

of serving the superior; and if they refuse to serve, they are fatally condemned to disappear." Even Christian missionaries have come to be dominated by these new ideas of morality. Every European race cherishes the hope and the ambition of achieving the status of a world-power. In the political progress of Europe in the past the city-state, the feudal state and the national state have been recognised as stages of advance, and now the national state is giving way to the idea and conception of the national Empire. The Roman Empire and the Mediæval Empire have both failed, the former because it aimed at comprehending all civilised nations under the sovereignty of a world-empire and the latter partly because it was in some respects an impossible restoration under mediæval forms of the old Roman Empire and partly because it was unable to struggle successfully against the great principles of nationality, feudal aristocracy and religious freedom with which it successively came into conflict in the later stages of its history, and moreover it had to fight a deadly fight with the papacy which irretrievably weakened it and destroyed all its vigour and vitality. The ideal of a National Empire is still new. No serious danger has yet threatened it. What the future of this new form of the state may be no one can venture to prophesy at present. But its advance and prosperity continue unabated, and every European community is ceaselessly and sleeplessly at work to advance the interests and enlarge the dimensions of its own national empire, while at the same time endeavouring to avoid all

entangling conflicts with the imperial and national interests of other European communities.

Such are the tendencies and sentiments working at the present day among the great communities in the West which are now striving for masterful existence in the world. It is natural, therefore, that one result of the introduction of Western education and Western knowledge into India must be to bring into existence a number of active men bent on patriotic improvement and capable of founding an organisation for the redress of existing evils. Now is the time to rouse ourselves and make a determined and united effort to make up for lost time. As a people we have failed to resist the impetuous onward rush eastward of men bent on aggression and exploitation of various kinds. We have too long slumbered and slept until the ancient civilisation of India has become strangely transformed. Now at last the heart and life-centre of national existence is threatened, if not already enfeebled beyond hope of repair and recovery. British over-rule with its all-shadowing peace, its broad tolerance of creeds, its mighty efficiency for controlling the passions of fanatics and sectaries, and its inherent love of expanding freedom offers India the best chance of reform and recovery, if only we have leaders who know the right and the opportune and can both win a following and gain the confidence of the masses of the people. The question for consideration is, what are to be the lines of activity proper to be pursued by those of us who have the heart to feel for the indolence,

lifelessness, and degradation into which the people of India are sinking. By what means can we enlist the sympathies of those who rule the destinies of men so as to induce them to help forward the cause of Indian revival and progress?

There are two alternative courses open to us. One is to take up the ideas and aims of European civilisation and try to work them up as best we can into the framework, the marrow, and bone, of our own civilisation; the other is to study our own civilisation and its place in the order of the world in the light of past experience and to base our collective life and new organisation on the results afforded by an intelligent comprehension of the capabilities of the national genius. As matters stand, both these phases of opinion are represented among those who form the most active and vocal section of the Indian educated community. Men are hopelessly divided and organising themselves on distinct and irreconcilable party lines. Bombay has taken the lead in organising what may be called the party of the West, and Bengal—which is the stronghold of the spirit of conservatism—has founded what may be called the party of the East which, though yet in its infancy, has already gained some memorable triumphs for the cause of the ancient mother-land, triumphs which are indicative of the undying, though dormant, vitality of our race, if only, we know where lies the fountain head of the nation's energy and inspiration. As the late Mr. Ranade stood forward as the representative

man and leader of the party of reform on Western lines, so Sri Ramakrishna Paramahansa and Sri Swami Vivekananda are the representative men and leaders of the party of the East with its shibboleth of spiritual revival. We in Madras have yet produced no man endowed with the gift of leadership. That is indeed to be accounted a fortunate circumstance for us, inasmuch as leaders have always the tendency to take a road of their own and to cause a split in the already divided camp. Moreover, as the alternative has been already clearly placed before us by Bombay and Bengal, we have no need for a third course and no possibility or chance of having one offered to us. Which shall we choose as the inspiring centre of the new movement in India? Under which banner shall we enlist and organise such energies and forces as we still possess? But let us know clearly what are the alternative courses just spoken of. They are the ever-old, ever-new, alternatives placed before men in all the great crises of history. *Shall we adopt a revolutionary ideal, or shall we fulfil the past and further develop the national aim and ideal which has so long fascinated men's minds in India?*

Put in this form, we can have no difficulty in making our choice. Revolution is no new remedy for the evils and miseries of humanity in India, nor even, as we shall show presently, the idea of national revival and reform. Buddhism rose among us not so much as a revolution, but as a rebellion against some aspects of ancient Indian thought and society. Soon, however, a spirit of destructive radicalism



tended to develop itself, and it sought to overthrow the very foundations of the national life, to set at naught the motive power which man needs to support and console him in his onward march through this tangled skein of life, and to make man's lot on earth a passionless perfection by ignoring all natural inequalities of endowment and endeavour. What was the result? Let us hear the greatest modern authority on the subject, Swami Vivekananda. He speaks of the Buddha and his ideals as follows:—"No blame attaches to the Lord. He is pure and glorious, but unfortunately such high ideals could not be well assimilated by the different uncivilised and uncultured races of mankind who flocked within the fold of the Aryans. These races, with varieties of superstition and hideous worship, rushed within the fold of the Aryan and for a time appeared as if they had become civilised, but before a century had passed, they brought out their snakes, their ghosts and all the other things their ancestors used to worship, and thus the whole of India became one degraded mass of superstition." And again:—"I have neither the time nor the inclination to describe the hideousness that came in the wake of Buddhism. The most hideous ceremonies, the most horrible, the most obscene books that human hands ever wrote, or the human brain ever conceived, the most bestial forms that ever passed under the name of religion have all been the creation of degraded Buddhism." When now-a-days men—especially Europeans—speak of Buddhism they refer only to the Buddha's preaching of mercy to animals, to his ethi-

cal precepts, and to his and his followers' philosophical discussions. But in place of our old simple daily Panchayajnas and the occasional big sacrifices and in place of the simple forms of divine worship such as *dhyana*, *yoga*, and *bhakti*, the Buddhists substituted gorgeous processions, gorgeous ceremonies, gorgeous monasteries, gorgeous temples, and the most endless discussions, often of a most absurd and baseless character. We, Hindus, also discuss a good deal, but the Veda and the Vedanta, with their boundless and unquestioned authority, set limits to the nature and extent of our argumentation. Moreover, our controversial literature is the product of ages of polemical warfare with the Buddhistic philosophers. Jainism has had a history more or less alike and so we see what evils have been wrought in India by the method of rebellion against the regular course and the chosen ideals of the national life. So long as the national life was left undisturbed to pursue the even tenor of its course, we had an uninterrupted career of prosperity in every department of national activity, and India truly shone as the light of the East,—the home of wisdom and the source of inspiration to the nations of the world. But the Buddhistic rebellion—and to a less extent, perhaps, the Jain heresy—gave a twist to the course of national life, and for ages we were involved in a tremendous spiritual warfare with these forces of disturbance. Then came the impulse to reconstruction and revival with the appearance of Sri Sankaracharya. But before it could bear fruit the Mohammedans broke into the land with their tremen-

