

field of Kurukshetra, the chances of maids getting married became rare and so widows who had had a chance of enjoying married life restrained themselves from remarrying. It became a custom in a course of years and verses were interpolated in ancient religious books and women were prohibited from marrying again. The degradation of women and their illiteracy brought them under priestly control. The priests took pride in the injunctions they imposed on them. The ascetic life which Buddhism introduced into the society made men and women think of the joys and pleasures of life as ephemeral and that their permanent abode is in heaven and this life is transitory and man had come here for a short sojourn to suffer for the wrongs he committed in previous births. Thus the body was neglected and consequently the pleasures attached to it. When asceticism had become the fashion, disfigurement of widows and severe austerities restricting their food and raiment, were adopted and young windows were forced by the authority of custom to remain unmarried.

### ILLITERACY.

Women used to receive as liberal an education as men. Gradually, however, the importance was lessened and about the time when dramatic literature arose we find that as a class they were not taught sanskrit though they could read and write in the popular languages and even compose poetry in them. Even so late as 11th century, women were not condemned to exclusion and were taught scientific music as appears from a copper plate inscription in which one of the wives of the king of the Deccan is represented to have sung a beautiful song in an assembly composed of the highest officers of that and the surrounding kingdoms and to have obtained as a reward the consent of her husband to give land in

charity to Brahmins. The seclusion of women and their ignorance is a custom that came into vogue in later times and the loss of the political power by the Hindus aggravated their situation. Custom is a god whom Hindus worship and religious sanction was accorded to these customs by interpolating verses in later books. The moral sentiments were very weak and they could not come out of the thick veil of custom and assert the claim of truth, justice and humanity. Custom has been and is our authority and custom is our religion. The Brahmins after they were overpowered by aboriginal customs and accepted the priestly offices and became Purohits, the earnings of their profession tempted them and it became a custom that all ceremonies, sacrifices and temple worship must be conducted by Brahmins alone. They monopolised the learning and the people were kept in ignorance of what the Vedas contain. Thus the Vydikas became the sole repositories of Vedic lore and common men gradually fell into the slough of ignorance. Men, to perpetuate the subjection of women, kept them also ignorant. Thus men and women sank into ignorance.

### PROHIBITION OF FOREIGN TRAVEL.

As Aryan civilisation became stationary and after a time it began to take a retrogressive and downward course, people lost their spirit of enterprise and became exclusive. After the wave of foreign invasion settled itself and the conqueror became as timid as the conquered, the militant type of society revived. The larger Hindu States were split up into smaller Kingdoms and principalities. Feudal institutions came into existence. Tribal jealousies and sectarian hatred became the order of the day. A selfish priesthood imposed its yoke upon the neck of the people. Custom fixed and stereotyped the course of national life.

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF DEMOCRACY IN INDIA.

Caste system elaborated its net in the meshes of which were caught the elements of progress and advancement. Unfortunately all this took place at a time when people were feeling the need to unite themselves again and caste spirit was losing its importance. While other nations were entertaining ideas which have through a long course of centuries fashioned and perfected what is called modern civilisation, the Hindus locked themselves up within the four corners of India, cut off all foreign intercourse by interdicting foreign travel, and instead of profiting by what men were doing in other parts of the globe began to forget and finally did forget what they themselves had done in former days, because knowledge became the monopoly of a special class. The political life was sapped by the extending sway of ecclesiastical pretensions, and the seeds of racial and sectarian animosities were sown which corroded the society from within and made them fall a prey to invasions from without. India lost her zeal for intellectual pursuits and love of political independence. Despotism in state crushed the political spirit of the people. Despotism in religion had enslaved their intellect. Wants were simplified and society was swayed by an ascetic system of morality and caste by tying down everybody to his hereditary status, paralysed the zeal for individual effort and destroyed the feeling of the dignity of manhood. Foreign intercourse was not encouraged by the state which was unstable and despotic nor by the society which was priest-ridden and conservative. The passion for travelling was absent because neither intellectual unrest nor political ambition dominated their minds.

### IDOLATRY.

The glory and chivalry of the Aryan disappeared and the worship of the One God gave way to ghost and

demon worship and idolatry became rampant everywhere. The Buddhists used to keep images of Buddha in their monasteries and the Hindus imitated them in the days of Buddhistic glory. Thus the pure worship of the Aryans degenerated into idolatrous worship of the Hindus. As the Aryan culture received a set-back the study of the Vedas and the Upanishads was neglected and people fell a prey to gross superstition. Human sacrifices also were offered to propitiate the gods and goddesses. In the Puranic period a glorious mythology was borrowed and engrafted to the Aryan religion. Added to these there were the foreign invasions of the Scythians, the Huns and the Goths, the ancestors of Jats, who crushed the last remnants of Aryan civilisation and introduced the many inhuman customs so widely prevalent in Northern India.

The Aryan settlers in the Deccan were too few in numbers and too weak in power to make any lasting impression beyond their own limited circle upon the vast multitudes who constituted the aboriginal races. The Puranas written at that time display the pusillanimity of the Aryan settlers. Moreover Buddhist power was paramount in Andhra Desa. When Hinduism revived from the depression into which it had fallen on account of the rise of Buddhism it lost its old pristine purity and became corrupted by the idolatrous worship of the Buddhists. In their anxiety to destroy Buddhism, Brahmins allied themselves with the aborigines and incorporated many of their social and religious institutions into their society. From being sages and philosophers, poets and prophets, they descended to the lower level of priests and purohits and thus sacrificed their independence for power and profit. The gods and goddesses of the aborigines were identified with God as so many incarnations. Brahmins became the priests and Archakas. Brahminism having failed to



conquer from want of power, allowed itself to be degraded and being unable to civilise them failed in its mission and ultimately effected a compromise with the culture of the aborigines. The priests and Archakas in their own interests magnified the old superstitious beliefs. The Puranas were regarded as a fifth Veda for most of them failed to understand the four Vedas. Even the iconoclastic spirit of Islam could not divert them from the fetish worship and the most debasing worship of the sexual organs of man and the ape.

### EXCLUSIVENESS.

After the Hindus lost their political independence they became so contemptuous in the eyes of their conquerors that no-body ever thought of having social dealings with them till the time of Akbar who was the first Mussalman emperor who extended his hand of fellowship to the conquered and subjugated Hindus. During these five centuries of their political degradation their instinct of self-preservation developed a sort of exclusiveness peculiar to themselves and the rigidity of caste went a long way in making the Hindus an exclusive people. This peculiar social system worked well enough so long as they were an independent and self-contained community but it could not adapt itself to fresh environments as they rose and could not promote social solidarity. The high level of material prosperity which the nation was able to reach on account of favourable physical conditions soon resulted in effeminacy of character, a result which came about all the more easily by the aversion of the people to material advantages, naturally induced by their spiritual ideas. The military defence of the country against external or internal dangers was neglected, the Hindus being evidently under the belief that outside India there were no people capable of invad-

ing her and establishing a foreign rule subversive of their own religion and civilisation. Dependence on outside help benumbs the inner conscience. If man begins to quote the scripture for everything he loses his individuality and relies on the text. His reasoning faculty becomes blunted and he lives in the happy idea that the ancients had done all the thinking for him and he is only to blindly follow their sutras. For him duties and obligations are duties and obligations, not because he felt them to be so, but somebody reputed to be wise had laid it down that they were so. It is no wonder that his mind is a *tabula rosa* and all that should be done for all world to come was already thought of and ready-made in laws and regulations dictated to him by his purohits and any violation would result in excommunication. Heredity and birth are the guiding factors of his social and political life, no less than in religious and economic life. Fatalism and the law of Karma completed his degradation.

### THE ARABS.

The Arabs are Muhammadans. They are the type of a democratic brotherhood for there are no caste institutions in their community. Their religion is monotheism. Adultery is forbidden but concubinage of conquered women was allowed. Their social arrangement is indissolubly bound up with politics and religion. Their conception of state is a socio-religious polity. A study of the Old Testament shows us that no other theory than a socio-religious polity ever occurred to the minds of all of the prophets and other sacred writers. To Isciah for example, the social, religious and political position of Zion were the three aspects of the same thing—Jehova's election of the Israelites as his chosen people. It was only the shock of the Babylonian captivity that compelled the beginning of the reconsidera-

tion of this theory which nevertheless reigned even through centuries of Judah's weakness and prostration. Polygamy is prevalent among them. The size of a man's harem is a proof of his importance. Even the practice of servile and captive concubinage is tolerated by them for it settles the fortunes of many homeless women. In the case of the conqueror his fame as such could not be marked unless he took the noblest and the most beautiful for himself. It is why we find later on that the Turk Allauddin in whom this Arab sentiment was predominant claimed the fair and lotus-eyed Padmini for himself though she was the wife of the Rana of Chittoor. They are greatly zealous, brave, skilful and dauntless. They are iconoclasts.

When Mubammad conquered Mecca in January, 630 A. D., he proceeded to the Kaaba, reverently saluting with his staff one by one, the numerous idols placed around. He commanded that they should be hewn down. The great image of Hobal, reared as the tutelary deity of Mecca in front of the Kaaba, shared the common fate. "Truth hath come" exclaimed Muhammad, as it fell with a crash to the ground, "and falsehood hath vanished; for falsehood is evanescent." That was the proudest day in the history of Arabia, nay of humanity, when man could boldly raise his voice and condemn the nefarious system of idolatry. Mecca is undoubtedly a sacred place of pilgrimage, for there the Arab for the first time in the history of humanity had shown that idolatry is a curse among mankind. Assimilation and conversion are very common among the Muhammadans. Nay, it is the strength of Islam. The greatness of the Arab lies in his zeal to make the whole world adopt what he believes to be true. "Never compromise with evil" is the spirit of Muhammad. It is this spirit that made the Muhammadan the terror of the

erring humanity and his sword flashed even at the gates of Vienna.

What, then, are the causes which led them to victory in early days? The first cause is their burning zeal in the new faith. It had made these sons of the desert feel that they were a nation chosen by God to establish this new faith in this world. The primary impulse was given by a zeal for a living Deity. After the first momentum had been acquired all sorts of secondary and very material motives were found necessary to sustain it. The warlike operations were directed with an unflinching self-devotion and an uncorrupt sense of duty. There were many warriors in the battle front moved with an enthusiasm typical of the Puritan and the Cromwellian ironside. There were similar enthusiasts even at the headquarters at Medina. But however purely burned the zeal for God and His cause in the hearts of Muslims it is the Arab passion for war, spoil, captives, concubines and forfeit lands that brought success in the early stages of Arab expansion.

