

and Brahmans I know, fully sympathise with those who quietly go against the law of penances, and secure by their free domestic efforts many a perfect conversion in the character of such women. Here in fact we can find Brahmanist society to be actually in advance of Brahmanic doctrine. I dare not say that the Saivas understood this question. But I believe Nityananda, the chief of Chaitanya's followers did in quiet Hindu fashion recognize the grave importance of the problem. And now I claim that Brahmanist penances must be recast by the Pandits in order to suit the far more pressing demands which have arisen in the wake of Christian preaching and under Christian rule. As soon however as this question is settled to the satisfaction of the reasonable followers of orthodox Brahmanism, and it must be so settled unless Brahmanism fails altogether, a solution for the sea-voyage and like other questions will also be arrived at without any serious difficulty. Hence I consider that the Brahmanic system of Penances should be studied as part of Hindu Law as well in the interests of Brahmanic policy, as in order to lay the foundations of that morality which has hitherto silently governed their politics.

5. I shall now try to bring forward the question of Brahmanic Church Government. I propose to do it in connection with the question of the Hindu Religious Endowments. But the facts are of considerable intricacy, and opinions will differ as to the manner of putting them for the purpose of a general survey.

The best plan would perhaps be to construct a theoretical side for the practical reforms I have got to lay before my reader. The theoretical portion would comprise facts about (1) the denominational differences of our priesthood, (2) their financial resources and (3) their functions. These matters of fact must for our present purposes, be taken for granted. I could not possibly come at the question of political reform in Brahmanic theocracy in any other manner. My facts may of course have taken a coloring from my scheme of reform.

But no requisite correction can be made in any such subjective factors without a measure of sympathy for the corresponding objective or reformative ends. However, with the foregoing division in the theory of the matter, I shall have to speak on Hindu church-property and its administration on one side, and on the other, on the rank and gradation of our priesthood, and on an improved organization within their ranks and orders for the purposes of a reform in Brahmanic church-government. It is true that foregone conclusions are detrimental to any fair study of facts. But it is not always that foregone conclusions can be quite dispensed with. And the only remedy for the evil is to know them, and to guard against consequent errors.

Although the subject is open to controversy, I will ask my reader for our present purposes, to look upon Brahmanism as inculcating the worship of one Great Being called Brahma, though through a plurality of names and forms. Now, some of our sects are more exclusive than others. These exclusive sects are some of the Sivite and Vishnuvite ones. I shall here call these and like other sects or sections, Denominationalists. Some other sects, including the rest of the same Sivites and Vishnuvites are I think, of less exclusive kind. Though these other sections worship more divinities than one, such for example as Surya, Siva, Ganapati, Sakti and Vishnu, yet it is well known that they have all been brought into one fold, i. e. under the same priests or Gurus. And that fact is of quite as much significance, as the opinion that the many names given above are all applicable to the one Great Being, Brahma. It would thus seem that our non-denominationalists had employed some skill in winning over a large portion of the denominationalists and at all events, in retarding further growth of Brahmanic denominationalism. This result has been attained by means of what is a special class of scriptures, called the Tantras. The Vedanta has helped to resolve Vedic polytheism into Pantheism; and the Tantrik doctrines extended those Vedanta teachings all pointing to the worship of one Great

Being, but by means of a complicated system of ritualistic art or artifice. Hence I am led to infer that there is an Esoteric and an Exoteric side to Brahmanism, and also that when these two sides are coupled together they serve to take Brahmanism out of the category of Polytheism. Nevertheless, the problem has to be solved viz., how the undeniable divergences thus occurring in Brahmanist exoteric worship, may be completely removed. On the other side, we have it also, that in the past this very problem was approached with no small ingenuity by the Tantricians.

The Tantrician's action may now be conveniently held as merged in what is called the Diksha. This is a religious rite or institution which is important to us for its connection with church government. Diksha however presents a resemblance to what is called the Upanayana. Both of these are rites of initiation into that form of worship which is known as Prayer. The Sudras were excluded from Upanayana, because it was a Vedic initiation. But the Tantrik Diksha serving the very same ends, was instituted for all the castes. And it may be administered by one same priest or guru to worshippers of apparently different divinities. Thus the denominational differences of the time became more apparent than real, and lost all their sting so far as religious strifes and political disorders were concerned. The Vedic Upanayana was at first not only an initiation into Prayer. It also led the way to the whole of a young man's occupation during the time he should spend with his priest for the purposes of education, religious or general. But when the Brahmanic education-system got relaxed, Upanayana came to be narrowed into something very like the Diksha.

Thus the Brahman caste has to go through two initiations, Upanayana and Diksha, the Kayasthas, only through the latter. But in the recital of Prayers, the one observance runs into the other. Prayer in Hindu worship, as happens in other forms of worship also, had been at one stage of its history, degenerating into mechanical recitation of words. Hindus

do not even now reject it for its mechanical character. But it is quite possible that in the past they thought that Japa and the use of the rosary would, as a devotional exercise be better than the use of the prayer-wheel. Whatever may be said of such mechanical prayers, it would also seem that the requirements of Japa and the rosary had led to the coinage of various names and symbolic words. These names were cleverly contrived to recall to some people, certain mental images, and to all people, the ideal suggestion of the imageless Great Being, Brahma (ब्रह्म). And by means of such symbols and names, many sectarian or denominational differences are obviated through the Tantrik Diksha. So that it is presumable that Diksha as an institution supplemental to the Upanayana, was introduced in the fullness of time and with the assistance of the Tantras. I shall take it as a historical fact; and also try to use it for the Brahmanist political purposes.

The Finances of our Priesthood are derived from (1) Temple property and (2) private property, acquired in the exercise of the priestly function. Land is often given to Pandits without any reservation. The fees obtained by Gurus and Purohits as priests may also lead to private property. Though no reservation was made in the former case, yet there may be a tacit understanding that the property given should defray in part at least the cost of maintaining some of those expensive educational institutions, called Tols. The fees given to priests are voluntary gifts made in consideration of vicarious performance of worship. In both of these cases the relation between donor and donee is explicit; and it is governed by well-understood restrictions imposed by Smriti on the Brahmans. The caste of the donor must be unexceptionable at least for each single class of the priests. The money paid and received, should not lead to any objectionable relations, like that of master and servant between donor and donee. The business may be abused into extortion, but even contractual relations are eschewed. And some credit men, faithless

for this fact either to the scriptural restrictions or to natural disinclination of the people or to both.

