

so far changed, that though arms and armaments are being looked after and increased, the tendency to war and blood-shed is distinctly on the wane. The world spirit is itself stepping from one ideal into another. The end of war is after all peace. But the end of peace should not be again war. It must be something else.

R.—It is quite a surprise to me to hear you propound the Indian ideas. It is wonderful how when we Indians are trying to grasp the Western ideals, Westerns like you are trying to grasp the Indian. And the salvation of India, and I may say of the world itself, rests in unifying these two classes; *of Indians who represent the best of western thought and culture, and of Englishmen who represent the best of Indian thought and culture and making them the instruments for working the future of the British Empire. These are to be the builders of the future. The rest may be left out of consideration.*

A.—That again is a dream. I was going to tell you that though the world spirit is now more for peace than war, the world has not yet become so unselfish as you and I may desire. Where national interests clash, there the weaker goes to the wall. England is in India by right of conquest just like any other conquering dynasty or race before the British rule. They continued to hold the reins of

government as long as they could; that is exactly the way you should expect England also to go on. England will hold India as long as it could. This is however not inconsistent with the British principle so beautifully expressed in the Queen's Proclamation about England's mission in India. It is necessary to hold the country if you would do your mission by the people entrusted to your care.

R.—Pray don't forget the part Indians and Indian troops played in the Mutiny. *It is more glorious to England to say that it holds India not merely by the sword but by the devotion of the people as well to England. That is the truth.* I quite agree with you that England must hold India for fulfilling her mission. It is well that the unfriends of British Government both here and in England just realise how well and nobly on the whole England has done by India from the day of the great Proclamation up to date. Let me make a rapid review. You know how after the mutiny, the great question was as to what the motive power of British rule in India should be. Was it to be merely to rule India as long as possible, keeping the people under the thumb, or was it to be to raise India to the level of a self-governing country in due course? There were two schools of men, as usual on such occasions. The memory of the mutiny had made things sufficiently bitter for the narrow

school who believed that the policy should be either one of retrogression or standstill, but the other school representing the broader view and the wider outlook voted against the narrow school, and then did British genius speak out the policy to be pursued. The narrow school cried out, "India for England," "India for the East India Company", but those who looked farther ahead said, "India for India".

Sir William Jones said "the principal object of every Government is the happiness of the governed."

Sir Thomas Munro was equally emphatic in his opinion.

Lord Metcalfe said "if the spread of knowledge may eventually be fatal to our rule in India, I close on that point and maintain that whatever may be the consequence, it is our duty to communicate the benefits of knowledge. If India could only be preserved as a part of the British Empire by keeping its inhabitants in a state of ignorance, our domination would be a curse to the country and ought to cease. But I see more ground for just apprehension in ignorance itself. I look to the increase of knowledge, with a hope that it may strengthen our empire; that it may remove prejudices; soften asperities and substitute a rational conviction of the benefits of our Government, that may unite the people and their rulers in sympathy, and that the differences which sepa-

rate them may be gradually lessened and ultimately annihilated. Whatever, however, be the will of Almighty Providence, respecting the future Government of India, it is clearly our duty, as long as the charge be confided to our hands, to execute the trust to the best of our ability for the good of the people. The promotion of knowledge is manifestly an essential part of that duty". Sir Charles Trevelyan said "I conceive that in determining upon a line of policy, we must look to the probable eventualities. We must have presented to our minds what will be the result of each line of policy. Now, my belief is, that the ultimate result of the policy of improving and educating India will be to postpone the separation for a long indefinite period and that when it does come, it will take place under circumstances very happy for both parties."

Mr. Halliday, the Governor of Bengal, said "I go the full length of saying that I believe our mission in India is to qualify them for governing themselves: I say also that the measures of the Government for a number of years past have been advisedly directed to so qualifying them without the slightest reference to any remote consequences upon our administration."

The Duke of Argyll speaking in the House of Lords in February 1857 said, "Our Empire will



never cease until one of two events happened,—either until we had declined from the valour and virtue of those who founded that Empire or else,—*and might God speed the time*,—we should have raised the people of India more nearly to a level with ourselves.” This was received with cheers in the House.

The Duke of Argyll has put the thing in a nutshell. The British Empire must last till one of two things happens. Till there is a decline in the valour and virtue of the British or till India has risen to a level with the rulers as a capable self-governing nation. That the great ideal set before themselves in the Government of India 50 years ago has been steadily carried out and that on the whole the British Valour and Virtue has been holding sway thorough thick and thin, is undeniable. That the Indians as a Nation are yet far from fitness for self-government is equally undeniable. That the mission of England in India has been so far one of steady fulfilment notwithstanding the defects or deficiencies inevitable in a huge Government is patent. Were the mission of England not so, and were the ideal of Government in India essentially one of narrow selfishness instead of being one of large-hearted progressiveness, we should not to-day witness the enlargement of the legislative councils, Indian mem-

bers of Parliament, Indian members of the executive councils, Indian members in the Secretary of State's Council, Indian justices of the High Court, eminent Indian educationists, Indian Dewans of Native States, in short, a growing India in all directions. We should not witness to-day an Indian Mr. Bose, in the field of western science. Thus England's mission was not only declared long ago, but it has been carried out so as to result on the whole in efficient administration, spread of education, advance of educated Indians, and advance of a popular form of government on western lines.

What has to be done is to carry out the mission still further with undaunted courage and unlimited sympathy once more. That Indians after 50 years of unceasing progress are yet far from becoming a nation, is at once a guarantee and necessity for British rule in India for a long time to come during which India has to fit herself for taking her place among the nations of the world. This can be done by the Indians only under British over-lordship and guidance.

Lord Minto's scheme would have been impossible even as an experiment, had the ground not been steadily prepared for it by the rulers and statesmen who preceded it and who are to-day working it loyally and generously. It is therefore absurd to

characterise Lord Morley's reform as if it were a political cataclysm brought about by the bomb and pistol outrages of the anarchist, while it is really a constitutional reform in the light of Indian history. It is nothing more than yet another step in the fulfilment of England's mission in India expressed in unmistakeable terms by the greatest of England's statesmen 50 years ago and which has been given effect to all through, by those who have had the actual administration in their hands.

The spirit of Indian political unity which is now in the air is exotic. It is entirely western. It is due in the main to the British genius and to the system of British Government. Few people realise how tremendous has been the force of unification under British rule. The Anglo-Indian codes, the British system of Administration of justice, the Educational system, and the commercial spirit of the day, and these and a thousand such influences have been making for unity in India under British rule without which they would vanish this moment into thin air. If there is one thing more than another which is offering resistance to this great unifying tendency of British rule, it is not the British Government but it is the internal condition of India itself. One point in the Budget speech of Mr. Montague in the House of Commons, which must be laid to heart

by every Indian is his frank allusion to the Indian social problem. While this confession of Mr. Montague is very refreshing, the pity of it is that he did not follow it to its logical consequences, but we should feel thankful to Mr. Montague for having hoisted the danger-signal in Indian politics. No Indian of any position or prominence who wants to take the lead in politics should be allowed a place in public opinion, if he does not give us his practical programme for the social upbuilding of India; and those Indians who are really hostile in spirit to social elevation while crying for the political should be relegated to a safe corner.

A.—Yes: that is the correct view of the situation on the whole. But in that case, how do you account for the fact that the words of Lord Metcalfe are being falsified? Whereas Lord Metcalfe expected as the result of English education the strengthening of the bonds of the Empire and a Union of the people with the rulers, in sympathy, there is to-day more of cleavage between the two, and we are passing to-day through a period of unrest and discontent. How then do you account for the seditious troubles and seditious outrages? After all, we wanted to bring England and India closer together and while we have been doing all we could in that direction, we find to-day the prospect of unree between England

and India becoming more distant than ever and the breach appears to be becoming wider. This is surely the unexpected happening and great hopes are getting wrecked and the saying "East is East and West is West" is becoming more true; and the two do not seem to meet but it looks as if they would rather be where they were.

R.—It does look so just now when the clouds are passing over us. But the saying of Rudyard Kipling about East and West is but a half truth which must give way to the fuller truth that the East and West are after all to be knit together, and the present struggle itself appears to indicate that the need for the unity is only all the more, while it is expressing itself in the way of a storm before a calm. *It only means that the wholesome forces of the East and the wholesome forces of the west must join hands.* There must be great travail before a mighty birth. It would not do for us to lose heart or to grow pessimistic. The very fact that a section of Indians have come to believe that India is already fit for self-government is perhaps in one sense the greatest compliment to British rule in India. ~~It means that~~ *It means that* under it people have not only become conscious of themselves but even over-conscious. This is the enthusiasm of the growing childhood of India under British guidance.

---

## CHAPTER V.

---

### SEDITION.

A.—You asked me how I would account for the seditious troubles through which the country is passing. This is the great point for India and England to discuss calmly and dispassionately. This is the crisis we have to face.

R.—*Before* the bomb, the keenest observers and thinkers both in India and in England assigned *one* meaning to it but *after* the bomb they have to assign *another* meaning. We have to read it in the light of facts. *Before the bomb outrages*, the cause of sedition was largely believed to be indifference on the part of the rulers to the claims of India for constitutional reform. But after the Reform Scheme of Lord Morley, sedition has not stopped. The inference is ~~that~~ <sup>that</sup> constitutional reform and sedition have nothing to do with each other. Anarchy and sedition are things let me say, of the West. It appears to me that it came from the West and its nursery ground is still in the West and its ideas and literature are bearing down from the West. Its working centres are in the West even more than in India. It is the idea of jur-

a few who have wrongly persuaded themselves that British connection must cease if India is to progress, and as British connection cannot be severed in an open fight, the spirit of sedition has taken to the cruel pastime of bomb and blood-shed. This spirit is not of the country. It has no place in the average Indian mind. It has not touched the Indian people. It is a political epidemic; it is really a sort of plague. While therefore it deserves to be studied and put down, it is no index of the mind of the country towards British rule. This must be grasped in England. If England should attach to it anything like political meaning or significance and mistake it as indicating the high water-mark of Indian discontent against British rule, it is a huge blunder. And if any policy is to be enunciated in the British Parliament out of tacit deference to it, it will only multiply the seditious troubles instead of putting them down. Sedition has been misread in England, and England has therefore missed till now the right method of solving it.

A.—How did you read the unrest *before* ~~down and before~~ do you read it *after* the bomb?