*military enthusiasm and power. Everywhere the Hindus fell before the fighting hordes of Islam. Their warfare of centuries with Buddhism had left the Hindus a debilitated and disintegrated mass. Incapable of cohesion, the Hindu States resisted the Moslem invaders one after another and fell separately. Moslem rule was established on a firm basis in the North of India, but its hold on the Deccan and the Southern peninsula was never strong. Still for nearly five centuries Moslem predominance flourished without check. The Mussalman power had by that time lost all its vitality and cohesion. Centuries of unbridled indulgence in luxury, lust, bigotry, and extravagance had done their work. Simultaneously with the disorganisation and decline of the Moslem power, the people of India obtained a renewal of vitality. The rise and fall of the great Vijayanagara Empire of South India had also fore-shadowed the coming Hindu revival and borne witness to the undying vitality of the ancient Aryan civilisation. Even under Mohammedan rule, the civil and even the military administration and the foreign relations of the various Mussalman states had passed gradually into the hands of the Hindus. The Mohammedan rulers were a good deal under the influence of Hindu wives or Hindu converts. Several Hindu families had also risen to power in various local centres. Hindu writers, too, had long ere this begun to indulge in dreams and prophecies of coming deliverance. A great leader soon rose. Sivaji re-founded the Hindu power in the empire of Maharashtra. His pluck, daring, self-denial, resource, and commanding*

power were duly rewarded with the success they deserved. But the great Hindu revival required time for its consolidation. An interval of probation and even of reaction in interval, too, of perfect freedom from all intrusive foreign influences, was needed before the consolidation of the reviving Hindu supremacy could attain to maturity and efficiency. This was not to be, and the movement of Hindu revival proved an abortion. For, meanwhile the octopus of European commercialism advanced eastward with giant strides and caught India within its all-grasping folds. The relentlessness of the commercial spirit is always active in man, and it also always seeks to take a leap forward by allying itself with militarism. But the unholy alliance of greed and force has always proved a failure in the history of humanity. The proclamation of 1858 restored the reign of human and humane sentiment in India, and the second great attempt to settle the fate of India by revolutionary methods failed. As, in mediæval times, the unholy alliance of fanaticism and force failed to revolutionise Indian society so at the commencement of the modern epoch the alliance of commercialism with force failed too. And thus our brief review of the past history of India for twenty-five centuries has taught us the great lesson that neither the process of internal schism, nor the advent of revolutionary influences from abroad, can restore India to her rightful place in the history of the progress of humanity.

That lesson, however, is more easily enunciated in words than accepted or enforced in practice. The spirit of rebellion is always with us. Revolutionary tendencies are apt to revive with the advent of every new influence from abroad. At present there are several foreign influences at work in Hindu society. The most important are those of Dogmatic Christianity, of Utility as the basis and test of virtue, and the socialistic dogma of the natural equality of all men in every respect. Dogmatic Christianity claims to uphold the existence of God and the future life. But in practice it is the most worldly of all influences, as every one knows that conversions to Christianity are mostly due to sinister motives of diverse kinds and very rarely to rational conviction or honest faith. As regards the two other influences, they are avowedly based upon materialism as they discard altogether the belief in the existence of a spiritual world or of a spiritual life. That all these diverse influences are acting on the minds of men is due to the modern system of high and university education. That system was devised with the practical aim of introducing European knowledge into India and of raising the political condition of India by improving the efficiency of the British system of government and associating the natives of India with the working of that system. But it has, by leavening the minds of educated men with European ideals, also brought into existence a movement whose object is to destroy the traditional social organisation and the dominant ideals of life in India.

We wish first to refer to the organisation known as the National Congress. That institution is an assembly of the educated non-official classes of the land who are banded together with the view of accomplishing a number of improvements in the existing system and machinery of government. Though it calls itself *national*, its methods are not truly such. Our study of the progress of national movements in European countries shows that they have invariably been initiated for the overthrow of foreign supremacy and the substitution in its place of an independent government controlled and officered by the native inhabitants of those countries. The Indian National Congress has no such aim. Lord Lansdowne, when Viceroy of India, acknowledged in handsome terms that it was a perfectly loyal and constitutional movement and the legitimate outcome of the educational and administrative policy of the British Government. A political revolution has no place among the aims of the Congress party in India. Some of its leaders are Englishmen who have held high office in India. The idea that these men are aiming at the dismemberment of the British Empire is one which can only occur to idiots and deserves no notice whatever. The only object of Indian Congressmen and their English allies is to make what they consider a necessary reformation in the existing methods and machinery of Government,—a change in accordance with the spirit of the times and one calculated to arrest the growing material and moral decadence of the Indian people and to secure for them a future of progressive

advance under British supremacy. So great a man and so loyal a citizen as the late Sir T. Muthuswami Aiyar—a man too, of eminently conservative instincts—once publicly stated his opinion that the goal of Indian statesmanship and of Indian progress must be the acquisition of a colonial constitution for British India. That shows that there is nothing revolutionary or absurd in the idea of Congressmen that India should not be allowed to remain for all time a mere dependency. India with her long and noble past, ought to be enabled to play a worthier part as a member of the British Empire,—a part not inferior to that now allotted to the British colonies. The British Empire is a vast and powerful organism, and British India must be made worthy of its place side by side with the other communities within its pale. To perpetuate the existing weakness and inferiority of her political status would not only be unworthy of her past glory and of the British traditions of freedom, but a source of danger to the best interests of the British Empire itself, just as a diseased member would be to the human frame. Our Congressmen, therefore, claim that theirs is a constitutional agitation for effecting the political reforms now needed and ensuring to India a future of honourable existence within the British Empire.

