THE
CRISIS IN INDIA

BY

K. SRINIVASA RAU

EX-MEMBER OF THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,
TRANSLATOR OF SUBADAR MAHOMED BEG'S
DIARY OF JUBILEE VISIT TO LONDON,
AND AUTHOR OF PAPERS ON
SOCIAL REFORM

MADRAS
HIGGINBOTHAM & CO.

PRINTED AT THE WEDNESDAY REVIEW PRESS,
TRICHINOPOLY

TO

His Excellency

Sir Arthur Lawley G.C.S.I.,

G. C. I. E., K. C. M. G.,

IN GRATEFUL RECOGNITION.

OF

HE WARM SOLICITUDE FOR THE MILLIONS
OF THE PROVINCE

ENTRUSTED

TO HIS CARE

THIS BOOK IS, BY KIND PERMISSION,
RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED

BY

THE AUTHOR.

THE CRISIS IN INDIA.

PREFACE.

"PAGETT M. P." is busy writing and publishing his books about India, after as usual a few months' tour. Mr. Keir Hardie M. P. has written his. Mr. Ramsay Macdonald has written his. These have seen India through their spectacles of English Socialism and English Labour party. English Socialism and English Labour party have no place here in India, though the Socialist and the Labourite would be only too glad to convert the world to his creed. Monsieur J. Chailly wrote in French his "Administrative Problems of India" (translated into English by Sir William Meyer K.C.S.) after years of observation and study unlike "Pagett M. P." who has not as much time at his command as the laborious French Deputy Consul. An American came the other day and went round the country and he seemed to take in everything but he gave out very little. Reticence was his cardinal point, but he may, for aught one knows, jump on us with his book on

India, sooner or later. Thus British India and British Indian Administration are fast becoming the perennial topic for book-writers, British politicians and statesmen of all shades of feeling and all schools of thought. The Indians have been contributing their share of political, social and religious literature all over the country mainly in English and recently in *some* of the Vernaculars as well, but what commands at present most attention in the western world, is apparently what others say about India and not so much what Indians may have to say of themselves under British Rule. Indian views and opinions are taken by foreign writers or globe-trotting M. Ps., just to the extent they tally with their own notions of things, either pre-conceived or conceived on the spot or on the spur of the moment of their observations in their tour, and the result is book after book seen through this pair of spectacles or that, but none of them comes up to the Indian eye. While the Indian reads all these books about himself and his fellowmen written so kindly and condescendingly by so many foreigners, he is sore tempted to ask himself "while so many are anxious to write about us, and write us up and down as they like, why should we not tell the world about British Rule in India, ourselves, to help to a better understanding of things as they are? While we are seeing ourselves

CONTENTS

frequently enough as seen by others, will not the western world like to take first-hand views about India under British Rule from Indians, instead of being content with hearsay evidence on all sides, from people who may after all have to confess that they have tried to read India aright, but India is still a puzzle to them. It has been a puzzle after all even to the best of Viceroys, Governors, Lieutenant-Governors, Rulers, Administrators and Officers of the best type. It has been a puzzle to the Indians themselves in all conscience. No wonder if only one realises the vastness and complexity of Indian life and the ever-increasing difficulty of mastering the Indian problems, in a practical working spirit. So then it may not be one too many for a sketch like this to appear from an Indian, who means well for his country, as much at least as the foreign book-writers do and who knows practically where the shoe pinches. He may labour under some obvious disadvantages, like the want of the literary touch in a foreign language, or want of sufficient knowledge of British Politics,—which perhaps may be a point in his favour,—or above all, want of that knack of advertisement which makes a book in English by an Englishman sell roaringly well in the Western world, and then come down to the Indian plains to be read with dismay and doubt by the Indians themselves for

whose benefit however it is said to be written. The Indians read such books and say "very clever but conclusions wrong". So Indians must write more about India and it has got in its favour the fact that it is the Indian who is writing about himself and his fellowmen under British Rule. Foreign doctors who wish to treat diseases Indian in the body politic, may be exceedingly well-intentioned and exceedingly able and even correct in very many particulars, in the diagnosis. but the patient may know about his real ailments a little more than all the doctors, and if he and his doctors understand each other a bit better, the treatment may save the patient instead of killing him, with drugs and nostrums which may do well enough in the countries to which the eminent doctors belong, but which may just fail in the Indian climate in reaching the Indian constitution. It is thus that this book may be of some use, however small, as it is written from the Indian point of view, and meant to catch the British eye with a desire to bridge the gulf between India and England.

The writer is however not unaware that the views enunciated in the following pages run counter in some respects, to the views held to-day by a considerable body of Indian writers and politicians; but those views have had too exclusive an acceptance hitherto without sufficient scrutiny and discussion

and therefore it is essential that the other side of the picture should be honestly and faithfully presented to the public in the best interests of India and England.

As these problems come to be discussed more largely and with greater freedom form bias of any kind, there can be little doubt that the true interests of the country will be more efficiently and more comprehensively served. It is this consideration alone that has led to the publication of this book and it is hoped that it will receive at the hands of the public an independent and impartial judgment uninfluenced by pre-conceived notions and theories which have acquired more or less unquestioned authority among the generality of Indian Politicians.

There can be no doubt that India is passing through a serious transition both socially and politically. The one great point in which the writer of the book believes is the intimate connection between our Social and Political advance and how largely the latter is dependent for its success upon the former. If he has succeeded in bringing out this point clearly and made his countrymen realise the urgent need for an upheaval in the direction of social reformation the writer of these pages will feel amply rewarded.

LAKE VIEW,
Coimbatore.
September 1911.

K. SRINIVASA RAU.

P. S. Permission to dedicate the book was very kindly accorded by His Excellency Sir Arthur Lawley on the 15th July and the publication of the book was finally approved by His Excellency on the 8th September 1911.

It is remarkable that the declaration suggested in the book as worthy of being made by His Most Gracious Majesty the King-Emperor on the great occasion of the Coronation at Delhi, has been actually announced by His Majesty.

19th Dec. 1911. K. S.

THE CRISIS IN INDIA.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROBLEM.

MONARCHY *Versus* DEMOCRACY.

MR. Ramdoss is awaiting at an Indian Railway station the arrival of Mr. Alfred from England whom he had never seen before. On the arrival of the train they make out each other easily enough. While driving out in the evening, Mr. R said to A, "It is so very kind of you to have come here all the way to look me up. I should have been terribly disappointed if you had gone home without coming here."

A.—Oh, no. I should have been disappointed too, if I had not seen you; I wanted to see you.

R.—How long is it since you left India? It must be very interesting indeed to hear from you as to what you think of India now, since you last saw it.

What do you think of the changes that have taken place? I must hear from you all about it.

A.—Let me see. I think I was 24 when I came to India. 24 years I have served and 24 years I have been drawing pension.

R.—You are then 72! You are now touring round India!

A.—Yes. I feel quite fit. I like travelling. You see my luggage. How compact and small it is. I can carry it myself: only a bed and a box: I do not drink: I do not smoke: I am very sparing in my diet. I do not care for meat. You see how well I am keeping. By the bye, how old is your father? I saw him the other day. He was looking very well indeed.

R.—Yes, thank you. My father is keeping good health. He is a bit older than yourself.

A.—How many languages does your father know?

R.—About half a dozen, I think. But, language after all is but a medium. Where the heart speaks it transcends all languages. But where it is deficient, difficulties are only multiplied. But I am straying away. I beg your pardon. I commenced asking you how India strikes you now compared with what it was 24 years ago. 24 years is sufficiently long for comparison and contrast.

A.—Oh, yes. The change is wonderful. It is simply marvellous. Everywhere I see things are quite different from what they were. Things are so changed indeed that one finds it hard to describe. At Calcutta I was at a big dinner at which I saw the foremost Indians and Englishmen. The Hon'ble Mr. Bux was there.

R.—Did he speak?

A.—No. Many spoke, but he would not. It seems he wanted to talk politics but that was not the occasion, you know. It was no political dinner. It was purely a social one. But Bux was at that moment so socially inclined, I suppose, that he would either talk politics, or keep mum and so he was left to his moods.

R.—That is a great pity. I do not think Bux would have done that, had Ranade been alive to-day. With Ranade some of the most cherished principles of Bux appear to have gone. Ranade was for the social first, and for the political next in matters of Indian reform. And so long as Ranade was alive, Bux adhered to that principle. But after his death Bux has allowed himself to be so fully drawn into the vortex of politics that you see him talk about Indian social problems only as an apology to politics and as if some of his friends would charge him with

apostacy if he did not tell the public once in a way at least that he has not altogether forgotten the lessons he learnt from Ranade, whom he always refers to as "his master."

A.—You mean to charge Bux then with having forsaken his master!

R.—Oh, no. I do not think Bux will admit that. But all the same he has forsaken his master's creed though he is faithful to his *memory*. What can Bux do? The creed of his master came in conflict with the creed of the Indian politicians. Bux had to choose between the two. If he chose his master's creed, he would have been true to truth and to his master alike. But he would have had no following and he would have to cry in the wilderness. If he took to politics, numbers were at his beck and call. What does it matter where the truth lay? What does it matter where the vital centres of Indian life lay? It matters absolutely nothing. Politics is power. It carries *everything* before it. It is the sunshine in which every one wants to bask. It is the stage on which every one wants to play. It is the easy and smooth downward course for India just like the children sitting at the top of the rock and sliding down through the smooth and sloping granite surface. Whereas the creed of Ranade is uphill work. The

ascent is very like climbing the Himalayan heights to reach the Everest. A popular falsehood is better than an unpopular truth. The world is too bad to be true. It always likes masks and masquerades. It prefers the bubble on the water to the water itself. It prefers fancy to fact. It prefers the fitful rainbow and the fleeting wind to the blue expanse of the skies and the stately calm. In short, it runs after shadows in utter disregard of the substance.

A.—Do you mean to say that Bux does not know his own mind? Does he not know what is really good for the country? Do you mean to say that he has sacrificed truth for popularity? And that he is following the political Will-o-the-wisp contrary to his master's commands? I am afraid you are hardly fair to Bux. May he not think that politics must lead and the solution of social problems will follow?