R.—Ah, that is exactly the question. People in India and in England who were anxious to get at the true cause of unrest *before the bomb* ascribed the unrest mainly to three causes. (1) The progressive spirit which showed itself in the spirit of discontent,

with the existing state of things and the desire for a healthy change all round, although thoughtful minds apprehended that there was a misdirection of our energies in devoting them so exclusively to the political and so little comparatively to the social and religious side. (2) To the policy of Government in inaugurating the spirit of a popular franchise without giving it a proper framework to work in and (3) To the despair caused by this policy. So, every one thought that the moment something was done to meet the public demand for a constitutional change in Government the spirit of sedition would disappear. But it was soon clear that the seditious school did not care for constitutional reform. It spoke its aim and purpose through its own ways and acts. Its aim was the overthrow of the British Government by pure physical force, simply because it did not like the foreign rule. It proceeds upon extremely plausible half truths and generalisations which would take in any one but the most wary in the West or East. It asserts that one's own Government must be better than a foreign Government and that one's own government in spite of its defects, is better than foreign Government with all its excellence. Though this idea is shown to be far from the truth by the entire course of the history of British rule, in India, still it has become to-day a great sentiment to conjure



a few who have wrongly persuaded themselves that British connection must cease if India is to progress, and as British connection cannot be severed in an open fight, the spirit of sedition has taken to the cruel pastime of bomb and blood-shed. This spirit is not of the country. It has no place in the average Indian mind. It has not touched the Indian people. It is a political epidemic; it is really a sort of plague. While therefore it deserves to be studied and put down, it is no index of the mind of the country towards British rule. This must be grasped in England. If England should attach to it anything like political meaning or significance and mistake it as indicating the high water-mark of Indian discontent against British rule, it is a huge blunder. And if any policy is to be enunciated in the British Parliament out of tacit deference to it, it will only multiply the seditious troubles instead of putting them down. Sedition has been misread in England, and England has therefore missed till now the right method of solving it.

A.—How did you read the unrest *before* ~~the bomb~~ <sup>the bomb</sup> and ~~now~~ <sup>do you</sup> do you read it *after* the bomb?

R.—Ah, ~~that~~ <sup>that</sup> is exactly the question. People in India and in England who were anxious to get at the true cause of unrest *before the bomb* ascribed the unrest mainly to three causes. (1) The progressive spirit which showed itself in the spirit of discontent,

with the existing state of things and the desire for a healthy change all round, although thoughtful minds apprehended that there was a misdirection of our energies in devoting them so exclusively to the political and so little comparatively to the social and religious side. (2) To the policy of Government in inaugurating the spirit of a popular franchise without giving it a proper framework to work in and (3) To the despair caused by this policy. So, every one thought that the moment something was done to meet the public demand for a constitutional change in Government the spirit of sedition would disappear. But it was soon clear that the seditious school did not care for constitutional reform. It spoke its aim and purpose through its own ways and acts. Its aim was the overthrow of the British Government by pure physical force, simply because it did not like the foreign rule. It proceeds upon extremely plausible half truths and generalisations which would take in any one but the most wary in the West or East. It asserts that one's own Government must be better than a foreign Government and that one's own government, in spite of its defects, is better than foreign Government with all its excellence. Though this idea is shown to be far from the truth by the entire course of the history of British rule, in India, still it has become to-day a great sentiment to conjure

wit<sup>h</sup>, especially by a sentimental people like Indians. They are shown only the defects incidental to a foreign rule and that too sufficiently magnified and painted black. Even some of the cleverest men holding positions of trust and confidence under British Government have been taken in by this specious assertion. Half truths are at times more dangerous than wholesale falsehoods. That a foreign Government however good, must be worse than one's own government however weak and inefficient is as true as saying that one's own disease is more health-giving than foreign medicine. There is a wise Indian moral which is quite illustrative of the point. It says "Don't believe whatever is yours, to be really your friend, because the disease of your own body may prove fatal to you. Whereas the drug from the far-off mountain may cure you. There might be people who are like this foreign drug." This simile is very apt in its application to British rule in India. When the Indian body, social and political, became too weak and diseased internally, to cohere together and grow in efficiency it was the foreign element from the far-off isle that has so far proved a great healer. But it must be remembered that there is something in the word *'foreign'* which lends itself easily to the generation of any amount of sentiment against British rule without facts and figures. I know

of no foreign government in the world or history which has done on the whole more fairly and justly by the people than Great Britain has done by India. Faults there have been and faults there are both in policy and in administration but the question is what is the standard by which the British Government should be judged. Is the standard to be a practical and sensible one or a mere Utopian one which obtains nowhere in the world? Here is a foreign government coming to rule over millions who even to-day cannot hold themselves together for self-government or we may say without going as far as self-government, that they cannot hold themselves together yet for a great many purposes of social efficiency and social organisation. The social and political virtues are just dawning upon the country as a direct consequence of the spirit of the British ascendancy and western civilisation. The reason is simply that national virtues take time in the building. Every Indian working any institution in India for the betterment of the country feels that these virtues are difficult of development in the people at large, and take a long time. *Surely the British are not responsible for these internal weaknesses of ours which are still with us whatever else they might be responsible for.* There are a thousand things open to us in public life to effect and yet it is nothing but our own

innate weakness that prevents our working on right lines. There is something in us making for lack of sustained energy, continuity of purpose, lack of initiative, courage and enterprise and above all, the character, individual and social, which takes long periods in the evolution of history. It is nobody's fault. It is merely due to the hard and simple fact that progress is painful and is achieved only inch by inch for the individual as well as the nation.

The school of sedition, however, has sprung up out of a mass of sentiments with a colouring of facts, and figures. The sentiments are all based upon the democratic politics taught by Western history like "*no taxation without representation*," "*the people are the source of all power*," "*representative form of government is the best*" etc. In the light of these ideas the critical spirit against the British Government and its method applied itself vigorously for 20 years and more, ignoring more or less completely the great question as to how far Indian conditions would permit the engrafting of such a form of Government.

Whether India had emerged socially and religiously into a state of fitness for such a form of government was never taken into account and whether even she meant to emerge out of it was also left out of account. The critical spirit thus developed without any proper sense of relation to facts and figures or to

the fitness of the people for the form of government in question soon became divorced from anything like even an attempt at construction of the elements of a healthy social polity and became hyper-critical and destructive. The conclusion was arrived at that a government which falls short of the proposed form was an intolerable burden to the people. What the spirit of destructive criticism thus began, race bias completed. The unfortunate instances of friction between the rulers and the ruled, were all pressed into service vigorously by way of showing that the British Government was not only bad but that it meant to persist in being so. This became the politics of sentiment and bias to work upon. When again unfortunately, the Press on both sides began to dip the pen deep in the ink of race feeling and race bias, the whole political atmosphere came to be surcharged with the feeling of race-hatred. The school which imbibed the feeling of race hatred to the utmost naturally became the anti-British school of politics. The step afterwards to sedition and anarchism was only easy. Contact with Western countries especially the continental countries of Europe and their methods of wreaking vengeance for differences between the rulers and the ruled came to be taken up as the most effective weapons to play with. Thus came sedition, as the result of a senti-

ment<sup>l</sup> and destructive school of politics at the one extreme. On the other side, there is the loyal India of Princes and Chiefs, noblemen and men of education who have nothing but the greatest abhorrence for sedition and seditionists. There is the great mass of people who are going on in their old ways of quiet and peace and who are in blissful ignorance of the constitutional agitation of the educated on the one side and the outbreaks of anarchism on the other. There are the native Indian regiments which have to be borne in mind in this connection. If the anarchist organisation has got for its root idea, as far as we could see, the overthrow of the British Government, you may ask me how does it mean to compass it by these isolated, stray murders here and there of Englishmen and Indians. It is impossible to furnish a complete answer to this question unless one knows the seditious programme fully enough. But nobody knows it and therefore one can only make a guess from what one sees of its working. It may be that it has no definite programme yet, and means only to spread its creed among the people and these outrages are done merely to give emphasis to the point that no amount of concession in the shape of constitutional reform is going to allay or kill the spirit. Or it may be that being in its infancy as yet, it is trying to complete its organisation and net work

of societies in all possible places and centres so that some great blow might be struck against the Government when the organisation becomes powerful enough: or it may be that there is some agency either in Europe or in India, or in both, which for some unfathomable reason does not mean well by the British Government and wants to give it as much trouble as possible by supplying the seditious school with the necessary funds and materials to carry out its programme. But what is becoming clear is that secret societies and memberships are coming into existence. It is also pretty clear by comparison of the method of its work in remote and in apparently unconnected parts of the country, that it is a regular organisation whose members freely use all the blessings of the British rule to the detriment of the British Government. The Post Office, the telegraph, the railway and the press are taken full advantage of by the members of this creed for pushing on their work. Seditious literature published in Europe in Indian vernaculars as well as in English are regularly received and distributed in various parts of India. Seditious books and pamphlets in English and Indian vernaculars are printed in beautiful type and poured into this country through our very Post Offices. When the press regulation about sedition is becoming more and more stringent, the problem of printing is



solved by the printing being done outside British India in places like Pondicherry. I met once a budding seditionist who said, when I asked what his programme was that it was merely "blood and fire." This he uttered while Madras was in full swing some years ago over the seditious movement. Could you persuade this youngster by any amount of argument that his idea is wrong and likely to do no good? He has become a fanatic and fanaticism is contagious. One fanatic makes more. And so the fanatic school spreads. They all behave in the same manner as if they had got by heart the same lessons in the same school. They write exactly in the same strain and they preach very like each other. They call their society the Barathamatha Association and they show a predilection for the red colour in choosing even their letter papers and covers and the red colour is supposed to have a meaning; perhaps it means blood. The members are keen enough to send their terrorising missiles to all and sundry: their style is a settled one for terrorism. The stronger the Indian loyalist or the British official in putting down sedition, the greater is the attention paid by this school to him and his doings and the greater is the number of anonymous communications and threats showered upon him day after day. It says "The members of the Barathamatha Association wish to inform you hereby that if

you mix yourselves up with public questions as against the Barathama Association you will soon find the consequence you will be cut, quartered, and thrown to the winds'. This is a rough specimen of the sort of letters which our Post Offices are made to convey and the innocent Postman made to deliver to the addressees!! When the spirit spreads sufficiently enough in a district, you do not know how far it has spread. It has perhaps spread a great deal wider and deeper than you have any conception of. That letters pass from north to south and from east to west in the country and that they are all kept by the workers in strict secrecy and confidence is perhaps beyond doubt. They are working it in a systematic, compact and business-like manner with courage and caution combined. There may be those who are indifferent to it who would not however tell anything about it even if they happen to know something of it. There are again those who are perfectly innocent and honourable and who abhor it but who are so timid by nature and training that they would say nothing about it to the authorities. There is always the fear on the part of these and an honest fear that the consequences to them personally may be serious indeed if they become active and aggressive Loyalists. The net result of all these is that the authorities are left practically helpless, and those who never dream

of sedition and who in their heart of hearts have no touch of it, have been as good as if they did not exist, so far as the practical work of suppressing sedition is concerned. Then again there is this great sentiment coming in the way of the good men and true, and that is, that in waging war against sedition in a bold and honourable manner they are not only exposing themselves to a certain amount of risk personally, but they are given bad names by some of the most enlightened of their own countrymen occupying high and responsible posts under Government, who look upon this active and aggressive work of loyalty and loyalists as proceeding from a low and selfish motive. This is the most awful part of the situation. Active loyalists are given an unpopular colour while sedition passes for patriotism. As a matter of fact, however, nothing is more easy than to swell the current of anti-British feeling in the name of patriotism or prompted by personal discontent. In the Districts where sedition is rife, the secret organisation is active and the one point you invariably notice about these districts is no information can be had against sedition or its active workers and sympathisers, and active loyalists are either terrorised or vilified. The latest and worst instance of such seditious vilification appeared in the columns of "India" of the 30th June, in connection with the Ashe murder.