Mr. Theodore Morrison, of Aligarh, begins his recent work on "Imperial Rule in India" with the following noteworthy declaration:—"In the back ground of every Englishman's mind is probably to be found the conviction

that it is our duty to govern India that she may one day be able to govern herself, and as an autonomous unit take her place in the great Confederation of the British Empire. This is the ultimate justification of our Asiatic dominion, and a statesman who ventured to advocate the alternative policy that India should be kept in a state of perpetual vassalage, as the milch cow of England, would be hooted from public life." And again:—"Once convinced of the ultimate objective of their policy, I maintain that it is the duty of the English people in whose hands lie the destinies of India, to examine from time to time the general tendency of their administrative measures, and to consider whether the policy which their agents in the East are pursuing, is preparing the way for the eventual emancipation of India. The test of a truly liberal policy should be that it tends eventually and in the long run to put the people in a position to manage their own affairs." As we are assured that these "sentiments" and "convictions" form part of "every Englishman's mind," though still lying only "in the background" of that mind, there is no need to discuss the propriety of their forming part of the political creed of an educated British Indian citizen. The only question for consideration is whether the proposals of the Indian reform party are suited to the end in view. Says Mr. Morrison:—"The Congress is deeply pledged to the introduction of representative institutions in India." Mr. Morrison holds that India is not and can never be fit for representative Government, for the reason that the



differences of creed and race are too many to justify us in holding that the several communities would work harmoniously together in carrying on such a form of Government. He says of the inhabitants of India :— “ They would not consent for long to subordinate their racial and religious jealousies to the common good ; they might, under great provocation form a great opposition ; they never could frame an administration.” If this is true, how does Mr. Morrison hope to achieve what he calls “ the ultimate objective ” of British policy, viz., to enable India “ to take her place as an autonomous unit in the great Confederation of the British Empire,” “ to put the people in a position to manage their own affairs.” Moreover, already have representative institutions been brought into existence as a part of the machinery needed for the management of local and provincial business, though at present these institutions occupy a very insignificant position and are far from being properly and efficiently worked by those for whom they are intended. Perhaps to a European mind it might well appear that differences of caste and creed are bound to prevent the efficient working of these new institutions as well as the further enlargement of their powers and the more effective popularisation of their existing basis. But we in India know well that those differences are not inconsistent with the tolerance and love of fair play which must exist wherever men begin to perceive the existence of common interests. A great deal of progress has also already been made in these direc-

tions during the last quarter of a century, and there is no reason why that progress should not continue. When Mr. Morrison says of the people of India that "they could never frame an administration," he is thinking of the social and religious differences now existing among Parsis, Sikhs, Christians, Mohammedans, Buddhists and Hindus, and of the internal racial or sectarian differences within each of these communities. These differences need not be a bar to common action in matters of common political interest, as such differences exist also in European countries and even in the British Isles. But at present we need not consider the question of the framing of an administration, and the reason for Mr. Morrison's attempt to raise it just now is not clear. The demand for popular representation in India is at present made not with a view to overthrow British supremacy, or prevent the admission of Englishmen to responsible office in this country, but to ensure an equality of opportunity for both the British and Indian subjects of His Majesty and to ensure the industrial progress of India in the future. The idea of "framing an administration" consisting entirely of natives of India has never entered into the mind of even the most patriotic and perfervid of Congress orators. Moreover, we are here at present concerned about a different matter. We firmly believe that there is nothing inherently absurd in the suggestion that, in spite of wide and even infinite divergences of caste and creed, the Indian people can unite and co-operate with Englishmen in a common effort to advance the well-being of their common country

under British rule. To adduce instances of religious or caste riots and disputes in India is altogether besides the point, as similar phenomena have recently occurred and are still occurring within the British Isles and other parts of the civilised Western world without interfering to check the political and industrial progress of those countries. What the so-called national party in India have in view is really not to form a national state independent of the British Empire but to secure political and industrial progress in India on modern lines so that she may be worthy of her place within the British Empire and not degenerate as she is doing at present until she becomes a danger to that Empire. Ancient Rome abandoned her provincial dominion in Britain under circumstances well-known to all. Our modern ears, too, are not quite unaccustomed to hear the cries of the "Perish India" party in the British Parliament and on British platforms. India's political ambitions do not and cannot extend to anything beyond the preventing of the present fearful degeneracy, intellectual, industrial, and political. The word *national* has been unnecessarily affixed to the political movement in India and has proved the proverbial red rag in quarters easily susceptible to the influence of imagination and sensitive to the demands of racial sentiment. A truly *national* sentiment is impossible in a land situated like India and among a people imbued with the traditions of Vedic culture and enlightenment. Hindu civilisation is certainly not an exclusively passive civilisation. But its

strength lies in its passivity while no *truly national* community can safely afford to take its stand on the exercise of the passive virtues. Western communities are discovering to their cost that the rise and progress of national sentiment means a state of ever-watchful and aggressive militancy, and they are trying, therefore, to bring into existence new institutions like the Hague Arbitration Court and the Continental Concert for the purpose of restraining the excesses and evils inseparably associated with the formation of nationalities. Moreover the sentiment of nationality is giving way to the conception and sentiment of Imperialism. The big empires of to-day comprise many different races and communities within their vast areas. The necessity of mutual forbearance and conciliation among men of these different races and nationalities is gradually paving the way for the substitution of *Imperial* for *national* sentiment as the cementing force in modern politics. At such a time, therefore, the strength of passivity is not certainly to be despised among the great social forces working for human welfare, and this consideration alone ought to enable Indian political leaders to realise that India's present and future fate is not necessarily bound up with the idea of a National State. The only question of practical politics in India is to ensure a healthy and progressive political organisation which will prevent the present intellectual and economic degeneracy of the Indian people and ensure their efficiency and importance as a member of the big and ever-expanding organism known as the British Empire

It is worthy of consideration whether it is necessary for the attainment of this object that India should first be deprived of the ideals of life and the social organisation which have become inseparably associated with her name and have survived the revolutions of ages. There are those who maintain that, under the changed conditions of the present day, India can only live to any purpose if she will accept the social ideals and organisation of the ruling race. If we want to reform the existing machinery and methods of Indian Government in consonance with Western ideas, it is, they say, necessary also to adopt—with suitable modifications—the social life and ideals of the West. It is this view of existing requirements in India that has led to the formation of a party of reform banded together to revolutionise the social ideals and institutions of India and to replace the Indian civilisation by the civilisation of the West. But, first, the avowed object of even Congress politicians is, as already stated, not to found a nation or national empire in India, but to make India a worthy member of the British Empire. To achieve this limited aim, it is not necessary to destroy our social organisation and replace it by a bran-new one imported from the West. The Hindu social organisation is the product and survival of the storm and stress of past circumstance and so must be something specially suited to the character and genius of our people and our place in the order of the world. Apart from the feasibility of the proposal to remove from the surface of the earth an institution which has its roots in a dim

and remote antiquity and which has lived and prospered by changing in response to the changes and revolutions of successive epochs of history in the course of 40 or 50 centuries of social life, we have to consider what is its essential aim and purpose, whether it has filled a place in the onward march of our history, and whether it is proving or must necessarily prove a bar to social or political unity. Certain foreigners first introduced into this country the idea that caste is the author of all evils, and they did so for their own purposes, not for ours. But, if we calmly consider the true state of the facts, the institution of caste has a peculiar significance in India; and it is altogether misunderstood by foreigners as well as by those who have come under the influence of foreign culture. Caste in India is the result of man's obedience to irresistible hereditary impulses generated and developed in the course of countless epochs of past history. It is as little the work of executive or legislative action on the part of the Indian rulers of the past as the modern social institutions of the West. Caste is the Indian equivalent for the conventions of Western civilisation, and neither can bear transplantation. Those European writers have spoken truly, who have spoken of the eternal diversity of spirit between the East and the West, between Europe and Asia. An English writer has remarked that "material civilisation is a thing not of conscious contrivance and deliberate legislation, but an impulse due to national history and national character." This is true of the East quite as much as of the West. As