The Temple-priests like the purohits, also officiate vicariously for worshippers. But the temple and the divinity attached to it, taken as a whole, acts as an important intermediary. The worshippers make their gifts ostensibly to the divinity in the temple, but as a matter of course the ministering priest gets them. The gifts may swell into large accumulations; and the divinity, it may also happen, is not dissociated from such property. So again large endowments may be made to a divinity with carefully devised provisions for their appropriation by priests of the temple. Thus it may be said that some of these temple-properties are not absolutely owned by the priests as private property; and that they are of the nature of Public Trusts, as the lawyers would have it, or of church temporalities, as I should suggest instead. Certain it is that the temple priests as a class, rank lower than the ordinary Purohits. Both render vicarious worship. But the former class is linked to the temples, and receive money quite indiscriminately from all classes of worshippers. The purohits have to maintain a personal relation with each worshipper. The temple-priests are screened by the fiction of a divine recipient.

When any endowments are made with well-defined reservations as to appropriation, there is just reason for complaint, if the priest makes any sort of misappropriation. Even when no reservation is made, there can be no question that there is a moral trust attaching to the property held by the priest in consequence of his religious ministry. But I think it is not quite fair to make so much of the lawyer's view of these temple-trusts or endowments. I should rather insist upon the moral responsibilities of those priests whose functions lead to the possession of any such properties. According to Smriti, all sales of landed property are objectionable; but the incidents of a legal trust have to be imported from elsewhere into the Hindu Law of these endowments,

imposing the anti-Brahmanist distinction as to what misappropriations are morally but not legally wrong. The simple question about the subject is how is a spiritual power to be prevented from running into abuses in the control, ownership, or trusteeship of property which has been unquestionably endowed for the purposes of Religion? It is however, an enduring defect of Theocracy, and the question is as old as the hills. * Our Westernizers evince only a lamentable obtuseness when they think that Western experience is not to be availed of for the benefit of our Brahmanic priesthood. I will state later on, what changes I have got to suggest in this connection. But here it is only necessary to point out that the financial question ought to be studied in the light furnished by the properties and temporalities of the Church, in Christendom. More especially, we should look for what the Hindu law has got to say about the penances due on account of the misdeeds of any Temple-priests. Can it be that the worshippers are never affected by the ministry of a fallen priest? And what is there to be said about the religious claims of the donors or their heirs, when the purposes of an endowment are frustrated or defeated? Above all it is necessary to insist that the restrictions imposed upon the temporal functions of the sovereign, and more especially a foreign sovereign, should not be relaxed because there has been an abuse in the conduct of individual members of the Brahmanic theocracy. The office of the priest must be saved, no matter what befalls any incumbents of it. Thus I come to the question of the Brahmanic Function.

It follows from what has been said above, that our priestly functions are related to a divinity, either in a direct manner

* See p. 76, on the evils of having two sides to religion, an esoteric and an exoteric one, and on the only remedy available for it being through Popular education. It is one thing to suggest what preparations may be requisite in a theocracy for an eventual national independence, and quite another, for the subjects of a foreign Government to lament that a theocracy does not possess the virtues of a democracy.

or in a vicarious capacity. But some of these functions also partake of the nature of self-culture through literary study, or practice of austerities, or both. By this sort of culture the priest strives to become an exemplar to society. Some of the functions may also be educational and political. The priest was originally a minister to the Crown, and belonged to the council called the Parishad. Now this function is discharged by him as the only authorised exponent of the Smriti. Our Judges may or may not call him as an expert witness. As Educationist, the Priest has not only to render gratuitous service, but also to take his students into his household as free boarders. This is a very heavy burden; and no adequate financial resources are available to match with this function. A further branch of the educational function occurs in administering the Diksha and Upanayan. And it may happen that some priests as Gurus confine themselves chiefly to the Dik'ha business, and others are too much engrossed with their Tols and the Educational function. In this way the Pandits sometime rank above the Gurus; and it will be recollected that the functions of the Gurus are also varied in consequence of Denominational differences.

Brahmanism rests on the Vedas, and what are called, the words of the Rishis or saints. But their human exponents are the Adhyapaks or Pandits, who constitute the organization called Parishad. The Pandits when they descend into personal relations with the lay people may rank as Gurus, or as Purohits. The Guru administers the sacred teaching or Diksha; and the Purohits act vicariously for the worshipper. The Guru holds a higher rank than the Purohit, probably because a fee is due to the latter on each occasion of worship; whereas, the pecuniary gains of the former are like offerings made to a divinity. Beneath the Purohit there is a third man who acts as his paid substitute, and is called the Pujari. The Purohit sinks low if he officiates for inferior classes of worshippers. And I believe he becomes utterly degraded

if he comes within the list of the functionaries of the Village Community. Thus there are two triple divisions between our priests and their authorities. I. We have for authority, (1) the Scriptures, (2) Rishis or saints, and (3) the Parishad. II. Then for Priests we have, the (1) Gurus, (2) Purohits, and (3) Pujaris. The connecting link between these two groups is the Pandit or Adhyapaka with his Council or Parishad, and his college or Tol. His financial resources are very scanty; and he has often to eke them out as a Guru, if not as a Purohit. However, the Gurus, Purohits and Pujaris are inferior in means to the temple-priests. And it is quite possible that the Pandits and Gurus rose in honour above the temple-priests when they renounced their connection with what may be called the temporalities of the church. In any case, we have here very definite indications of an historical landmark.