You know "India" is published in England. The Editor of "India" like the Indian Editors of the red-hot school has readily published this gross piece of libel in his paper without enquiry. I never thought that the policy of "India" was to lend itself to such libels against the Government and against people as honorable as himself and his compatriots. The murder of Mr. Ashe happened on 17th June and the article in question appears in *India at the end of the month*. It could not therefore have been sent from India. It must have been written in England. It tries to account for the murder as due to the policy and action of the Madras Government! Such a gross travesty of facts as this is extremely un-English and unfair. It is both malicious and false. The British public at home must take the statements in question with a very large pinch of salt. But the person who deserves to be held criminally responsible for the libel is the correspondent who supplied the matter; because the Editor might have taken it on trust, though he must know the danger of accepting such silly stuff on trust. Such attacks would justify and warrant effective Press censorship both in England and India. Liberty of thought and speech under the British Government is fast degenerating into license, in some quarters, and newspapers in England whose aim is to serve the public, cannot be

too careful about not playing into the hands of the seditious school.

The Native regiments are composed of illiterate or half-educated people or people who could be urged in various ways and worked insidiously against the Government. If the secret society school establishes a foothold even in Native regiments, it must be awful indeed. The British officers may have no means of knowing what is taking place in their own regiments. The general public outside the Native regiments may also know nothing. And while the surface is calm as calmness and smooth as smoothness, a burrowing underneath has taken place here, there or in a little corner and in byways and side-ways. The school-boys of any school, be it Government or Mission, managed by Europeans or Indians, may get affected in some little part of a corner without the masters knowing anything about it. If school masters get into this body, and unfortunately here and there they too may have been caught in the net, they become powerful centres of this cult. No wonder then that while the authorities are under the impression after one season of hunting down sedition, when it lifts up its head, that it has been cleared and that they are going to have an era of peace in that quarter, the truth is they are perhaps only sadly mistaken.

They have only taken hold of a unit here and a unit there, or some persons suspected of having something to do with it but the root has not yet been got at nor its ramifications cleared !

The Native States are under the delusion that so long as sedition has not made its appearance in their dominions, there is nothing to be said about it there. But that is a mistake. The British Districts were all quiet and happy till a few years ago. They knew not anything like sedition. But some of them have come to be affected in a most unexpected manner. The Native States think in a general and vague way that there must be something wrong in the British Government to account for the seditious outbreaks and they may think also that their own administration is so superior to the British rule, that they are free from seditious thoughts on their side. But this idea is again a delusion. The tendency of sedition is to replace orderly and peaceful government, by mob-law and mob-rule. Once the mob like the elephant realises its strength through the teaching of this school, it will pull down its Mahout, British or Indian. As for the idea that there are no grievances in the Native States like those under the British Rule and therefore they are free from the touch of sedition, they forget that sedition is not based upon grievances or no grievances, but that it

is merely the idea 'of doing away with the Government, and once it begins to work against the paramount power under whose guidance and protection the Native States thrive, they will not stop with the British Government but will make inroads on the Native States as well. If only the Native States would allow the preaching of seditious ideas half as freely as the British Government has done in the name of "liberty of speech and liberty of the press," it would not take very long before the phenomenon appears in the Native States as well. Grievances there are, and there will be everywhere. The Native States have their own grievances real or sentimental. *The underlying idea that works the whole mischief is that the method of getting rid of grievances is the use of brute force in one form or other.* Once this idea develops and takes hold anywhere, it is sure to work the same trouble regardless of facts and merits.

No Government in the world can get on once it is admitted that grievances real or imaginary would justify such outrages, and this method of settling grievances was foreign to the genius of India till now. And once it takes hold of the country, it will spread like wild fire among the people and establish itself as the simplest method of settling differences between man and man. The village factions and private and

personal malice will take to such violent methods more freely than hitherto following the example set by the seditious school. Once you take away the respect for human life which is deeply ingrained in the millions of India and which has been built up during centuries of religious and moral influence peculiar to India, the result to the country at large is likely to prove terrible beyond description. Black mailing and corruption will commence to rule, and Robbery and Brigandage will become the order of the day.

That anarchism cannot in its very nature hasten the pace of the country towards Swaraj or Self-Government in any form could be made obvious at once. A few murders here and there cannot certainly affect the general course of administration except for the worse by rendering measures against sedition only more and more necessary. The general sentiment of the country is too humane and just by instinct and too grateful to England to be at all affected by seditious outrages. The only way the general mind of the country is getting affected by them is to increase their sense of abhorrence against such deeds and increase their powers of organisation and persuasion against their repetition. So the revulsion of feeling against sedition is bound to be on the increase with such outrages. Anarchism is in its



essence the tendency to blow up Government, law and authority. Out of such a tendency no good can come to any Government in the world, but it is bound to become a tendency in human nature, a menace to every Government foreign or native. Out of it therefore to expect Swaraj or self-government to come, must strike every one as an impossibility of thought and expression. To make the position clear one need only realise the simple fact that the most heinous crimes like Thuggism, day-light dacoity, highway robbery or cold-blooded murder have never made one inch towards anything good? Are there not now all over the country any number of murders committed? Have they led to any good? How then are these political or anarchist murders going to produce any good?

A.—That is exactly what puzzles every one. Perhaps the idea is that such outrages will tend to deepen and widen the anti-British feeling and keep the rulers and the people wider apart every day. That might be the purpose of such attacks.

R.—The result will be just the other way. Public feeling is likely to be roused more and more against such outrages committed on good and innocent people who have the best interests of the public at heart.

A.—Then what can be the motive of such attacks?

They appear to be planned and organised and supported by numbers, infinitesimal as they might be, compared with the entire population. I am afraid the general attitude of the Indian press is not what it ought to be in such matters. They have got into the habit of characterising such attacks as stray instances of political insanity and as conveying no great political significance and even English papers would fail to adopt the same view, because nobody wants to magnify the extent or limit of sedition but the trend of seditious attacks hitherto both against Indian and English officers, points to the conclusion that the school of sedition and anarchism is worked on certain organised lines and that it cannot therefore be treated lightly. The proper policy of the Indian press is to admit the existence of some sort of organisation working this school and the necessity for clearing it up vigorously. It is a very erroneous and unwholesome policy for any responsible newspaper to treat such attacks as if they were only so many stray cases beginning and ending with the individuals concerned and having nothing more behind. Nobody wants to take an unduly alarmistic view but what is happening is certainly not only alarming but is highly suggestive especially in a country like India where such outbursts have never been known in the course of

history. But again and again one is tempted to ask what could be gained by such madness on the part of the people who have been all along so law-abiding and loyal. From an India that never knew any such seditious outrages till quite recently, after nearly fifty years of peaceful and progressive administration to the India of to-day with this blot of sedition on it, the change is one requiring serious thinking and explanation. I think the tendency to compare India with European countries in this respect is wrong because anarchism is so foreign to the spirit of India that there must be something to account for this change and the real cause must be got at.

R.—I quite agree with that observation. There is a great deal of ignorance and misapprehension about the nature and extent of sedition. There is also the general disposition to treat the thing lightly as about the best way of getting rid of it. It may be that anarchism is yet confined only to an infinitesimal fraction of the population but I cannot after so many deliberate murders of an obviously seditious character acquiesce in the policy of treating the affair lightly or of blaming the Government for taking stringent measures of repression. M. Ps. like Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and Mr. Keir Hardie are advocates of this policy. If they only lived in India and either administered a District or worked with Indians,

they would not treat sedition in the light manner they have done.

A.—Yes; Quite so. But what do you think of the real meaning and significance of the seditious movement?

R.—That is exactly what we have to get at and it is by no means easy. You see how the perverse spirit of sedition might misread even good books, “Ananda Mutt” and “Prince of Destiny” are both of them<sup>two</sup> written by eminent Bengalees. “Ananda Mutt” is based upon the idea of Hindus overthrowing Mohammedan rule and contains the scheme for a weak people to overthrow a strong Government. *The author of “Ananda Mutt” has distinctly said that the British must hold the country in the best interests of the people.* But the ideas propounded in the novel for the overthrow of the Mohammedan rule if adopted against the British Government by the unfriends of British rule, the result would be very much like the seditious movement of the day. The “Prince of Destiny” is a good book for its honest appreciation of the good side of the British Government and for its frank enumeration of its defects as well. The author pours out his fervent admiration for the British while pleading warmly for a healthy change in the British policy towards the peoples and the Princes of India.

A.—Yes. "The Prince of Destiny" did strike me as highly suggestive regarding the present situation. But I am afraid the author has failed to bring out the critical side of the people's condition, while he has pointed out with a masterly hand some of the main defects in the British policy. The picture therefore represents only one half of the truth leaving the other half intact.

R.—I admit that it is so. But perhaps the reason was that the author was afraid ~~that~~ if he dwelt on the defects of the people as well as he has done about the defects of the Government, it may have the effect of not leading to the necessary change of policy in the British rule. While I adhere to my view that what is needed in India at present is a great movement on the part of the people to inaugurate a healthy social and religious reformation it should not be forgotten that a wise change of policy on the part of the Government is urgently needed to allay the public mind and to help the people's own reformation, because the people and the Government are but one body, and there can be no real antagonism between the rulers and the ruled. They are not two different bodies nor are they two opposing bodies. That they are opposing bodies is entirely a western idea for which the school of thinkers like Herbert Spencer and John Stuart Mill

is mainly responsible though that school is now out of date and almost obsolete. At any rate, that school and the main ideas propounded by it are quite out of place in India which always looks upon the Government and the people as one composite and inter-dependent whole with identity of interests and no conflict whatsoever.

A.—But that is exactly the principle enunciated in the Queen's Proclamation of 1858.

"In their prosperity will be our strength. In their contentment our security : and in their gratitude our best reward." Is it possible to have a fuller enunciation of the principle of identity of interests between the British Government and the people of India than that contained in this ever memorable Magna Charta ?

R.—I quite agree. But the great question has been there from the beginning as to how best to give effect to the Queen's Proclamation. There are two ways of giving effect to it and they depend each upon the respective ideal to be aimed at by the Government. It was open first either to have the ideal of a limited form of Monarchy with a council of chosen men from the people to help the Government or to have the ideal of self-Government on the lines of Colonial Government. The two are radically different and would be governed by different principles of work.