R—He may think so. But in that case he would be differing from Ranade radically. Politics and Ethics!! Take your own party politics of England. We know just as much about your politics as you know perhaps about our Indian life. But the one thing we know about British politics is that you are swinging round and round like the spider in its web in your whirlpool of party politics. The great British nation is like so many

chips of wood caught in this whirlpool going round the pivot of party politics. I am not quite sure whether the British Parliamentary system of Government is, after all, the best in the world, though you seem to think that what has been so good for England must be good everywhere. It may not follow at all. Each country may have to evolve its own form of Government instead of being dragged willy-nilly into any particular form as if there is any inherent virtue in mere forms apart from the conditions of the peoples to which they are suited. The form of Government best suited to a people is after all but a human contrivance and it is nothing but a struggle to adapt itself to the conditions and requirements of the people from time to time. To be successful, it must be more a growth from within than an imposition from without. If you push a man too much from behind, the chances are one may fall over the other and both get hurt by the fall. It is this that is not realised by those generous and well-meaning politicians who are known by the name of Radicals in England. Some think that the British Parliament is better than the British public. But the truth is perhaps the other way. The British public is better than the British Parliament. That may account for the greatness of the British notwithstanding their Parliamentary system of Government. For what does Parliament after all amount to? It

is nothing but Party Spirit, Opposition Benches, endless talk and little action. The English nation appears to consist of two portions. One being the ruling, living and working portion which educates, trades, colonises, fights, conquers and consolidates, and the other which assembles in Parliament and talks. It is a wise division of labour that the minority of the British nation possessing means, leisure and intellect should go into this wonderful assembly to do all the talking; while the rest of the nation is doing all the working and as long as the real nation is allowed to do its work, no great harm can be done by the Parliament. Parliament is a great institution for preventing the intellect of the country from getting rusty. Besides, the phlegmatic British must cultivate the art of speaking and Parliament is the place for it. The best way of improving the art of speaking is to have a Debating House and Opposition Bench and two or more parties, to oppose each other tooth and nail. To add zest and point to the fight, the party which wins most of the units to its side must be in power in order that the opposite party may pound it away and get into its place. The Parliamentary system is like two wrestlers who are constantly trying to throw each other down and the British Parliamentary arena is now getting more complicated and more confusing than ever before.

Where Whig and Tory fought before, we find now Liberals, Conservatives, Unionists, Labourites, Home Rulers etc. What with the Socialists and Labourites and the uprooting of the House of Lords, the British Parliament is very like a building round the crater of a volcano which is rumbling and thundering, exploding and throwing up its red-hot lava. It looks as if the British Parliament just now is on the eve of a collapse or chaos. There is one ray of hope about it, that it has been evolved, with all its defects, out of the genius of the British which may yet save it in time. But there is absolutely no reason to inflict it on every part of the globe as if it were the political panacea without which every country in the world will sicken and die. It is as suited to the fighting, pugilistic and political genius of the British, as it is opposed to the calm, philosophical and spiritualising genius of the East.

A.—I confess I am a Radical Reformer. The Radicals believe that they have a great mission, and that is, of hoisting the flag of political freedom all over the world. That is what the world is tending to. You see how even China is waking; how Japan has beaten Russia and so India is waking too. England should only feel proud of India becoming free under her domination. It is for effecting that

freedom that England is here. That is what I should think. The world is marching towards freedom and it is the duty of each country and each nation to help the world towards that fruition. But as one who has been a practical administrator in India for nearly a quarter of a century, I quite agree with you that a free or self-governing form of government is a thing to be gradually achieved by the people instead of being imposed on them. But don't you think that Lord Morley's scheme was just in time to save the country? Don't you think that in that scheme lies shadowed forth the political liberation of India? Don't you think broadly speaking, that between Monarchy and Democracy, Democracy is the better form of Government and that therefore England is only doing the right thing to give India that form in which it believes itself. We give you our best, but if that fails it is not our fault. England cannot but believe in a Parliamentary form of Government as about the best for the world.

R.—"For forms of Government, let fools contest,
Whatever is best administered, is best."

This couplet contains one view of Government. Democracy is the other view. You may call the first view Monarchy or any modified form of it. But it is essentially monarchical. The genius of Indian polity is and has been essentially monarchical. I

quite believe with you that the world-spirit to-day is making for freedom in a sense. But the great question is "What is freedom? How is it attained? A great Frenchman, the author of a book on Vedantism, who has seen India and spent here a long time, wrote to me thus about that grossly ill-used word, freedom. He said "I was in India from 1871 to 1895, and love both the country and the people. Above all, I love and venerate the Indian sacred writings..... .. .. .. I am now living in a country where the ideas of liberty, brotherhood and equality may almost be called a national passion. Yet with all the high qualities of the French and their wonderful intelligence, I find as little real liberty here as there is in Germany. I rather look upon liberty as a thing realizable only by a people which should have attained its highest potentialities, *moral greatness and perfect self-respect*. "Moral greatness", that is the basis, which means a high national character.

Mark, Mr. A. Hight said this in his letter of the 13th September 1906 from France. That letter is well worth quoting in full, which I shall do later on. Mark the opinion of this eminent author who is a great friend of India and whose book "The Unity of Will" may well be called a book on Vedantism.

Hegel says that progress is nothing but the assertion of the universal spirit step by step and

stage by stage towards freedom, but Hegel strangely enough condemned the East to eternal political bondage because of the social and religious conditions in which he found the East. Hegel was no doubt guilty of self-contradiction when he defined progress as instinct with *the universal spirit*, but denied it *to half the world*. But we must note that however bitter Hegel's condemnation may be to us Indians, still he wrote what he thought and felt honestly, because of the conditions of the East. He felt that they were so unprogressive, dreamy and immobile that political freedom was impossible in India and in the East generally. While Hegel's condemnation is overdrawn and his conclusion is over-generalisation, we cannot overlook the truth underlying Hegel's observation as applicable to India even to this day. True as you said, marvellous is the progress made by India under the British Government. If Hegel were writing now about India he would write differently. He would perhaps say "East is to be freed by the West" instead of saying as he has done, "East is never to be freed."

Modern Japan would have sufficed to upset Hegel's conclusion. But ancient Japan was quite different from India in several essential respects and so modern Japan was evolved easily enough out of ancient Japan, and even that only after a great and

mighty national training under the British, and rigid national culture on the lines of the West. Japan is a small island, compact and well-knit, and with the t of freedom warming her blood all along her history. Nevertheless, there was a moment when Japan might perhaps have blundered egregiously from which however it was nothing but the genius of *The Mikado* that saved it. Those who would worship the multitude and the Hydra-headed Demos would do well to remember that what saved Japan at the most critical hour in her history was her Monarch and not *Demos*. The theory that half a dozen men are likely to give wiser counsel than one man, which is the basis of democracy, is not true at all times and in all countries. It is true only in certain stages of the history of the world and in certain stages of advancement of the people. At other times and in other stages the truth is just the other way.

It is more easy to find one wise man or a few wise men to rule the destinies of millions rather than find materials enough for building a democracy upon. If only *The Mikado* had not with rare prescience seen that the British must be first studied before they are opposed, the position of Japan to-day would have been unenviable. It was again the one man Mikado and not the many men of Japan, who with a rare breadth of mind and freedom from prejudice sent his

Ambassadors all over the world to find out what was best in the world, in every branch of knowledge and science, art and life, and it was once more the Mikado, *the one man*, who issued edict after edict, throwing overboard all the cargo of baneful custom and deadening unprogressiveness, to a loyal and patriotic people who obeyed their monarch willingly and implicitly. Thus Japan in spite of her great natural and national advantages, *unlike India*, had to make large sacrifices for the common good in a truly national spirit under a wise monarch, before she could become the "England of the East" and the "Wonder of the world" But never has more nonsense been spoken in India by dreamers and visionaries than when they mistake India for Japan and talk of the two countries as if they were alike. But I do not mean for a moment that India alone is to lag behind when even China is progressing. On, no. All that I mean is that the Indian problem of political freedom is not so easy to grasp as you Radicals would have it. It has to be studied in the light of other root-problems of Indian life and Indian conditions. No one has cared to study it in that light. Yet that is the only true light in which it can be studied.

A.—You must explain yourself a bit, please.

B.—Yes, I am sorry I have not made myself clear enough. I assert in the first place that democracy

is not necessarily the best form of Government in the world. Secondly, I assert granting that it is the best form, it can be achieved only by a process of social and intellectual freedom on which alone it can be built safely. And thirdly, I assert that in India the introduction of democracy would mean a life-and-death struggle for the ancient Indian civilisation, the result of which no one can foresee. But one thing is certain, that the political genius of India and the genius of her language, literature and religion are all a direct antithesis to the spirit of democracy. If the genius of India were to build her own political future, it will not be on democratic lines. How far it is a gain to India and the world alike to make a terrible sacrifice of all that is dear to her in her ancient wisdom, is a great question. How far India is really going to assimilate the democracy of the West, is a great problem. If India did effect the change to democracy, how far it is going to profit her in the long run, is a great doubt. England would have the melancholy satisfaction perhaps of having destroyed India in all that was good, noble and enduring in her, leaving in its place a demoralising democracy, drunk with corruption and brute force, bearing perhaps a very close resemblance to the small French dependency here.

A.—You mean Pondicherry ?

R.—Yes: If you want to see the experiment on Indian soil, you need only go to Pondicherry. It has been long enough there and it is quite a tiny and small enough place to try the experiment with the concentrated wisdom of the French Revolutionists, the warmth and fervour of the great French nation and their democratic war-cry,—"Liberty, Fraternity and Equality". What is the result? The less said the better. But the French are not to blame for it. They gave Pondicherry their best form of Government as *they* knew it in France. They gave it as free as their flowing wine just as Radicals are trying to push us into Radicalism in all earnestness and sincerity. Yet the worst critics of British Government in India dare not say to-day that Pondicherry is better governed. Why? Because the form of Government was not suited to the genius of the people. Again let me tell you that the fault does not rest with the French. Where you expected to transplant France in Pondicherry and raise Pondicherry up to the level of France, you have only succeeded in producing a Pondicherry which is neither Indian, nor French. The reason is, as I have been trying to show, a mere form of Government when it is not evolved from the conditions of the people but when it is merely imposed upon them, may not only do no good but may possibly do harm. Freedom has got

two aspects, the subjective and the objective. In its objective aspect, it represents the desire for liberation from external control. In its subjective aspect, it implies a certain amount of minimum virtue and intelligence *in the mass*, as the ground-work on which alone it can stand. This ground-work which may be called broadly, *the national virtues* are largely in the free countries and nations of the West. For instance, in the Boer War, every Englishman far and away from the scene, was feeling the victory of the British, as *his*, and was likewise feeling every defeat as a blow to *him*. Even so, would Frenchmen do, Americans do, and Germans do under similar circumstances. Because, the national feeling has long since come to dominate each of these countries and nations, and it is on that national feeling mainly that the free and self-governing character of the French, the English or the German depends, whatever might be the strong or weak points in the internal administration. Even so, in America, when the war of Independence was declared, there was first the national feeling which prompted it and it was the national feeling that carried it along the lines against the mother country. But for that national feeling, there would be no upbuilding of American freedom. There would have been no upbuilding of the present form of American Govern-