The temple-priests are of various kinds. There are Priests attached to particular sacred places, to temples (containing any of the many images of the five divinities named before, and worshipped for Brahma,) and to *Maths* which has been defined as "places of abode for students, monks and mendicants." (*Siromani* p. 618.) In this sense, the Maths may be denoted by the term monasteries. The priests attached to the temples and monasteries are known by a variety of names; and the same names are employed by different sects to denote such different offices that the safer plan would be to reject them all. The temple-priests are either representatives of the worshippers or paid servants of such representatives. Their function in the former capacity is exactly similar to that of the Purohit; and in the latter case, it resembles that of the Pujari. Only in several religious rites, the temple-worship and even the worship of images may be absent. Thus, a Purohit may not be a temple-priest, but as temple-priest, he always officiates as Purohit. There is occasionally a headman, the eldest member governing a college of priests attached to the same temple. But such headship is not observed in every case. The monks are

divided into, one chief or abbot, and a number of disciples attaching to any particular monastery. But the monasteries themselves may be ranged into one chief Math, and a number of subordinate ones. Consequently, there is the same triple division comprising chief abbots, subordinate abbots and priestly disciples. The monks do not officiate for other worshippers; but are expected to lead a life of austerity, and thus to become exemplars for all priests and lay people. There is however something like a Diksha initiation administered by the abbot to his disciple monks. Thus the chief of many monasteries stands in the place of the Guru, the subordinate abbots may be paralleled to the Purohits, and the Chelas or disciples to the Pujaris. The temple-priests do not all follow any head-man like the Gayalis; but as age always has its privileges in Brahmanist society, we may assume, the rank of a chief or senior temple-priest. And in this manner, the second triple division named before becomes applicable to the whole of the Brahmanic priesthood. And we have also the further fact of their general subordination to the Pandit or Adhyapaka eminent for his learning, piety, and educational function, and as an expositor of the Smriti. These Pandits constitute the Parishad. And their control over the Brahman Pristhood in its threefold rank serves to establish the requisite unity between Brahmanic scriptural authority and its human exponents. The greatest defect in this organization lies in the disuse of old provisions for the control and guidance of the Parishad. The system so far as I can understand it, seems also to require that the leading Pandit should die and then grow into a Rishi. But I speak under correction.

The followers of Chaitanya are a recent sect. But they also disclose the same triple division as between Gosain Kaviraj and Adhikari on one hand, and on the other between Gosain, Foujdar and Chharidar. These priests rank midway between the priests of temples and Maths on one side, and the Gurus, Purohits and Pujaris on the other. In their

denominational proclivities, the Chaitanyite priests are unlike the latter class and resemble the monks. The control of hierarchical kind as exercised between the several orders of the Chaitanyite priests is also similar to that of the abbots and monks. But the monks as originally constituted were bound to observe celibacy. The followers of Chaitanya have the option to marry or go into celibacy, and to continue in or re-enter into married life. The Tantric Gurus and the ordinary Purohits are all householders and seem to discourage celibacy. The monks have latterly followed the example of the Chaitanyites and taken to marriage in some cases. But from before this change, they made a new departure in respect of the hereditary rule of succession which is all but universal in Brahmanic caste-Government. As celebrates they have had recourse to a process of election by the contrivance of voting ; and in some cases the office of the abbot as superior over his monastery also devolves by nomination.

It is I suppose superfluous to mention that this rule of devolution of office by nomination has had in it the essential conditions of a testamentary provision, and that in this way the fact shows a great advance in Brahmanic politics. It may be similar to bequest of property in social economy, but the political device in question is markedly different, and it shows a deeper confidence in the testator's judgment and in the devisee's sense of moral responsibility to posterity. Thus it affords a curious testimony to the capabilities of human good sense to overleap the normal evolution of history. For we all know that testamentary bequests are of very recent origin in India ; whereas, the devise of succession to office through nomination however inconspicuous and confined to a certain order of Brahmanic celebrates, arose long long ago. I have not the space to dwell on the point at any length. Nor would I venture to take on myself to discuss the large and important bearings of the question. But I must point out that this devise comes up to Comte's teaching, and discloses wide divergence from another Western growth or decline, I mean

the scandalous system which has found its tutelary genius in St. Tammany, for the American or democratic rule of succession in the offices of civilian Judges and Magistrates.

The first question that I have to suggest here on the political side of Brahmanism is how did such an important new departure in Hindu rule of succession come about. The history of the subject is beyond reach of study, yet it presents an important opening for examination of how the Hindu Wills Act could be reconciled to the ideas and sentiments of the people, if not also modified with the help of Smriti. The work is important though some may consider it to be superfluous in the face of the British Indian statutory law. That law relates however to property only and not to office. The importance of the study is obvious so far as we should try to secure a wider scope for Smriti. But I shall have to revert to this point on another account.

A similar practice obtains in the relation between a Purohit and his many Yajmans. When the two parties are separated from each other by inconvenient distance between their respective residences, the Purohit appoints one or more representatives to officiate for him with his several Yajmans. They are called Naib Purohits. The parallel between the Naib to a Purohit and the successor to a Mohant lies in the departure in both cases from the hereditary principle which works in all of our other institutions. I shall have to propose later on, that the rules of appointing a successor and a Naib should be combined in the case of a Guru, so that there might always be a successor-apparent for each Guru to take his place in the event of death, and also when the need occurred to cover his defects in point of merit. The appointment of a successor-apparent would be governed by the opinion of people other than the parties immediately concerned. And if such opinion is fairly developed, the arrangement ought to lead to a gradual purification of the Guru and Gosain classes, which in many cases has become so very necessary.

The next question, to examine with reference to the Smriti is the election of Mohants or abbots by means of voting by the monks or Chelas. How does it happen that such a democratic method has got into Hindu Church-government? Another instance of voting in our oriental ways occurs so far as I know, in the settlement of accounts in those village communities which are composed of numerous coparcenors governed by the Mitakshara law. The process bears I believe, the name of Bujharat. Both of these cases of voting have to be reconciled with the rules of Smriti. I have said a great deal against the democratic methods of our Westernizers. But I should not be supposed to hold that Brahmanic Theocracy must never get out of its theological connections. I should think that a slight extension of the democratic method, as it prevails in the election of Mohants was open to be made into all our church government. It would not take the form of voting, but conform with the democratic principle of checks and counter-checks, as I shall have to recommend later on.