The former would be suited to the genius and traditions of the people of India and would be essentially monarchical, while the latter would be opposed to the Indian genius and traditions and require to be worked on Western lines of democracy. How much there was in choosing the one ideal or the other is now becoming patent in the light of facts. England chose the second ideal, that is, the democratic one instead of the monarchical one. This would appear to be the great initial blunder. English education was indispensable for both the ideals and there is no need to quarrel with it. It is not so much English education that is to blame as the choosing of the democratic ideal. For instance, the Native States have found nothing incompatible between English education and the Indian monarchical ideal. If however, England chose the democratic ideal, she ought to have considered beforehand the social and religious conditions of India and how far they should be changed for affording a basis for democracy. The assumption that without doing so, democracy could be planted on Indian soil was the great root mistake. The connection between the Indian social conditions and those requisite for democracy was entirely overlooked and the democratic experiment has gone on steadily from the time of the Local Self-Government scheme of Lord Ripon.

The British Government never cared during all this time to study the social and religious side of Indian life. This amounted to pushing the democratic experiment in India without a proper democratic basis to build upon. This fundamental error is bearing its natural fruit to-day. The people developed ideals and aspirations suited to the democratic form which the Government itself ushered expressly and impliedly in ever so many ways, without realising the necessity for creating the conditions requisite for it or, in other words, the antecedent social and religious reformation was dropped out of sight by both the people and the Government and they both worked on the assumption that it would somehow come and that they need not devote themselves to it seriously. The antecedent conditions thus neglected for building a democracy upon but the democratic form having been set on foot, we are to-day witnessing the conflict inevitable under such circumstances. Had the other ideal been chosen instead from the beginning, there would have been to-day no such conflict. The people were only told ever so often that they were not fit for political rights and privileges on democratic lines while they were taught to work for it as the ideal. Was not this wrong radically? The people were made to believe in election and representation, and political agitation as their political means



for attaining the political goal. So they went on developing the ideas suited to political agitation and demanded political rights and privileges on purely western lines. The Congress was a huge political agitation and when divorced from social and religious reformation on a sufficiently large scale to leaven the people into anything like homogeneity or solidarity, it had in it the germs of trouble in the minds of those at least who bore no good will to the British. The spirit of assertion of political rights and political equality of a democratic character has been on the increase without a corresponding development of the sense of civic responsibility on the part of the people whose great obstacle is to be found in the conditions of the peoples themselves. The spirit of political discontent based not merely on administrative defects and grievances, but mainly on a passion for a Parliamentary form of Government to which the people were asked to look by the Government itself as the goal, led to the result that grievances against the Government were sought by the political press and the political leaders as the basis for political demands. The grievances multiplied, agitation increased, discontent spread and the general idea that the British Government was becoming unpopular day by day and unsympathetic, came to fill the atmosphere. All this was due to the ideal set before

the sovereign power and their representatives. Loyal organs of public opinion should be encouraged and the disloyal or seditious ones treated as they deserve. In Native States, such crimes and outrages will not be allowed to remain undetected for more than a few days. The usual time limit known to ancient India and conveyed to the Prime Minister is 8 days. It is conveyed thus. "If before the 8th day, this is not cleared up such and such consequences will follow." The people will not rest quiet until the thing is cleared up. Another useful measure that would at once be adopted in Oriental Governments would be the peremptory exclusion from all honours, titles etc., of persons who are known to be of a seditious turn of mind. The policy of the British Government in all these respects is weakness itself and is entirely unsuited to the ideas of the people. It has come to be so weak that no good man is safe. He has more difficulties to face than the false man, and yet he is left often enough in a state of suspense and doubt as to whether he is not getting on the whole rather knocked for all his troubles under the present British policy. This is a most serious defect requiring mending. One is afraid that the position of the British Government has come to be one of ignorance more or less regarding sedition. It is now in the mouth of every Indian that in spite of enormous

details of information collected by the Government through some of its officers, the people now and then happen to know more about men and things regarding sedition than the Government itself !! It is sometimes a wonder how about men and things the Government and the British Officers could make such mistakes. This ignorance on the part of the Government has led to two sad results in administration. As the Government does not know who could be trusted among Indians sufficiently they have grown so wary and distrustful that they perhaps think it best not to trust any one absolutely. Secondly, the people who are aware of the ignorance of the Government take full advantage of it by dividing the mind of Government by any number of contradictory opinions about men and things so that the Government does not know who could be relied upon and how to act. Not only many good men suffer for want of sufficient direct knowledge of the Government regarding them, but what is worse the false men even in so serious a matter as sedition not only escape the attention of the Government but even flourish! The people are laughing in their sleeves, that the Government is suffering most from divided counsel and for want of direct knowledge of men and things. They know the thousand and one small ways and tactics by which the Government

could be balked in its efforts to get at the good men and put down the bad. I have heard it said that while on the one side, the policy of distrust has gone beyond all reasonable limits, it has, on the other, failed at times to get at the wrong men and when they did get at them, it has not dealt with them in the way even our smallest Native States would have done. Is it any wonder then that the British Government is strangely enough, the only one to the Indian mind under which such weaknesses can prevail in the face of all warnings to the contrary! It is all well to say with a sort of nonchalance "Oh, that is our way, we let things go on till they come to a point. Then only we take note of it." All that one can say is there is neither prudence nor policy nor principle in such a course. And certainly not in a country like India which is accustomed to entirely different methods. What Native Governments would do perhaps by the officers assassinated by the hand of sedition be they Indian or English, is to grant them an adequate pension, say, for three generations. The effect of this would be very sound and far-reaching. It would show for three generations how the faithful men who stood by the Government were protected and it would supply the courage to the timid, high or low, that if they die in the discharge of their highest duty to the sovereign

picture there was none to present. The Government allowed all this criticism freely without trying to meet it. It went further and shut the mouths of the Government servants and prevented them from correcting the wrong ideas. Thus the wrong ideas flooded the educated minds without let or hindrance. The Government servants themselves and the youths of the country became saturated with this politics as unquestionably correct. When this criticism against the Government and its methods went on for 20 years uncorrected, unopposed and unsatisfied, the idea took deep root that there was something rotten in the state of Denmark. Not only was this criticism not properly met by facts and figures at the proper time and in a proper spirit, but the attitude towards it came to be one of utter indifference under the notion that no danger could come out of it and that it was merely a process of getting rid of extra steam. And there were now and then good-hearted Englishmen or Irishmen who said jocosely that political rights could not be got for the mere asking, and they even went the length of saying that unless they adopted the Western methods of strike etc., there was no hope. I am afraid this was the course of events that precipitated in Bengal the school of sedition and anarchism. Now all this was perfectly avoidable. Had the other ideal been taken

up, there would have been no school of political agitation against the Government. There would have been no fomenting of grievances. There would have been among the people of India, no such idea as that without agitation against the Government and without attacking its methods of administration, there was no political salvation for India. India never accustomed to such political ideals and methods but ever content to look to the sovereign power for protection of her interests, was in no need for such ideas and should not have been launched upon such turbulent political waters entirely unsuited to the Indian conditions and environments. While justification there can be none for sedition and anarchism, I am only tracing how far the political ideal set by the Government itself before the people is responsible for this unexpected state of things. When the public mind had been brought to such a pitch of feeling and sentiment against the Government, anything was enough to set things ablaze, and what was wanted was some pretext or other, and the Bengal Partition came in. We know the rest.

From this point of time the wildest of sentiments like Swaraj and Boycott came to fill the air. Anti-British feeling came to be spread, race hatred grew,

bombs began, secret societies formed, seditious literature spread and now, we are face to face with the situation.'

A.—Is it impossible to wipe out sedition without repression and establish friendly relations between England and India?

R.—I have always looked upon sedition as a mere wrong idea and as perfectly capable of being met by right ideas. The Oriental method of dealing with sedition would be quite different. It is not the English method. It would proceed upon two or three clear and definite principles. First, it would make ample provision for the families of officers who come to an untimely end at the hands of seditionists. Secondly, it would devise substantial methods of recognising the services of all officers, English or Indian, who have a trying time of it in seditious tracts. The measure would be extended to all who whether official or non-official, literate or illiterate, rich or poor, render any substantial service in putting down sedition, in ferreting out seditious plots and in giving timely information about them to the authorities. The fabulous sums spent in prosecutions and trials for sedition might well be spent in helping the growth of aggressive loyalty among Indians as the one sentiment that should now go forward to guard

intellect is not to be honoured when it is associated with the seditious touch, because some of the cleverest and keenest intellects are perhaps unfortunately lured into the ring of this camp and the best way of curing such men would certainly be not to ignore the latter in appreciating the former. Is it not true, that it is the clever, intellectual and perhaps the over-clever and the over-imaginative on the wrong side, that have to be weaned? Honour by all means all who work *with* the British. Honour by all means those among the non-officials, who adhere to the British Government and remember that in this hour of peril. England deserves at the hand of every educated Indian his whole-hearted devotion. Honour by all means the honest and constitutional critics who while pointing out the errors of Government for the betterment of the country, abhor anarchism and actively spread the cult of unity between England and India. Had the Government adopted the policy of honouring such friends, during all these years instead of leaving them more or less alone, who can say we would not have had to-day more men devoted to the British Raj and less of those who side with the seditious? The policy of throwing sops to the unfriends of Government as a means of appeasing them is disastrous and must give way to the policy



of standing by the friends. The seditious often point with a feeling of triumph to the unfriends of Government who have succeeded either in opposing and hoodwinking the Government as the capital weakness of the British on which they can rely and from which they can derive their very sustenance. They say point blank, "See how we can divide the Government and its friends and show that to be popular with the mob-cry against the British Rule, serves to get a name among the people on one side, while silently weakening the Government on the other." Is this not a bad policy to pursue? Such wise and prudential steps as those suggested above will meet with great opposition at the hands of the seditious as well as the sitters on the fence, and those who are adepts in the policy of hunting with the hound and running with the hare. They label hard and honest service with the name of sycophancy and elevate sedition to the rank of patriotism in a thousand ways. The Government has to choose its policy definitely and unflinchingly. A few years devoted to the working of the right policy sternly even as a trial will more quickly wipe out sedition and take its edge away than mere prosecutions which end in leaving the Government only the poorer financially and, far more, morally, because every failure to prosecute a case of sedition successfully means

an accession of strength to the cause of sedition, increase of unpopularity and odium for the Government and the general atmosphere getting more surcharged with unrest than before. A preventive remedy on Indian lines is what is perhaps best while repression is but a painful necessity, with not much of the elements of permanent cure in it. The remedies suggested above are more calculated to appeal to the Oriental mind as a powerful incentive to loyalty than quartering regiments or Punitive Forces. It is because the might and main of the British is admitted and the British prowess and strength is acknowledged, that sedition has taken to by-ways and side-ways and to nook-and-corner attacks as the only means of spreading the maximum of terror with the minimum of strength.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

---

### THE BRITISH CHARACTER.

AND

#### SOCIAL INTERCOURSE BETWEEN EAST AND WEST.

A.—Is social intercourse between East and West to be only a dream?