ment. Democracy in one form or another derives its life and continuity from this national feeling as its perennial fountain. And where that national feeling has yet to be built as in India, the great problem is whether nation-making is the first thing so as to build democracy on it safely, or whether it should be an imposition of democracy, leaving the nation-making severely alone. They are two different things. Where there is a nation, and where nation-making has been done, there democracy is not only easy but even an inevitable outcome. But where it has yet to be done, democracy can only sit as a heavy dead-weight. You see the term "*Indian*" does not evoke in the mind of all Indians the same feeling which the term Frenchman evokes in the French, Englishman evokes in the English or American evokes in the American. "*Indian*" is yet a word which evokes no particular feeling because it is yet too vague and too high to touch any one among the multitudinous divisions of Indians. It is the *divisions* that are alive and in full swing. The word Indian is yet nebulous and vague. If instead of using the word "Indian", you use the names of the divisions, they evoke a feeling. "The Mahomedan," "the Christian", "the Parsee", these evoke the feelings of the particular classes. But even the word "Hindu" is only a little less vague than the word "Indian"

but all the same, it yet evokes not much feeling. But if you use instead the names of the particular divisions of Hindus, you touch a chord of each division. If you allude to the "Brahman", you have touched a chord, though here again, you have to remember how much the feeling is attenuated by the numerous divisions of brahmans, and so, the general name "Indian" is unmeaning and vague. If you particularise "the brahman" through his divisions, you touch a deeper chord. Even so, if you allude to non-brahman, you are still in the region of vagueness. You must particularise still further. Go down again to the other classes lower down in the scale like the millions of what are termed the depressed classes. There is any amount of room for prticularising even among them. Where you have thousands and thousands of small circles and big circles into which the millions of India are grouped and divided each with its own centre round which it moves, you have got ever so many circles of class feeling, sect feeling, race feeling, religious feeling etc., which are perpetually making for *antinational feeling so unlike the national feeling of the West*. All these innumerable circles so long as they persist and live, are all, if correctly viewed, so many powerful centres of *anti-national feeling*. We have not only not got national feeling in India, but we have got ever so

many centres round which anti-national feeling is perpetually revolving. A form of Government suited only to the national feeling must be unsuited to such anti-national centres which represent the real life of the great Indian continent. You may say that democracy is powerful enough to destroy the anti-national centres and bring about national feeling in course of time. But with equal force, I may point out that it is just as possible that in the conflict between the nationalising tendency of democracy and the anti-national centres of Indian life, *which* is going to win, will depend on the strength of the one as against the other. If the anti-national centres are strong enough and would not yield, then democracy will fail. At any rate, those who would see national feeling gain the victory must show how far the anti-national centres are yielding under the touch of national feeling. It appears to me that the anti-national centres are yielding after all as little as ever to-day. And unless and until they yield and disappear, the very basis for democracy would be wanting; and throwing democracy in the meanwhile as a huge experiment in India would be certainly putting the cart before the horse. Which is the better method? To prepare the ground and then to build on it or build first and then look to the ground on which you have built,—which is as absurd and

ruinous a method of building as you can think of.

A.—Do you mean to tell me then, that the nationalising forces are not working now in India? If so, it would be the severest condemnation of the British rule for half a century. Look at the National Congress for 23 years where all India meets: look at the Conferences, political, social and industrial where again all India meets. Look at the spirit of co-operation all over the country as shown in the co-operative credit societies, which have shown such marvellous capacity for work during a very short time of their existence. Look at the District Conferences, social and political. The spirit of combination and co-operation is quite in the air. Trade Unions, Commercial Unions, in fact, Unions and Associations of almost every interest big or small, appear to be the order of the day. It is quite clear to my mind comparing the India of to-day with the India as it was 25 years ago that you are now passing through the most interesting stage of progress. One feels the touch of new life everywhere. At one time it looked as if you would not move on quick enough, but now it looks as if you are moving on too rapidly. It looks already as if India has entered from the Agricultural into the Industrial stage of civilisation. Indian trade and commerce are showing signs of fresh vitality and strength. Indians are going to

England, America and Japan. Don't you think on the whole that the forces of unification and co-operation in India to-day have been steadily and rapidly on the increase under the British rule and that they point to nationalising India as the purpose. Don't you think that the forces of unification are on the whole more powerful to-day than the forces of disruption in India? Don't you think that India has been drawn willy-nilly into the vortex of the world's civilisation and that she has therefore no option or choice in the matter, but to adopt the western modes of thought and Government and that the sooner she does so, the better.

R.—That is what is exactly happening. But what is happening may not be for the best. Democracy, as I said, is not necessarily the best form of Government and now let me say the Industrial civilisation of the West is not the best civilisation either. And both are opposed to the genius of Indian polity and Indian civilisation, and when left to herself, India will never keep your democracy or your Industrial civilisation. The industrial civilisation of the West with its inevitable tendency to accumulate wealth on one side, and accentuate poverty on the other, is not, after all, the highest civilisation, to be sure. It is a civilisation which brings in its train labour strikes and dynamite, Fenianism and drink.

It certainly needs mending somewhere. It has nothing in it akin to the civilisation of India. Indian civilisation is built on the basis of contentment and every man doing his duty to others and looking on the pricks of life as due to *Karma*. But the western civilisation is built upon the basis of rights and ambitions wherein every one hopes to become somebody sometime and none will accept anything as inevitable. In the western civilisation there is more kicking against the pricks of life than in the Indian civilisation. In the West, people are everything. But here in India, individuals are everything, and the people nothing. In the West office is nothing, but wealth is everything, but here office is everything and wealth nothing before power. In the West, the King Emperor may pass through the streets unnoticed, and Gladstone might be pulling up a cart side by side with coolies unknown and unnoticed. But in India it *cannot* happen. Under the British Government the element of personal rule is infinitely less than under the Oriental Government. Whereas to this day, the element of personal rule is infinitely more in the Native States than in the British Government. The Native States do not believe in democracy. They dread it, because the idea of sovereign or king in India is that *He* is the source of all power. Whereas the idea of popular government is that the *People*

are the source of all power. The most enlightened of Indian princes may vie with each other in bringing up their dominions to the highest level of progress on modern lines. But none of them would give a particle of power to the people as such. Baroda may educate under compulsion its subjects. Mysore may give education to the girls. Travancore may develop culture and refinement in their womenkind. And they may indulge in feeble imitations of a mere shadow of the popular form of government like the Representative Assembly of Mysore or the Srimulam Assembly of Travancore merely to satisfy the *amour propre* of British Government. It is nothing more than a compliment paid to the British. They do not mean to adopt it themselves. On the other hand, while they feel that they are dragged into imitating the ways of the British, they have an uneasy consciousness that the British are introducing a very dangerous element in introducing democracy which might spread like a contagion and place them at the mercy of *Demos*, one day or other. They would rather cease to exist than divide power with the people, much less wipe themselves out by admitting the democratic doctrine that the people are the source of all power. In Mysore care is taken by the Dewan to sound the note every time to the Representative Assembly, that they ought not to mistake their position and

that they are there not as a matter of right but merely as a matter of grace, and that they are there not to control or guide the ruling power, but merely to represent *humbly* their wishes and grievances. I do not for a moment think that the Native States are thankful at all to Lord Morley's scheme, because the underlying principle would sooner or later mean a death blow to their sovereign power. At any rate, it is foreign to the genius of Indian polity.

You must remember that the Native States in India cover a considerable portion of the country and rule over millions of people. They are all modelled on the monarchical system. The blood in their veins is monarchical to the core. They believe in aristocracy. They believe in the aristocracy of blood, in the aristocracy of birth, and in the aristocracy of caste. Rudyard Kipling has hit the truth in Sir Puram Doss that the Indian genius is philosophical and that the Indian alone can accomplish the feat of severing himself from the world in one strange and inexplicable moment in the midst of power and wealth. The genius of India is religious and it may take strange forms. The Indian Maharajah or the Indian Dewan who has drunk deep from the fountain of English life and English literature and who looks upon English civilisation as the best going, and who denounces caste as most corroding to national life

may come across a Brahman saint or Sanyasi one day and at once the convictions of a life are upset and he becomes the docile disciple of the Brahman. Yes, that is India; or a Mahomedan Fakir goes about preaching Vedantism. He is canonised and at his tomb, even Brahmans may worship. That is India again. While our Native States are all fired now with the new ambition to bring up their States to the highest level of modern excellence they are conscious in doing so only of reviving the best form of ancient Indian monarchy and they do not in their heart of hearts think of opening Houses of Parliament which might soon reduce them to the position of mere figureheads. Already it was supposed in Mysore that the Advisory Committee is only a contrivance to do away with the Representative Assembly. And His Highness the Maharajah has had to re-assure the public mind against the suspicion. The ideal Indian monarchy looks to the King as the source of all power, but he may at will have his own council of notables to help him which is as far away from a Parliamentary form of Government as Heaven from Earth.

It is a mistake to suppose that the progress of Native States under the guidance of British rule and on the model of British Government has anything of the democratic touch or basis in it. On the other

hand, they appear to me to be already shrewd enough to observe and dread the democratic current in Lord Morley's scheme and to be carefully providing against its influx into their own dominions. They are busy raising embankments against it. They are, in fact, already giving form and shape to their conviction that without democracy they can develop the best form of Government in their own States, by way of proving to the British in the fulness of time the blunder they are committing. Monarchy in its best form is now developing in the Native States so as to prove a powerful antithesis to Lord Morley's experiment in British India.

I am afraid you have not read the signs of the times aright, when you tell me that the present day forces in British India are all towards nationalising. I do not believe it one bit. It is a great delusion to suppose any such thing. On the other hand what is happening in British India under the guise of nationalising is merely the development of each of the multifarious anti-national centres to their utmost possible strength and fitness. Each circle is only developing its own strength without meaning to break the circumference or flow into the common mass. No: the Mohemedans are strengthening themselves without meaning to coalesce with the Hindus. Hindus are likewise strengthening themselves with-

out meaning to coalesce with the Mohemedans. And, among the Hindus themselves the various classes and sections are each one of them strengthening and developing its own small sectional life as a matter of mere self-defence, self-protection and survival in the great race of progress that has been set on foot. The race for life and living has become terribly keen and each class and each community is girding up the loins and trying to run as fast as it could so that it might not be left behind in the race. And the co-operation and combination, you see to-day, is nothing but this race of the numerous divisions and classes in India with each other. This is no more than a running race of classes and class interests at best. There is nothing national in it. Mysore for Mysore, Baroda for Baroda, Travancore for Travancore, province for province, Maratta for Maratta, sect for sect, etc., is the real key-note of the situation. Did you note the re-actionary forces like the Adwaita Sabha, the Madhwa Sabha, the Brahman conference, the Non-brahman conference, the Okkilia conference, the Devangari conference, Ceded Districts conference, the Northern Sirkars conference, the Telugu Conference, the Tamil Sangam, the Malabar Conference, the Christian conventions, the Nadar Unions etc. Each of these appears to be acting under a sort of panic, that if they did not each one assert its own