We see, besides the religious zeal for God, and the political zeal for plunder and slaves, there is the civil aspect, the quiet yet tremendous power Islam brought to bear after the settlement of a country by the mere fact of its being a settled social system. The institutions of the Muslims were characterised by a very large measure of good sense and humanity, and justice was frequently well administered. Hindus and Christians who refused to become Muslims paid tribute and received in return the protection of the Islamic state. So popular was this arrangement that Christian subjects of Islam were in those days not infrequently the objects of envy and Muslim rulers frequently received appeals from Christians pleading to be transferred from Christian rule to that of

Islam. And although the diminution of the number of Christian tributaries by conversion involved a financial loss to the state, more than one Muslim ruler showed a genuine religious earnestness by refusing to prefer a fat revenue to the salvation of souls. Considerable administrative ability, too, was shown by Arab rulers. Again, the Arab being a man of great attainment and culture on his own lines, and proving extraordinarily teachable and receptive in mundane matters, welcomed the teaching which Greek and Persian could so freely give him in philosophy, letters, arts and crafts; and the indubitably brilliant civilisation he thus created, especially at Bagdad, Cairo and Cordova, at a time when Christian Europe was in a state of blank ignorance and darkness and when Hindu India was engaged in offering human beings as sacrifices to propitiate the gods, attracted many from outside to adopt Islam and become as great as the Arab. Moreover socially the democratic brotherhood and the laxity of marriage laws induced many people to embrace Islam. Lastly, the survival of the fittest theory also holds in religion. In India religious interest was fritted away in interminable wranglings about infinitesimal points of metaphysical theology, whilst real faith waxed cold and a burning hatred of sect for sect appeared and the rigidity of caste dismembered the Hindu society into various fragments with no sympathy with each other. There was internal warfare among the petty kingdoms also, that, when the Arab came, the one would openly exult when the other was smitten or would even co-operate with the invader in defeating his neighbour.

### THE TURKS.

Before the Turks came to India some Turks from Turkestan founded a kingdom with Bokhara as its capital and conquered Afghanistan and Beluchistan. Muham-

med of Ghazini invaded India in 1019 A. D. with a ferocious host. After two centuries, Delhi became the Muslim capital in 1206. A second sultanate was formed in Bengal and Bihar by Bakhtiyar Khan (1206-1288.) It is only under the Turkish rule that Indians came to know something of Islam. The unshakable belief in the unity of God is the central tenet of Islam. The Creator and the created are utterly distinct. The Creature had been brought into existence by the divine word *Be*. Naked of power he came into existence and naked of power he stands before the One and the Only Powerful One and the All-powerful One, in things great or in things small.

Man's deed, character and faith are determined by an irresistible decree of God. By the power of the same irresistible decree he joins the ranks of the believers or of the unbelievers, so by its power he is numbered among the saved in the Garden of Delights or the damned in the burning fire. Allah is not to be questioned for what He does. He is "responsible" to no one; for to conceive of him as having to answer for any of his actions or decrees would be to invest the creature with a certain right or power as against Him, and so limit His omnipotence which is impossible. In short, to set any limit whatsoever to the absolute, the unmitigated omnipotence of God was to Muhammad, as to every Muslim, a simple blasphemy. There are ninety-nine names deduced from the epithets used of Allah in the Qur'an: "Yet the ideas of gentleness and kindness are certainly not absent from the Kor'an. Every Muhammadan who says his rosary calls God "The Merciful," "The Compassionate," "The Forgiver," "The Clement," "The Guardian," "The Loving," "The Acceptor of Repentance," "The Pardoner," "The King," "The Patient." These gentler attributes are men-

tioned again and again. Muhammad was never tired of telling his followers that the love of God for man was more tender than that of a mother bird for its young. Still although there is the recognition of the loving kindness of God, it is true to say generally that the predominating thought in the mind of a Muhammadan is that of the power of God—The Muhammadan call to prayer is "Allah O' Akbar"—"God is Great."

A faith in a living God that wills and acts is indeed a vitally necessary thing in religion. Indeed, how morally right and necessary it was that men in the living heat of this conviction should have put to shame and to flight men in whom this conviction was a thing of name and not of reality! This faith is only efficacious and constructive when it is in ebullition. At other times it sinks to a dead fatalism which instead of goading to action, paralyses it. Another noble feature of Islam is the dignity with which it invests the believer who, though a slave, has a right of access to the Lord. The calm dignity of a Muslim at prayer is ever a striking and even a moving sight. And the stately bearing of the well dressed Muslim has at all times excited the admiration of beholders. The Hindu temple is open only to the Hindus while the Mosque is for all. What a contrast is it with the noble brotherhood of Islam! Look at the *Idaga*! How simple it is! How grand is the sight on a Bakried' day when all Muslims irrespective of authority or wealth come and pray to God! A wall is built opposite to them so that their sight might not be distracted. How picturesque is the mosque! How stately is its architecture! How beautiful to look at! Hindu temple worship had failed to instil in the mind of man the universality of Divine love over all men equally and had failed to vindicate the justice in His impartiality to man. It has created

differences between man and man on the basis of birth. Every Hindu cannot claim the equal rights in the worship of the Divine Father, the Maker of them all. How narrow and circumscribed is the spiritual vision of the Hindu even in the worship of God! The Christian churches do not prohibit men from entering their aisles nor do Muhammadans object others entering their mosques.

### ESCHATOLOGY OF ISLAM.

The eschatology (i. e.) the relation between God and man in Islam consists in an infinite descending series of grades of spiritual beings thus connecting, at last, God and man. Muhammadans have gone a little way in that direction by the importance they attach to the doctrine of angelic hierarchy, the chamberlains of the heavenly Monarch and by their explicit belief in regularly organised hosts of Jinns—demi-supernatural beings of uncertain spiritual temper and spiritual location. Belief in these beings is obligatory, for they prominently occur in the Qur'an, and charms for the evasion of the more malign influences of the intervening spiritual world are also mentioned in the Qur'an.

### SAINT WORSHIP.

There is also often found in even orthodox Islam a system of what is practically called Saint-worship. The spirits of great saints are vaguely supposed to linger about their tombs, their intercession is continually claimed with God, and their protective powers are ardently invoked. They generally hang teeth, bits of rag or other souvenirs, to keep the owners thereof before the exalted mind of the saint.

### RELIC WORSHIP.

Muslims pray at the shrine in which some bones of the prophet are preserved. The men of Cairo flock



together to touch the carpet that is sent annually to Mecca to cover the Kaaba for the blessing that it communicates. After it is finished with, fragments and scraps of it become relics, blessing the very house in which they are stored.

All these practices and engrafted acts of devotion are condemned by modern reformers of the 'Abdul Wahha'b or Puritan type and such men indignantly assert that they are a corruption of Islam. But orthodox example and Qur'anic precept can generally be found for them. The whole system of Walis is defended on the score of one text in the Qur'an. Islam divides religion into two parts. Imam:—Belief—all that has to do with creed. Din:—Practice—all that has to do with religious duty.

### DIN.

Four duties are prescribed compulsarily for every Musalman:—(1) Prayer at stated times after the prescribed form, language and manner and preceded by the prescribed purifications and ablutions. (2) Alms-giving according to well-defined rules. (3) Fasting—total abstention from sunrise to sunset during the month of Ramz'an. (4) The Pilgrimage to Mecca. The holy war is accepted by some doctors as a fifth obligation but its stringency is in any case discounted by a host of "considerations." Statutes define the limits of his actions. But the statutes are limited and every ruler has found himself compelled to add to this Shariat or sacred law and to place alongside of it a body of administrative decrees (i. e.) civil law. But the strict Muslim in his heart of hearts thinks that Shariat is sufficient or ought to be made so and that these man-made institutions are Kufr or unbelief.

The Turks, when they came to India, brought with them a large number of slaves. The earliest political

ideal of Islam was constitutional but the islamic rulers, unable to connect authority with duty and to dissociate it from irresponsible power, held despotic sway over the people. But the trend of the whole Muslim authority was democratic. Outside India the democratic brotherhood was prevalent. Caliph Umar told his subjects: "My brothers! I owe you several duties, and you have several rights over me. One of them is that you should see that I do not misuse the revenue; another that I may not adopt wrong measures in the assessment of the revenue; that I should increase your salaries; protect the frontiers; and that I should not involve you in unnecessary dangers. Whenever I err, you have a right to stop and take me to task. There is no caliphate without the consultation of the general body of Mussalmans." It was the characteristic feature of his career as a ruler. The emoluments of his office were just sufficient to enable him to keep body and soul together, and to cover his body with a shirt of rough, coarse cloth, with twelve patches in it; in fact, the total daily expenses of his household did not amount to more than a shilling. In the beginning he did not take anything from the Bait-ul-Mu (Treasury), but later on he found that the duties of his office were interfered with by his private efforts to earn a livelihood for himself. He then put the question of his stipend in the hands of the "Majlis-I-Shura" (the representative body of counsellors) as well as before the Mussalmans at large, congregated in the mosque for the Friday prayers, and it was decided that he should be given just as much as he required for his ordinary needs.

The degradation of women in Muslim countries is a great stumbling block in the advance of constitutional freedom. The matter of the family is fundamental. The responsibility of Islam for the state of woman and the degradation

of family life, is a matter about which there can be no doubt, for it goes directly back to the Qur'anic laws of marriage, divorce, polygamy and concubinage, and the consequent view of womanhood encouraged, nay, necessitated thereby. No doubt, Islam gives women power over their own property. But this aspect of freedom contrasts strangely with the chattel-like position which beyond all controversy Muslim women occupy in India. Like the Hindu woman an unmarried Muslim woman is a chattel in the hands of her father or brother and if married, in the hands of her husbands. Ghazzali, a great Muhammadan Doctor says "Marriage is a kind of slavery, for the wife becomes the slave of her husband, and it is her duty to obey him absolutely in everything he requires of her except in what is contrary to the laws of Islam." She is practically under tutelage for her whole term of life. Upto the time of Muhammad the Arabian women enjoyed a great deal of social freedom; her relationship with the other sex was healthier and franker than at present. Seclusion and the veil are explicitly commanded in the Qu'ran itself, yet the occasion of the fatal texts, which have fixed the fates of so many millions of women ever since, was nothing than the annoyance of the prophet when his domestic privacy had been slightly disturbed (Sura 33 and 24, Muir's Life of Muhammad). The whole tendency of polygamy, slave concubinage and unrestricted divorce shows that there is in the Muhammadan mind an unhealthy suspicion about women and it is the chief cause of their seclusion. The marriage bond is at the discretion of the husband to hold or break, and that any man can therefore look upon any married woman, (relatives excepted) as within his reach by marriage, and any woman can be divorced at any time without any valid cause being assigned. Even such a great Queen as Raziya, daughter of Altamash

one of the slave kings at Delhi was maltreated by her subjects. Her brother was a wicked man and they installed her on the throne. Raziya ruled as few men ruled in Delhi. She loved justice and mercy and she gave both to her people. She led them to battle pitching her own tent in the midst of the greatest danger. She was generous and wise and entirely forgetful of her woman's self. All this her people knew of her; and all this historians have said of her. "She was a great monarch, but she was a woman, and she ruled as a man." The Muslims of those days could not forgive her. They say that she, being a woman, ought to come with face veiled. Though they lived under her care and protection for a very long time they forgot the cruelty of her brother who reigned before. They turned against her in the end and dethroned her and put her in prison. Later on she escaped from prison and led an army to regain her kingdom. She was defeated in battle and fled alone to the jungles. Hard pressed by hunger she begged of an old peasant in a field for some food. The man gave her a piece of bread which she ate gladly. While she was sleeping there the peasant killed her and buried her there in a corner of a field outside the walls of that very Delhi which she had ruled. Such was the treatment accorded to a queen simply because she was a woman but not a man. Polygamy and unrestricted divorce had taken away the vitality of the Turks. Some of the bitterest results that followed these customs are: divided families, favouritism, heart burnings, jealousies, separation from children, despair, cruelties, ruin to the character of man and the life of the woman. A man may divorce his wife without cause, save his own disappointment or whim, immediately after marriage or, even worse, after many years of married life. Every divorce means a blow to the woman's self.