R.—The Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale has made a pronouncement on the question of social intercourse between East and West very recently in which he says that it would not be possible except on the basis of political equality between the two communities. Mrs. Tyabji, wife of the late distinguished Judge of the Bombay High Court said in 1903 at the annual meeting of the Indian Ladies' Club, "We complain that Europeans keep aloof from us, but that is largely our fault. I ask you how many among ourselves, Hindus, Mussalmans, or Parsees, want to meet together? Is it pride or reserve which keeps us apart? Is it not rather a difference in manners, habits, education, dress, language and religion?" "Let us," she added, "begin by union among ourselves." The Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale has thus come to assert

now in so many words that the political idea of equality must lead and that the social can only follow but as against so great an authority like Mr. Gokhale, I can safely pitch no less a person than the late Mr. Justice Ranade, with whom it was the social that was the first and the political only the next. There have been and there are two schools of thought in India all along. The one, the school of social reform, which may be called the social school, which though small in number is strong in its conviction that in the salvation of India, the social must precede the political reform. The other school which may be called the political school has been working on the principle that the political must precede the social. Most of the members of this latter school do not even believe that there is any necessary connection between social and political reform, so much so that you find to-day there are ultra-Radicals in politics all over the country who do not believe in social reform, and who are even strongly opposed to it. The school of social reform headed by such distinguished men as the late Mr. Justice Ranade, Mr. Justice Chandavarkar and others have led this school of thought. The motto of the social school may well be described as "*Liberal in social, Conservative in politics and Protestant in religion.*" The motto of the political school as deducible from its conduct is "*Radical in*

*politics, Conservative in social and orthodox in religion."*

I have deduced this motto of the political school from the conduct and creed of the majority of the people who constitute the rank and file of the political school and not from that of the small minority of leaders of political thought. I can understand Mr. Gokhale if he had said that, from his point of view, social intercourse between East and West was not possible and that political equality to India should nevertheless be granted. I can understand his going further and saying that he means to solve the problem of Indian self-government on the lines of Colonial Government with Indian conditions of caste and society more or less as they are and without any great changes being made therein. It would then be for the public to decide how far such a position would be sound or tenable. But to say that it is want of political equality between Englishmen and Indians that now stands in the way of social intercourse between them, is what must come upon every one as the greatest surprise and especially when it comes from the Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale who has sat at the feet of Mr. Ranade.

The 'Indian Social Reformer' says "Experience shows that a placid political atmosphere is most favourable to social and moral progress. It is this fact which compels the social reformer, in spite of

himself, to intervene in political discussions with the object, if possible, of bringing about a better understanding between the people and the administration." The Social Reformer also adds that social reform has received a check from the shock the people got to their faith in the disinterestedness of the British rule, and that that shock has produced an anti-British feeling and that the anti-British feeling has produced a feeling of indifference to social progress." I confess this baffles my comprehension and I feel staggered by this process of reasoning, only all the more because the "Indian Social Reformer" is a paper for which I have so much respect.

A.—I cannot follow it either. Your social problems of which social intercourse with foreigners is only a part have been with you ever so long before the British, and they will be with you, for you to solve, even if the British should quit India to-morrow. How then could it be said that any political inequality could hinder, or political equality could help social intercourse between East and West? Social intercourse is only a means to an end. It is no end in itself. It is only a means to a correct understanding between Indians and Englishmen. Whereas a democratic form of Government is a great end in itself to be achieved by a people who believe in it and who bring about the conditions of fitness for it.

R.—Quite so. What stands now in the way of any intercourse between Hindus and Muhamadans? Is it want of declaration of political equality between them? What stands in the way of social intercourse between Brahmans and non-brahmans? Is it want of political equality between them? What stands in the way of sufficient social intercourse between the various sects of Brahmans themselves? Is it again want of declaration of political equality between sects? Anti-British feeling which is alleged by "the Social Reformer" to have come to stand in the way of social reform is the growth only of a few years. But our stagnation in social reform in defiance of the advance of the country in social ideas, has been our standing grievance during all the time the political atmosphere has been most placid. Till the Bengal Partition and the Surat Congress, there was nothing to disturb the political calm of the country, and yet till then, were giant strides being made in social reform and did social reform get suddenly deflected over Anti-British feeling? Is it not the bare truth that our slow progress in social reform has been all along due to the culpable indifference of the mass of the political school and our educated men alike and their refusing to realise the need for social progress, and failing to bring up the necessary moral courage and numerical strength to solve the social problem? And

is that not the true state of things to-day?

Now it cannot be denied that marriage reform is one of the foremost planks of social reformation. Among the educated men all over the country, what is the progress made in the fusion of sects and sub-sects. by inter-marriages? Is it not yet very very small and is it due to Anti-British feeling? Is it Anti-British feeling that comes in the way of inter-marriage between the Aiyars, Raus and Iyengars or between the various sub-divisions of non-brahmins?

Take the Native States where there is no anti-British feeling and where even social reform legislation has been introduced as in Mysore and Baroda. Has marriage reform progressed by leaps and bounds there? So far as infant marriage and inter-marriage of sects and sub-sects are concerned, the state of things there is precisely like British India, and perhaps in some respects the Native States are even worse.

Under the British Government, political equality has been declared among subjects without any differences of caste or creed, and all are equal before the eye of law and have equal rights and duties. Why has not this equality politically led to improved relations socially on anything like a sufficiently large scale? It is obvious that the real hindrance to sufficient social intercourse among the various classes



of the people is more social and religious than political. The pinnales of caste and the pinnacles of religion have been and are standing up in India for ever-so long without any planks to connect them. And when the Englishman comes to India, he finds that these pinnacles which are devoid of planks to connect them are even farther away from him. When the Brahman stands on his religious pinnacles and would have nothing to do with the Englishman socially, the Englishman naturally stands on his racial pinnacle. No amount of declaration of political equality will solve the social and religious prejudices of India. If to-morrow such a declaration is made, will that make for social intercourse between Englishmen and Indians one bit more on that account? Will it make the bigots and the orthodox among us relent one bit and give up their social ideas which are a part of their religion? I can understand Mr. Gokhale's position as a retort but I fail to understand it as a reform. I can understand it if it means to assert a position like this towards the British Government, "If you want social intercourse with us, you must give us political equality. But if you do not give us political equality, we have no faith in social intercourse."

I however look upon social intercourse pure and simple between East and West as not only possible but

as indispensable. If only the best of us on both sides would make it their principle of life to come together on the social side and understand each other, it will prove the golden bridge between the East and West. While Indians should hold India with one hand with all their love, they should hold England with the other hand in devotion, good-will and gratitude. Englishmen likewise should hold England with one hand in all that is best in her and hold India with the other in a spirit of love and sympathy. England and India have both gained immensely by each other and it is idle to try to settle accounts and find out who has benefited more and who has benefited less. The truth is that the British Rule in India deserves to be looked upon as a Divine dispensation in which the Western and the Eastern Aryan have come to meet after long separation and they have to look upon each other as brethren well-met. This is no mere fancy. England has come to rule in India a great and ancient but a fallen civilisation. The Western Aryan is now at the zenith of his power and is justly proud of his present condition. The Indian Aryan, though fallen from his high estate, looks back to his great past and feels the inspiration of great ideas and ideals. While there is a great deal India has to learn from England in Western science, arts and industries, the ancient literature and philosophy of India has some-

thing in it that may lift India once more. 'So then, the proper attitude between England and India must be one of kinship *even racially*, and not one of antipathy. If, when you are great and affluent you meet a long-lost brother of yours fallen and in adverse circumstances, what would your attitude be towards him? Would it be one of sympathy all the more for his fallen condition, or would it be one of haughty or supercilious indifference to him? After all, the duty of man to man and nation to nation in this world is merely for the higher to teach the lower and for the lower to learn from the higher. This is the end of all ethics and governments as well. So then, the task of uplifting India, however difficult, is yet the duty of England to fulfil. As the stronger, the more knowing and the more fortunate of the two to-day, it is again England's duty to bear with India nobly and patiently and not turn back from her mission. The hand has been set to the plough in the wisdom of Providence, and let nothing take it away. There is a Sanscrit saying that the good man must be like the sandalwood tree which emits only its sweet fragrance even to the wood-cutter who smites it. It is exactly in this spirit that the good men of England have been acting all along. It is in this spirit that Lord Morley's Reform Scheme has been given to India notwithstanding the fire of bomb and

revolver amidst which it was ushered.

Let me tell both Englishmen and Indians that good Government is not a question of mere muscle. If it were, there is plenty of muscle in India as there has always been which however could not hold the country. There is also plenty of brains in India. What is wanted, however, is a combination of both muscle and intellect. The Englishman is a combination of both muscle and brains. He can fight as well as write. But again, mere muscle and intellect will not do for good government. Something more is needed. And that is, the moral force which would hold the balance evenly between conflicting interests and classes under a sense of duty for its own sake. The Englishman can fight, can write and what is more, he can also hold the balance evenly. That accounts for his power in India. Smallness in number is thus made up for by this combination. Now the fourth stage is awaiting development. The fourth element is a spirit which enters into the genius of the country that has to be ruled and realises the function of the ruler in the light of that genius. It is the want of this fourth element that is perhaps the cause of our present day difficulty. The struggle before us is, to my mind, nothing more than a struggle for the development of this fourth element in our rulers and ruled. When we develop the four-

fold combination in us, the result will be unity between the rulers and the ruled. This combination is unlimited in its scope and illimitable in its endeavour and purpose! The ancient Aryan ideal in India represented this four-fold combination. The ancient Aryan, as seen in the heroes and heroines of the Ramayana and Mahabharata have shone out as embodiments of this four-fold combination. They represent in them the highest valour, the highest virtue, the highest intellect and the world-wide spirit of sympathy and justice. This may well be the ideal to-day for both West and East. But this ideal having been departed from, has disappeared from the actual life of India, and her ancient writings now beckon to all who may read them to come under its sway and to drink once more from its deep and clear springs to renovate the world. It is really the highest Christian ideal and the highest Indian ideal as well. It is really the combination of the spirit of Jesus Christ and of Sri Krishna. 'It is the ideal which to-day we see in the best of Englishmen. The best of our Viceroy, Governors and Lieutenant-Governors, the best of our Civilians against whom Pagett M. P., is so hard, and the finest of British soldiers and statesmen are all representatives of this ideal. When Lord Roberts after losing his son in the battle-field, proceeds to South Africa, to lead the

British army, it reminds us of the heroes of the Mahabarata. When a Madras Civilian says while giving evidence before a Commission that Indians are fit for the highest places not excluding even that of the Viceroy, he is echoing his best instinct as an Englishman. When Lord Minto in his breadth of mind characterises the unrest as "the loyal unrest", he reminds one of the true Christian. When His Excellency, Sir Arthur Lawley, while in deep mourning proceeds to visit the plague-camp in Coimbatore to speak kind words of sympathy to the unfortunate sufferers, it strikes one as the noble spirit which forgets its own grief in ministering to the sick and suffering. Even so His Excellency, Sir George Clarke of Bombay proves his heart-power. When Lord Ampthill does the fight for Indians in South Africa, India is moved to gratitude! Instances can be multiplied from the history of British India of officers of comparatively humbler station than Viceroys and Governors, who have had to bear the brunt of Indian administration, in plague and famine, in riots and sedition, and who have given their very best, aye, their very lives in the faithful performance of their duty. Nothing would be farther from the truth than a wholesale condemnation of this body under the epithet "official bureaucracy."