sectional life as against the rest, it might be sunk. The co-operative movements are purely economical or industrial as a sheer necessity, in the struggle for existence without meaning to change or divert the main currents of Indian life. Indian art is reviving; Indian industries are reviving; Indian agriculture is improving. In fact, we are witnessing a great revival in India of all the lost or forgotton arts and industries, but without affecting in any appreciable degree the main *anti-national* centres of life. In fact, the spirit of revival and re-action is a powerful indication that India is developing on its own old lines of monarchy and aristocracy. The brahman does not mean to merge himself in the non-brahman. The non-brahman does not mean to merge himself in the lower classes. The Hindu does not mean to merge himself in the Mohamedan nor does the Mohamedan mean to merge himself in the Hindu. Among the Native Christians, the great problem of the day is to remove caste from among them. Are you aware of the numerous divisions of Indian Christians who would not intermarry? Are you aware of caste Christians who would not give up their castes? Are you aware of the bitter feuds between Vellala Christians and Nadar Christians? And how much more bitter they are towards each other than towards other communities? Are you

aware of the numerous divisions among Mahomeddans? The sectarian spirit of Southern India is today not only as powerful as ever but is even developing strongly on sectarian lines. Each sect feels itself elevated in the rise of its own men but does not feel equally so in the rise of other sects. Have you noted that intermarriages among the various sects of Brahmans or various sub-divisions of non-Brahmans is still a very distant hope. Did you notice the fierce war of Madras versus Mysore in the Mysore politics? And that while Madras and Mysore may marry, the feeling of Madras *versus* Mysore is still keen and unabated, when it comes to a question of power and office. One must study these great undercurrents of sociology and how they cross each other and oppose each other. They have not the slightest idea of giving way to each other, or sacrificing themselves for the great ideal of nationalism; a fact which Englishmen even here cannot fully grasp; and they are taken in by appearances. As for Radicals at home they are only more ignorant of them and they are only too ready to be deceived into hasty and superficial generalizations of which every man in India capable of thinking is however aware. You must realise more than all that these tremendous currents and counter-currents of Indian life present a smooth surface under the spell of British rule which is constantly throwing its

charm of peace and unity and that the moment the spell is withdrawn, the mutually antagonistic anti-national centres of Indian life will be left mercilessly to a state of internecine and internal war which will reduce India in a second to its condition during the pre-British days from which it will have no means of recovering so far as human eye can see or imagination can picture. The globe-trotting M. Ps. who write up their books for the edification of the British public are quite innocent of the real life of India or the real difficulties of nationalising India. While the Indians themselves do not mean to do it and have not begun doing it as yet, is it not ridiculous for the Radicals at home to think of doing it at the point of their generous vapourings printed in London and spread broadcast all over the world? Every foreigner who comes to India and goes back has now come to adopt as his creed clever vituperation of the British administration holding up the British democracy as the great fruit from which the people of India are kept by the British officials here with the one sinister purpose of keeping down India and Indians. The British rule in India has made every nation in the west a bit jealous of England apparently. The American holds up the Philippine Islands for model. This is the latest by way of pointing out how the Phillippinoes and Americans

are fraternising with each other compared with the Indians and Englishmen. This is all cheap theorising and generalising but a great deal beside the mark. Americans cannot nationalise India, England cannot nationalise India. The example of Philippines can no more nationalise India than France nationalised Pondicherry. India alone can nationalise itself, but if she does not mean to do it no one can push her into it.

A.—I admit that India is a laybryinth difficult to unravel. I admit the force of your contention. But what about the social reform movement which at least you will admit is a distinctly nationalising force? What do you think of the Arya Samaj which is nationalising? What do you say to Brahma Samaj which is nationalising? You have not taken note of Theosophy which is bringing together the various religions on common ground and trying to make people forget their difference and emphasise their unity. You have also forgotten to take note of Free Masonry which is again a great factor in bringing the east and west together. Don't you think that caste is visibly crumbling before this force? Don't you think that the next step after these innumerable divisions get strengthened, each in its own way, will be towards a general coalition making for Indian nationality.

R.—Yes, I do believe in the Social Reform Movement. But so far, the country has not responded to its call sufficiently. Similar movements like the Arya Samaj and Brahma Samaj have again failed to rouse the enthusiasm of the country. As for Theosophy, while it has softened the religious animosities *in theory*, it has unfortunately made so far every sect and every class believe only in itself as about the best and has never roused itself equal to the call of universal brotherhood, which has so far remained a mere name. If the country had only responded to this larger call hitherto, you can place some hope in these forces. Unfortunately, the larger calls have been cries in the wilderness, and the classes and sects have been and are asserting to-day their own vicious and selfish cries to the detriment of the national life. How this is going to disappear is more than I can say.

A.—Is not Social Reform a success? Mr. Veerasalingham is a hero of a hundred re-marriages which have stirred up the Sirkars into reform activity. In Bombay, Hindu ladies, Parsee ladies and even Mahomedan ladies have come to take part in social movements in an inspiring manner. The Poona Widows' Home is the flower of the reform movement. The depressed classes mission is another great and encouraging feature of the nationalising tendency

and Gokhale's Elementary Education Bill if passed and worked out by the country would render democracy inevitable.

R.—That is where the greatest mistake is made. You connect every accident of modern civilization with democracy as its necessary concomitant or the invariable cause. There is nothing incongruous between the most absolute form of monarchy and the best form of mass education, the best form of female education and the highest development of arts and industries. Because the American President shakes hands with his cabman who is holding his reins with one hand and a newspaper in the other, and because America has so much that is great and good in it, it does not in the least follow that the greatness and goodness of America is the result and the American President's shaking hands with his cabman is the cause. May not the connection between the two be merely one of co-existence instead of being causal? Do you think during the best days of monarchy all the world over under great and wise kings and monarchs, the people were not happy, the country was not prosperous, or the arts and industries did not flourish? On the other hand, it is one of the most deeply rooted articles of faith in the Indian mind that under a just and wise monarch, the people attained the highest eminence and prosperity all

round. Indian history, Indian religion, Indian mythology and even Indian fables and stories are full of this faith. The king was everything to his people and the country and its subjects everything to him. The conception of a just rule is so high in India that under it no injustice can happen, no tear can be shed, and no wrong perpetratad. The king was responsible for anything and everything amiss in his country. Under a just rule there was no widowhood and no premature death. The greatest of the Tamil poets describing the country under Rama during his reign says with even more wisdom than poetry that "there was no wealth in the land because there was no poverty: that there was no strength in the land because there was no weakness: that there was no truthfulness in the land because there was no lying, and that there was no ignorance in the land because debates and discussions were the order of the day." Therefore it is obvious that the happiness of the people could be secured as much under the form of government known as monarchy as under any other, provided the instruments of government are efficient. But if the people would prefer one form of government to another and of which a Parliamentary form becomes an integral part, it presupposes the efficiency and fitness of the people who ask for it. It is for the people to adjust themselves up to

the necessary state of fitness and efficiency before demanding it; this presupposes again a number of conditions, which not only happen to be wanting in India, but which are strenuously opposed to the existing Indian conditions. Unless therefore the existing conditions are largely changed and the requisite conditions for a popular form of government are initiated instead by the people, there is no meaning in thrusting on the country a form of government for which it is not yet prepared. It will never become a part of the people though it may work in a way so long as the foreign hand works it. *It would be wise for the British Government and the people alike to agree frankly to working up first and foremost, those antecedent conditions of fitness before building up the popular form of government on a large scale.*

A.—I quite agree that there is a great deal of truth in what you say. But how would you work those conditions up? How would you have the people work them and how would you ask the British Government to help them? Before proceeding to discuss that topic, I should like to know what you think about the policy and principles of British Government hitherto and why there has been such an amount of outburst of feeling against the British Government of late? How do you account for the school of sedition in India? What do you think

generally of the effects of the British rule? Do you think the people have grown tired of the British Government and want a change? These are the questions which are troubling the British public. The British public would have an honest and impartial view of the situation from the purely Indian point of view.

CHAPTER II.

INDIA

AND

A Parliamentary Form of Government.

R.—Before we resume our discussion on the questions you have raised, let me make the observation that a Parliamentary form of Government is suited only to a free and self-governing nation or at any rate, there must be a certain amount of minimum solidarity and social unity of thought and feeling among the people before the experiment could be tried. History has no parallel to the system of British Government in India, because never before was so large a tract of country which consists of diverse peoples and religions ruled by a single sovereign power and that a foreign power, whose home is separated from India by thousands of miles of sea. Before talking of Phillipinoes under America, we would do well to know what are the social customs and divisions of the Phillipinoes and if they are anything like those obtaining in India. False analogies must lead to incorrect generalizations. If Lord Morley, Mr. Ramsay

Macdonald, Mr. Keir Hardie and the scores of foreign tourists and visitors to India, could only have a clear grasp of the Indian conditions of life and living and the Indian customs and manners of thought and feeling, before inditing their criticisms or drafting schemes for the political uplifting of India, their views would be helpful to progress on right lines. I wish Charles Bradlaugh had tackled the Indian social problem. I wish we had a Herbert Spencer or John Stuart Mill to think out the Indian sociology and write on Indian social liberty. I wish Lord Morley could come to India and live with us for a few years and try to understand Indian life.

If the spirit of democracy were introduced too soon, even where the Government is by the people's own monarch, it will tend to revolution. But when it comes gradually as in England, to give the country the best form of limited monarchy, it is safe, because the people, the Parliament, and the king are all of the same nationality. There is no incompatibility therefore between intense love for the sovereign on the part of the people and an intense love for a constitutional system of government. The stability of the government or the safety of the King is never at stake on account of the constitutional liberty of the Parliament. Even the gravest constitutional crisis may therefore come and go in England leaving

no great danger behind for the nation or the country at large, because the nation facing the crisis and the nation coming out of it, is one and the same and it is a matter of national self-interest to see that the nation comes out of the struggle whole and unhurt. But when one nation rules over another as England is ruling India, the function of a Parliamentary form of government becomes radically different, in that while in the British Parliament, it is only the parties that are opposing each other and nobody is opposing the King or the Government as a whole, in India the subject of opposition is not this party or that, but the British Government itself. In the British Parliament the fight is between the party in power and the party out of power. Both being English, it becomes merely a great political game and no danger can come out of it affecting the stability of the constitution. But in India the party in power is the British Government and it is the party *perpetually* in power and when it is opposed by the party out of power *perpetually*, the result can be nothing like the British Parliament, but can only be that the ruling power is perpetually under the fire of criticism at the hands of the party out of power. It is only where a form of party Government could be instituted that a Parliamentary form of Government could be inaugurated. And this is possible only

when the rulers and the ruled belong to the same nationality. Otherwise the obvious result will be that the difficulties incidental to a foreign Government would be not only multiplied endlessly and without sufficient cause, but the very stability of the Government is constantly undermined by the habit of attack against it which the Government itself has engendered by introducing the Parliamentary form. It is most remarkable that this aspect has never been taken note of and Indian politics is discussed by the politicians both here and at home just as they would discuss British politics, overlooking the fact that the same course of criticism which in England would be not only harmless but might be only a phase of party politics to which the nation is accustomed all along, would in India lead to shaking the very foundations of the British Government, because what the Opposition Bench in India is attacking is not any party but the Government itself. It is not merely, as in England, the party in power that is ridiculed, that is exposed, that is weakend, that is discredited or defeated making room for the other party to come in, but what is attacked, what is ridiculed, what is exposed, what is discredited and what is defeated is for the moment the Government itself. If a party form of Government could be possibly evolved for British India as the one in England which would leave the

Sovereign power untouched and unaffected, there would be no great danger to the stability of the British rule. But as long as this is not possible, this form of government is obviously unsuited where one nation rules another, because it amounts to creating a state of affairs never intended either by the rulers or the ruled. I do not think the British politician of any school, however Radical, is anxious that the British should retire from India to-morrow. But yet he is strengthening by his criticisms unconsciously the impression in India that the British Government is something so wicked and heinous that the sooner it retires the better. While the Radical thinks that his honest criticism of Indian Government is merely to mend it in his own Parliamentary fashion, he scarcely realises that the millions of India unaccustomed to the Parliamentary form, only take criticism to mean that he is willing to contribute another axe to be laid at the very root of the British Government. The Indians on the other side who represent the party in opposition, must come to the conclusion by a simple process of reasoning that so long as they have no power to carry on the Government themselves on the lines of the Parliamentary system at home, this sort of mere form must only lead to discontent and helplessness. It can only lead gradually to a perfected system of attack against

the British rule which would widen and deepen the impression already set afloat that the British Government is a failure. That this is what is happening, there can be no doubt.