The hierarchical relation between the several orders of priests as referred to before, is one of most explicit kind. I am not aware that it has been traced to the Smriti. But it ought to be. Moreover, the political side of Brahmanism should here be expanded by introducing the rule of testamentary succession in offices which now obtains only with the monks. There is no reason whatever that the ordinary Gurus, or those who among the Chaitanyite sect are called the Gosains, should for ever cling to the prevailing rule of hereditary succession, especially when the practice of appointing Naib presents such an opening for progress. The Gosains and Gurus really belong to the same category, and they should all join hands with the monks (Mohants) as well in providing for succession to their offices, as in securing for themselves a hierarchical principle of church government. The Naibs of Purohits too may be given a wider scope of work.

The Gurus are not denominationalists like the Mohants and Gosains. But there is no reason why the latter should overlook the fundamental truth, that their sectarianism is not essential to Brahmanism, and that the worship of apparently different divinities arises only in the exoteric side of Brahmanism. It is the people who for their want of education and for their superstitions, favour particular and differing names and forms of one whole Great Being ; and it is this circumstance which imposes the burdens of divergent worships and apparent Polytheism upon the Brahmanic priesthood. An esoteric and an exoteric side occurs in Brahmanism as well as in all absolutist religions with the exception perhaps of Mahomedanism. But it is necessary now in Brahman politics to recognise the principle of unity which lies at bottom, with a view to bring all orders of Brahman priests into mutual harmony, and thereby to prepare the ground for a future solution of all Indian religious differences. The secrecy attached to the particular form of initiation called Diksha, enables the Guru to screen the religious divergences of their disciples. But this transparent cloak put on by the Guru in order to adapt himself to the diverse spiritual wants of different disciples proves that Brahmanist worship is really governed by the principle of unity. Let me not be misunderstood. I do not at all endorse the distinction between an Esoteric and Exoteric teaching in Brahmanism. But it should be remembered that the Universal Education upon Western principles which should furnish the remedy is as yet far from being an accomplished fact. And the difficulties in the way of extending knowledge of the literary art to lower orders of our society are not to be measured even by our miserable acquirements in the English language. In India the battle of languages has had a longer history than Macaulay ever dreamt of. For aught we know the Sanskrit language itself, like the Tantras, was a theocratic movement for the esoteric. It seems to have been artificially raised from the churning of a large number of exoteric vernaculars. In any case it was a monopoly of the

Indian theocrats. The Prakrit and the Pali have certainly died out in its time. The Urdu came as a new invention towards an universal or popular language, and a fusion of distinct nationalities. But I fear, it may not last. Its alphabet is foreign, its grammar impracticable, and its vocabulary absorbed by the Hindi. The future of the Hindi and the Bengali too cannot be free from misgivings. And it will be long before we can surmount these and the rest of our many barriers to the formation of a nation with one language, one literature, and homogeneous ideas and traditions. And Universal Popular education must wait till we are a nation at all. And hence the former advance made in Brahmanism ought to be appreciated which may have secured for it a unity, through an esoteric system working in correlation with all the then existing divergences of its exoteric branches. With the advance of our vernaculars, the screen between the esoteric and the exoteric will certainly vanish. But meantime we have to recognize the old unifying action of esoteric Brahmanism and return to the Dik'ha in order to come again at a unified Brahmanism. I once ventured to ask a Pandit whether the picture of Humanity which has been recommended by Comte according to Raphael's conception of Madonna, could not be accepted as the mental image (ध्यान) of any Tantrik divinity. I need hardly mention here, the wonderful unity which has been traced out between the images of Madonna, Isis, Yasoda, Ganes-Janani and Mâyá Devi. My pandit did not know anything about Madonna, but the description was fairly applicable to Yasoda. I asked him also whether the sacred formula of Positivism could not be used for a Tantrik Diksha. I did not of course expect any assent from him; but I was surprised to find that his answer was not in the negative.

I may also mention another fact. I had a long discussion with the late Babu Bhudeb Mukerjee as to the rival claims of Positivism and Tantricism. My late lamented friend brought forward a Tantrik text for almost every article of

faith in Positivism. And he regretted to his last as some of my Revivalist friends still do, that I should continue to adhere to my religion. I myself was a little put out because my friend would not appreciate even the historical reason for which as a Hindu also, I was bound to adhere to the Western Guru from whom I first received my light. As Bhudeb Babu was a venerable senior to me, I did not insist that it was clearly incumbent on him the first of all, to purify Tantras so as to meet our modern requirements.

But the fact remains that the Tantras deserve to be carefully examined. And I should think that they are wide enough to remove all the sectarian differences which have cropped up in India since they were made to supplement the Vedas. We were I believe, really moving in this direction when the country was upset by the intolerant propaganda of the Christian missionaries. The Brahmans were distinctly prepared for a unity in worship when they came to preach identity between the Musalman Satya-Pir and the Hindu Satya-Narayana. Besides Sufeyism, we have had Sikhism to unite the Brahmanists with the Musalmans. Chaitanya's movement had also indirectly, the same tendency. Consequently, even if the Tantras could not be depended on now by Brahmanists to lead to universal brotherhood, there can be no question that all the different orders of Hindu priests might by that means be reduced into homogeneity and put under the systematic guidance of the Smriti Pandit. It is necessary for them to resolve that their doctrine and theory should be cleared of all dispute ; and that wherever danger of a split has to be apprehended, it must be avoided by methodical recognition of the fiat of the priest's superiors.* The Smriti lawyer combines the functions of the Judge and the Advocate both ; and it is only the dangers of contentious

* For obvious reasons I shirk the question which would arise here as a necessary parallel to the doctrine of ultramontaniam in Romanist Christianity. My solution for that extreme condition of spiritual supremacy would be the Positivist one with universal education and its

advocacy, which have now to be recognized and provided against.