But the fact remains that there is plenty of room

for the British to develop this genius and breadth of mind to enter into the people's thoughts and feelings. It may not be possible for every one to do so. The average man may find it too hard a strain on him and so he would prefer the normal routine of officialdom. On the Indian side, the difficulty must be infinitely more to rise to this level, but the best of Indians and the best of Englishmen feel the kinship of thought and feeling. It won't do to condemn the British for the faults of a few. It won't do to condemn the Indians for the crimes of the mad or misguided here and there. It is the small men that are the cause of trouble. It is small things that to-day cause more irritation than big things. The Railway incidents, the breach of etiquette, shaking or not shaking hands, the returning or not returning the visit to an Indian, be he an official or non-official, a Maharajah, Prince or Chief, it is these things that swell the torrent of ill-feeling. You cannot help in a big Government having some crusty and sour spirits, who like caste have become immobile. They are like the Orthodox Brahman who cries at every step of Reform "Church in danger". How many Indians have we who are suffering from class bias? How very sad that the best of gifts, the best of governments and the best of men, should all suffer for the faults and foibles of the mediocres! Can we not change these? Should it

point. It was not the position of the ancient Aryan. The Aryan women even like the British to-day were learned and free, but under different ideals perhaps. Nevertheless, if only the Indian women could be brought up to the level of the ancient life of India, there would be no difficulty for the women of India and the women of England meeting on the friendliest of terms. *The western social life is the direct antithesis of Modern India, mark you, not of ancient India, in these respects.* Ancient Indians, men and women, would have met the British in social intercourse infinitely more liberally, I fancy, than Modern India. *So then, the Indians have to advance towards better social ideals from the point of view of their own ancient social polity.* For the Britisher the centre of life is woman, the club and the dinner-table. For the Indian also at one time the centre of life was woman. Without woman to guide and help, he was not fit for the life of "*Grihastha*" or "*house-holder*." Woman was the mistress of the house "*Grahini*." Marriage made man and woman one whole, half of which was the husband and the other half, the wife. It is exactly like the word "*better-half*" in English. The chivalrous sentiments of the West are all entombed in the ancient life and writings of India but now this real life of India is too clouded to be visible. When it comes out of the cloud, the points of contact will



require a G. O. to point out etiquette? Etiquette taught at the point of a G. O. while showing the anxiety of the Government to set things right shows also that etiquette has come down so far as to require a G. O. to pull it up !! It is admitted on all hands, that the British are, as a rule, strong, frank and good. They are as a rule generous and just. Underneath a somewhat rough exterior they carry a warm heart. But how few Indians even among the educated have made a close study of the British, in a spirit of disinterestedness? We want them to move with us closely and yet few of us have cared to move with them closely. And the pity of it is, the social gulf between us makes understanding each other so difficult. How to bridge it? Whose fault is it that Indians and Englishmen have not yet come together sufficiently to understand each other? It is the social system of each that accounts for it. There is the hide-bound social system of India from which the great majority of even the educated Indians have not emerged. That was not the social system of ancient India. It was not the system of Arjuna and Sri Krishna, but yet the sentiment and prejudice of the day is, as if the ancient Aryans were divided into sects and compartments of implacable isolation and opposition to each other. Then again, the position of Indian women to-day is another great

be many between England and India. It is to this end we have to work.

A. Do you believe that England and India would come to intermarry freely at any time?

R.—I do not believe in such marriages. I do not believe that they are possible very largely nor do I think they are desirable. Herbert Spencer looks upon it as a Biological question. *He said that marriage is healthy beyond certain limits but it must be also within certain limits. Nature is neither for marrying too close nor too far. She is for a healthy medium.* The present Indian marriage system has erred on the side of marrying within too close limits. *The other extreme of trying experiments in matrimony between persons divided by half the world's girth, or by social customs and religious sentiments which are a perpetual note of opposition to each other, is bound to prove as great a failure as the other extreme.* Let each society and nation develop on its own lines to the highest point, and let them nevertheless break through all stupid barriers to social intercourse. Let each develop all that is best in Art and Life. Let Indian communities and classes learn to develop the highest possible social unity and social efficiency. Let again the Indians and Englishmen learn to develop the highest possible social unity among them.

The immediate, practical and pressing problem

for Hindus is the fusion of sects and sub-sects of the various castes by inter-marriages and relieving foreign-travel from the trammels of custom and prejudice, and basing it on the broad principles of Hinduism. These changes, simple as they are, will demand the utmost nerve and strength of all true Indian leaders in the field of religious and social reform. When we see that Hindu society is not yet prepared even for these simple measures and that caste and sect prejudices still sway the minds of educated Indians who are wedded to orthodoxy and who would even persecute the social Liberals, a bill like the Hon'ble Mr. Basu's Civil Marriage Bill cannot but be looked upon in India, as attempts too revolutionary to prove useful. In social matters reform from within must be more the aim of practical workers than reform at the point of Legislation. Legislation can at best serve only as a hand-post shewing the direction but it cannot compel an unwilling people to take the road. Here are words pregnant with wisdom uttered by His Excellency Sir Arthur Lawley. They are so true, so eloquent and so much to the point that I give them. He said speaking at St. Andrew's Dinner of 1910 in Madras:—

“Take for example these Constitutional Reforms. We borrow from England a system, a polity whose foundations are the work of centuries of popular and

democratic evolution, and we apply it to a particular communism in which caste is the basic principle of every indigenous system, whether political or social. I have no desire whatever to disparage the ancient institutions of Hinduism, but around that venerated and wonderful system known as "caste" have arisen prejudices and forms and procedures which have become anachronistic, out of date, and sadly out of harmony with modern ideas of progress and civilisation. It is the removal of the unwholesome excrescences which have grown out of the caste system that I so earnestly desire. Some of them have taken the form of customs which find observance in Hindu society and accord ill with the principles and ethics which give inspiration and motive power to our educational system, so that it seems well nigh impossible to bring the liberal spirit of a Western School into harmony with the conservative spirit of the Eastern home. Or again in social matters! Look at the gulf between East and West? In what way is it to be spanned? By what means is the chasm to be bridged? To this question I can find no answer so long as rigid exclusiveness is insisted on by the old world code of social observances which still regulates Hindu life. It is not the caste system that I would demolish, but the walls of prejudice and suspicion which have been built around that system to bar the ingress of

modern thought and science and progress. It is for this that I would earnestly plead to my Indian friends, far beyond the walls of this room, that they should rally their forces to the advancement of social reform, if they really desire to draw more closely the bonds of friendship and sympathy between rulers and ruled ; if they would render the Indian home more capable of assimilating the liberalising spirit of Western education, and if they would ensure a satisfactory answer to the question "How will the new Reforms succeed ?"

That is a big question. For myself I believe they will succeed. I want them to succeed as I am sure every Englishman does who has the welfare of India at heart, and I am confident that each one of us will use his utmost endeavour to ensure that they shall be successful. But, as Lord Minto has truly said, it is upon the people of India and their leaders that the future depends. And that is why to-night I have ventured to put forward however crudely and cursorily, the plea that the next great advance may be on the part of the Indians themselves and in the direction which I have indicated. I know that infinite courage, infinite toil and infinite patience are demanded of those who would scale the citadel of caste and plant on its topmost pinnacle the banner of social reform, but great will be their reward."

Those who have not the heart for this great work could hardly find justification at the bar of their own conscience.

But it cannot be denied that it is to-day quite possible for the Indians and Englishmen to have a system of social intercourse, provided they are prepared to meet each other half way. The Indians are fast giving up the ideals of "Don't Touchism" and "Don't Seeism". In Europe, vegetarian dinners and vegetarian Restaurants are not wanting. At vegetarian dinners Indians and Englishmen may well meet. At even mixed dinners the vegetarian side may have its place. Social gatherings are now quite common where meat has no place. The "cup that cheers but does not inebriate" is the centre round which all may meet. The Indians must be prepared to meet freely and frankly at such parties. If they cannot get over their prejudices even so far, they cannot claim social intercourse. It is the spirit of friendliness that is of the essence of social intercourse. With Englishmen sociality without touching the stomach is absurd and uninteresting. There can be no friendliness in the misanthropic aloofness that taboos everything down to a cup of tea. There can be no genuine conversation and hearty exchange of thoughts, without some social cement which binds all without difference. The spirit of aloofness leads

to unsympathy and unsympathy is misunderstanding. The Englishman wisely taboos the personal element from social and convivial moments. "Talking shop" is the height of social offence. Wrangling and discussion in an unsociable thing. The average educated Indian knows not what it is to avoid unpleasant and controversial topics or to avoid "talking shop" or avoid trying to push the self in social moments when men are supposed to breathe the air of disinterested and selfless calm and pleasure. A pleasant half hour every evening dissociated from the cares of self or the pricks of life is the ideal of English club life. In an English club a few healthy rules make for the club life, and woe to him who breaks them. Respect for each other's feelings, respect for the harmony of the entire body and the spirit before which the Colonel and the Subaltern are equalised, these constitute the essence of English club life. There is no cliqué there by twos and threes. There is no talking against each other there. There is no party spirit there which mars the general concord. There is nothing like consciousness of power or office in club. All are equal and woe to the man who betrays any touch of self-consciousness. Implicit obedience to these ideas and principles form the basis of English club life. Into an Indian club you go, and in two days you know who are particularly thrown together

and what they talk about day after day. The same twos and threes come together as by some spirit of schism. But in an English club, you cannot make out which two are more particularly attached to each other than which other two. They are all so clubbable that you only know you are one of the lot and your function is to make others happy and find your own happiness in that of the club-life in general. If two are at Billiards, others may not shout and talk but may only look on. Others may not even walk except gently so as not to disturb the players. Peace and quiet, mirth and jollity, play and fun, these are the elements of club and clubbability. The Englishman's definition of home is "peace and comfort". His club is the place to recoup the lost energies and cement good feeling. We have yet to learn club-life. Is it to be had by compelling others to open the door for us on pain of newspaper attacks? What a silly idea? Is it to be had for commanding a gentleman to propose you and if he does not, exclaim "see, how badly I am treated!" No, a thousand times, no; it is not to be had for forcing the doors open. It can be had with the gentle touch and what is conveyed by the qualification "gentlemanliners", at once so easy and difficult. A thousand little things and details of cheerful self-abnegation go to form the "gentleman". Once in a