A.—The British nation would certainly be astonished to hear that the criticism at home has the effect of undermining the faith of the people in the British rule. They rather think that they are strengthening the bonds between India and England, but if the result is unfortunately, as you say, then it is time that that method of criticism was dropped and some other method of criticism adopted.

R.—Yes, that is exactly the danger of the situation. You see the British Government is in its very nature exposed to great difficulties. No true well-wisher of India and England should add to them. In the first place, it must be conceded that the first and foremost feature of the British Government unlike its predecessors in India is that the ruling power does not reside in the country it rules. Those who conquered India or any part of it one after another during all the political vicissitudes through which India had passed before the British ascendency made India their home so that the rulers and the ruled were really together. This guaranteed touch between the rulers and the ruled. But the British from the beginning have been, so to speak,

absentee rulers. They come and go. They do not reside amidst the people they rule. This perhaps accounts for a great deal more of aloofness of Englishmen from Indians than anything else. Then again the British Empire though the biggest in the world and the most marvellous too, has not got in India any sovereign whom the people could cling to with the devotion and warmth of oriental nature. Is it not very extraordinary when you come to think of it that the millions of Indian subjects should have no sovereign in their own land in flesh and blood but that he should be visible to us only in pictures? Had Her Majesty the Queen Victoria spent a quarter of her reign in India, I have no doubt the devotion to the British sovereign would to-day be a thousand-fold stronger. It is human nature more or less. If the British Sovereign were in India all the time and not seen in England I am sure it would affect the public mind of England just as much as now the people of India are affected by want of a visible Sovereign. M. Chailley says:—

> "Indian loyalty is like a bird which finds no rest for its feet. It was a comprehension of this that inspired Disraeli, in 1875, with the happy thought of making Queen Victoria Empress of India. But why, it is said, not go farther? why not give India a member of the

Royal Family as a sub-king? The people would respect him because he would be powerful and would love him because they would have found a worthy object of love. The British alone can decide whether such a solution is feasible or desirable."

Thirdly, nobody knows where the centre of British Government lies. Is it in India or in England? Is it in the Local Government, or Indian Government or the Secretary of State or the British Parliament or the British public? Nobody knows were the centre is. It is in the Local Government and yet it is not. It is in the India Government and yet it is not. It is in the Secretary of State and yet it is not there either. It is in the British Parliament and it is not quite there. It is in the British public, but what does the British public know of India? Thus British Government in India has got ever so many centres that one does not know which is the real centre. The rulers and statesmen who come to India and rule are a perpetually shifting factor. They come and go and their place is taken up by others. They come and go back to their far-off native isle. To the Anglo-Indian rulers and administrators, their work in India is a part of the history of India, and to all good Britishers India has become dear as the scene of their labours and when they bid good-bye to India it is with a heavy

heart. But yet it is sad to reflect that India is not their home and they have to go. If only half of our rulers and statesmen should look to India as their home, there would be to-day more touch undoubtedly between the rulers and the ruled. While thus the British rule in India is the marvel of marvels, it is like a huge kaleidoscope turning from England to India and back again to England in a manner unprecedented in the annals of history. A colony of Englishmen in India composed of retired officials or even a part of the retired officials who would look to India, if not as their home, at least as the land of their adoption would be a great bridge between the East and the West. The amount of intellectual and moral wealth that comes to India from England every year in the shape of Englishmen and goes away without stopping here to lift up India is the real drain that we should deplore, and the best of them come and go like flashes of lightning after having acted their part on the stage of Indian administration.

A.—Yes: I quite see the point, but if Englishmen made India their home I am afraid they would soon cease to be Englishmen and lose their power for good. They must preserve the freshness and vigour of their native island before they can be of any use to the world. That is why they send their

children away to England early for training. The Englishmen whose sojourn in India is long, find themselves out of touch at home and so they hurry back to make amends. So the term Anglo-Indian means Englishman who has lost a bit of the English touch and gained a bit of Indian touch by his stay in India.

R—You seem to be talking exactly like the brahman who says that he loses his caste by touching the black waters or treading on the English soil. Whether Englishmen could make India their home or not is a problem for their own decision. But I for one, look upon the difficulty as purely sentimental and as capable of solution. *If India is worth ruling, it must be worth living in.* What about the large number of missionaries who spend almost all their lives in India? However the question is yet in the region of speculation and not in that of practical politics. When we go to England and stop there as long as Englishmen do in India, we are bound to become a bit Anglicised; and even so Englishmen in India must get a bit Indianised. Perhaps we would get more Anglicised in England than Englishmen would be in India under existing conditions. That is inevitable. But there is no reason to dread it. It is said that Englishmen when they come to India are fresh, free and frank and that under Indian conditions they become what is termed Bureaucrats but to

the extent to which this is true, Indian conditions are a great deal responsible. For the Anglo-Indian code of conduct in India the Indians will have to bear their share of burden. We often hear the charge now-a-days that the Englishman in India is a bit of a Nawab. If it is so, may it not be that the Nawabism of India has affected even the simple and free Englishman?

Twenty years ago when the Collector was on tour in his District, he was received with a great deal of pomp and splendour, music and tom-tom, nautch girls and garlands and he was quite demi-godded and so he became a demi-god. It was not his fault surely. Even when he did not want it, the people demi-godded him. When the Collector went for Jamabandi, he was received like the Governor. I quite remember when I was a boy how a Collector was received in a Taluk Station when he went to Jamabandi. That again is Indian custom. What could the Collector do except to bow to the custom of the country he had to rule? Pomp and Splendour attaching to power is a thing of the East, and it could be washed out only gradually even if Englishmen would put them out at once. The Collector who at one time loomed so big has now been shoved into the back-ground. The Revenue Board has likewise gone into the back-ground. The Local Government has like-

wise gone into the back-ground. The Viceroy himself has had to recede before the Secretary of State and the Secretary of State in his turn, finds himself before the Parliament to answer questions. This must gladden the hearts of Radicals but after all it is worth asking now after so much of Indian progress and enlightment whence proceeds this Nawabism? From Indians or from Englishmen, and who is the bigger Bahadur, the Indian clothed with power or the Englishman? When the Indian tries to become a free man, it is in spite of himself, his surroundings and traditions. That is why so few of the Indians even of the highest culture and eminence are still not free in any real sense of the term. And when the Englishman becomes the Nawab, it is again in spite of himself, his surroundings, his blood and his traditions. The result is that if you scratch the surface of the loudest Indian nationalist, you will find underneath Nawabism running in his veins. Likewise scratch the surface of the Anglo-Indian, he is essentially the free and freedom-loving Englishman. Nawabism in India is a concentric circle in which for centuries the Indian as well as the Mohamedan has been living. It is the normal political life of the country. The Village Officer plays the Nawab in the village. He is honoured in the village as its centre. His word is law in the village. While he

exacts obeisance from his villagers he is cheerful in paying it in his turn to his Revenue Inspector or Tahsildar, who again in their turn are ready to pay it to their immediate superior, the Deputy Collector. Time was about twenty years ago when the Deputy Collector's arrival for Jamabandi was a great event. He was the centre of attraction only next to the Collector. Again the Deputy Collector gave the Collector the respect he got from his Tahsildar. It is so in Hyderabad. The Mohamedan says "give respect and take it." So round the small circle in the village of which the Headman or the Village Officer is the centre you come up by gradations until you reach the monarch at whose feet everything lay. This is India still. Similarly in the religious sphere you find the religious head of each community exacting implicit homage like the Pope in Rome. In the social sphere, man has come to play the Nawab over the woman in India. In the domestic sphere, the husband plays the Nawab over the wife. As everyone in India must play the Nawab sometime or other, the woman too wanted her chance and that she got when she became a mother-in-law. So when the mother-in-law played the Nawab over the daughter-in-law, and when the latter grumbled, the mother-in-law said to the daughter-in-law "wait for your turn till you become a mother-in-law". Caste again is a

huge aristocracy which tends to Nawabism of class over class. In this land therefore where the air is saturated so thoroughly with the spirit of Nawabism socially, religiously and politically it would be a wonder if Englishmen were not affected by it more or less. But after all how much of it each takes is a question of personal equation. There are and there have been excellent men who have never been affected by it. There are again those who come to be so taken in by it honestly as the only thing that can rule India properly, and they readily remind one of the lines, "Assumes the God, affects to nod and seems to shake the spheres." Already this tendency has reached its climax and it is no longer possible. This is Imperialism of the wrong type. But, after all, it is true that between the average Englishman and the average Indian the bigger Nawab to this day both in *ease* and in *pose* is the Indian rather than the Englishman, because the Englishman's Nawbism if anything is at best assumed in India. It is not in him. It is not natural to him. Whereas the Nawabism of the Indian is in his veins and his freedom is only of the lips. When the English official goes to the club in the evening he has to shake off his Nawabism and mix with every one there on a footing of equality. The English merchants, missionaries, planters or bankers break the officialdom, and the English-

man has been so brought up that he looks upon his office as a mere necessity but his real life is out of it. He is more visible in his genuine colours when he is out of office, in the club, in the house, in the hunting ground or in sports. He is then at his best. But with the Indian it is entirely different. It is just the other way. Power and authority are the air he breathes and office is the life he lives. To club and clubbablity of the genuine sort, he is a stranger. Consciousness of power and consciousness of office are his food and drink. He carries it whereever he goes.