it is true of the complex conventionalities of European civilisation, it is also true of the institution of caste which in India takes the place of the artificialities and fashions of European society. Caste, too, like the conventions of European civilisation, changes with the course of time, but it cannot be destroyed without destroying the essential basis of Indian society as moulded by long-standing hereditary impulses. Indian caste is sure to adjust itself, as it is already doing, in response to our new conditions, and all revolutionary attempts to destroy it are bound to fail, as they have already failed among those who have become converts to Buddhism in ancient India and to Christianity in modern India. The progress which Roman Catholic Christianity has made in India as compared with its Protestant rival is due to its accommodating policy in regard to the Indian institution of caste. Moreover, it is caste that has helped India to maintain her ancient religious faith—that marvellous doctrine of the Atman of which the world stands so much in need to-day and which has just received fresh illustration from the marvellous results of the scientific labours of the great and world-renowned Hindu scientist,—Professor Jagadisa Chunder Bose. Originating in the natural differences of tendency and temperament among men, the Indian institution of caste has utilised the tie of mutual helpfulness in the home and in each natural division of society to bind men together in a common love of institutions and sustained the vitality and historical continuity of the Hindu races during

several thousands of years. Social homogeneity can be best preserved when cherished systems of faith and usage are entrusted to small groups than when left to be moulded by the resultant of numerous forces playing on a large community composed of heterogeneous and even hostile elements having no fixity of aim and no common basis of action. Were it not for caste, the noble religion of the Veda and the Vedanta with its belief in "the omnipenetrativeness of God and the solidarity of man" and its insistence on the wholesome doctrine of the harmony of religions and its declared opposition to aggressive and militant religious propagandism would long ago have been destroyed by the active and unscrupulous militancy of the propagandistic religions of Europe and Asia. The marvellous staying power of the Hindus during all the ages that are past while race after race and religion after religion have risen and disappeared in other parts of the world is due to the help which our races and faiths have, as above stated, derived from caste, which, in its primeval form at least, has its sanction in the ordinances of the ancient teachers of India and certainly appears to be an expression of the universally-existing variations of natural character and endowment among men—with this difference, however, that in India the value of the law of heredity was also recognised, though not to the exclusion of the principle of association in all cases of established individual worth. Nor is caste in India a necessary bar to social or political unity. Just as a country in which caste does not exist



need not necessarily be politically great, so a country in which society recognises caste differences need not necessarily be reduced to a position of political impotence and subordination. Empires and nationalities have fallen in Europe and Asia even among casteless communities and peoples. Also, in spite of the existence of caste, the mediaeval feudal nationalities of Germany, France and Spain were founded. In India itself, not only the great empires of antiquity, but also the Vijayanagar and Mahratta Empires were founded and maintained in spite of caste. The absence of caste has not prevented the downfall of Burmah and the decline of Siam or China. The truth is, caste may exist, and has existed, without producing alienation of feeling among men ; and in fact, it has long promoted social unity and mutual helpfulness among Hindus. It has also always proved a bond of strength and cohesion against aggressive systems of faith and society. It has not proved a bar to the growth of hereditary intelligence, character, affluence, social position, mental culture, and the purity and chastity of individual life in any of the different sections of Hindu society ; and hence there has ordinarily existed no feeling of antipathy between men of various sub-sections or divisions in the Indian community. Non-Brahmins have produced masterpieces of thought and style and have proved benefactors of mankind as statesmen, as merchants, as generals, as teachers, as ruling chiefs. The existence of caste is not inseparably bound up with the feeling of race-exclusiveness or race-hatred among men and

need not be a bar to social and political unity. The movement for political progress in India—for such national progress as is consistent with the maintenance of the unity and the integrity of the British Empire—for such national progress as is needed for the fulfilment by India of its destiny as an efficient and strength-giving member of that great and world-wide organisation—may and will go on without a previous revolution being effected in the fundamental basis of our social organisation.

Nor is there any need to overthrow the traditional spiritual ideals of Viveka and Vairagya in order to achieve the end we have in view of arresting the present decline of the Indian people in industrial welfare, social union, and national and individual self-respect. This decline is the accumulated result of the combined action of misfortune and self-forgetfulness. The fatalistic poison of individualism and indolence has worked to stultify the vigour of our ancient social organism, but so far without destroying its life-centre. What is wanted to evoke the dormant power is to uproot the poison and restore the pristine purity and health of the ancient self-conscious manhood and spirituality of India. Alone among our modern teachers did Sri Swami Vivekananda come forward to declare that we too have something to teach to the Western world and that we can realise our national inheritance and again become great and useful to our race as we were in antiquity. He declared as follows in language equally wise and fearless:—"Are we to take always, to sit at the feet of the Westerns to learn everything,

even religion? We can learn machines from them. We can learn many other things. But we have to teach them something, and that is our religion, that is our spirituality." And he added:—"The world is waiting for that treasure; little do you know how much of hunger and thirst there is outside of India for these wonderful treasures of our forefathers."

Nothing can better prove the extent of the degradation into which we have fallen in recent times than two great and conspicuous features of modern Indian society. There is a section of modern educated Hindus which loudly asserts that we have no religion or spirituality in India, that mischievous or misguided men are utilising these words for various purposes of their own, and that it is impossible for any one to point to anything present and practicable as conveying to thinking minds a definite idea of this much vaunted spirituality. As a reply to this class of men, it is necessary to offer some explanations. In the *first* place, when we speak of Indian spirituality, we are not to be understood as implying that Western people have no spirituality at all. We do not, in the *second* place, mean that those who have spirituality can, or must, give up bread-winning activities of every kind. *Lastly*, we do not mean to assert that in the India of to-day the spiritual life exist universally in its ideal form, as it did of old. Now, what does the Vedantin mean by spiritual life? The answer is, that which leads to the knowledge of God,—in one word Tyaga or Renunciation. But what is the aspirant after spiritual