respect, a diminution of her market value, a cruel separation in many cases from her children.

Usury is denounced in the Qur'an and many a pious Muhammadan is prepared to renounce even the ordinary interest on his loans. The human directions of the Qur'an and the Traditions make many Muslims kind to animals. The flat prohibition of all liquor has made greatly for sobriety and the condemnation of games of chance had checked gambling. There is no priesthood among the Mussalmans. Muslim authorities say that there are now 150 sects, but there may be even more. I shall briefly narrate the origin and growth of principal ones. The Muslim world is broadly divided into Sunnis and Shi-ites. The latter are far more subdivided than are the Sunnis.

### SHI-ITES.

The main point of difference is that, rejecting the first four khalifas, the Shi'ah sects hold that Ali, the fourth khalifa, Muhammad's son-in-law was the "Prophet's" due successor. Hence instead of regarding the khalifas as 'Vicegerents of the Apostle of God' they revere Ali's descendants, who with himself are termed the 'Twelve Imams.' The two parties differ also in the collections of Traditions (Aha'da'ith) which they accept. The Sunnis condemn Mut'ah or temporary marriage, which their opponents approve of. The Sunnis hold that everything must be decided by an appeal to the Qur'an, Tradition, or authoritative deductions therefrom. They are more legalistic than the Shi'ites. The latter are more inclined to admit ideas from without. They admit the need of an atonement, holding that Hosan's and Husain's deaths effected that. Incarnation theories have developed among not a few Shi'ite sects. One of those worships 'Ali as God.' They

hold in general the tenet that they may conceal or deny their faith when life and property are otherwise in danger. Abu' Kasim, the 12th Imam, is said to be still alive, and is expected to reappear as the Imam Mahdi.

### SUNNIS.

Of the Sunnis there are four orthodox sects, the Hanifis, the Sha'fis, the Ma'likis, and the Hanbalis, which are really schools of interpretation of the Law. The founder of the Wahabi sect was a Hanabali. He endeavoured to reform Islam by abolishing saint worship and restoring it to its original state. This necessitated the use of the sword. The Wahabits overran Arabia, capturing Mecca and Medina in 1803. Their power had been broken by the Turks in 1818. Later on there were revivals of sects in India and also in Arabia. They are not bound by the views of orthodox sects, but hold that each man may judge for himself from a knowledge of the Qur'an and Tradition. Muhammad will at the last day obtain permission to intercede with God. They recite the ninety-nine 'Excellant Names' without a rosary.

### SUFIS.

The Sufis are the mystics of Islam. They are mostly professed Shi'ites but in reality they are Pantheists or free-thinkers. They profess to aim at union with God, to be attained by absorption and loss of personality. A stage in their spiritual progress may be reached at which all religious observances are needless. They profess to prove from Surah 23—151 "Verily we belong to God, and verily unto him do we return" their doctrine of emanation and absorption (Ifna) saying that this "return" to God is like that of the raindrop to the ocean from which it came and in which it is finally lost.

### MUTAZILITES.

The Mutazilite sect was founded by Wa'sil in the 9th century. His followers denied the Muslim doctrine of Fate, and affirmed freedom of will and action. They were Muslims only in name. The Neo-Islamic school in India claims to be a revival of this extinct sect. They reject tradition, and profess to found their belief solely on the Qur'an. But they have been greatly influenced by Rationalism. They deny the miraculous, and are rather Deists than Muslims.

The Turks entertain regard for the rights of private property and for the rights of children, women and slaves. They are a people in whom the generous elements of the great pastoral peace of desert and steppe which is the living force and unity of the whole Moslem world are betrayed. They are very kind to their children who in their turn respect their parents. In inculcating the doctrine of devotion to the mother and chivalry to old age Muhammad is unequelled by any of the great teachers of the world. Muhammad said, "He who kisses the feet of his mother attains Paradise." Most of the Hindus, when Turks settled in India, were fascinated by the extraordinary kindness shown by these Mussalmans towards their fellow brethren. It represented to the low-caste Hindu what the Buddhist orders once represented, a perfect democracy in which stains of birth, blood, profession are all blotted out by a common brotherhood. Whatever a man's past, he could as soon as he became Muhammadan do whatever he desired. One of the Muhammadan Sultans, Khusrum, was a low-caste Hindu. He was the companion of Mubarak, the son of Allaudin. Even slaves could become Sultans. The word Sheikh is generally prefixed to the names of those who were converted to Islam. The vast majority of Mu-

hammadan cultivators, workers, coolies and others are thus Hindu by blood and Muslim by creed. These people follow their old Hindu customs and worship Pirs. Their idolatrous habits could not be changed. The orthodox Sunnis, though they dislike this, allow them to follow their own ways. The message of Muhammad is a message of freedom to the whole race of man. The early invaders did not settle in India continuously for a very long time. Dynasty after dynasty came to India, ruled for a short time and was dethroned by successor after successor who poured into the plains of Hindustan.

### MONGOLS OR MOGHALS.

The 3rd great Islamic race that conquered India were the Moguls. Before Babar came and established the Mogul empire in India which lasted from 1526 to 1857 two Mogul invaders, Chengizkhan and Timurlane, invaded India in the 13th and 14th centuries and carried away all that was precious from India.

India was sunk in poverty, all the agriculturists were highly indebted, famine was everywhere, trade was paralysed and commerce was hindered. The darkest period of Indian history is the time when Babar invaded India. Baber describes India in his memoirs as follows:— "Hindustan is a country which has few things to recommend. The people are not handsome. They have no idea of the charms of friendly society or freely mixing together in familiar intercourse. They have no genius, no comprehension of mind, no politeness of manners, no kindness or fellow feeling, no ingenuity or mechanical invention in planning and executing their handicraft work, no skill or knowledge in design or architecture. They have no good horses, no good flesh, no good grapes or muskmelons, no



good fruits, no cold water or ice, no good food or bread in their bazaars, no baths, no colleges, no candles, not even a candle stick. They have no aqueducts or canals, no gardens and no palaces; in their buildings they study neither elegance nor climate, nor appearance nor regularity. Their peasants and lower classes all go about naked tying on only a langoti. The women too have only a lung." The only good points which Babar could find in favour of Hindusthan were that it is a large country, and has abundance of gold and silver and there is also an abundance of workmen of every profession and trade for any work and employment." During the reigns of Babar and Humayun the Mahomedans adjusted themselves with their Hindu neighbours and Sufi heresy gathered strength from contact with Hindu teachers and made many Muhammadans believe in transmigration (Samsara) and in the final union of the soul with the Supreme Spirit. The Moharrum festival and saint worship show that the Muhammadans were greatly influenced by the Hindus. The Pir worship also came into vogue. The pure iconoclastic religion of Muhammed was transformed and transfigured into Pir worship. The Mummadans were more tolerant towards Hindus than under Turkish rule. By the time Akbar came to the throne the two races, the Aryans and the Mongols, began to appreciate each other and the great Akbar was the first Islamic Emperor in India to see and realise the true nobility of soul and the devotion and fidelity of the Hindu character. He gathered about him the best men of his time men like Faizi, Abdul Fazel and their father Mubarak, the historians Mirza Abdul Rahim, Nizamuddin Ahmed, Bodami and others. These translated the Hindu epics and shastras and books of science and philosophy. He entertained many Rajaputs in high offices and married their daughters. Raja Todamral, Raja Birbal,

a companion of Akbar, Maharaja Bhagavandas, Raja Mansingh who acted as Governor of Bengal and sometime for Kabul were welcomed to court and trusted in the full consciousness that their interests were the same as those of the Mussalman noblemen. Akbar wanted to cement the union of Hindus and Mussalmans by the establishment of a religion of the Din-i-Ilahi in which the best points both of the Hindu and Muhammadan faiths were sought to be incorporated. Poll tax and Jaziya were abolished and toleration for all faiths became the universal law of the empire. To conciliate his subjects, Akbar abjured the use of all flesh except on four special occasions in the year and he joined in the religious rites observed by his Hindu queens. In regard to particular customs of the people relating to points where natural humanity was shocked in a way to make union impossible Akbar strove by wise encouragement and stern control where necessary, to help the growth of better ideas. Remarriage was encouraged and marriage before puberty was prohibited. This process of removing all causes of friction and establishing harmony between the two peoples went on without interruption during the reigns of Akbar, Jahangir and Shahjahan. Dara translated the Upanishads and wrote a work in which he sought to reconcile the Brahmin religion with the Mahomedan faith. This century was the halcyon period of Indian History when the Hindu and Mahomedan races lived amicably with each other. Aurangazeb followed a different path and the result was the destruction of the Mogul Empire. Muhammadan rule helped to refine the tastes and manners of the Hindus. The art of Government was better understood by the Mahomedans than by the old Hindu sovereigns. Muhammadans also excelled in the arts of war. Gunpowder and artillery were introduced by them. They brought ingenuity and mecha-