Railway journey I happened to meet a Civilian of a well-known English family, who defined "gentleman" and brought under the definition all that was good and noble. He went on pointing out the traits of a "gentleman" from the collar and the necktie. But he did not stop with these superficialities. He went on and on, and pointed out how a "gentleman" was the very soul of honour and virtue and how in the midst of wealth and power he was but a kindly man moving amongst his kind, absolutely unconscious of self. He pointed out how a "gentleman" was the very pink of courtesy and how he should be ashamed of himself if he did not wish properly his very gardener or syce. When I told him how his code of gentlemanliness was broken in India, he simply said "such people are not gentlemen". I pointed out to him that while I had come across so many who were unexceptionable for true gentlemanliness, there were those who were far from the mark and they were responsible for irritation and friction. Those who curse and swear, who do not even return a good morning properly, who are supercilious in their behaviour, who think rough-riding and bad manners a symbol of authority and who in the Railway journeys "damn the niggers" and won't travel in the same compartment with them, these are the worthies who have brought discredit on

the fair name of England. There must be all over the world persons of this class. You find them in every society perhaps. Each society has its own scums who "boss it over the show". It is in the blood. All well-bred men, all the world over, are the same in gentle and good manners. I, for one, can look with pride and pleasure on my social moments and social calls with Englishmen all these years and say that on the whole, I have had only a pleasant and interesting time of it. The misshapen units of the West with whom I had an unpleasant experience I can count on my finger ends, while the number of those Europeans, civil and military, official and non-official of the right side, I can re-count by scores. Not a few of these have been persons of the highest station, calling and birth; and it is such a pleasure and instruction to meet them. It is from them one learns to appreciate and admire the British. Their life and example are so high and inspiring, so noble and generous that it is only bare truth to say, that we have to work up a lot to come up to that level of thinking and feeling. It is not for us to appreciate ourselves. It is for others to tell us what they think of us. The British are adopting a wrong policy in saying all the good things about each other at dinner-tables and at political functions exclusively European. It would be more appropriate if we said it about

them. Likewise it won't do for us to blow our own trumpets and say we are equal to anything. It is for others to say what we are good at. This is the end of all true 'social function where politics and prejudice are eliminated. I might just point out how Englishmen differ from us. The average Englishman is strong and insular. One has to get at him. Whatever he comes to hold, he holds strongly. His likes and dislikes are strong, but, as a rule, they are honest. If it is hard to dislodge him from his opinions, there is his other trait coming to his rescue and that is, his frankness. If he is shown to be in the wrong, he at once makes amends for his mistakes. The Englishman carries the palm for appreciation of merit wherever found. He is fair and generous. An English Military Officer writing from England to an Indian said, "Give my salams to all,—including 'my syce and grass-cutter'". It is England's just pride that they extend the right hand to merit. They are just and generous in their estimate of men. As a matter of fact, to-day they are giving us more liberally than what Indians themselves are prepared to concede to their own countrymen!! This must sound strange but is true nevertheless. Take club-life for example. The Indian has to confess that club-life has not yet come to him as it has come to the Englishmen. It is slowly coming here and there. But it is yet in the

coming; it has not yet come. Every one feels the superior powers of organisation of the British, be it for pleasure or profit, conquest or administration, courage and self-sacrifice, or a lofty sense of duty and genuine patriotism. Every one feels that in spite of our efforts to organise and co-operate all these years, we are just learning the first lessons in the art of combination and co-operation, in sacrificing smaller interests for larger ones and in sinking the personal to the public side of life. The Indians must run their clubs on the principles of English club. In the meanwhile, the Englishmen must slacken a bit of their icy coldness towards Indians and throw their clubs open to them. That is one way of helping social intercourse. See how Free Masonry has brought the two together. It is marvellous. The keynote is harmony and he who is not up to it and cannot tune himself to it is lost. One hour of this intermingling of hearts is worth a hundred sermons and a thousand lectures which bore you to death.

• Why do Englishmen display a general aversion to admitting Indians to their club? You say it is race-bias; but that is only part of the truth. It is also a fear that the peace of the club-life might be rudely broken by ignorance and want of delicacy of thought and expression. But that might be got over easily, provided the Indians would conform to the rules of

the English club, and the Englishmen would meet the Indians on a friendly footing. As it is, English club-life is, on the whole, unduly rigid and exclusive. It looks very much like the exclusiveness of the Indian caste. Those who are waging war against the exclusiveness of caste cannot but deplore the consequences of exclusiveness of the English club-life as having a tendency to keep up race-bias. It can do no good. It has done and is doing great harm. How to minimise it must be every good man's concern.

I know of one Indian club at least where ~~the~~ insoluble difficulty is "Touch not the Brahman cup; for the non-brahmans there is another." The non-brahmans have broken away as a matter of self-respect. It is high time something was done by the Englishmen and Indians towards a common club-life. Because I believe that the English club-life, if thrown open to Indians, is bound, in the long run, to ~~make~~ <sup>make</sup> for a proper and correct understanding between the two classes. To the Indian, it will prove an education in itself. To the Englishman, he would understand the Indian better. The fear that some undesirables may get into the club is the fear that must apply to all classes. Does not one often hear of the unclubbables among Europeans? But they are not tabooed. They are either tolerated or only

made to find their level. In one English club, I know that almost all the countries of Europe were represented. It was a most miscellaneous club so to speak. Even Europeans bearing no friendly feelings towards England and with no qualifications worth the name and with even one or two positive disqualifications, were free to be members of this club. But no Indian would perhaps have been admitted. But side by side with it and as a keen contrast, there was another club composed of the finest elements of English club-life. It was there, I found what club-life was, and what a delight it was to spend one's evenings there. I found that the real attraction of the English club-life lay generally in its heartiness, freedom and harmony.

---

## CHAPTER VII.

---

### BRIDGE-MAKING.

---

R.—Let me emphasise that without England we could hardly realise this great ideal of ancient India. Without England again we can hardly work it. Nay, without England, we could barely prepare the ground for it. Literally, then and without any figure of speech, in turning away from England or breaking with her, we are kicking the ladder by which we ascended, while hardly we have got on the first rung yet and when we have ever so many rungs to ascend before becoming anything in the world. But England has to begin the most trying of her task with India just now. This is the hour and the need for the hour is felt all round, but the Englishman has not yet realised it and is puzzled at the situation and knows not what to do. The secessionists are in a fit of madness and forget the need for the guiding hand and think it can do without England. A mighty effort is needed on the part of both England and India in facing the situation. There is no use regretting the past. There is no use trying to re-write on

the slate of the past what might have been written on both sides. It is vain speculation and it is wisdom perhaps to recognise that there is not to the thoughtful mind much room for regret because on the whole, England and India have both done splendidly together. Is it not silly to think of mending the past without working in the present? Is it not silly to hold up the picture of wrongs and weaknesses on both sides, instead of pointing out the strong and good points on which alone the future can be built? It is easy to write any amount of partisan literature to belittle England or blacken India. But truth is neither there nor here. Seditious literature is carefully planned on the principle of writing England and Englishmen down to a terrible indictment before the world or before the young. It is as easy to write down India for all its past weaknesses and wrongs. It is again easy for the political press of the bitter partisan type on both sides to indulge in mutual recrimination and fault-finding so that the result might be more of distance between the two countries and less of kinship. But no good can come out of such a policy. One is tempted to exclaim, "save us from the political partisan press, be it Indian or Anglo-Indian," but it is this dreadful game played by the political partisan press all over that is now bearing the bitter fruit. The Englishman is



naturally trustful and simple. But the Indian is by nature distrustful even with his own countrymen. The Englishman finds that his trustfulness and simplicity are taken undue advantage of and says he should have nothing to do with people who have not been prepared to see his good side and who would only see the dark spots in him. He then exclaims in a spirit of despair, "I have trusted so long and worked so hard and yet the result is discouraging." The Indian says in return: "This is hard. However trying it might be, it is still true that trust begets trust, and distrust distrust." Let there be room enough for all of us who would cling ever and anon to England and who would still link England and India together. Let England know that even while under the greatest trial she must know her friends from her foes. Let the best of us be admitted freely and frankly into her counsel and let us work together in a spirit of true comradeship without any difference. *It is not so much a question of place or preference but it is pre-eminently a question of confidence between the rulers and the ruled. It is a question of recognition of the principle of true Imperial unity between England and India. Thus the units among Indians who belong to the school of Imperial Unity have in them the true cement for the process of bridge-making between England and India. But*

I am told that it is not so easy to make out friends from foes. I am also told that while those who have openly declared hostility against the British Government are easily understood, the difficulty is in finding out who constitute the rank and file of the following of the seditious school. But all the same, the policy of suspicion and distrust is not to be carried too far. I know what it is for a handful of foreigners ruling over millions to find at a time of trial and trouble in administration, that those on whom they could depend are after all so few and I know from personal experience what it is to be served badly by our surroundings in matters of the highest administrative well-being for the public at large. I know some of the most sympathetic and kindly of officers whose whole service will bear the strictest scrutiny for British sympathy and fair-play, who trusted their surroundings to help them at a time of sore trouble and unrest, but who got in return nothing but bitter disappointment. The result of such experience can not but make even the best of us, Indian or English, feel that we do not know where we are, but yet I know of no other way of getting over the difficulty except by mixing more freely with the pick and flower of Indians and try to understand them. 15 years ago in writing to "The English Magazine and Review" about "Englishmen and Englishwomen in India",

I pointed out the disastrous consequences of want of mutual understanding between the rulers and the ruled. I went the length of saying that a G. O. may well be issued stating that at every important station there should be a mixed club of Europeans and Indians which all *officers* at least would be expected to foster and develop. Then again, I pointed out years before the sedition-troubles that the signs of the times proved more than ever the necessity for a correct understanding between the rulers and the ruled. Had only something been done all these years by both Indians and Englishmen to bring about a certain amount of fellowship and good feeling so as to bring the best of us together somewhat on the basis of Free Masonry, we should not be to-day still discussing the problem of social intercourse and despairing alike about its solution ; but it is never too late to try the good experiment. Now more than ever, there is need for it. Instead of growing hopeless over the situation, there is yet any amount of room for Indians and Englishmen to set themselves about making the bridge. Because the number of those who could be relied upon is small at a given time, it does not follow either that this number could not be increased, much less that even they should not be taken into confidence unreservedly. There is an erroneous idea among some

that the best way of working sedition out is to work it entirely through British instruments trusting as little as possible to the Indian. This is radically wrong. In war, in sport, in administration and in putting down sedition the best of Indians and the best of Englishmen, British soldiers and Indian sepoy have to work in true comradeship. The knowledge of the Indians, side by side, with the grit of the British can alone face the situation. Wherever I go, be it in British India or Native States, the one thing I hear from the highest of Indians, official or non-official is the need of the moment for this feeling of comradeship between the British and the Indians. There are so many who would serve but the best of them feel that somehow or other there has not been enough of confidence reposed in them. By all means, choose your officers and men, but having chosen them, trust them even as you do your own men. If even the best of us who would gladly give or who have gladly given any amount of proof of fidelity to England, be made to feel by some of your own officers as if even they should be kept at a distance, is it not sad? Be it noted that what the anarchists probably want is exactly to undo the bridge and widen the breach. Nothing would perhaps more gladden the heart of the seditionist than to see the rulers and the ruled cut

off without touch' and trust, but that is the very reason why the doors must be thrown open for the best men on the Indian side to come into the Chamber of State and the Chamber of local administration so that sedition might see that in spite of its efforts to undo the bridge, the process of bridge-making will go on only all the more vigorously. One is often tempted to exclaim with the author of "The Prince of Destiny" "O England, I hardly know what to do. While there is so much to admire in Thee for all that is great and good, there is so much to deplore for thy faults and failings"!