I am fully aware that the sacerdotal structure which I see before me lacks its key-stone;—I mean the Sovereign power, which formerly stood at the head of all our temporal matters, and was skilfully adjusted for the Brahman's spiritual control. If the sovereign had been a Hindu, and minded to reconcile with one another all these our different orders of priesthood, the question could be simplified almost in the twinkling of an eye. The large experience of the Western people is however, now at our own command, and our traditions stand really enriched by Western contact. The West-men rob our wealth. But their knowledge and skill ought to make up for us an ample return. There is no good in weeping over spilt milk because the Queen is not defender of *our* faith. We have to see by whom among us the responsibilities of our work ought to be incurred in the existing situation of our affairs. It is the Westernizers who ought best to understand our country's misfortune, and they may not blame the Revivalists for blindness in that regard. We have to make the most we can of our circumstances, and I shall presently show how all branches of the Indian patriciate both Westernizers and Revivalists, may assist in advancing the cause of Brahmanism in the immediate future.

It will be remembered that our abbots and other temple-priests have charge of valuable Hindu religious endowments, and also that the Pandits are poor but have to bear heavy pecuniary burdens as Educationists. Between these two ranks, stand the Gurus and Gosains with, their respective assistants

demonstrable basis as a scientific religion. But the time for these has not yet come in India. We ought to be concerned now entirely with turning the tide of secularism which has come upon us with Protestant absurdities. The Protestant ways of studying the Bible lead us into the cavern where we hear only an echo of Tom Paine's "my mind is my own church", and wherein every body threatens to be and that for each particular moment of his life, a law for himself, a critic for all his betters and a veritable ogre for all his inferiors.

and having direct and personal relations in the families of the lay Brahmanists. The Gurus and Gosains also act as Pandits if duly qualified. On the other hand, heavy complaints are made against Mohants and temple-priests on the score of waste of property and personal immorality. Through these complaints, our Church Temporalities, if I may so call them, have already been brought under the control of British Judicial authorities. Now, I do not like that these Church Establishments should be placed under the direct or indirect control of the Government. In every measure tending towards such control, I cannot help being reminded of the abolition of monasteries and confiscation of Church property under king Henry VIII. of England. And I may therefore be pardoned, if I have a scheme of my own to submit.

I am entirely opposed to interferences with religion. My idea however is, that the burdens of Tol education and the endowments for Hindu religion may be conveniently coupled together. I do not propose that there should be any law framed by Government requiring the Mohants and other priests to divert a portion of their income or expenditure to the support of Tols; but I should like to see Brahmanist Public Opinion developed to attain that end by means of our own internal movement. If the public can be made to feel about it, and if the disfavour recently avowed to the Mohants in charge of our Religious endowments has any meaning, all future religious endowments from any Hindu ought to provide as well for the temple-priests as for a Tol and its Pandits. And provision should also be made so that the two orders of priests might keep each other in partial check, while they co-operated with one another for general welfare in various ways. When this experiment succeeds, as it must be made to do, it would also be possible to insist on the trustees of our old religious endowments to remodel their functions in the same fashion.*

* Since writing the above I have come across a curious document. I ought to have known of it earlier though it would have taken away from the originality of the suggestion offered here. However, the confirmation

In this way the democratic device of checks and counter-checks might also be given a trial in our theocratic society, and the three important questions raised before might be slowly developed. There is the all-important question of making our Smriti the rallying point for all our priestly orders. There is the question of succession in office and that of organized Church administration, to be developed upon the models furnished by Mohants and Gosains. And there is the question of solving denominational differences in Brahmanism, if not also Mohammadanism, upon the Tantrik method. All these matters are within the purview of the Brahmanist politicians. And the financial resources of Religious endowments and the peculiar constitution of our monastic administration ought to be made available for the guidance of duly qualified Pandits. The Pandits have presumably, under a long historical process, if not also by the superior wisdom of individual Rishis, been divested of all temporal concerns. Therefore that purity of their present spiritual vocation must never be impaired, which must have cost the Brahmans in the past an infinite amount of energy. So also about the temporalities of the Mohants, it has to be borne in mind that for all that has been said recently against them, the constitution of what is called a Mohanti or the Trusteeship of a Mohant, is by no means open to many of those objections which have occurred in Europe against religious orders, church-property or even the domains of the Pope himself. Thus, union for

afforded to it by the document is at the service of the reader. The *Maha Bodhi Society* has attained a notoriety in connection with the Buddha Gaya Temple case. The Prospectus of that Society which in an earlier edition had in view the acquisition of the famous temple at Gaya from the "usurping Hindu mohants" announces as follows:—"At this sacred spot it is proposed to re-establish a monastery..... to found a college for training young men of unblemished character" and so on. I do not know how the friction is working between the Phoongys of Burma and the education Department which has been established there already by the British Government. But as our Tols and Mohants have been with us from time immemorial they may be spared the kind attentions of Ianano-Singalese politicians hailing from Chicago.

these two branches of the Brahman priesthood in the past could not but be a matter of great intricacy and extreme delicacy. It is no discredit to the Brahmans that the Mohants, who took to celibacy and life-long mendicancy, and organized a centralized government like the Buddhists, have not yet been fully controlled by the Smirit-Pandits. But the temple-priests are under their control. And the control over the Mohants and monasterices comes fully within the scope of the Brahmanic spirit, nay, the problem appears to me to be quite up to date. The work therefore fully belongs to the present generation and to those immediately succeeding us; and no excuse ought to be listened to on the score of waste of time or energy. The cheap solutions which have hitherto been laid before the public for the purification of our monasteries were necessarily unacceptable.