nical invention in a number of handicrafts. They introduced candles, paper, glass, household furniture and saddlery. They improved the knowledge of the people in music, instrumental and vocal, medicine, and astronomy. They made roads, aqueducts, canals and caravansaries. They instituted post offices and introduced the best specimens of architecture. They improved our gardening. They brought the rose and the onion. They established an efficient revenue system. Commerce flourished and relations with other parts of the world were established. On the whole the Mussalman rule was beneficial to India and awakened the Hindus from their apathy to material progress and the habitual lethargy to which they were accustomed in the degraded age of idolatrous and caste-ridden and priest-ridden mediæval India when dynasty after dynasty of Turks came and Turkish rule was unsettled—the darkest period of Indian history for over 5 centuries. In the 19th century a strong movement for reform was started in India by Sir Sayyid Ahmad. He energetically opposed fatalism, preached the doctrine "God helps those who help themselves," enthusiastically promoted education, founded a liberal College at Aligarh and in 1880 set on foot an annual educational Conference for the Muslims of India. Great success has attended those vigorous measures. The Indian Muslim reformers—care more for the spirit of Qur'an than for the letter. The Indian reformers, introducing as they do, a rationalizing spirit, treat the Qur'an itself with freedom, and they are thus at liberty to read into it almost everything they like and out of it almost everything they dislike. Arneer Alli in "Spirit of Islam" says, "Objectionable elements such as the veil, polygamy, and divorce can be explained away: they are occasional, not eternal, commands: look deeper into them and you shall see that in reality the freedom

of women, monogamy, and the permanence of marriage were intended." As India passed into the hands of the English, the Muhammadans having recently lost their political power in India, they were reluctant to adapt themselves to the changed environment, for their racial pride did not permit them to join English Schools and Colleges and seek English service. This afforded the Hindus a march in advance of them in availing themselves of the loaves and fishes of English service by qualifying themselves in English schools and Colleges. With the loss of political power the Mussalman became inert and the zeal for religion spent itself and no elevating force was found to make him rise to the occasion. The Muslim in India lost touch with the outside Muslim world nor did any progressive ideas enter his head and so he sank to the level of his companions the Hindus and his faculties were benumbed and deterioration set in more rapidly in the Muhammadan community than among the Hindus. It is only when Swaraj became the common ideal of all Indians that we hear of progress being once more set on foot, and the Muhammadan of to-day is as zealous for national glory as he was formerly. Now in some parts of India the Hindus are better equipped both intellectually and economically for the battle of life than their Muhammadan fellow-countrymen. The Hindus have a wider and more universal outlook. Muslims must put forth their best efforts to remove these deficiencies of their own community, and it should also be the duty of every true Indian to help his Muhammadan fellow-countrymen to secure their intellectual and economic advancement with a view to equalise their economic and intellectual position with non-Muslim communities of India. Without a liberal and modern outlook upon life the Mussalmans will not be able to build up a modern democratic State in India, nor will they be able to solve the

Hindu-Muslim problems for the evolution of such a State. What is wanted is a movement of modernism and liberalism among the Indian Mussalmans. The Turk or the Egyptian is far in advance of the Indian Mussalman. The leaders of the Khilafat organisation have openly accepted and approved the policy of the Angora Government with regard to the Khilafat question. This shows that the modern spirit is already at work. In the interests of the State the Hindus and other advanced communities of India must associate themselves with the Muslims even when they may not take the initiative in every movement that may be calculated to improve the intellectual equipment, the moral and spiritual outlook, and the economic strength and self-sufficiency of their Muhammadan fellow-countrymen. Besides, the best thoughts and deeds of a country are the most cherished inheritance of its people. "The religion of the State" says Pearson, "is surely worthy of reverence as any creed of the churches, and ought to grow more in intensity from year to year." It is the duty of all educated Indians who have widened sympathies to foster and strengthen the spirit of patriotism, this devotion to the common cause of the country as is done in all modern States. What could have been the state of Europe and America if this sentiment had not been ingrained in the very nature of the people during a long course of centuries? India will not progress as long as our people remain strangers to this lofty ideal which had given scope for heroism and self-sacrifice in other countries of the world. What is good for the country is also good to the individual. Every one should see that he sets in motion the various progressive tendencies in humanity in the Indian nation. Nations are made by the efforts of individuals.

## THE SIKHS.

In the 15th century a strong movement was started by Guru Nanack, the contemporary of Luther, to unite the Hindus and Muhammadans condemning alike the evil social customs among the Hindus and Muhammadans. Under the purely Hindu system, the intellect may admit, but the heart declines to allow a common platform to all people in the sight of God. The few educated Brahmans separated themselves from the rest of the community satisfying themselves that they are better gifted by God to know religion and that the rest are condemned and by a succession of births alone that they could be purified and be born as Brahmans when they could learn the true religion. Guru Nanack raised his voice condemning such doctrines and taught all men equally the love of God and of man. Caste, idolatry, polytheism, and gross conceptions of purity and pollution were the precise points in which the Muhammadans and Hindus were opposed to one another. Nanack condemned these evil customs among the Hindus. Nanack's watchword was that he was neither Hindu nor Muhammadan, but that he was a worshipper of the Nirakar or the formless. His teachings are the same as the teachings of Bhakti saints in Northern India. The religious scriptures are known as Granth and they are a collection of the teachings of Bhakti saints in Northern India. His first companion was a Muhammadan, and his teacher is said to have been also a Muhammadan. The abuses of polytheism were checked by the devotion to one object of worship which is the Supreme God, the Paramatma, and the abuses of caste were controlled by conceding to all Hindus and Muhammadans alike, the right of worship and love, the one God who is the God of all. The puritanic spirit of the Sikhs developed under persecution. Under Guru Govind Singh, the tenth Guru, the Sikhs

became a militant power. All their affairs, secular and spiritual, were regulated at the four great 'Takhats'—literally boards, platforms or thrones—of Akhalghar, Anandapur, Patna, and Abhainagar, where every Sikh, great or small, had a voice, for did not Guru Govind himself, after investing four disciples with 'pahal' stand in a humble attitude before them to be invested in his turn? Again, whenever Sikhs meet in the Guru's name there is the fifth Takhat, and it is not long ago that at one of them, the idolatrous practices, justified by the Durbar at Amritsar, were condemned by the consent of the faithful assembled at Akhalghar. Men and women, clergy and laity, of sacred and profane descent, all are merged in the one standing of 'Sikh'—learner or disciple.

### THE EUROPEANS.

These are Christians who had forgotten Christ and his teachings. They came to India in buccaneering expeditions and in the early part of the 16th century settled themselves as traders owning some factories on some sea-coast towns. They gradually penetrated into the country and the English now rule over an area of 1,093,074 square miles with a population of 244,267,542 with suzerainty over the Indian states. The French have Pondicherry, Yanam, Mahe, Karikal and Chandranagore. The Portuguese have Goa, Diu and Daman. When they entered India their social and political institutions were as bad as they could be. But the spirit of enterprise and the love of supremacy over the sea brought them in contact with many peoples inhabiting this vast planet and as soon as they found that their social institutions were not suited for their progress, they adjusted themselves to the circumstances. At the present day they have advanced far ahead of all the nations of the world. By gradual reformation England is

what it is to day, the 'greatest Colonial Empire' over which the sun never sets, the first maritime power, 'the most enterprising commercial nation and the richest industrial country in the world. The Indian has to learn from England that the 'stereotyped social institutions, in which he lives can no longer help him to advance any further. He must take heart and work with unfailing strength.

What was the state of Europe when India was in the zenith of glory? The state of Europe was worse than our present state. The father could dispose of his children as he liked. Children were freely exposed in the old Greek and Roman world and among the Norsemen. In the case of the wife or of acknowledged children the father had the rights of a Magistrate *i. e.* though he could not legitimately put to death except for a grave and sufficient cause, there was no recognised tribunal to which an appeal from his sentence would lie. The father's right over the person and property of the child was also absolute. Neither wife nor children could possess property. The husband could take a stranger into his family to share his children's inheritance. The right of selling a ward's marriage was amongst the most profitable incidents of feudal tenure. A girl of seven years could be betrothed in Mediaeval England, and as down to a later time the marriages of mere children were still common, the parental authority in regard to marriage was practically absolute, and to marry without the consent of the parents was regarded as an outrage on decency. In England the education of women was neglected until a quite late epoch. Mr. Stanton says in "*Woman's Bible*:" "The canon and civil law, Church and State alike taught that woman was made *after* man, of man, and for man, an inferior being, 'subject to man.'" St. Paul and the Christian fathers approved her inferiority



and subjection. Their disdain for her and their contempt for marriage are well-known. St. Augustine asks himself why she was created at all. Some fathers looked upon her as the "root of all evil" created "from a rib of Adam's body not from a part of his soul." "Marriage is good for those who are afraid to sleep at home at night and soon." In the feudal legislation of Europe woman sank lower and lower. Lcky says "woman sank to a lower legal position than she ever occupied under paganism, notwithstanding the fact that Christianity did introduce into the Roman world some true principles as regards woman." Legouve says "under the feudal regime conjugal morals return to Brutality." Miss Cady Stanton gives a summary (History of Women's Suffrage) of the English common law which, basing itself on the alleged inferiority of woman deprived her of the control of person and property and made her morally and economically dependent on her husband. What after all is the Christian conception of woman! When man was made, God, afterwards, of a rib of his side, made woman to show, it has been said, that "he was not created principally to attend to generation as other living creatures are; for work in matrimony is a work very base" (Ven. Louis de Ponte S. J. Meditations VI 264, 272, 274).

Even the great poet Milton, the Puritan, the republican, the Cromwellian, the author of *Areopagitica*, the advocate of the freedom of the press, wrote of woman as follows:—

‘Oh! why did God,  
 Creator wise, that peopled highest heaven  
 With spirit masculine, create at last  
 This novelty on earth, this fair defect  
 Of nature? and not fill the world at once

With men, as angels, without feminine?  
 Or find some other way to generate  
 Mankind? This mischief had not then befallen,  
 And more that shall befall, innumerable  
 Disturbances on earth through female snares  
 And strait conjunction with this sex."

"It is only after," John Stuart Mill wrote: "the subjection of woman that the conscience of England was awakened, after 1865 only that an advance was made to establish her position and rights." It is only very recently that women had acquired some status in England. The class distinctions in Great Britain are in no way better than the caste distinctions in India. Mr. Sydney Brooks (in the North American Review) says of England before the American War of Independence: "What was it at bottom that made the English atmosphere before the war so difficult for an American to breathe in freely? It was, I believe, that he felt himself in a country where the dignity of life was lower than his own; a country where a man born in ordinary circumstances expected, and was expected to die in ordinary circumstances; where the scope of his efforts was traced beforehand by the accident of position; where he was handicapped in all cases and crushed in most by the superincumbent weight of convention, "good form" and the deadening artificialities and conventions of an old society.... There were some trades and professions and occupations that were "respectable" and others which were not.... There was not a single Englishman who had not the social privilege of despising some other Englishman, and the lower one penetrated in the social scale. The more complex and mysterious and the more rigidly drawn did these lines of demarcation become."