In the Native States, this tendency is even more pronounced than here to this day. His Excellency the Governor or the Viceroy may be all affability and Council members and Civilians as a rule may be all courtesy and kindness to us; but the Indian gods strike one at times as much more imperious and imperial in their attitude. One despairs whether English education has after all effected any change in this matter. Perhaps with the Indians it has made things worse. We hear so much about want of touch between the Civilians and the People for want of knowledge on their part of the vernaculars. But the educated Indian has become a caste by himself. He looks down upon the rest of his countrymen: he would not mix with them freely because it is *infra dig.*

The Indian officers become again a caste by themselves. They look down upon the rest. The educated non-officials who are mostly Vakils, have their revenge on their own Indian officers whom they cut severely at their club, and the result is the feeling of official *versus* non-official, has now grown into a creed.

The Englishman is trained to subordinate himself to higher interests. He is trained to public life infinitely more than we are. He is trained to value and appreciate honest opinions and convictions even when he differs strongly from them. He is trained to the great virtue of a frank recognition of merit wherever found. But in all these respects and many more we have to learn a great deal from England. The convictions of a popular public man in England are sacred to him and to his following and to his country. He is constantly arraigned at the bar of public opinion for any change of front and he is on his trial. But here public opinion has yet to be formed on great many matters of public concern. Most of our public men are made in a very rough and ready manner and their opinions too are equally rough and ready. But thanks to the English education we can to-day show among us brilliant examples of public men though they are numerically small.

Again the liberty of the press and freedom of speech are very dear to Englishmen. The English know also how to take the press opinions at their worth. The English press, the English public opinion, the English national life and the British Parliament have all grown together whereas here the press is yet in its infancy and the trials incidental to it. The people have been accustomed only to personal politics and they cannot often rise above the level of personalities to the perception of principles, and therefore what interests the average Indian reader as well as the Indian press is very often personal criticism but intervals of reason come when no personal interests are at stake. But the liberty of the press or the freedom of speech is never at stake with Englishmen *as a rule.* The Mysore Press Law apart from its merits one way or the other and barely as a matter of principle, involving legislation against the press, has passed more easily in the Mysore State than it would have done under the British Government. Hyderabad would be even more summary with the press or with dissentients or angry criticisms against itself.

"The King can do no wrong"; "He is above all criticism": This is out and out an oriental sentiment and it is enforced in the Native States by the highest Indian officers therein. Whereas the theory

that even "The cat can look at the King" is purely British. The Native States have sometimes visited the press with scant courtesy. The treatment provokes no sensation in the States concerned; but all the opposition to it comes from our side. Mr. Pal carefully omitted the Native States from his programme. He played his game freely over the British province. From the Mysore Advisory Committee the press-men were excluded. The Indian press is angry. But the Mysore Government is not going to truckle to the Press. It has got its own reasons for excluding the press-men from the meetings and it is not going to hold itself responsible to the press. I do not know what Radicals would call this in England and how many questions would be put in Parliament about such doings if the British Government had done such a thing. But being Native States which possess perfect freedom in such matters they are free from the fears of attack in Parliament at the hands of pseudo-philanthropists, whose quixotic mission is in striking contrast with what goes on in the Native States. Let me tell you, my dear sir, Indian blood in infinitely more autocratic than the English. The average English politician knows the responsibility of forming opinions and holding them. He knows the difficulty of giving them up. His political opinions are a part of his

public life and public character. But most of our politicians (barring just a few brilliant exceptions) in a country of millions are just beginning their political alphabet. The newspapers do the thinking for the politicians and thinking is so troublesome that the average Indian politician is willing to adopt the thought of others as his for the time being. The Indian Press generally has come to think that its function is to play the role of opposition to the Government as completely as possible and it is found to pay. The politicians who differ from the press get short shrift. Indian politics has been all along politics of the purely personal type. It is in the blood of the people. In Native States, politics is simply making and unmaking the men in power, even to this day. During the pre-British days it was making and unmaking of the men in power or the Government of the day. It was done not by the press but by the old, old oriental weapon of party spirit and intrigue. The man in power, be he a Peshwa or Dewan, had at once his rival. Each had his own following, and the function of each party was to do its best against the man in power and pull him to pieces. You find this spirit, the same even now more or less in the Native States. English education has not minimised it very much. It has only made the weapon of intrigue sharper but it is covered now with velvet. That is

education.! Has English education stopped in Native States, party politics and the politics of making and unmaking Dewans? It has not. The way party feeling works in India is woeful, wonderful and worth studying by every honest Britisher at home and in India, because in studying it he has studied the real life of India and in holding the balance against its evil influences, he has mastered the secret as well as the difficulty of the British rule in India. If he fails to grasp it, the result is disaster. When one Dewan goes out and another comes in, the reversal of policy consists mainly in his own men coming up and in his predecessor's men going down. To *this* usual and *invariable party* spirit is added current feelings due to *conflicting* interests making the situation only more complicated. A man may be far above the average in character and intellect but he may get crushed on account of this party spirit. This is un-English but quite normal in Native States. In Travancore, the feeling is brahmans *versus* non-brahmans and a thousand such details of clique and cliquism baffling the strength and skill of the Britisher, constitute the normal Indian life. If the Dewan sent to rule the Native States happens to be too radical, he would upset the coach of Government but if he is too timid to initiate urgent reforms on sound and rational lines of western

thought, he would leave the Augean stables of custom and prejudice, corruption and cliquism untouched. The golden mean of taking a step or two in advance without aspiring for giant strides is the only thing given to the practical and wise statesman who reserves his Utopia to himself and takes care not to become another Don Quixote. This party spirit and personal politics being so much in the Indian blood no wonder the Indian press is deeply affected by it. For who are the Editors? They are not generally men with the large creed necessary for holding the balance evenly between the Indian classes but they are themselves men of class-prejudices and sect sympathies and Provincial patriotism and carry their own personal politics into their papers more or less. They are however agreed about one thing, *and that is, opposing the Government.* This accounts for the absence of papers representing various political parties in India. They are all engaged in the work of opposing Government. As remarked by a keen observer, the so-called public opinion may turn out on examination often enough "*the very private opinion of a very private man.*" But all the same, the Indian editor has become a power. He is well-read and he is conscious that the Britsh sentiment of liberty gives him a place in the Fourth Estate of the Realm. He can sooner do so under

the British Government, than the Native States and he need only pitch into the Government in and out of season to show himself off. It is thus he makes himself felt.

The Editors of the Indian Press and even their reporters and correspondents are becoming little press-autocrats. This is interesting study. They are talking democracy for the purpose of making themselves autocrats. They have become autocrats more or less. That is the Indian tendency. You start an organization to put down caste. It soon becomes another caste. The press wants to check uncontrolled power and abuse of authority. But it soon becomes a tyranny, which may be termed the tyranny of the Press. At the head of the opposition to the Government sits the Editorial God whose aim is to vie with the other Gods. 20 years ago the Indian press worked with the public more on principles and less on personal considerations, but now the rule of the Indian editor has become very personal indeed! While he is protesting against the incense offered at the altar of officialdom he wants a lot himself, and he gets it in abundance. He wants to be seen by the biggest men. Hon'ble Members of Council, Dewans of Native States and the highest officials who look upon an angry comment on them as a calamity, all those want now the Editor's good-will

both to put them up and not to pull them down. Power has got now not only separated from the Government but it has been shifted to the Indian Press. One paper openly said that it had pulled down one Dewan and put up another.

Seeing how opposition to Government pays the English knowing Editor, and how it has made him a power in the land, every vernacular editor has taken the cue from him and has opened the campaign of opposition against Government. The process is simplicity itself. Accept nothing done by the Government as done either with a good intention or as likely to do good, oppose the Government in an Irish spirit and write always in the spirit of an "Agin Government man." This policy in England would get checked by another class of papers but in India the great thing to remember is, the same thing will not occur because the Indian Press has already succeeded in creating a taste for opposition-literature against the Government, regardless of the merits of the opposition, and so, the taste of the reading public wants the sort of stuff on which it has been fed. Till a healthy current of journalism is widely created, the people who differ from the Indian Press will have no organ of public opinion suited to their sound and moderate views on politics, and till then, the Opposition Press will go on increasing in power

for baulking the Government at every step. Till then the real public opinion of the educated Indian public will be submerged and silent, for want of a voice. If they go to the Anglo-Indian Press they are put down as truckling to them. If they write to the Indian Press their opinions differing from those of the editor they either get badly clipped before being published, or they are thrown into the waste paper basket. Contradictions to editorial attacks and opinions were at one time allowed to appear as a matter of bare courtesy to dissentients but now, the motto has come to be "the editor can do no wrong". "There is no contradicting him." We have thus come to suffer from editorial autocracy more than the so-called Bureaucracy. Pray remember the Editorial Autocracy of the red-hot school of politics between whom and the British Government there is really no love lost. The Radicals are playing into the hands of this section of the press unconsciously.

A.—Have you been connected with any press yourself?

R.—Yes. I was for years the unpaid correspondent of one paper at least. That was when the paper had something like principle. There was then no Anti-British feeling.

A.—The commercial spirit is the cause. It is invading everywhere. Even in England the press in

not what it should be. But the public are not, I think, as easily taken in by the press opinions as perhaps here. The press is a great power when rightly used, but if used to push wrong ideas or class interests or Anti-British feeling above all it is an awful situation to be sure.

R.—That is where it is. Whatever appears in print here, has a charm about it. Nobody knows how much of it has not affected the average man. It has affected him in 9 out of 10 cases more than it should have been. That is where the trouble comes. Indian readers are too credulous. They are too timid towards the press. This tendency has affected the British public at home. Nobody knows how much of the dirt thrown by the malevolent critics of the Anti-British school, has stuck. I wish the British public would remember what Lord Morley said in 1908. He said:—

"If my existence either officially or corporally were prolonged 20 times longer than either of them is likely to be, a Parliamentary system in India is not at all the goal to which I would for one moment aspire."

Nevertheless, let me hasten to make the admission that the Indian press has got on its staff men here and there who would do honour to any country in the world for public character of the highest type.

CHAPTER III.

BRITISH AND NATIVE INDIA

AND

THE PRESS AND CASTE SPIRIT.

A.—BUT don't you think that the British spirit in British India is a powerful antidote to party spirit and intrigue? And that in British India the spirit of intrigue has not as much play as in the Native States? How do you compare British India with Native India?

R.—Yes. The difference between British India and Native India is remarkable in several respects. That again is an interesting study. The one point wherein British India markedly differs from Native India is the spirit of personal liberty and the spirit of public criticism. In British India every one walks with his head aloft, that is, what you have taught us to do, but in Native India, the attitude is bending down one's head. In British India we are conscious of serving something impersonal, but in Native India what one has to serve is persons more and principles less. A scion of the Royal family of Travancore and a brilliant Master of Arts preferred British service

to his own Travancore service. A high English Official was struck with the incongruity and asked His Highness the Maharajah, in the presence of the young man, why he was allowed to seek British service. His Highness said "He does not care for us." The young man at once retroted, "No, Your Highness, here one has to serve persons; there, one has to serve principles. I prefer the latter to the former.". That is British spirit. Another Prince of Travancore who also alas! is no more, used to say that when he was in his own State he felt himself a prisoner, but when he treaded the British soil, he felt himself a freeman. In his own State there was not a moment when he was free from the gaze of observers and the attention of flatterers. So he made it a point regularly to come to the British side for breathing the air of freedom. Would Englishmen believe it when I say that this Prince who was a Graduate, a high Free-Mason, an accomplished singer, a good dancer, a hearty good fellow, in fact, all in all, one who would be the centre of English society found himself tyrannised by the peculiar customs of his country!!