In addition to this necessary developement of the Brahmanic Church Government, I have to suggest a few other matters. It will be remembered that the Gurus, Gosains and chief Abbots of monasteries stand on the same grade of priestly office, though belonging to different denominations; and that the Gurus whenever duly qualified, rank and serve also as Pandits. As constituting singly or collectively the Council called the Parishad, they then give the law to all lay Brahmanists. The great drawback is that the Parishad has now become very loose as an institution, and that the Pandits do not have any chiefs or Pontiffs like the abbots (Mohants) and Gosains. As however occurs in all such cases, good sense supplies the defects of organization; and age and merit are every where great factors in practically securing leadership to some one Pandit. Some of the mendicants too, especially some of those who are unconnected with monastic establishments and church property, are very learned men, and are at times consulted by Pandits for opinion on various questions. But organization is needed in this line, no less than in Parliamentary movements, to approach our British rulers. If every temple or monastery has a Tol attached to it, the next step would be

to associate there with the Guru and his fellow-priests in order to revive and improve the Parishad's functions. Every local unit and its temples together with the attached Tols, should be able to furnish one or more Parishads of Pandits. The well-known human foible of pedantry often drives our Pandits into hopeless dissent. Consequently we must in spite of our wish be prepared for mutually dissentient Parishads. However that may be, each Parishad should also have a Chief Pandit, in the same fashion as we have a chief abbot for each group of monasteries and the respective Mohants; a chief Gosain or Kaviraj over many Adhikaries and Foujdars; and a head-Gayal over the many Gayalis attached to the several sacred spots in Gaya. And it may also be hoped unless pessimist views prevail too far, that all the Parishads so constituted, would gradually see their way to unite in electing a Chief Pontiff in the fashion prevailing with some of the Mohants. A mendicant like Bhaskarananda Swami would be helpful in any such movement from what I have heard and seen. The organization thus perfected would be competent to render unmixed spiritual aid, and in harmony with all our church temporalities such as those covered by Mohantis or monasteries, Temples and Tirthas.

As elsewhere mentioned, I think that a Naib Guru or successor-apparent is always desirable for our spiritual affairs. These Naibs would also naturally get into the Parishad in place of their principals, when the latter were not competent persons. And with the collateral aid of this little change, the office of the Chief Pontiff over all Parishads would be largely strengthened when once it was established. On the lay-men's side, the offerings to the Guru and Purohit ought also to be large enough to obviate the latter's craving to provide for his natural heirs. But the pecuniary difficulty however serious, should not call for any remark, if Hindu Revivalism of to-day has any religious meaning. The reform suggested here shows only how it can pave the way to a systematic rule of succession to office by merit

alone in every one of the disjointed sections of the Brahman priesthood.

The function of the Parishads would be to regulate the work of Tol-education and to construe the Smriti in a direct manner. And indirectly, it would tend to the appointment and supervision of qualified Naibs for all classes of priests. The rule should be for the incumbent to nominate his own Naib or successor-apparent. But the nomination should afterwards have the approbation of the Parishad. The Parishad should take cognizance of the misconduct of Gurus and Purohits, and when requisite, move for and secure the appointment of qualified Naibs, and arrange for a quiet transfer of functions from the principal to his deputy or successor. To compare great things with small, the Naib should be chosen so as to be ready to act as a king's regent does on occasions. But as a rule, the principal priest should himself obviate the need for extraneous interference, by appointing a successor-apparent, before the call for a substitute was raised at all. In their work of supervision, it would I fear, be necessary for members of the Parishad to give ear to reports against a priest from laymen. Consequently it would also be necessary to exercise a judicious caution. It is for our Westernized Indian lawyers to teach us how the principles of historical and forensic evidence have to be inculcated and adjusted with the habits of thought and speech peculiar to our countrymen. It is a very large subject, though very few would attend to it.

The Purohit according to this scheme should also have to enlarge the offices of his ministry. He must take to something like an oral exposition, not to say read sermons, to his Yajmans, along with the several ceremonial observances of his clerical office. I cannot say yet that the service as read in Sanskrit were best rendered into the vernacular languages in every case, though the Gaya Purohits are known to employ in some cases the Hindi in Sraddha ritual. We also have the Vrata Katha and Pauranik Katha in fair

operation. On certain occasions, our very women meet and speak without the help of a priest. I am referring to Lakshi-Katha. So again, the Yatras were calculated to meet similar requirements. But Bharat Chandra's obscene episode to the Annada Mangal has ruined for ever the religious value of Yatras. They have now become the property of mere playwrights, although their religious character is not quite dead. The Pauranik Katha is a very elaborate affair; and it has also its distinct importance. The Purohit's exposition however, should be brief and make a combination between the Gaya ritual and the Vrata Katha. I do not see any reason why a Purohit should not be able to command the requisite amount of literary or oratorical skill, in order to impress religious principles upon the families of his Yajmans, addressing them at their respective homes.

The Purohit's office is now less intimate in its relations with the layman than that of the Guru. The religious ministry of the former is extended practically to all the members of the Yajman's family circle, and with the proposed extension into oral exposition, it would make an approach to, if not be an improvement upon, the public worship of Christians and Musalmans. The Guru is allowed more intimate intercourse than the Purohitis with the disciples. In this way and by occasional attendance at the Purohitis' service, he should be able to exercise an adequate supervision over the Purohit's conduct and as to his ability. And when in the Parishad specially, the assembled Gurus compared notes between each other, about any particular Purohit, the collective opinion formed in consequence, ought to be sufficient to regulate the conduct of that Purohit and the rest of them. The same rule would apply to all priests of the Purohit's grade, in temples, monasteries, or under the Gosains.

As friend and guide of the layman or woman, the Guru is bound to know of their sins and sufferings, and to minister to their spiritual wants. The present custom is for the

and laywomen to consider the matter within themselves, and to pronounce what Vrata or Puja they should make, or what Katha they should listen to. I think the Guru ought to lend here his helping hand by judging, on careful enquiry, of the actual spiritual needs of any worshipper at any particular time. This would I think be a function far more onerous than to work the Parishads or oversee the temples. But the function lies quite in the line of the Guru's office and may not be shirked. The chances are that it is the laymen who might rebel against such reform. But our laywomen are far more amenable to discipline. And provided the Tols were improved, the Gurus could not I think, escape from their legitimate duties, on penalty of having to sink into the ranks of Purohits or even of Pujaris.

It would take considerable time to arrange our affairs so that the vast mass of our religious literature might be fully utilised for the proposed Purohit's vocation, namely, that of expounding religion by reading sermons to the people. In this matter, the labour of the Pandits and the work of the Gurus ought to be at once enlisted, if the patrician members of the lay Brahmanists have any life in them. On the other hand, there is a corresponding controlling power at the command of the Gurus which might also be immediately utilised.