All the various peoples described above who domicile

in India constitute the Indian nation. I have simply enumerated the races, describing their social customs and religious conception, but I have not attempted to state the localities in which these races are particularly found. Everywhere there is an intermixture of blood and it is not possible to speak with certainty what particular races inhabit each province. Indian Ethnology may give us some clue but the science itself is still in an embryonic state and I dare not rush into regions where angels are afraid to tread. Having acquainted you with these indispensable preliminaries I shall proceed to deal with the subject on hand—the development of democracy—from the standpoint of (1) Religion, (2) Politics, (3) Economics (4) Social Purification, (5) the Doctrine of Human Brotherhood.



## **Chapter II.**

### **RELIGION.**

With .atheists and agnostics, the dominating principle is that of Positivism i.e., the greatest happiness of the largest number of mankind in every field of human activity and enterprise. Theists look upon this universe as the manifestation of the Almighty existing from eternity to eternity. In the conception of this Almighty there are various interpretations given by various commentators. Each to force his own interpretation on others waged innumerable wars devastating countries and bringing sorrow into every home. In the name of religion the grossest atrocities were committed on humanity. Think of the Buddhistic blood that has been spilt on Indian soil to expel Buddhism from the shores of India. Think of the crusades between the cross and the crescent that manured Western Asia with human bones for centuries. Think of the wars between Protestants and Roman Catholics—the thirty years' war in Central Europe—the persecution of Huguenots in France and the Inquisition in Spain and the escape of Pilgrim fathers from England. What were these wars for? It is to inject into humanity through every gaping wound caused either by the sword or the bullet the interpretation of Almighty from the viewpoint of each offender. The world is sick of such wars and religious toleration is the outcome of this sad experience of humanity. All men believe in the power of the Almighty and look upon the universe as the revelation and each religious book as a commentary on the revelation. It is left to the individual will to choose whatever commentary he likes and there is no reason why all people should adopt the same commentary. True religion is the realisation of the Almighty in man. To be

one with God is the goal of all religions. If the Hindus and Mussalmans realised the oneness of all religions in the 18th century in India, Indian history would have had to tell a different tale and India would have been a prosperous nation among the nations of the world. It is the differentiation of religions that made one to run one's sword over the throat of one's neighbour and thus paved the way for European intervention and their final domination. It is the same spirit of intolerance that is prevalent in the Punjab, Mysore and Malabar that comes often like a cloud to make the sun of Democracy invisible on the Indian horizon. Unless every one in India gives up religious bigotry and tries to live and work for the common good of the nation, Democracy will be a stranger to this land, the rich will oppress the poor and the high will sneer at the low and the capitalist will tease the labourer.

### KHILAFAT.

Every human institution stands for the realisation of certain ideals prompted by human sentiments. Institutions are not to be judged by themselves but as furthering the development of sentiments and an institution is good or bad as the sentiment supporting it is one or the other. The institution of the Khilafat has often been misunderstood and the attempt to express Muslim ideals in Western terminology has made matters worse. The Khalifa is not a Pope and cannot issue "bulls." He is not even a priest. He cannot enforce his own interpretation of the sacred texts and meddle with the religious consciousness of his fellow Mussalmans. He cannot, like the Pope of middle ages, suspend even a divine law, as for instance, permitting persons to marry within the prohibited relations. The Khalifas of the past have never arrogated these powers to themselves. Throughout the extensive domain of Muslim religi-

ous law. "Ibadt and Momilat"—the Khalifa has no influence over his co-religionists except what his personal piety and learning might secure him. Kingly power is unnecessary to Caliph though many Caliphs of the past have exercised a despotic sway over their subjects. In fact despotic power is entirely opposed to the basic principles of the Khilafat; for unlike the King the Caliph's power does not arise from any sort of divine right but from the free choice of all free Mussalmans. That he is the chosen of the people and responsible to their opinion is his glory and greatness. That he should not act except after consulting them, that he should convince before he commands is, according to the best of Mussalman traditions, a necessary condition of his office.

What then is the Khilafat? It is an institution for the protection and preservation of those ideals of a common brotherhood found in the whole Muslim world. The Mussalmans are one people; in a sense the followers of no other religion are one people. The prophet said in his last speech at holy Mecca "And this is my last advice unto you: *You are of one brotherhood.*" And in spite of a thousand conflicts and a thousand wars the brotherly feeling dwells in the hearts of all Mussalmans to-day not merely as a pleasant memory but as a living reality. There is nothing clerical about the institution of Khilafat. The differentiation of Church and State is unknown to Muslim theory; for the Islam the State is the Church. The Khilafat thus, on the one hand, includes both the political and religious interests, on the other hand it should exclude those interests not common to the whole Muslim world.

The Mussalmans of the world have a right to give their opinion concerning the Khilafat but the internal Government of Turkey is purely a Turkish question and

outside Mussalmans have no business to interfere. So also the national state of Turkey has nothing to do with the internal administration of other Muslim countries.

When Kingship was the order of the day and a common culture had partially eliminated the consciousness of national differences the despotic rule of the Caliph over all Mussalmans did not appear anomalous. The days of Harun al-Raschid have gone. Arabic is no longer the language of common culture and the indigenous literatures of Muslim nations have been developing for centuries. The tradition of an international Muslim Government has been dead for a thousand years, while innumerable causes have tended to emphasise national differences. A Khilafat of the Abba Side type is impossible of realisation and would be altogether vicious if realised; for it could only establish itself by crushing the liberal movements so young and rigorous in the Muslim world.

### INDIA.

India has never been directly governed by the Caliph. The mediaeval Kings of India were the "helpers" (Nasir) of the commander of the faithful or they rose higher and became his "partners" (Quasim). They were confirmed in their royal authority after they had attained to it through force, election or hereditary rights. They were never appointed by him and consequently never degenerated to the rank of mere Governors. This was as it should have been. India was never included in Khilafat lands. The power of the Caliph rested on the Shariat, the religious law of the Mussalmans. But the Shariat must be remembered as the personal law of Mussalmans and could not be enforced on non-Muslims. Consequently when the majority of the inhabitants did not follow the Shariat the Khalifa could have no authority. If Harun Al-Raschid had conquered

India he would have become its king, not its caliph, for you cannot have a caliph ruling over a non-muslim people. The religious obligation which binds his co religionists to him has no force with men of alien creed. It must be quite another tie that unites them to him, a tie with which Islam has nothing to do. The reasons which kept India out of the Khilafat in the past have lost none of their force. The Khilafat, whatever form it assumes, has to be confined to countries overwhelmingly Muslim in population.

### POWERS.

The power of Khilafat according to orthodox tradition is for defensive purposes only. A caliph may be bellicose and aggressive like any other man; but if he takes the aggressive, he cannot as Caliph ask his fellow-Muslims to support him. Allied to it is another tradition that even in case of defensive war, the Mussalmans of the neighbourhood are to be called first and those far off only in case of extreme necessity. The Caliph has never been considered to be at liberty to throw the whole Muslim world into convulsions for the sake of every little skirmish on the frontier.

With the above considerations in view, the position of Indian Mussalmans will appear in a two-fold light. On the one hand, the Khalifa cannot legally command them for they are not in a land within the Khilafat fold. On the other hand, they are in duty bound to help him for the feeling of brotherliness which the Khilafat embodies is in them also. But their help can only be asked for and need only be given in cases of extreme urgency when the existence of Islam is really in danger, a contingency, which in the past has arisen about once in 4 centuries.



## TURKISH VIEW.

From the point of view of Turkey's interests as well as those of the rest of the Muslim world, Khilafat as it has existed in Turkey has been found to be worse than a failure. The Turks establishing a Republic as the only effective and safely reliable means of regenerating their nation, regard the existence of the Khilafat not only unnecessary but a positive danger to the growth and continuance of national life and unity not only in Turkey but also in the rest of the Muslim world. They contend "*the Khilafat Office idea* which has been conserved since ages to realise the basis of a United Muslim Government in the world has never been realised and on the contrary has been a constant cause of strife and duplicity among the Muslims." They say that an ideal Khilafat is an Utopia. They do not want to risk their future national destiny upon mere sentimental and theoretical grounds such as the need and importance of having one central authority "the Khilafat for the protection and uplift of the whole Islamic world." They say that except in the first 30 years the period of the first 4 Caliphs such a thing as an ideal Khilafat had never existed in any part of the Muslim world. They exclaim, "What are the fruits and achievements of the Khilafat in terms of national greatness and prosperity, whether in spiritual or temporal affairs?" "What example or standard of Islamic life and morality was set by the successive Khalifs?" "How far Islam has been a living force among the institutions and the daily life of the people during these 4 centuries?" The next question they ask is "How far the souls, the minds, the morals and the physical and material interests of the people had any chance of development and growth under the imperial and despotic rule of the Khalifs whom it would be nothing short of blasphemy to call or regard as the representatives or the

successors of the great heroes of Islam—Hazarat Abubaker, Umar, Usman, and Ali—the only Khalifs who ever fulfilled the conditions of the Islamic Khilafat.” The Khalifs in Turkey during the last 2 centuries were bartering away the most vital interests of the nation in the form of concessions, known as “the capitulations,” which they granted to foreign bankers and exploiters for the sake of money most of which was squandered upon personal pleasures. The Caliphs of Turkey blocked by means of an iron wall of unmitigated autocracy, all avenues of light and learning so as to keep the people in utter darkness as to what the rest of Europe was accomplishing in the way of human emancipation and advance. The Caliphs of Turkey had inflicted the severest penalties upon some of their subjects for the crime of being patriots. In 1854 the Caliph borrowed millions from six European powers and started the Ottoman Debt which had been sapping the very foundation of national prosperity ever since. In 1881 the Caliph signed the decree of Moharram by which he mortgaged six important state revenues of the Turkish Empire and placed them under the direct administration of the council of Ottoman Debt which consisted of the representatives of six foreign European powers who were competing for the exploitation of the country. Caliph after Caliph enforced a reactionary policy depriving the country and the people of all modern means of progress and prosperity with the result that practically the whole economic and financial resources of the empire were exploited by foreigners. While even such small countries as Switzerland, Holland and Belgium were producing great scholars and public men and were exporting their manufactures to distant parts of the world, Turkey, even though it was a great empire, till very recently could not supply necessary expert knowledge even for her own needs and had to depend upon foreigners