life to renounce? He must renounce all personal and selfish desires and aversions, and must work for work's sake. This however, is not all. That is but the *negative* aspect of the spiritual life, the commencement of the life of the spirit, still a commencement which will lead us far indeed. But true knowledge of God and complete freedom from bondage to material longings is only to be attained by *sraddha*, *bhakti*, *dhyana*, and *yoga*. These processes form the positive aspect of the spiritual life. Says the *Kaivalya-upanishad* :—"Do thou know it by *sraddha*, *bhakti*, *dhyana*, and *yoga*; not by work, not by progeny, nor by wealth, but by renunciation, the great Ones attained immortality." *Sraddha* is the firm faith that God exists, that what the Scriptures teach concerning Him is the truth and nothing but the truth, and that he can be reached by us. *Bhakti* is complete self-surrender to the Lord and the Guru. *Yoga* and *dhyana* mean the unbroken continuity of devout meditation on the Lord, his qualities and glories, so as gradually to attain to a knowledge of the unmanifested Atman, whether it be here on earth, or at least after going to Brahma-loka. This life of *yoga*, *dhyana*, and *bhakti* is what we really mean by spirituality, at least in the higher sense of the word. Mere philanthropy is at best but the negative aspect of the spiritual life. It may not be even that, for it may have nothing to do with belief in God. Many atheists have been known to be philanthropic, and philanthropy may often be dictated by national and secular considerations. When the Vedantin

speaks of *Nishkamya-Karma*—work done without love of fruit—he knows that it means something very nearly approaching to philanthropy, but he does not by any means refer to acts, however benevolent, which are dictated by secular and national considerations, but only to such as are performed on the ground that they are prescribed as duty by the authority of the word of God,—by the Veda. The spirituality of Western societies consists in philanthropy or “social scavenging,” as Swami Vivekananda has described it. In India, too, much importance has been, and is still, attached to *Paropakara* or philanthropy. India is, *par excellence*, the land of charity. We have relieved, and do still relieve, more human suffering—especially the pains of hunger—than any other people in the world. We do it all not out of secular motives, but as a duty prescribed in the Sastras, for then only does it truly become *Nishkamya-Karma*. The higher—or positive—aspect of the spiritual life is the life of devout meditation and love to God which we have spoken of above, and it is by no means to be regarded as a thing easy of accomplishment. The late Mr. Gladstone once wrote as follows :—“The work of divine worship, so far from being a thing of course even among those who outwardly address themselves to its performance, is one of the most arduous which the human spirit can possibly set about.” He also spoke at the same time of “the travail of the spirit in devotion.” Here we have a glimmering of what we in India mean by the higher spiritual life which leads to true liberation from all wordly bond-

age and to the knowledge of God which is bliss and peace. The meditations and worships which form a prominent feature of the daily life of the orthodox Hindu and which are practised even by many highly-educated Hindus at the present day are all meant to promote the advancement of truly spiritual life, of the Vedantic ideal of Viveka and Vairagya. Of course we have simultaneously to carry on our worldly activities. But that is because the vast majority of men are not highly advanced in the spiritual life. Sri Krishna says in Chap. VII of the Gita:—"Among the thousands of mankind, only one perchance strives for perfection, and even of those who strive for and obtain it only some one knows Me in truth." And again:—"At the end of many births, the wise man comes to Me saying 'Vasudeva is the All; he is a Mahatma, very hard to find.' The Hindu system of spiritual life is the means devised to produce such Mahatmas and is no sham, but a reality of the hardest kind. That Hindu system is still alive in India, though the fire has burnt feebly for some two thousand years or even more. We do not require any inspiration or instruction from foreigners—men or women—to regain the primeval purity and perfection of our national ideal of spirituality, and all who resort to such people are doubtless degrading themselves and the entire Hindu community. We are the teachers of the world in the department of spiritual life, and we shall only fall into bottomless perdition if now we carry our folly and apathy so far as to allow ourselves to be persuaded that even here we are reverently

to sit at the feet of foreigners and be thankful that we have the privilege of being taught by them that which they know nothing about. Let us all remember Swami Vivekananda's forceful declaration :—" Are we to take always, to sit at the feet of Westerns to learn everything, even religion ? " And moreover, this is just the time when the world needs those ideas of " the omni-penetrativeness of god and solidarity of man " and those practical processes of spiritual culture and realisation of which India alone possesses the secret. For, in the present political evolution of our race, big empires have evolved into being. Each of these big empires comprises men of the most varied racial connections and traditions. Each of them is so powerful that a conflict between them must necessarily prove a gigantic source of evil and suffering to humanity. It is just at this time that India has to carry to humanity the divine message of her sages and hold aloft the banner of spiritual perfection as the goal of human existence so that the world may realise the blessings of universal harmony and peace at no distant date.

But in order to ensure our future as the destined teachers of humanity in the historical developments of the present and the future, we must first endeavour, as already stated, to stop our present intellectual and economic inefficiency. No one can blame the British, Hindu, and other leaders of Congress in India for recognising the necessities of the existing situation here. The only question for consideration is, what are to be the methods to be adopted for

securing political improvement in India? We have said enough to show that we have no sympathy with those who hold that if India—and especially the Hindu community—is to advance in power, we must begin by shattering our existing social organism and reconstruct it on approved principles of social architecture borrowed from the West. We shall now first deal very briefly with that section of Indian opinion which is represented by the Congress party with its annual meetings, resolutions and reports. For seventeen years they have gone on meeting, speaking, passing resolutions, and making all sorts of demands on all sorts of subjects. They may go on doing the same thing for another period of 17 years, or for a century more. But they must remember that speeches and resolutions do not form social forces. It is the power of faith that can touch human hearts, and faith comes only to those who undergo great sacrifices and sufferings in what they conceive to be a great aim of human life and endeavour. The Congress politicians and speakers have assuredly made no such great sacrifices or undergone such sufferings as to touch human hearts in India with the power of faith or to communicate that magic power to human hearts elsewhere. The British electors alone have it in their power to determine the constitution of the British Indian Government and have to be won over before any change can be accomplished in the existing administrative and legislative machinery. The history of India shows that almost every political reform in India has in the past come to us as a



voluntary gift of the British people and as the result of their own advance in liberal opinion and in love of fair play. Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt has ably pointed out the great lesson of the history of the past century or more of British rule in India. He writes:—"Throughout this century the rulers of India, whether under the East India Company or under the Crown, have drawn their inspiration from England, and the great movements which mark the history of modern England have left their impress on the history of modern India" (Dutt's *England and India*, p. 3). It must also be acknowledged that the British rulers of India have not been altogether wanting in the appreciation of the qualities and traditions of our people here. But, in the main, the fact is unquestionable that "the rulers of India have drawn their inspiration from England" and that the movements of public opinion in England have almost altogether inspired the history of progress in India. In the future, too, this must be the case, and the British electors alone have it in their power to speed the progress of reform in India. Till 1885, there had been no political agitation in India worth the name. Whatever rights of citizenship are in our possession have come to us either as the result of the British perception and appreciation of the character and needs of the Indian people or as a free and generous gift of the British electors and their representatives here. The time has come when we can no longer expect free gifts from the British electors. They can no longer afford to continue their old policy of antici-