I have already spoken of the Brahmanist penances in general, and about those needed in particular, for our erring women. The need here is as pressing as the work is one requiring the utmost tact and delicacy. I am opposed to Protestant views about the sufficiency of introspective repentance and of the finality of one's own internal judgments in regard to private morals. But where the family as the unit of social organization has to take charge of misconduct or bad morals in any of its members, the matter has to be managed with a measure of secrecy, viz., within the domestic circle. And the relation established under Brahmanism between the Guru and each family as his disciple is best calculated to attain

the golden mean between dangerous secrecy and inordinate laxity. Romanist auricular confession and the Diksha as administered by Gosains are exceptionable on the former account, as, for the latter reason, we have to reject the Protestant rules of excommunication and repentance. Within each family circle, the Guru should have to work on the different members, so as to secure at least a homogeneous standard of morality for that domestic aggregate, and also in due consonance with the standard for other families in his charge. In trying to do so, the Guru should be enabled to grant temporary absolution to sinners in private, having regard to the penances requisite for those who have to offend against the Smriti in order to reclaim any erring members of their family. And the absolution thus secured from the Guru ought to be sufficient, so long as it subsisted, in order to protect the family of the sinner against the well-known penal action of our laymen, taken in order to uphold our social morality. Our social groups, called Dal or Samaj, who impose as laymen, the penalty of excommunication on offenders against private morality, must desist when the Guru had pronounced in favour of any family. For some reason or other, which must be left to the Indian historian to investigate, the relations of the Gurus and Purohits to the Dals with which they are directly or indirectly connected are in an anomalous condition. But the principle of their relations is beyond reach of cavil or interference. The functions of the Pandits, Gurus and Purohits are spiritual; and those of the laymen forming each Dal, are purely temporal and executive.

The first class priests should, under the reforms recommended, work the Parishad; carry on the Tols; administer Diksha; admonish disciples; look to reclamation of sinners by arranging about the penances and absolutions; supervise the second class priests; pronounce censure; regulate the succession to priestly office; and maintain the subordination of the laymen in their temporal functions. The second class priests should have to conduct worship in private houses,

temples or monasterics ; to read sermons and expound religion ; and to have charge of church-property and administer the same in the interests of the public, the public worship and the financial requirements of the Parishad and Tols. The third class priests should serve as novitiates and assistants.

I have dwelt on the claims of our so-called aristocrats and democrats to work in politics. When Hindus, they go to constitute the various Dals referred above. I also look on both the aristocrats and democrats as Brahmanist members of a large patriciate which comprises even divers sections of non-Brahmanist Indian people. It is for the Hindu Patricians to slowly work out all the reforms required in Brahmanism. My only difference with my colleagues is as to the spirit with which we should carry on our labours. In traversing the Westernizing methods of the Congress party, I have to object less to their matter, than to their manner ; less to their appreciation of the West, than to their inclination to ignore or suppress the Oriental and Brahmanic lines of action which are no less time-honoured than they are of vital force. Nobody ever supposed that in Western party-Government, the new departures made at any time by a Liberal or a Conservative leader ought to be expunged or re-traced, when one or other of such men was succeeded by a leader from the opposite camp. It is therefore that I look upon the enthusiasm of our Congress party for Western methods as only a survival of that same Exclusiveness which has hitherto characterized the Brahmans, and brought down upon their devoted heads such unmerited censure. From my point of view, that exclusiveness was itself a result of circumstances. But whether it may be accounted for on rational grounds, or whether it has to be attributed to some pardonable blunder, there can be no question that our Westernizers must not forget their own Western models, nor sink unconsciously into the exploded exclusive policy of their opponents, the Brahmans. There is such a thing as superstition in the

avoiding of superstition. The rejection of Brahmanic methods by Indian Westernizers is open to this serious charge. And I should be perfectly satisfied the moment they recognized the need of a catholic behaviour in dealing with Brahmanism and Occidentalism. But should the Westernizers persist in rejecting Brahmanism in spite of these facts, they must not complain of Revivalist opposition growing more bitter than what has been evoked by the intolerance of Anglo-Indians. Human vision naturally magnifies the nearer objects as compared to those which lie at a distance. Family discords are always more keenly felt than party differences within one same polity. And a solution for international disputes is often so little missed that the ideal of human brotherhood may be found quietly ignored even by the best of men. Between the Westernizers and the Revivalists among the Brahmanists, as between the Brahmanists, Musalmans and Christians among all Indians, there are sectional differences which are but too well-known. But what I make bold to suggest is, that the responsibility of reconciliation must now logically fall to the share of whichever party between them all claimed to possess the widest reaches of mental catholicity.

It would be hard if my view of Brahman politics failed to render satisfaction on the ground that it did not show the way to political independence, or even to any political privileges to be secured from the reigning Government. On the contrary, I should think that my view of the question should be all the better appreciated because of this particular short-coming. I do not at all desire that our political independence should have to be suddenly secured and therefore also, by some violent means. And I am more particularly anxious that its advent should be slowly but carefully approached on both or either side, as between the sovereign power and its Indian subjects.

It is really unfortunate that the Government has got no

policy to be followed by its members, in order to attain that end. Some may have vague yearnings about some undefined duty on this line! Some who count for Christians, are pleased to commend even euthanasian sentiments as much on behalf of the sick man of Turkey, as to the sicker men in India! And we all know, though it is bootless to recall the fact, that many have developed the fashionable doctrine of Natural Selection into that most striking of all ethical maxims, "after me, the deluge." But a remedy for these evils is not to be found either by knocking at the door of a Sovereign who cannot, or will not, or does not listen. In any case, it must be hopeless to advance our cause by lecturing to our Rulers from the Indian platform, or screeching like helpless children within or without the reach of their hearing. If the Government officials are tainted with hopeless Imperialism or more noxious Pessimism, our own work lies, not in the way so much of wrangling with them, as in that of trying to help ourselves, without or in spite of their alien instruction. What is needed is, that the Brahmans should be enabled to do for the country peacefully by their long-established influence, and in concert with all convergent members of the community, every little thing of economic, political and legislative kind, wherein we have been by favour, left to our own resources. The Paramount Power from my point of view, is restricted to Temporal concerns; and from the British point of view, to absolute Secularity. In taking advantage of both of these views, it becomes incumbent on us to hold on to the Country and its Past, as typified in Brahmanism and the Brahmans. I yield to none in appreciating Patriotism which however is not a Brahmanic teaching. But I would depend upon our own History, and not that of England, or Europe. Indeed, there is less reason for neglecting the Brahman-Pandits, than for fearing a religious fanaticism in any of the Brahmanist communities acting without control of the Brahmans and their Scriptures. They see in the Congress a Frankenstein of their own creation; and