for such vital and national requirements as banks, railways, telegraphs etc., so much so that even for the purposes of defence, fortifications and armament she had to call in the aid of German generals and British manufacturers. The last 2 centuries which is the period of greatest advance in European civilisation and prosperity, is the time during which Turkey's decay, moral, material and political, has been continuous and complete. This is what the Khalifat had effected in Turkey during the last 4 centuries. What did it do for Islam and the Muslim world outside Turkey? Did it protect the Muslims in Morocco or Algeria or in other parts of Africa against the European Christian powers which had brought them under their sway? Did it help the Muslim power in India when it was attacked or overwhelmed by internal or external foes? What was the nature of the Government in Egypt and Arabia while it lasted? Has it left there any monument in the shape of systems or institutions necessary for moral and material well-being of the Muslims entrusted to its charge? Ghazi Mustafa Kamal tells the Indian Mussalmans that "The Khilafat Office idea, which has been conserved since ages to realise the basis of a united Muslim Government in the world, has never been realised, and on the contrary has been a constant cause of strife and duplicity among the Muslims, whereas their real interests expect it as a principle that the social associations may constitute themselves into independent Government. The spiritual and real bond between Muslim nations is understood to be in the signification of the sacred verse: "*Innamal Mominoona Ikhwatun.*" The bond of "Imam" or true faith is the real unifying force. The most effective means of realising this desideratum is the determination of the muslims to make an organised effort to equip themselves with all the spiritual, mental, moral and material forces and resources

so as to acquite the condition and status of a progressive and prosperous people. When such is the view of the Turkish Free State the Indian Mussalmans also must adapt themselves to the circumstances that are preparing in the modern world.

There must be an open and unambiguons repudiation by every patriotic Mussalman of his conceit of extra territorial patriotism. He must be loyal in all political and economic relations to India in preference to every other country in the world. There must be the separation of sectarian or denominational religious authority from political and economic duties and obligations. Even the declaration of Jebad shall not be permitted to interfere with the supreme obligations of the Indian Mussalman to the law and authority of the composite Indian state.

Cannot a Mussalman nationalist reconcile himself with international co-operation with his brother Mussalmans out-side the political limits of Nationalistic India? That the Turkish Free State has already solved by federalism. The various Muslim countries and their legislatures should be left not only with powers of internal administration but also with full sovereign status. Only certain specified rights should be left to an international administration presided over by the Caliph. The exact definition of those rights would be necessary to prevent the Caliph's servants from clashing with the national Governments.

The Caliph would become the grand international representative of Islam.

The Caliph should be above all national and sectional feuds. In the national Government of India the Mussalmans have a right, not as Mussalmans but as

minority, that their religious rights should be respected and that they should be provided with guarantees sufficient to ensure them against the possibility of sectarian oppression. The right belongs to all minorities in all lands. Minorities are tender things. Any little event upsets them. And yet once minorities are alienated a truly national Government is impossible. Majorities and minorities lose their moral claim to govern the country when the ideal inspiring them is their sectarian welfare and not the general good.

### MAJORITY.

There is no transcendent law giving the majority a right to govern; its moral power is based on the simple assumption, that since the good of the country is what all have in view, the opinion of the many is more likely to be correct than the opinion of the few. But where a majority makes it clear that the public good is not what it wants the majority is under no obligation to obey it. Force, then, takes the place of discussion and heads are broken, instead of being counted. Thus in the interest of Indian Nationalism, not that of pan-Islamism, that Mussalmans and all other Indian minorities are granted the guarantee they demand. A nationalistic government is founded on good will, assurance of fair play, and safety to all. Without this no nationalistic Government is possible anywhere. The Muslim claim to veto any law touching their communal interest by a majority of three-fourths would neither gain nor lose its force if there were no Mussalmans outside India. These claims are not items of general pan-Islamic push. They are problems to be viewed from the standpoint of Indian Nationalism. The state should always observe religious neutrality. There is the supreme need of building up a purely secular state in India, which shall owe no special allegiance to any particular denominational law or scripture.

India is the land wherein almost all the religions of the world are found. In a truly nationalistic India, the rights of all should be guaranteed, whether they belong to majority or minority. Whoever domiciles himself within the geographical confines of India has a birth-right to be treated with all fairness as a free citizen of a free state. Every nationalist in India must so change his heart as to look upon every Indian with a brotherly feeling. He should earnestly attempt to discourage every kind of jealousy between various religions and encourage mutual understanding and sympathetic co-operation between them all, as the one indispensable requirement for fostering the spirit of Nationalism. Sons of the same father, professing the same religion, living in the same house, enjoying the same social and religious privileges may entertain the bitterest feelings of hatred and enmity against each other. It is not on the oneness of religion that social harmony can exist but on the development of those sentiments in the human heart, of fellow-feeling, kindness, toleration, sympathy and an earnest desire to preserve national independence at all costs. It is the change of heart that is required. All people may not necessarily profess the same religion. Every Nationalist would lay to heart what a well-known poet has said about the deepest cause of the failure of the greatest of ancient European Empires:—

Like ours it looked in out-ward air,  
 Its head was clear and true.  
 Sumptuous its clothing, rich its fare,  
 No pause its action knew.

Stout was its arm each threw and bone,  
 Seemed puissant and alive—  
 But ah! its heart! its heart was stone  
 And so it could not thrive.

The lesson thus enshrined is one that must be learnt and acted on by every national organism that desires to prosper or even to endure.

Religion is no doubt the motive power setting in motion every human activity, purifying, ennobling, stimulating and evolving humanity. All the piety of the world has its basis in religion. The love of God, the promptitude for righteous action, the knowledge about God and the communion with God have all their bases in religion. But no one is a true devotee of God who injures his neighbour. All are equal in the eye of God. Men and women are the children of God. Any injury inflicted on a neighbour is a violation of the fundamental principles of religion. Above all religions is Freedom. Freedom is Mukti or salvation. A state without freedom is a body without life. Plato says, "The state is the individual writ large." When freedom is the goal of individual existence it must also be the goal of a collective existence of individuals forming the state because the individual in striving for the ideal has co-operated with other individuals of like nature in placing the results of the joint achievement in a permanent form of a state not to be shaken with every blast of the wind. Every sacrifice made for the preservation of the state is a step in advance towards perfection. Every sacrifice made for the preservation of the state accelerates the evolution of soul and brings the individual nearer to God.

### CHRISTIANITY

Does Christianity stand in the way of Indian Nationalism? A sincere Christian may experience a kind of shock in finding that friends cannot see as he sees and think as he thinks. If he realises at an early stage, before irreparable mischief is done by his prejudices, differences are not

always as great as they seem with regard to fundamental unities of thought and life. They are merely varieties in the preference of methods rather than in the principles underlying all. What matter all these religious differences of which we make so much, when we find eternal verities of beauty and truth underlying them all and teaching us the elementary lesson that we learn from the lips of the teacher, "Little children, love one another." If we keep in mind this fundamental unity we learn to look upon each other as sons and daughters of God and heirs of the same Kingdom of Heaven. Every one must lay to his heart what Longfellow has said of this fundamental unity:

"One holy church of God appears  
Through every age and race  
Unwasted by the lapse of years  
Unchanged by changing place.

"From oldest time, on farthest shores,  
Beneath the pine or palm,  
One Unseen Presence she adores  
With silence or with psalm.

"Her priests are all God's faithful sons,  
To serve the world raised up;  
The pure in heart her baptised ones,  
Love her communion cup.

"The truth is her prophetic gift,  
The soul her sacred page;  
And feet on mercy's errand swift,  
Do make her pilgrimage."

### POLITICAL AGGRANDISEMENT.

But the vulgarity of turning religion into a means of money-making and empire-building has been a fashion



of these political and commercial times. It is a greater abuse of what is sacred when these manoeuvres are worked by persons who have no religious faith in the doctrines which for other motives they seek to propagate. Many instances might be given of the exploitation of Christianity in support of political interests. It was in this sense that it was said by a French minister, "Anticlericalism is not an article of export." For religion attacked at home was found to serve French colonial aims and the maintenance abroad of French interests. There are (Conflict of Colour—by B. L. Putnam Weale P. 119) those "who still believe that, as it will be, in our day, impossible to bar out the hordes of Asia and Africa, the only safeguard for Europe and the white man still lies to-day as in the past in Christianity, and that the impossibility of allying themselves with other creeds is perhaps the reason why instinctively the great movement towards Christianising the coloured world is growing stronger and stronger in Anglo-Saxon countries as a sort of forlorn hope launched to capture an almost impregnable position." The author cited is not ashamed to supply an example of political Christianity of his own and to confess that "the part which the white man is politically called upon to play in Africa is the part of "Delilah and no other; for if the black man is Christianised, his destructive strength is stripped from him as was Samson's when his locks were cut." He says that in India the hope of a general Christianisation is illusory for "it is there looked upon as a disintegrating force, a purely European thing aiming at destroying the most essential parts of social fabrics which have been slowly and painfully built up through ages." He adds that "it is a strange fact which has often attracted the attention of unbiassed observers that Asian converts to Christianity are not only denationalised but are not morally benefited; the very effect of breaking away from the support of

their natural environment being an unnatural one and therefore visited with bad effects." Indian nationalism respects the rights of all minorities because her aim is the general good. All sincere Christians have not only any fear from their neighbours but they should also, in the interests of notionalty, be very careful that they do not fall victims to the machinations of the political Christianity of the West so ably depicted by Putnam Weale. Their attitude towards the nationalistic movement decides the sympathy and veneration of their fellow countrymen towards them. They have to bear in mind the passage in 2 Kings X 15: "*And when he was departed thence, he lighted on Jehonadab, the son of Rechab, coming to meet him; and he saluted him and said to him: 'Is thine heart right, as my heart is with thy heart?' And Jehonadab answered, 'It is. If it be, give me thine hand.'*" The circumstances preceding this passage are briefly these:—The house of Omri after the death of Ahab advocated the worship of Syrian gods Baal and Ashtarothe in the regime of the Dowager Queen Jezebel instead of Jehovah, the God of the Israelites. Elijah and Elisha the prophets of Israel encouraged Jehu, the leader of the Jehovistic revolution. The whole of the royal house of Omri was massacred and Jehu was returning from the scene of massacre. Jehonadab was the leader of the Kenites, a tribe of Arabs from the Sinaitic desert, which had proved friendly to the Israelites in the time of their wanderings. They were also followers of Jehovah adopting a primitive puritanism from which Israel, to her shame, had fallen away. In this crisis they met. Jehonadab is known to Jehu as the friend of the Israelites and his coming to meet Jehu corroborates it. The question is whether he will go along with him in full confidence. "Is thine heart right even as my heart is with thy heart? Will you trust me