pating the growth of circumstance, and moreover the progress of modern invention and knowledge and means of communication have enabled them to administer and hold India so as it may be free from all sudden and unforeseen contingencies and dangers. So, there is only one resource at the disposal of the representatives and leaders of Indian progress. That is the establishment, anyhow, of an assured claim on the British electors and people for the acquisition of a higher freedom than we now have. The fact that representatives of the Indian people share at times—and sometimes even without official requisition or solicitation—the burdens and obligations of empire both in India and beyond its bounds certainly constitutes such a claim. But the greater growth of wealth, of national vigour, of working capacity, of industrial efficiency, of commercial reliability and of impressive instances of individual self-sacrifice for public and patriotic or imperial purposes is also wanted. More than all, we must be able to give something tangible to the British people so as to evoke gratitude in them and to secure from them *as a return* the blessing of a higher freedom. Have we no such gift to make to the British people? If we do have it in our power to make such a gift and if we make the effort needed to bring it home to the minds and hearts of our rulers, then we shall make easy our path to the goal of political emancipation. If we have nothing to give and all to receive, we shall never command respect, and perhaps we shall get precious little indeed. The Congress party, while claiming to be the most important of

the forces working for political advancement in India, has to confess that it has nothing to give to the English people and is content to ask for various favours. Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea, the President of the Congress Session which has just closed, begged the Viceroy to commemorate the Delhi Coronation Durbar by the grant to the Indian people of "some boon which might remind them and their children of the occasion and of the principal actors therein." Certainly it must be confessed that the policy and wisdom of pursuing such a course is questionable in the extreme. Moreover, there is a lamentable want of dignity on the part of Congress in taking up the role of a beggar asking for alms. Political privilege cannot fittingly be bestowed as alms, but must be earned and claimed as the legitimate due of civic merit in the subject. There is no other means to the goal which Indian Congressmen have in view of securing a share in the work of guiding the state machinery without being passively content to receive the protection to which state machinery is largely intended as the means. In a country like India and with our past history making for loyalty to the rulers for the time being, irrespective of race or creed, there are but two methods available to us for the acquisition of a higher freedom, and they are, first, to render them honest and loyal service whenever opportunities offer, and, secondly, to give them freely of our rich inheritance of spirituality—"the most sublime philosophy and the most satisfying religion" of the Vedanta. Swami

Vivekananda said truly that India's mission in the world is "to conserve, to preserve, to accumulate, as it were into a dynamo, all the spiritual energy of the race, and pour forth that concentrated energy in a deluge on the world whenever circumstances are propitious." The gift of the Atman—"the One only without a second," the "*Ekam sat vipra bahudha vadanti*"—is ours by right and by choice,—by the right of heredity and by the choice of a true discrimination of what is eternal from what is ephemeral. Of this great and central truth of our religion, it can be truly said in the weighty words of the greatest teacher of this age—Swami Vivekananda :—"It is not only in our books, but it runs through every phase of our national literature, and it is in the national life. Here and here alone it is practised every day, and any man whose eyes are open can see that it is practised here and here alone."

And the Western world, too, needs the inspiration of the great doctrine—"the highest and best of all religions"—from those who for ages have guarded the precious legacy by practising its inspiring mandates and precepts. Both the modern religion of science and the dogmatic religions of the Christian Churches have offered to men in the West nothing but the actualities of the hour with its ceaseless struggle and its resulting unethical, unsatisfying morality of "the strength of the strong and the cunning of the weak." The *Quarterly Review* of October last pointed out how in modern Europe "the thinking world is gradually recovering from the temporary aberration resulting from the

spread of materialistic modes of thought," and expressed its opinion that "it may be put down to the credit of pessimism that it has brought into prominence the tragic side of life, and thus combines with other salutary agencies to purify, elevate, and strengthen those emotions of sympathy and compassion which animate the sense of altruistic duty." The prophet of modern pessimism in Europe is Schopenhauer, and he got his inspiration from Buddhism and Vedantism. Christianity proved unequal to the task of preventing the appearance of—or suppressing the social and moral evils arising from—"the spread of materialistic modes of thought" in Europe; it was also daily losing ground before the aggressive advance of materialism. But neither the Buddhistic nor the Vedantic view of life can be said to be the same as what is called pessimism. Both, no doubt, agree in speaking of human life as *dukkha* (sorrow), but they mean by this not that there are no pleasures in the life here, but that they are evanescent, and therefore unsatisfying. The Vedanta, also, proceeds further than Buddhism and points out that *Brahmananda*—the eternal bliss of the realisation of the Atman—is the end and aim of life on earth and that it is realisable by the practical and practicable processes of *bhakti*, and *dhyana*, and *yoga* as systematised and formulated by our sages. This is not pessimism, and the *Quarterly Reviewer* abovementioned is certainly mistaken when he says that "pessimism, as a survival of Eastern philosophy, maintains that life is nothing but a tissue of illusions." The

Vedantist says that the world is *mithya*, which means transitory or phenomenal existence,—not illusion. He declares that life on earth, whatever its faults or failures, is the best of all for the reason that it alone offers us the best of all possible means of attaining to the eternal life of peace and freedom, the bliss of immortality, the realisation of the Atman.

Here is the balm needed to console and elevate humanity in Europe and to redress the wrongs and miseries of those who are in bondage to the heartlessness of millionairism, militarism, and materialism in the West. Mr. W. T. Stead, the famous British Journalist, expresses the hope that “the materialism which dominates the Western world may some day have its corrective in the purified spiritual philosophy which has its home in India.” A writer in the July (1902) number of the *Quarterly Review* also hopes that “the deep level thought of the Indian sages may do much to spiritualise the too material life of Europeans.” It is our right and duty to carry the consolations of the Eternal Religion—the *Sanatana Dharma*—of our holy Rishis to our brethren in the West. Our best hopes for the future of our race here and hereafter lie in the fulfilment of that divine mission.

Nor is there any need, to fulfil that mission in a spirit of apology, hesitation, or dubitancy. We have to act without trepidation or haste, and with the calm confidence begotten of the true enlightenment—“mystic, inward”—which is in our possession,—confidence begotten of the Viveka and

Vairagya which is equally our blessed endowment and our precious heritage. It is in this spirit that Vivekananda—that prince among Eastern sages—carried his Vedantic message to America and Europe. Look at the photos of the mighty Swami teaching in the West. See the attitude of command, and the expression of resistless power in his countenance, strongly contrasting with the charmingly sweet smile, and the benignant expression lighting up his face in the photographs taken of him in India. His is the example, and his the inspiration, for those who are to lead in the India of the future. And the Western world has shown by its appreciation of his mission as the representative of our ancient sages that the time is ripe for the dawn of a new epoch of harmony, peace and brotherhood among the world's communities.