seem also to be losing their wits. This Westernizing prodigy whether Hindu or Musalman, is however essentially theocratic still for all its democratic pretensions. And this theocrat is also Brahmanic. The Porte and the Kaliph are for our Musalmans, only a shade less remote from India, than the Pope or the Britannic Defender of Faith. The Government however do us deplorable wrong in pretending that our religious Revival might take the turn of violence and bloodshed. But it is we who have got to guard against this great wrong.

There are religions and religions. It is not all religions which have sought their propagation by force or for purposes of commerce. The Brahman priest dates from a time anterior to Moses, if not also to the pyramids of Egypt. He had loved and worshipped the Moon * from before the waxing Crescent came to be coupled with the Scimitar. He has had his Trisula as emblem of Death and Renunciation, from before the Cross came to be recognised in Egypt or Palestine. But he has not had either the glory of rearing up Martyrs, nor the shame of waging Crusades and Jehads. If he has not known of Western Patriotism which has given us a Themistocles or a Scipio, a Richilieu or a Washington, he has done more for India, than any or all of these, through his Mendicant peregrinations from State to State on this Indian continent. With him for its guide, oriental theocratic Civilization has not it is true, risen to the heights of a Pax Romanica or a non-military United States; but it has not sunk either into the depths of Roman depravity or Mediæval disorderliness: the Lynch-Law or the Tammany Hall. Brahmanism went through a rough schooling during the Buddhist revolt; but both Sakya Sinha and Sankar-Acharya died in peace. When Brahmanism had hardly got over the Buddhist

* The moon as *dwijaraj*, is High-Priest or sovereign over the Brahmans; as residence of the *Pitris*, it is also the Brahmanic symbol or emblem of All the Dead; and as *shudhakar*, its associations with Subjective Immortality are fairly obvious.

disruption by absorbing Sunyatabad (Nihilism ?) into Maya (illusion), and announcing a comprehensive Pantheism, there came upon it, in the wake of Greek and Roman militarism, the surging hordes of Pathan and Moghal barbarism.

But still it stood its ground ; and with its much reviled policy of self-boycotting, it managed to steer the vessel of State until we come to the times of British Indian history. During the Mahomedan period we have had wonderful progress made in Smriti by the Brahmans. And we also know that as the Sikhs attempted to unite Hindus and Musalmans, even so did the observers of the Tantras, and the followers of Chaitanya. Even under British rule, we were once enabled to think as our countrymen, of the domiciled Anglo-Indians, whose angry passions were coming to tolerate Brahmanist worship and even relished our Yatras. Even under British rule, the free-trading Interlopers helped to uphold the claims of Justice and religious Neutrality in their democratic opposition to the East India Company. But at last the fire-loving missionaries from the cold North, with the traditions of Luther and Knox, have found their Way, in their proselytising fury. And what has been the result ? The Parliament rules in place of the Court of Directors. We have got Brahmoism, Theosophy and constitutional Agitation. We have got the *Pioneer* and the *Englishman* on one side, and the Cow-protection Societies on the other ! And our Government Officials are treated to an universal distrust, as fomentors of quarrel between the Hindu and the Musalman.

But Brahmanism now really quails before the consequences of two things : a non-spiritual physical Science, and a non-moral political Craft. The Scientists of Europe in their strange unconcern for morality keep glorying over their own successes, and with such things as the Suez Canal. And the politicians of the West keep wrangling over things like Ironclads, unholy alliances, and the purchase of Suez-canal Shares. By means of this same Scientific instrumentality, the map of Europe has been carried through unprecedented alterations ! And

thanks to pedantocracy and Science, all Europe now stands armed to the teeth, and breathing fire and sword, while maintaining every possible appearance of Western decorum. Alas! for Western Science ! Let Brahmanism beware of it, until Western Science accepts of some Great Being to govern Man's conduct in the lines of a Scientific Morality : and until his meditations may be fastened upon a Scientific estimate of his After-life. It is however the two events, the imperialisation of Germany and the improved oceanic communication between the East and the West, which have led to a monstrous revival of militarism and a portentuous complexity between guileful Commerce and force-loving Territorialism. And these two towering forms of human corruption now threaten to consume Brahmanism into ashes, as of old the Saracen disturbance consumed the Pagan treasures of the Alexandrian Library. And I can only suggest that my countrymen will see their way to compare the Brahmanic method of separating the Spiritual and Temporal functions in the State, with the several Western efforts in that very direction, and chief among them, the ideal scheme put forth within the last half-century by M. Comte. In any case, I hope that with an adequate comparison of this kind, people will be able to perceive that if the success of the British rule here, has to be attributed to the eminence of British character rather than to British bayonets, it has to be traced also and in fair proportion, to this other cause : viz., the virtues ingrained upon Indian habits by the skill of the Brahmanic Theocracy. I point to these facts not from purposes of meaningless and unseemly boasting, but because I believe with the Brahman, that Dharma will last as long as the Sun and the Moon ; because I believe with Comte, that Man grows more and more Religious ; and because I believe that St. Paul's visions of a universal brotherhood may not, in the honourable name of the true Christian, be blasted by the science-loving International lawyers of the West. It is for these reasons that I ask my countrymen to look to the Political side of Brahmanism. It is possible that

my cry should be lost in wilderness. It is possible that the Brahmans will share the fate of the Maories and the Red Indians. But it is not possible for human Reason or Moral discrimination to ignore, that what has been achieved by the Brahmans in the Past, ought to be followed up in the Future, by the Brahmanists of to-day, for themselves and for all Mankind.

November. 1895.



(5) 2