But in Native India the scope for Indian talent in administration is wider. The highest offices are manned by the Indians. The heads of departments from the Dewan downwards are Indians and they are

called upon to display their highest talent and energy and so far, it must be said to have proved a success; but it should not be forgotten that they owe it essentially to the British spirit animating the administration as their model. They closely copy the British system through chosen and competent Indians who have imbibed the British principles and who try to vie with all that is best in the British system. The ideal is to adopt all that is good in the British system to the conditions of Native States through the Indian machinery of administration. There is said to be more freedom of initiative in Native India than in British India which is due to the comparative simplicity of the machinery and to the smallness of the area under administration. British India is in its very nature and extent vastly more complex and complicated and the difference in area and population is not to be lost sight of in instituting a comparison between the two; Division for Division and Taluq for Taluq the work is more here. In Native India, the European element in administration is markedly less than in British India and this imparts to the administration its peculiar colour and character. The European element is naturally the dominant feature in British India while in Native India the Indian element has the upper hand. Each has its own peculiar merits and drawbacks and we,

on the British side, have got for our model the superior energy, system and vigour of the British to copy much more largely than there. But it strikes one that while British India may adopt and assimilate from time to time whatever has suited the Native States, the Indian genius and the Indian sentiment, the Native States should never lose sight of the fact that more and more complete dissociation from even the minimum of the British element in administration will result in the weakening of that moral fibre and strength with which the British is instinct. The proper combination in British India as well as Native India which may be described as the common basis of both, is the British *plus* the Indian working side by side in all that concerns the highest well-being of both. I, for one, believe that any tendency to divorce unduly and beyond certain limits the British and Indian elements either here or there is likely to do in the long run more harm than good and to impair the general tone and efficiency of administration. Apart from the position between the British and Indians as rulers and ruled, and bearing in mind their essential characteristics, they appeal to me more as complements indispensable to each other and not as combatants who should develop anything like a feeling of incompatability between them. There is not only room but there is clear

necessity for the best specimens of the British animating the administration till Indians come up to their level. The best way of curing an unhealthy feeling of rivalry and jealousy between the two communities is to look to increasing the stock of the best in both and not pushing up the mediocres. For example, the decadence of the race of English Barristers in Madras is due doubtless to the ascendancy of the Vakils of which they may feel proud, but I, for one, wish we had amidst us in the Bar, the great examples we used to have at one time of English Barristers for keeping up the high level and the great traditions of the English Bar. My ideal is a combination of brilliant English Barristers working side by side with the Indian Vakils. In driving out the English Barristers we have gained commercially, but we have lost morally and intellectually. Let us not forget the giants that once adorned the Bar from among the English Barristers. A Sullivan who made Sir Bashyam Aiyangar, a John Bruce Norton who pleaded warmly the cause of Indians, a Mayne whose Hindu Law is still our text book, are names for forensic eminence and legal acumen by the side of whom the best Vakils and Indian Barristers may well take a subordinate place. Even the lesser lights that adorned the Madras Bar latterly left a great mark for character and individuality which were a

source of inspiration to their surroundings. What is true of the Madras Bar is true all round. Likewise one hears in Native States the names of British Officers of old which are a house-hold word to-day.

As for the Press, we have been compelled to create the press law. The Mysore Press Law is a more stringent measure. It is impossible for the Englishman to live without his paper. Evening tea, newspaper and cigar are the tripod of his social life. The Englishman would as easily commit suicide as kill the liberty of the press. But he finds the infant Indian press has come to mistake its function. Therefore what he has been compelled to do much against his grain, is to control by legislation its thoughtless and undisciplined excesses in order that the ignorant Indian public may not go off their heads as they have already done. But in Native States the exit of the Goddess of Liberty of speech and thought evokes no tear. Here are two extremes containing the problem. Is the press to be controlled or killed? In Mysore, the feeling is that they are all to-day very much the poorer for want of a free paper and so long as the press-law continues unchanged, no paper worth the name, can live. The author of press legislation in Mysore, true to his liberal instincts feels that the time is come for amending the press-law and letting the newspapers

live. But the fear has perhaps come to invade the minds of our Maharajahs and not unnaturally whether the institution of a free press might not prove dangerous in the long run to their own power and prestige. If the press exercises its functions in India in a manner tending to upset the people's minds and produce a feeling of unrest and disaffection to the Government, it becomes a matter of the gravest concern as to how to separate the healthy freedom of the press and let it live, taking care to curb its erratic tendencies. The problem apparently strikes the Indian ruling instinct as best solved by letting the press live only on stringent conditions.

An English Civilian District Magistrate who was better known as an archeologist than administrator once told me "I am glad I am not a Brahman: Life is spent in intrigue from morning to evening." It will take a long time before this tendeney disappears.

A.—How can you be so hard against Brahminism?

R.—How did Luther protest against Popedom? That is exactly why I oppose false Brahmanism as against true Brahmanism. Go and ask anywhere about the general feeling of antagonism and conflict of interests between Brahmans and non-brahmans, between Hindus and Mohemadans, or between Brahmans and Nairs, or again between Hindus and Christians, you will find that the fight is between

class against class for office and power. Among Brahmans themselves, the fight is between the various sects. Have people in England any idea of this? Do they know anything about the bitter feeling of resentment of non-brahmans as a class against Brahmans? Do they realise the intensity of sectarian feeling among the Brahmans themselves? You will hear the murmur all over India, of the war between classes wherever you go. The weaker sect or class for the time being in point of power and influence goes to the wall. The tendency of the stronger class or sect is consciously and even unconsciously to monopolise office and power. We want the British to hold the balance evenly between us, though even they at times succumb to the combination and power of a class. What can they do? They are but human. If one class comes to hold power and office very largely, it can effectually keep down the other classes in a thousand ways, and even the most lynx-eyed of British officers may be unable to cope with the situation, because wherever they turn round if they find the class influence of any *one* class prevail by their numbers, this class being most in touch with the Government can easily carry the day with the Government and become virtually the ruling power. The Government must consult those nearest them and if one class happens to be nearer than

the rest, that class has the ear of the Government and easily wins in preference to the rest. The other classes go to the wall. This is India. Am I not right? Am I drawing one bit upon my imagination? No, Sir, no. The strongest working feeling in India is "Our class", *versus* "Your class". *The nation is nowhere. The class is everywhere.* The wail of the weak is "my class is gone to the bottom. That class is in the zenith of its power. If only I had belonged to that class, I should have been better off". A balancing of power between the classes as far as possible and consistently with efficiency is absolutely necessary. otherwise it becomes a wrong to the weaker and may prove a danger to the administration. It becomes positive injustice to the men of the classes out of power and the British must come to the rescue. But the combination proves at times, as I said already, too strong even for the British which shows that the British Government must never yield to clamour or prejudice of class against class, however cleverly the game might be played. The glory of the British administration lies in this that the weaker always seeks its protection and what is more, it gets it. *The chrous of the weaker classes is "Where would all of us be but for the British? The answer is "Nowhere."*

Even to this day, it is only barely true

that the true and generous friend of merit, be it in the lowest of the low or the highest of the high, is the British. It is to them the eye of the country looks with confidence. It is again true that every Indian of position or eminence owes it to the firm grip and frank appreciation of the British. Now before the people can share power with the Government, they must show that they can hold the balance evenly between the various classes.

Till now, the advance we have made in the right direction in these respects, though considerable, is yet but a drop not *in the bucket* as Mr. Ramsay Macdonald would say, but a drop *in the ocean*. Till now we have been in the region of mere theories and ideas about the higher life. Mere theories and ideas do not help us much. And in India it is well to remember that what has to be changed is not merely a detail here and there, but it is the customary centres of social life that have to be changed. It is the customary pivots of social existence that have to be shifted. Social and religious ideas of ages and centuries need changing, but till then the higher life is in the hope, in the air, but it is not yet in the life. You should not therfore be surprised if I tell you that the struggle till then will be between the life we are living and the life we are aiming at. Till then we shall be talking the higher life, but we shall be

living the lower. We shall be wishing for the broader life, but we shall be constantly pulled down by our surroundings and be content to live in them for the sake of peace. There is not an Englishman in India who does not know this. There is not an Indian who does not feel it. The spirit of schism which we still possess in abundance cannot be wiped out in a day by mere political institutions sprung upon us. *As Mr. Justice Ranade, one of the greatest of leaders of Indian Reform thought used to say it is not the privileges which others give us that will save India. It is the development of our own life and living in the right direction that is going to be the Saviour.* Indian public life will be till then, one-sided and defective. The life within us, Indians, the life of our very homes, in short, our domestic and social life has to be the starting point of the great reformation that is to save India. Till that is done, we are getting to tell you the truth, disgusted with ourselves, despairing about our future and making confessions to each other. The confession is now running round every one that, after all, we are not facing our real problem in a proper spirit. The confession is also going round that Lord Morley's Reform Scheme has only put us on a severe trial and that if we do not begin the wider life now at least, there is no hope.

CHAPTER IV.

THE HIGHER LIFE OF INDIA

AND

THE MISSION OF ENGLAND.

A.—WHAT do you mean when you say the wider life has not yet come to India?

R.—I mean that, while Indian intellect has been roused under the magic wand of English education, the broken fragments of real Indian life, real Indian wisdom, real Indian art and, and above all, *real Indian* character, have yet to be picked up and woven fresh into the life of the nation. The Indian political vicissitudes of ages have, among other things, broken the Indian character as well. It is the character building that is the immediate problem before Indians.

A.—Has not that begun?

R.—Hardly yet, I am afraid, in anything like an earnest spirit even by the bulk of those who see clearly the need for it. It has not taken hold of the general mind though there is just at present a wide

yearning after it.

A.—But don't you think that a bit of the life you want has come to Bengal and also to Bombay though perhaps Madras is still lagging, because of the numerous sects and sub-sects into which Madras is divided. I am afraid you are taking Madras as a standard while it is perhaps the least advanced in the essentials of the great reformation you seek.

R.—There is considerable truth in what you say. Bengal stands first in intellect. Bombay is perhaps good second, and Madras is modest third. But all of us share the national defect of being more sentimental and less practical, and more critical than constructive. Besides, all of us have taken hold of the wrong end of the stick instead of the right one, and that is the cause of all our trouble. Will we give up the wrong end and take hold of the right end, I am afraid the future of India will be enveloped in darkness though flashes of light may appear and disappear.