Rome and Greece were to the ancient world what Britain and India are to the modern. Rome, in ancient times, created, by the marvellous efforts of her statesmen and soldiers, the mighty empire whose force served as the predestined instrumentality for the propagation of the Greek ideal of a rational and progressive humanity. Greece took captive her Roman conqueror, and, though the corporeal existence on earth of the ancient Hellenic race terminated long ago, the spirit of ancient Greece lives in the secular civilisation of modern Europe. Britain, imitating the example of ancient Rome, has consolidated a great modern empire and created the force which seems destined to serve as the instrument for fulfilling a

higher and nobler destiny than that of Rome viz., the propagation of the Vedantic ideal of an enlightened spiritual humanity ; and India, which has lived and suffered for the spirit in the past, now lives to conquer the modern world for the spirit,— for the Atman. Greece perished in the attempt to conquer the ancient world for reason, but its cause has triumphed and lives in the secular civilisation of modern Europe. Aryavarta has for countless ages stood forth as the champion of the soul,—of the soul as ruling and guiding reason, and as the principle which pervades and sustains the Universe. Her cause is the cause of what is supremely and lastingly true in nature and in man, and so she has remained and will remain the heir of all the ages and the world's great enigma and desire.

---



## APPENDIX.

---

### THE BOER AND THE HINDU.

**N**OTHING brings out more clearly the chief points of difference between Hindu and Christian civilization than the origin and progress of this Transvaal War. The Boers and the British have long lived side by side under a common Government and have enjoyed common and equal rights. To these artificial ties must be added the natural ties of a common native land, a common racial origin and a common religion. Moreover, within recent times, the British nation has, under the inspiration of the genius of the greatest Englishman of this century, given the Boers unquestionable indications of their magnanimous desire to see them develop into a prosperous, independent, strong and at the same time friendly, community in the Transvaal State. The Boers living directly under British rule in South Africa form a majority of the population and exercise a good deal of influence—in fact their influence is said to be predominant—in determining the political and administrative conditions of that region, and the Schreiner Ministry now in power is strongly pro-Boer and maintained in office by the Boer vote. British enterprise and British capital have largely contributed to the prosperity of the Transvaal State and the Uitlander adventurers whose thoughtless violence

—now known as the Jameson Raid—has been the proximate cause of the present troubles had apparently become permanent settlers in that state and therefore become entitled to receive the blessing of good fellowship and equal rights of citizenship from the Boers, just as the brethren of the latter freely share these with the men of British race in Cape Colony and Natal. In spite of all these circumstances, this cruel and desolating war—this fratricidal strife, as it may well be styled—has happened, and it is beyond human power to predict all the disagreeable complications to which it might lead in the future even after the two Boer republics shall have ceased to exist as independent states and the British supremacy established over the territories and populations now under their sway.

Why should such a state of things have arisen? What has led to all this unnecessary bloodshed and desolation? Why have men who ought to have lived in amity plunged their swords into each other's hearts with demoniacal hatred and unrelenting ferocity? Why has this war been such a disgrace to humanity, notorious as it has become, beyond all former wars, for its innumerable stories of barefaced treachery on the part of one of the parties and for the charges of heartlessness made on one side or the other, and that, too, at the close of a century which has proclaimed itself to the world, *ad nauseam*, as "The Age of Progress"?

The answer to these questions is not far to seek. Did not the Boers know that England's right arm is both long

enough and mighty enough to strike with deadly effect, as it has now done? What else could have been the meaning of Kruger's message to America about the Boer's resolve, before submitting, of paying a price that would "stagger humanity"? Was not the European world aware that this foolish and conceited community of rustics and farmers was deliberately seeking to commit suicide in entering upon a war of unprovoked aggression against the mightiest empire and people that have borne sway among men in the world's history? And yet why did they not interpose and prevent their quixotic attempt to bring upon themselves the dire consequences of this unequal strife? The only answer that can be given is that to which Count Tolstoy long ago pointed when he said that "God makes no distinction among peoples, and lavishes his gifts upon all men; men ought to act exactly in the same way towards one another, without distinction of nationality, and not like the heathens who divide themselves into distinct nationalities," and again :— "When I think of all the evil that I have done, that I have endured and that I have seen about me, arising from national calamities, I see clearly that it is all due to that gross imposture called patriotism --love for one's native land." Patriotism and national sentiment,—these are the true products of Christian heathenism in the world, and they are at the bottom of the miserable record of wanton aggressiveness, treachery and brutality that this war has been the means of unmasking in all their horrible reality before an astonished world.

It will be easy to see, when we understand the Boer point of view, why this war could not have really been avoided. The Boers are like all other products of European and Christian civilisation, a people animated by patriotic purpose and narrow national sentiment, and so they can have no parleying with the feeling, however noble and catholic, of friendly and brotherly co-operation even with those who are aliens in race, which flows from that larger patriotism which regards all the world as the pathway to the City of God and all the men in it as fellow travellers wending their way to the same goal. The Boers, therefore, cannot be expected to weigh considerations of justice, social welfare, or even morality when once they begin to feel that honourable national existence is at stake. To every European community, independence of all outside and alien control in internal matters, constantly increasing scope for expansion, commercial and territorial, wherever possible; the admission to, or acquisition, of an honourable place in the comity of nations in all concerns affecting the interests of civilisation within a sphere of influence varying with the conditions of time and circumstance,—these are essential to national existence; and where these are denied, every community will fight to the death and resign, if necessary, a life which cannot be lived with national honour. A duty, however fatal, is a duty, and must be performed. No community, in their view, ought to be tempted by the offer of worldly advantages, such as peace, security of person and

property, economic or intellectual advantages, &c., to make a voluntary submission to a foreigner. Even total ruin and extinction, as in the case of Carthage, is far worthier than an inglorious career of enslaved ease. Often in history communities thus situated have been reduced to desperate straits, but in the end an honourable revival has been found possible though only after efforts of heroic self-sacrifice,—witness, for example, the rise of the Dutch Republic under William the Silent, or of Italy in recent times under Victor Immanuel.

Such being the temperamental condition of communities inheriting, or trained in, Christian and European civilisation, it is most natural, however unpleasant it has proved, that the Boers should have adopted their present course. If they had yielded to the demands of Mr. Chamberlain, intelligible enough as these are from the national point of view of Great Britain, and given the franchise to the Uitlander population and permitted the use of the English language in the Transvaal Volksraad, surely they must have done so with the full knowledge that they must soon be swamped by the numerically larger Uitlander population and, losing their political preponderance, must have sooner or later become reduced in affluence and social solidarity and inevitably mingled their blood with the Uitlanders', and thus lose their separate existence as a nationality. To posterity the Boer name in the Transvaal must then surely become a memory and a tradition of ignoble import, indicative of national and social

impotence and loss of vitality. Under these circumstances, the only course open to the Boers was to walk by the light of history and, trusting to the God of Battles, to take their chance, as they have done. If they are effaced, as they must be, after the efforts they have made, if they perish sword in hand, their name will remain untarnished in history. It is evident that they cannot have peace with independence. No British statesman, worthy of the name, can, after the experience of the past, accept any such conditions. The Boers have shown that they cannot be trusted to remain peaceful and allied subjects or neighbours and they must henceforth be treated as conquered subjects in the true sense of the term.