as I will trust you? In this movement I have put my foot down and I cannot reconsider, and I will not go back. If we are to be allies, it must be all 'in all.' Similar is the question which the Indian Nationalist puts to the leaders of the Christian community. The sympathy of Indian Christians is always with their other Indian brethren as that of Jeponadab with Jehu. They all suffer under the same tyranny and are subjected to the same exploitation and suffer from the same evils that eat into the vitals of the Indian national organism and also carry on their forehead the same badge of slavery and inferiority among nations of the world besides being equal victims to famine, pestilence, plague, malaria and cholera which are the results of the same economic forces working in the country. What heals the sores in the Indian national organism heals the sores in the Christian community. Let them bear in mind the noble words of St. Paul: "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honourable, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely; if there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think on these things. The things that ye both learned and received and heard and saw in me, these things do, and the God of peace shall be with you." The aim of Indian Nationalism is to allow each people to work out their own development without outside interference from others. This is the principle of Swadharma which was proclaimed by Bhagawan Sri Krishna on the banks of the Saraswati river in ancient India and now named by the modern European nations as the principle of self-determination. It is an essentially Indian principle that each individual and people, has and have his and their own law—Swadharma governing their development and that they should be free to follow it. "Swadharma," says Prof. P. N. Mikhypodhaya, "is the individual's particular current in the great

stream of the flow of cosmic evolution." India stands for the principle "live and let live" according to the law of self-evolution. Indian Nationalism will never attempt to commit suicide by cutting the very basis on which it stands. When the first disciples of Jesus came to him and said, "Master, we saw one casting out evil spirits in Thy name and we forbade him because he followed not us." Jesus replied, "Forbid him not, for there is no man which shall do a mighty work in my name and be able quickly to speak evil of Me. For he that is not against us is on our side." The followers of Christ must view with the same spirit of catholicity the basic principles of which Indian Nationalism is the embodiment. Since Nationalism is not against the noblest teachings of Christ, Indian Christians will work out their evolution as the other communities in India. Nationalism enables them to lift their heads and look the whole world in the face as the free citizens of a free country. The Northern Christians came and settled in the West coast as early as the 6th century of the Christian era and nobody interfered with their religious worship and they had nothing to complain against the nationalistic governments then existing.

### BUDDHISM AND JAINISM.

Turn we to the two religions of Buddhism and Jainism which have their birth in this ancient land. Professor Rhys Davids has said: "Gautama's whole training is Brahmanical. Buddhism is the product of Hinduism. He probably deemed himself to be the perfect exponent of the spirit as distinct from the letter of the ancient faith." The reverence with which Hindus look upon Buddha and his teachings is nothing short of their devotion to Sri Krishna. He is an incarnation of the Hindu religion and his Avatara succeeds that of Sri Krishna. It was possibly owing to

the later developments of Buddhism which the Hindus had to combat that his Avatara was spoken of by puranic writers in the age of decadence and degradation of Hindu religious spirit as having been for the purpose of misleading and destroying men. Buddha taught Dharma, Karma, Reincarnation, deliverance from Avidya in Nirvana, practised Dhyana and experienced Samadhi which in no way conflict with the teachings of Sri Krishna. Jainism is another offshoot of Hinduism. Its first Tirthankhara Rishabdewa is said in the Bhagavata Purana to have been an Avatara of Vishnu; and the 22nd Arhat of the Jains Shri Nemijnatha is described as a cousin of Sri Krishna.

### ZOROASTRIANISM.

As far as the vague records of the past can be traced we find the Aryan stock settling for some time on the western borders of India divided at a later period into two groups, one of which went down into Persia, while the other occupied the North Indian plains, the birth place of Buddhism and Jainism. Though there is a little difference in the religious conceptions of these two peoples their languages have strikingly similar roots. The Rig Veda embodies the religious conception of Indo-Aryans and Zendavesta those of the Parsees. This difference in the religious conceptions is accounted for by the late production of Zendavesta many centuries after the Rig Veda. The Parsees lived in India long before the advent of the European nations and they were respectfully treated by Hindu princes though they had to flee from Persia, the land of their birth for the sake of religious toleration.

### SIKHISM.

Sikhism has its origin in the Punjab. Its founder was Guru Nanak, the contemporary of Luther in Europe.

It is a school of advanced religious thought in Hinduism itself laying great stress on Bhakti or devotion. Owing to the religious persecutions of its followers by Mogul emperors this purely religious order was changed into a fighting people by Govind the 10th successor of Nanak. The religious scriptures of the Order are called the Granth which is a compilation of the hymns of the various Bhakti teachers of North India.

### NATIONALISM.

Above all these seven great religions and common to all these (Hinduism, Muhammadanism, Christianity, Buddhism, Jainism, Zoroastrianism and Sikhism) there is a higher religion in India to-day which calls itself Nationalism. It is not a mere political programme but a religion in which all who follow it, will have to live and suffer. It is no intellectual conceit to call oneself a nationalist. To be a nationalist in India means to be an instrument of God and to live in that spirit for it is no human force that is awakening the nation but the divine call ringing in the ears of young India. India may not be politically strong, she may not possess able-bodied sons, she may not have great scientists and literates. She may not have high intellectuals. But she must have a people, who believe in her new religion, Nationalism.

Every religion is persecuted in its earliest stages. Similarly certain forces have appeared against this new religion. The question then becomes a personal one. Are you who wish to take your part in this divine movement able to endure? Will you suffer? Have you got a real faith that the movement is from God or is it merely a political aspiration? Or, is it merely a larger selfishness? Or is it merely that you wish to be free in order to oppress others, as you are being oppressed?

Does your political creed spring from the divine fountain? Is it really God that is born in you? Do you really believe? Have you realised that you are merely the instruments of God and that your bodies are not your own? If you have realised all this, then you are true nationalists able to save the soul of India from everlasting perdition.

You all know what Turkey used to be—a term of reproach and a by-word among nations. What has made Turkey so different to-day? What has made Turkey to be the ideal of the world? Turkey has learnt to believe. She has now her faith in God. She believes in her new religion, Nationalism.

Nationalism is a movement which no obstacle can stop. However high the dam of oppression may be built as the great Asian Poet Laureate has sung of the dam of Mukhtadhara, it will one day burst over-power and destroy the machinery that is instrumental in raising it. God is born again on earth to save his people. The Hindu believes that God is born again and again to save the world when Adharma is predominant. God has a mission to accomplish through His great and ancient nation in India. He had preserved a few thousands of Jews the *Israelites* to sow broadcast the gospel of Christianity. Has he preserved in vain the 300 million people of India from being swept away from the face of this planet during so many centuries of oppression if He has no divine mission to achieve?

God is revealing himself in you—not that you may rise by human strength to trample under-foot the weaker peoples, but because something must come out of you which is to save your nation and the world. That which the ancient Seers knew and revealed of old is to be known again on earth; and in order that God may reveal Himself

again, you must realise Him in yourselves and shape your own lives and the life of this great nation that it may be fit to reveal Him:

In the season of ordeal and persecution only the children of grace, for whom the gospel is preached, are able to see the vision of its glory. The world admires and hates but will not believe. It promulgates ordinances to eradicate all believers in the Divine mission and breathes out threatenings against the disciple of the Lord. Even in the nation itself to which the gospel is preached, the rich man and the high-priest receive the doctrine with contempt, because its enthusiasms are unintelligible to their worldly wisdom, its inspired teachings are a scandal to their narrow systems; they even accuse its apostles before the tribunal of alien rulers as pestilent fellows and movers of sedition throughout the nation. But Nationalism is a divinely appointed power of the Eternal and as such cannot be suppressed and must do its God-given work before it returns to the Universal Energy from whence it came.

Sir Herbert Risby, in his speech on India at the annual banquet of the Royal Asiatic Society, held in May, 1910, says, "The idea of nationality was first divined from India; it travelled westwards; now it is travelling back to the East growing and spreading but without the root of experience." He quotes Sir Henry Maine as his authority for this statement. May it please the Almighty to foster and strengthen Nationalism in the land of its birth, its roots penetrating deep into humanity so that they may touch the true springs of human life from which it may have a perennial supply of nourishment which will keep it ever-green and flourishing.

Lord Acton observes in his essay on Nationality:—  
 "The pursuit of a remote and ideal object which captivates



the imagination by its splendour and the reason by its simplicity, evokes an energy which would not be inspired by a rational possible end, limited by many antagonistic claims and confined to what is reasonable, practicable and just. One excess or exaggeration is the corrective of the other, and error promotes truth, where the masses are concerned, by counter-balancing a contrary error. The few have not strength to achieve great changes unaided, the many have not wisdom to be moved by truth unmingled. When the disease is various, no particular definite remedy can meet the wants of all. Only the attraction of an abstract idea or of an ideal state, can unite in a common action, multitudes who seek a universal cure for many special evils, and common restorative applicable to many different conditions."

At first, man, under his selfish impulses, refuses an obligation to serve the interests of others but as the complexity of the said structure increases he learns to identify the interests of the nation with his own, and realises the duty to his nations as well as to himself. When there is a clash of interests between the individual and the nation the individual must subordinate his interests to that of the nation. C. H. Pearson says in his "National life and Character;" "There was no sense of national life in the community in the Roman Empire when it was about to fall. The Roman Empire fell to pieces, not because its administrators were always inefficient or its armies weak or its finances and mechanical resources inferior to those of the nations which overpowered it, but because there was really no sense of national life in the community. Unless the general feeling in a people is to regard individual existence and fortunes as of no practical account in comparison with the existence and self-respect of the body politic the dis-integrating forces of time will always be stronger, in

the long run than any given organization. In fact, devotion to the state as the embodiment of the collective interests of the nation has become in all civilised countries an article of faith, almost as binding as a religious duty. Even more than a citizen's duty to his religious faith is his duty to his country regarded as binding. Amongst the obligations of a citizen patriotism is above all religion. The paramount duty of the citizen to make every possible sacrifice for the protection and honour of the state is recognised by all modern states by passing the law of conscription, requiring any able-bodied adult male to serve in the army when required. This sacrifice is demanded solely on the ground that the requirements of the state are paramount over those of the individual for national existence. The best thoughts and deeds of a country are the most cherished inheritance of its people from generation to generation till the end of history. "The religion of the state," says Mr. Pearson, "is surely worthy of reverence as any creed of the churches, and ought to grow in intensity from year to year."