A.—What do you consider the right end and what do you call the wrong end?

R.—The right end is social and religious reformation on lines of ancient Indian wisdom under the British overlordship, on the basis of true Imperialism, while the wrong end is mere political advance on democratic lines without social reformation and with

anti-British feelings leading to political anarchism. To take the example of Japan which is so near us: if only Japan, like India, had stuck to her old and narrow ways of life and living and had developed anti-British feelings, she would by this time have had to capitulate before the west. Japan took the right end of the stick and built herself up on the basis of internal reform and complete devotion to all that is best in the western civilisation. If India should adopt to-morrow the same track the first thing to do is to give up political anarchism and anti-British feelings and begin social and religious reformation on the basis of fellowship between England and India.

Were proof wanted of the need for social and religious reformation, you have it in the following figures given by Mon. Chailley :—

"As regards child marriage, the statistics are stupefying. In India the 1901 census showed 121, 500 married boys and 243, 500 married girls whose age was under 5; between the ages of 5 and 10 the figures are 760,000 and 2,030,000 respectively; between 10 and 15, 2,540,000 and 6,585,000. Further there were no less than 1,277,000 widowed persons under 20, of whom 914,000 were females. Of these, 6000 widowers and 96,000 widows were less than 5 years of age; 37,000 widowers and 96000,

widows between 5 and 10; and 113,000 widowers, and 296,000 widows, between 10 and 15. These figures testify to the result of infant marriages, one of the parties to which has died, coupled with the almost general forbiddal of the remarriage of widows in the higher castes. A little girl married, or to speak more accurately betrothed, at 4 or 5 may become a widow at 6 and must remain so all her life."

No wonder the confession is going round the mouth of every Indian, including even the anarchist that India cannot do without England for a day and for a long come to time. The confession is also going round that we are yet nowhere compared with England as a nation, in arts and industries, in commerce and charater, in the development of economic resources and in the spirit of enterprise, and that we must learn patiently all that the Western World has yet to teach us.

To quote the French author M. G. Ainslie Height once more, this is what he says about Social Reform commenting on a set of speeches and writings, I had sent him on the subject. He says, :—

"It is most gratifying to me to know that a Native of India is working so strenuously on lines very similar to my own. Indians have my warmest sympathy especially in the matter of child marriages.

Your cause is certain to triumph in the end, though it may not be in our life time. When the more enlightened heads amongst a people begin to realise as you do and others of your countrymen, what position women may and ought to hold and how great may be her power, the end cannot be doubtful. Infant marriages are not enjoined by the Shastras as you point out, nor are re-marriages of widows prohibited. In that fact lies your strength against all opposition on religious grounds, rather than in a doctrine of freedom which is at the best a mystery." That M. G. A. Height is not one of those Europeans who merely find fault with our customs and look down on us as an inferior race of men but that he has a profound admiration for the ancient philosophy of India and love for the Indians would appear from the following part of his letter. He says, "I do not hesitate to put the Vedanta Philosophy on a level with or even above the highest thought of Europe not excepting Plato, and Kant as regards Metaphysic though these have the advantage of literary style and more luminous working out. Particularly I have been struck by the close affinity between the thought of the Upanishads and our Christianity. This may not seem clear to you if you judge of Christianity either by what you see of it in its modern form or by what you have read of the history of councils etc.

But it came home to me when I was in Rome last winter and saw something of the early Christian church, that is during the first three centuries of its existence, when its thought began to find utterances before it became corrupted by politics. I see you quote Bacon, Mill, Spencer etc. Nothing can be farther from me than to wish to belittle these great men or the noble work to which they have devoted their lives. It was much needed and was well-done. Still there are some of us who begin to think that perhaps they may have carried us too far with their rationalist ideas of Liberty, Equality etc. .... I do not think that theories and formulas will help us much. The practical difficulty that in snatching at liberty, you only escape from one bondage to another remains. But it will come of itself in so far as a people is fitted to receive it. For the present our first duty is to guard the integrity of our sacred writings, a duty which has been sadly neglected both in Europe and in India, where they have been so tampered with by priests and politicians that it is difficult to distinguish the divine from the human. ....Have you over read Schopenhauer? He is well worthy of study by brahmans, and is tolerably translated into English. He has certainly without comparison the greatest philosophical mind of the last century, but is unpopular especially at the

Universities partly because of his very aggressive style, partly because his thought is too high for most men. He takes his starting point from the same ideas as the Upanishads which were, I am told, always open in his room, at a time when few people in Europe even knew their name. His thought is entirely Indian, but developed in harmony with the logic and science of our time..... .....I wish you good-bye and God-speed in the work which you are doing for your fellow countrymen."

A.—Supposing Indian social and religious reformation on the lines you indicate either cannot come at all or does not come for an indefinitely long time do you mean to say that no popular form of government should till then come to India? What is the form of government you would propose for India as best suited to it, till India becomes fit for some form of self-government, say, like the self-governing colonies?

R.—It is impossible to lay down the limits of time up to which a particular form of government should continue and when another form should come in. It is a question of constitutional growth. England has pushed her own liberal form of government in British India not merely in advance of the conditions of the people, but also in opposition to the genius of the country. However, it is worth trying

a great experiment as to how the Indian genius is going to deal with it. Whether it is going to assimilate it and make it a part of herself will depend as I have been telling you, very largely indeed on the upbuilding of her social efficiency. If she does not care to effect it, India will have nothing to complain against England. But if British India does assimilate a popular form of government by developing the requisite social efficiency, the Native States may have to follow suit and adopt, in course of time, something like the form of government in British India. But if British India means to preserve the main lines of her ancient form of government without caring for a Parliamentary form, the best proof she could afford of this tendency on her part, would be to continue as she has been doing all along, to turn a deaf ear to the call of social and religious reformation and stick to her political outcry merely as a temporary make-shift. India at present, does not know her own mind. But there are not indications wanting, as I have been urging all along, that her own genius and traditions are rather for a limited monarchy than for a self-governing colony. A limited monarchy is quite in keeping with the spirit and genius of India. It is to that all changes and struggles, social, political and religious are, in all probability, veering round to-day in India. If so, is it not best to develop that form for which India is

most fitted and which she most desires instead of embarking her on the unknown deep of a form of government which even if it succeeds to a certain extent under British guidance and control, is not likely to strike anything like deep roots in the soil. If so, would not the experiment be a sheer waste of energy? Would it not be even perilous as could be seen from the course of events? It appears to me that trying the experiment of domocracy in India of continental vastness and countless millions is like breaking the embankments of a mighty reservoir and letting the floods loose. The greatest calamity that may befall India is mob-rule in any form or shape. There are clear indications on the horizon already, that the worst tendencies of mob-rule are taking forms and shapes and you may at once see, what course they will run, if unchecked. We know from the history of the west something of the terrors of mob-rule and the devastations it will cause. Before it gets out of hand it will be wise on the part of England to quickly adapt herself to the Indian genius and adopt at once those principles which would define and work the limited form of monarchy under which British rule in India would become the best form of Indian government, instead of becoming as it has already begun to be, a doubtful democratic experiment at tremendous cost. Under the caste-civilisation of

India, the millions of India have been accustomed to maintain a sense of mutual dependence, stability, law-abidingness and order which dispensed with the police as well as militia. Now all that is changing. The end of all government should be to secure peace and order not at a maximum but at a minimum cost, not at the maximum of physical and minimum of moral force, but rather at the maximum of moral and minimum of physical force. It is this system India has been accustomed to. And caste, despite all its defects as seen to-day, has succeeded in securing obedience to law and authority on the basis of the moral force more than on that of the physical force. The great problem is how to minimise or wipe out the objectionable and unprogressive features of caste without doing away with the great conservatism for good, underlying it. If England would really adopt this course, it should be no doubt on Indian lines of all that is best in the ancient Indian polity and not as she is doing now, purely on western lines. Supposing England were to rule India on the ancient Indian model, there would be at once a great and cheerful response from the people and it would at once disarm even the most fierce and reckless opponents of the British government, who have now taken to the game of anarchism which was unknown to India for ages and centuries, even of the worst misrule.

A.—The question is how to effect this Reform you talk about.

R.—It is simple once you imbibe the spirit of the Indian genius of government. The central principle is to look upon the people just as an Indian monarch with his Indian council would look upon India and Indian interests. It would put an end to conflict of Indian interests, with other interests, be they commercial or political, and the Indian interests will come to weigh with the Government not merely as the first and foremost, but as the only one which the Government of India would be called upon to defend. That is the true Indian spirit of Indian polity. There would then be the Indian genius of government working through British overlordship. There would at once be not only a coalition of feeling between the Government and the people but a coalition of interests, as well, and England which has already done so much to uplift India would become in the eye of the people in no way different from her own native government. What England is now doing towards India, is the highest example of justice and fairplay of one nation ruling over another. But the system I have before me is one under which there is a coalition of feeling between India and England as a composite whole. Indians and Englishmen would at once have to throw off their differences and

opposing currents of thought and feeling, racial, national or religious, and would come to feel that the ideal to be evolved is not merely a westernised form of eastern government or a dead unprogressive form of the eastern monarchy, but a combination of the energy of the west with the wisdom of the east. This is given only to the British genius to evolve and that appears to my mind the great solution in which the best thoughts of England will permeate the best thoughts of India and produce a result which would be the crown and glory of the British rule.

A.—Can you describe to me that political millennium? It seems to me more imaginary than real. Can you perceive it yourself?

R.—Being a state of things which has yet to be realised in the world, it naturally strikes you as nothing more than a dream. But you must know that the British Government in India as it is, is itself one of those marvels which if prophets had foretold, none would have believed. Therefore our inability to perceive a state of things, infinitely better than the present is no valid argument against it. We can all but dimly realise it in our imagination, provided we bear in mind the essential points of the genius of England and the genius of India, and know how to weave the one into the other.

A.—I am afraid it is more easily said than done.

How would you satisfy the thousand points of conflict between the East and West and between the interests of England and India? There is no hiding the fact that when one country rules over another there are certain difficulties and inconveniences incidental to it, which are absent from a free and self-governing country. You cannot by any means remove these incidents of a foreign Government. Secondly, it must not be forgotten that the Government of every country in the world, be it foreign or native, must depend upon the strength of arms in the ultimate analysis. Your own Sanskrit saying, you have forgotten. It says "Balo Raja Prithivi".

The world belongs to the strongest. In pre-British days, India was a prey to rival claimants for supremacy and what decided the victory was not who was the most just or the most intelligent and capable of the claimants but merely who proved the strongest in the field. You know in ancient days in India when the system of Aswameda Yaga was prevalent, war was waged for no reason at all, except to prove who was the strongest. A horse was let loose with a motto on a plate, tied to its forehead and whoever ventured to catch the horse and keep it, had either to fight and win, or surrender and lose. So did Arjuna fight his battles. That is the true spirit of Kashatriya. But now the spirit of the world has