We have advisedly used this expression, *conquered subjects in the true sense of the term*. For they have fought with the British and have been conquered; and they can have *no manner of claim* for equal rights with the men of British race in South Africa, for they have been guilty of base treachery in deliberately disregarding the terms of the treaties under which they were guaranteed internal independence under British suzerainty and secretly preparing during all these years for the overthrow of the British Empire in South Africa and the establishment of their own in its stead. Even the Boers in Cape Colony have rebelled in many places, and it is certain that, even where there has been no actual rebellion, a spirit of disaffection has long been abroad and may long continue, fomented by the insidious tactics of the notorious Afrikander Bond. If the

Colonial and Imperial authorities are to continue unmolested, they must maintain martial law in operation for a fairly long period and resolutely proceed to disarm the entire Boer population and restrict the concession of the franchise so that their influence on the internal politics of South Africa may be limited to the extent that is absolutely necessary for securing to them the blessing of impartial government.

It will help to make the position of the Boers under British rule clearer, if we contrast it with our own in our dealings with the British in the past. We cannot justly be called a conquered people. Some Hindu chiefs were indeed overthrown and lost their power, but they were overthrown by methods and instruments absolutely without parallel in the history of conquest, properly so called. Of course we know that it is now usual enough to speak of the British conquest of India. But what is conquest? Sir J. R. Seeley, the late eminent Professor of History at Cambridge University, explains the process as follows:—"Surely the word is only applicable at all when it refers to some action done to one state by another. There is war between two states; the army of one state invades the other and overturns the Government of it, or at least forces the Government to such humiliating terms that it is practically deprived of its independence; this is conquest in the proper sense." In this proper sense there has been no conquest here. Did the English state ever declare war against any Indian chief or send out an English army, like the one which Lord

Roberts now commands against the enemies of the Empire in South Africa? Not at all. What was the composition of the army by which the victories which secured India for the British East India Company were wrought? Sir J. R. Seeley says:—"Four-fifths of this army was always composed of native troops." He proceeds to mention various other facts which are here worth noticing. From the time of the Regulating Act to the time of the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857, the proportion of Englishmen to natives in the Indian Army was less than a fifth; in 1773, the proportion was less than a seventh, and even now it is less than a third. And what about the fighting capacity of the Natives? James Mill, the historian of British India, says:—"The two important discoveries for conquering India were: first, the weakness of the Native armies against European discipline, secondly, the facility of imparting that discipline to Natives in the European service." The historian adds, "Both discoveries were made by the French." It must be also remembered that no less a man than Lord Roberts has spoken of the Indian military officers as his "Comrades," and he recently started the "Indian Heroes' Fund," which proves conclusively that Lord Salisbury's reference to this "age of heroes" applies no less to India than to England. Sir John Seeley writes in well-chosen language:—"India can hardly be said to have been conquered by foreigners; *she has rather conquered herself.*" These words which we have put in italics are the words of a true and brave Englishman, and it is because



England has in abundance men like Seeley and Roberts that it exercises so great and so beneficent an influence in the world. The people of India have really placed themselves under British rule and intend to remain loyal to that rule, for it is so beneficent and so progressive that there has been nothing to compare with it in this country for two thousand years at least. Such being our position in regard to the British people in the past and in the present, we have every right to demand that, sooner or later, we should be afforded every possible opportunity to show ourselves worthy of being the citizens of this great Empire. This hope glows in every true Hindu heart and buoys up even those of us who have been disposed, with or without proper grounds, to complain that there have been hours of trial, affliction or suspicion. The power of patience is, equally with the power of imitation, a dominant characteristic of the Hindu mind, and every Hindu feels himself the truly destined heir of all the ages. For instance, when India was accorded a treatment different from that of the Colonies on the occasion of the Jubilee, many felt that such a thing need not have been. But none for a moment believed, as none now believes, that India will always in the future be assigned the same position, for the spirit of Imperialism is abroad and no man on earth can retard the growth of Imperial Federation. When the Maharaja of Durbhunga declared the other day that he would consider it the mission of his life to promote Imperial Federation, Englishmen throughout India came forward to hail his pronouncement.

ment on the subject as a welcome manifestation of loyal India's spirit of co-operation for all worthy purposes of Imperial welfare. How different is the position of the Boers to-day in South Africa, where even in Cape Colony and Natal they have manifested a spirit of rebellion and thereby lost all claim to be treated on a footing of equality with the men of British race, even though England is sure to be generous enough to extend to them, as it has done till now, the blessing of British citizenship in its entirety!

How does it come to pass that India and the Indians are placed in their present position? We have heard some people say that it is due to national cowardice and to the supreme anxiety of every one to save his skin at any cost. This is nonsense, pure and simple. India can furnish even to-day as good a body of fighting men as any other country in the world, and every part of India possesses sound fighting material in sufficient quantity and ready to obey England's call to enlist in her service. What, then, is the true explanation of the phenomenon above referred to *viz.*, that unlike the Boers, the people of India are, and will continue to be loyal British subjects? The answer is that they, alone among the world's communities, have no national and racial feeling. To what is this due? It is needless to dwell here at length on the subject. Our religion alone has taught the world the Supreme Secret, the *Paramam Guhyam* (Bhagavadgita XVIII, 68), the *Gnana-yajna* (ibid 70), the

truth which underlies the great doctrines of "the omnipenetrativeness of God" and "the solidarity of man." The Christian Missionary in India has at last had to acknowledge this and thereby to recognise India's place in the providential order, and the insufficiency of Christianity as the religion of humanity. The Vedanta is thus *the only absolute religion* for the whole world. As the destined teachers of humanity, the Rishis, have enjoined on us to accept all men as our other selves, to put into practice the *Tattvamasi* of the Sruti, to bear no ill-will to any one, simply because he enjoys political supremacy on earth. "It matters not who rules, Rama or Ravana," says the Indian proverbial wisdom. As the men of British race have by Indian aid established their political ascendancy in this country, they shall have for ever our loyal co-operation in all that is noble, virtuous and useful for humanity, and none can deserve it better, as we know from ample past experience. India cannot and will not become a nation, and the rival or enemy of any other community of men.

THE TAMIL, SANSKRIT  
NATIONAL LIBRARY, KOLKATA