Dr. Sir Rabindranath Tagore writes in his *Visva Bharati* of religion thus :—

"It should be the function of religion to provide us with the universal idea of truth and maintain it in its purity. But men have often made perverse use of their religion, building with it permanent walls to ensure their own separateness. In the region of worldly interest, our individual boundaries, in spite of their strength, are adjustable; they are ever changing their lines of demarcation. A man, who, in the natural course of things, is a stranger to me, may establish intimate kinship with me tomorrow; one who has been my enemy may become my best friend in time. But if we use religion itself for the delimitation of our mutual relationships, then those boundaries become rigidly unalterable. Religion must only deal with things that belong to the spiritual realm of the central and with the sentiments that are self-luminous carrying their ultimate value in themselves. It should allow a great part of human existence to lie

outside its direct interferences, so that life may enjoy its freedom of growth, guided by laws of reason or rhythm of beauty. The guidance of reason constantly varies its course, in its perpetual process of adjustment with unforeseen circumstances; its scope is ever being widened by contact with new data. But, if religion, which is to give us emancipation in the realm of the infinite, tries also to usurp the place of reason in the world of the finite, then it brings about utter stagnation and sterility. There are very many dangers in a Sectarian Religion. There was a time in the middle ages in Europe when religion acted like a wall surrounding the whole life of the people. We know how it tried to keep its sway over the western world through persecution, excommunication and even suppression of science. By the sheer vigour of their intellect the Western people have broken through this imprisonment of their mind and have achieved in their life a freedom which makes it possible for them to approach and receive truth in its various phases and forms. Intercourse between men is not merely external, its deepest channel is through the freedom of the mind. When religion instead of emancipating the mind fetters it within the narrow confinement of creeds and conventions, then it becomes the greatest barrier against a true meeting of races. Christianity when it minimises its spiritual truth, which is universal and emphasises its dogmatic side, which is a mere accretion of time, has the same effect of creating a mental obstruction which leads to the misunderstanding of people who are outside its pale. A great deal of the unmerited contempt and cruelty, which the non-western peoples have suffered in their political, commercial or other relations at the hands of the West is owing to sectarian calumnies with which even the Western children's text books are contaminated. Nevertheless this Sectarian religion does not occupy the greater part of the Western life and therefore in its heart still remains the possibility of a better human relationship than what prevails now between the races. We have seen Europe cruelly unscrupulous in its politics and commence widely spreading slavery over the face of the earth in various names and forms. And yet, in this very same Empire, protest is always alive against its iniquities. Martyrs are never absent whose lives of sacrifice are the penance for the wrongs done by their own kindred. The individuality which is western is not to be designated by any sect-name of a particular religion but is distinguished by its eager attitude towards truth, in two of its aspects, scientific and humanistic. This openness of mind to truth has also

its moral value and so in the West it has often been noticed that, while those who are professedly pious have sided with tyrannical power, encouraging repression of freedom, the men of intellect, the sceptics have bravely stood for justice and the rights of man.

I do not mean to say that those who seek truth always find truth, and we know that men in the west are apt to borrow the sanction of science under false pretences to give expressions to their passions and prejudices. To many thinkers there has appeared a clear connection between Darwin's theories and Imperialism, Teutonic and other, which was so marked a feature during the sixties. We have also read Western authors who, admirably mimicking scientific mannerism, assert that only the so-called Nordic race has the proper quality and therefore the right to rule the world; extolling its characteristic ruthlessness as giving it the claim against universal dominance. But we must not forget that such aberrations of science, added with wrong or imperfect data, will be knocked down by science itself. The stream of water in a river does carry sand, but so long as the stream is fluent it will push away that sand from its path. If the mental attitude is right we need not be afraid of mistakes. That is why the individual in the West has no unsurpassable barrier between himself and the rest of humanity. He may have his prejudices but no irrational injunctions to keep him in internment away from the wide world of men.

## RELIGION vs. REASON.

A Muhammadan is defined by his religion. But a religion does not consist merely in its spiritual essence; a great deal of it is formal, the out-come of special historic circumstances. All things that constitute new forms of religion are exclusive. No man belonging to a different creed can claim them as his own. There are therefore fences that separate and are more-over constant causes of conflict so long as they are more valued than the essential truths of religion. Therefore the people who are chiefly recognised by their religion, whose behaviour and intellect itself is dominated by the externals of that religion, must find it difficult to establish channels of intimate relationship with neighbours belonging to a different religion. Men often are unreasonable, but their unreason is as fluid in character as life itself; it is constantly mitigated by experience and education. But when religion stands against reason in the region which by right

belongs to the latter, then it becomes a fixed screen of darkness against all communication of light. Truth finds no permanent antagonism in our passion or stupidity, just as sunshine is not perpetually obstructed by mist. But when religion, with its own material and authority, builds a barricade against truth, then woe to the men who bend their knees to such a power, terrible because it is the power of light that has blinded itself. On the other side, a Hindu also is known by his speciality, which is not so much his religion as his social conventions. A Muhammadan is comparatively free in matters of his personal life, as to his food, companionship or occupation. Therefore he has more freedom of opportunity in the choice of his vocation than an orthodox Hindu. A narrow range of vocation not only entails for men their field of livelihood, but also limits their chance of coming into close touch with others in the active pursuit of common objects. Surrounded in his personal life by prohibitions of all kinds about the most insignificant details of his daily career, an orthodox Hindu lives insulated in the confinement of his conventional solitary cell. His is a world which has its one gate of entrance, the gate of birth, though those of departure are innumerable. The strict code of Hinduism is, in every way, inhospitable to the world at large, which cannot but react upon the mind of the orthodox Hindu by narrowing and deadening his human interest detracting from his power of forming great combinations.

We have to realise this in India, and know that the religion, chiefly based upon a fixed code of custom which we have allowed to fasten upon the entire region of life, has been the one radical cause of the separateness of our races, and has made the cracks from which comes out the poisonous gas—degeneracy. The problem of untouchability is merely one of the numerous symptoms of this fatal malady. By suppressing these through external means we do not cure the disease. The thorny bushes of evil are overspreading over social soil, made barren by the obsession of a religion that insults reason. Uprooting a few of these will not help in improving the soil, the impoverishment of which is the real origin of our futility. Civilisation is that which gives individuals the best facility to deal with the greatest number of human beings in the noblest spirit of truth. Unfortunately for India, the latter development of Hinduism has been the product of a history of reaction. It represents the most powerfully organised effort of a people, not only to withdraw itself from contact with the

larger world, but also to separate its own component parts so that they become out of touch with each other. The greater portion of the world is branded by it with impunity. Defilement is waiting for it at every turn, against which its only security is the strict system of segregation built up by itself. In order to build this effectively it has not been content with forbidding its members to cross the sea, but has nearly obliterated from its annals and literature all men of foreign contact. For, though from Greek, Tibetan, Chinese and other sources we find materials for that great period of India's history when her influence transcended her geographical limits and spread civilisation over peoples completely alien to her own children we find no mention in the Indian scriptures about what those outside countries were to her, so much so that all the records of the greatest of India's sons were banished for centuries from her memory till they were brought back to her by foreigners. The mentality produced by such a contemptuous ignoring of the world out-side her own immediate surroundings, still persists in the life and culture of India's people. No doubt, in all parts of the world we have such restrictions of narrowness under different names. Societies in all the countries have their irrational conventions and traditions that have outlived their original meaning, clogging the path of human intercourse with incongruities. Everywhere such social holes and ditches are the breeding places of moral disease and callousness of heart. The latter-day orthodox Hinduism of our country, though free from militant aggressiveness is fatal in its effects on its votaries, for it has to kill the mind first in order to make it possible for human beings to accept such deprivation of freedom and outrage on dignity as are entailed by its prohibitions and exactions. Accustomed as we are to it, we may not feel the humiliation of such restriction of life and mind, or may even glorify it in our blind pride; but in these days when we are talking of nation-building, and uniting of the different Indian races, we must know the Hindus and Muhammadans can never effect any real union until we can cast off the shackles of our non-essentials, and free our mind from the grip of unmeaning dread of tradition."

## CHAPTER III

### POLITICS

Democracy is the Government in which every man has a natural part in the civic life as well as the cultural institutions of the state, an equal voice in the determination of law and policy and as much share in their execution as can be secured to him by his right as a citizen and his capacity as an individual besides his rights of freedom being guaranteed. Freedom of thought, speech and assembly were the earliest of human rights to which the freedom of press may now be added. The transference of all sovereign functions from one sovereign administrator or the few dominant executive to society as a whole organised into a state is the function of democracy.

### CITY STATE

The city states of Greece, the regional states in ancient India and the village communities of mediaeval India contributed largely to the development of this democratic tendency in the early human mind even though such tendency existed from prehistoric times. In Rome the tendency was equally present but could not develop so rapidly or fulfil itself so entirely as in Greece or India because of the necessities of a military and conquering state. But the mediaeval Italian city state played a very great part not only in reviving this tendency but sowing it broadcast over the whole of Europe in the age of Renaissance. In India the early communities were free societies in which the king was only a military head or civic chief. We find the democratic element persisting in the days of Buddha and Mahavira and surviving in small states in the reign of Chandragupta. It existed even when the great bureau-

cratically governed monarchies and empires were finally replacing the free earlier polity.

## EARLY REPUBLICS

Dr. Sit K. G. Bhandarkar says in an article on oriental research in the Times of India :

"The Indian Aryans had, like their European brethren, the rudiments of few political institutions. When Kshatriya tribes settled in a province the name of the tribe in the place became the name of the province, and the Panchalas, Angas, Vangas, Vrijas etc., collectively became identified with the countries in which they lived. And actually the existence of aristocratic republics is alluded to in Buddhist Pali books."

Mr. Vincent A. Smith also says in the Early History of India at page 250 :

"The Punjab, Eastern Rajputana, and Malwa for the most part were in possession of tribes or clans. The Yandheya tribe occupied both banks of the Sutlej, while the Illadraks living under republican institutions held the central parts of the Punjab. In Alexander's time these regions were similarly occupied by autonomous tribes, then called the Malloi, Kathoiol, and so forth."

There were certain kingdoms in ancient India when the law of Primogeniture was not in force. The people elected their own chief who ruled over them either for life, or for a certain number of years, at the expiration of which he had to vacate his office. We have an account of a democracy like this in Buddhist records, which we cannot do better than reproduce here in Dr. Rhys David's words :

"When Buddhism arose there was no paramount sovereign in India. The kingly power was not, of course, unknown. There had been kings in the valley of the Ganges for centuries, long before Buddhism, and the time was fast approaching when the whole of India would be under the sway of monarchical governments. In those parts of India which came very early under the influence of Buddhism, we find, besides a still surviving number of small aristocratic republics,