A.—I must say that your tribute to England is touching. With more men of your creed, I should never despair of making the bridge; but what do you consider to be the chief of these faults and failings?

R.—Foremost among them I would say is Red-tapism. *The one great rule which is above all rules, is that the object of rule is to help justice and good government.* Red-tape must give way before truth and justice. Too much of rules and red-tape are likely to reproduce in grim reality the story of the doctor who pronounced a living man on board dead and there was no help for the living man who was exclaiming that he was alive except to be thrown over-board because the doctor had pronounced him dead! I know of a Municipal Secretary—and he was

only the type of this class of red-tape men and he used to give endless trouble to the Municipal administration by his remarkable knack for applying G. O's. and B. P's. so as to work hardship. He had, besides, the knack of offending everybody. The Municipal Chairman was a good old Divisional Officer who for want of time had delegated all his powers to this unpopular Secretary. Plague was raging in the neighbourhood. Passport holders were pouring into this place where this Municipal Secretary was holding sway. To bring things to a climax, a banya shop had to be disinfected on account of suspected plague infection. The Secretary went to do the disinfection one morning with his buckets and thotties and his belted knights each with a cane in hand which is an emblem of Municipal authority. Within a few minutes after the Municipal staff reached the shop, a menacing mob, thousands strong composed of Muhammedans and Hindus, surrounded the Municipal Secretary ! The axles of the wheels of his cart had been removed and the Municipal Secretary was, by no means, in an enviable position. He had the good sense to send word to the Municipal Chairman. He was there at once on the spot, and he took the situation in at a glance. All he could do was to make up his mind that it required firmness and tact and that it would be disastrous to show the white feather. It would have

been equally so to plunge precipitately into tactless measures. He kept parleying with the mob on the one side, and sent information to the Police and the District Magistrate on the other, taking care that it did not leak out on the way. Shortly after, came the Police and the District Magistrate who was an Indian. The mob began slowly to disperse and they were told what a simple thing it was that was going to be done for their benefit, and proceeded quietly to do the disinfection. The thing ended quietly. When it was found that more than half the cause of the trouble was due to the previously piled up acts of odium and unpopularity of this red-tape Municipal Secretary, the first thing the Chairman had to do was after consulting the District Magistrate to relegate him strictly to the desk as his proper place and take the administration himself. He commenced obstructive tactics. He would send him bundles of papers for disposal to frighten him by their bulk. He would next point out in the name of G. O's. and B. P's. how the Chairman's orders were wrong. But the Chairman found more often than not that while his quotation was correct, his misapplication was due either to ignorance or worse. He had only one of two courses open to him either to strictly limit his functions or to allow the administration to become a scandal. He did the former and I should think with nothing but good

results. The less we have red-tape of this sort in administration, the better will it be for all concerned.

While red-tape is a weapon which many a desk-man may wield innocently, it must not be forgotten that it is very often wielded by the vicious underlings in all departments. It is remarkable how the Sheristadar either of a Collector or a District Judge may carry point after point cleverly and ingeniously in spite of all the care you take. A high-placed civilian remarkable for his strength and commonsense alike, told me very humorously how he once got tired of the tactics played by petty men in the name of petty rules, to the detriment of good men and good government alike. He told me how he had come across subordinate officers who tried to prevent him in following the healthier and higher principles of administration in the name of following minor rules. He said, "whenever rules, G. O.'s. and B. P.'s. were pointed out to me as a piece of obstructive tactics, I always overcame them by saying that the rules were all meant to help and not hinder the right thing or the right man, and that when they were sought to be applied to hinder the right thing or the right man, the best thing was to disregard them." This spirit is badly needed in solving many an administrative problem, where the Government is sought to be put into the meshes of the letter of the rules at the



cost of the spirit. The extent to which Red-tapism has permeated almost all the Departments of administration is astonishing, and the grim humour of the situation is that those who perpetrate it, are hardly conscious of it. The evil has gone so far as to affect even Departments which might be well expected to be free from it. Scrupulous conformity to *mamool* and *Red-tape* has come to invade us so completely that any deviation from it, however essential and desirable in the public interests, is looked upon almost in the light of a calamity !! The heads of all Departments must rise above it, and infuse a new spirit in administration. Red-tapism cannot be more aptly described than as the spirit of caste crystallised in officialdom. Just as Hindu Society wants its small doors and windows to be replaced by bigger ones so as to admit more light and air, even so, should the official doors and windows be replaced by bigger ones so as to let in plenty of fresh air and light. A great deal has been done by the government in the right direction and what is wanted is the attitude of mind on the part of all concerned which would welcome the change instead of offering it resistance, as if a healthy deviation from immemorial usage would bring down the very Heavens on our head:

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

---

### THE BRITISH POLICY.

---

A.—What are the defects in the British policy and what are the changes needed therein?

R.—This is the most vital and yet the most difficult problem to solve. But solved it must be, for on that depends the fate of India. Indian political parties are yet nebulous. The names of the British political parties can bear no very close resemblance to the names of the Indian political parties. Any conclusion or comparison based upon mere fancy or superficial similarities between the parties here and the parties there, can lead to no practical good. It will only tend to obscure our vision regarding the vital points of difference between the British politics and Indian politics. The British political parties have for their basis the way in which their social, industrial and political interests are affected by them. So before the British political parties could bear any vital resemblance to the Indian political parties a great and radical change must take place in Indian sociology. The terms "Liberals,

Conservatives, Socialists, Unionists," etc., have no meaning in Indian politics. That is why the party politics of England ought to have nothing to do with the Indian administration. India must be above party politics. That is why the best of rulers and administrators in India must quickly eschew their pet principles or prejudices of party politics and must apply themselves to work out the best form of Government for India agreeably to her own genius, traditions and conditions. The distinction between Conservatives and Liberals has been really wiped out in the Indian administration, because Liberals or Conservatives coming to India had to leave aside their respective political creeds and work on what seemed to them best for the good of India. So the idea of linking India with any particular party in England as alone conducive to its progress and prosperity will turn out on examination to be unfounded. In fact, the Liberals may be opposed to the Conservatives and think that Conservatives deserve only to be thrown overboard. That is English politics. But in Indian politics the truth may be that Conservatives have done more good to India than Liberals. It is a very common thing in India to mistake that the Liberal in English politics is likely to be more friendly to India than the Conservative. This is due to a sort of vague notion in the Indian mind that the word

“Liberal” imports “progressiveness” while the word “Conservative” denotes the opposite. The truth is perhaps that great and illustrious names may be mentioned of Englishmen whether Liberal or Conservative who have proved themselves friends and benefactors of India without regard to any difference in their political creeds. This is the tendency that India requires from all Englishmen who love India and have no idea of propagating their own political creed here. Taking the words “Conservative” and “Liberal” not in the worst sense, but in their very best, the word “Conservative” should mean the principle of conserving whatever is good in the present, while the word “Liberal” may import the principle of taking a step in advance though at the cost of breaking a bit from the old moorings. This is the right side of Conservatism and Liberalism. The wrong side of Conservatism is to cling to whatever is old or ancient regardless of merit or worth, while the wrong side of Liberalism is to break everything old and ancient in an Iconoclastic or Utopian spirit. India is pre-eminently conservative both in the right sense and in the wrong sense. It clings to its past with intense devotion. It will not yet give up a great many things which are injurious to her and whose sole merit is that they are old. India is now coming to realise more and more fully the right side

of Conservatism and the necessity for preserving Indian life and polity at its best on ancient lines of Indian thought and wisdom. If India succeeds in passing from her wrong Conservatism of ages to the right Conservatism of ancient India, it would be true to her national instincts. That is apparently the trend of India's future, as it strikes the most thoughtful of minds. Now the present tendency of British politics is just the other way. It is beginning to lose itself into the Liberalism of the wrong type. It is fast descending into the abyss of socialism which India will never accept. England herself cannot stand it for any length of time. It is like the attempt to make the cone stand on its apex. India is too sound, too old and, if I may say, too wise for specialistic experiments. England herself will pass through the wave of socialism and when it comes to the crest, will have to veer round somewhat violently to conservatism of the Indian type. I have an idea that the West itself will some day have to adopt the Indian ideals of polity when it is tired of all her experiments in the school of socialism and when it finds that, as long as the world lasts there is no equalising the Newton and the idiot, and therefore the theory that every man is as good as another or which comes to the same thing as bad as another, is in politics the most misleading and dangerous of

doctrines. It is just possible that the most democratic of countries in the West may come to adopt in course of time a system of Oligarchy or a limited form of Monarchy as about the best. At any rate, in the Eastern horizon and in the Eastern hemisphere this form of government alone bids fair to be a success. The sovereign in the East is like the sun which can never be dimmed by the satellites and stars. The great question, therefore, is whether when one country rules another, the ruling power should study and follow the genius of the country it rules, or whether it should try its own experiments in the main departments of life. Till now the British Government has been following in her methods too much of the western forms paying no heed to the Eastern ideals. This has proved a source of weakness and trouble. The unexpected has happened. The representative form of Government was ushered by the British rule, bit by bit in ever so many ways. It was put in the Municipal Councils and Local Boards as a scheme of Local self-government. It was put in the election of Dewastanam Committees for electing members. It was put in the Legislative Council for helping the Government with its criticism. It has come to dominate us in the form of non-official majorities. Having thus created the frame work of representative govern-

ment, the spirit of the people demands the fruition of that form. This is only natural. Having tasted of the popular form of government and having been taught to look upon it as the political ideal to be reached, the people want more and more of popular power and less and less of official control. The village Reddy whose vote was till now solicited, is now looked upon as an unnecessary and troublesome official appendage. Even the Tahsildar is likewise spurned. The higher functionaries share the same fate. The people exhibit the spirit of impatience of official control and wish to do away with it. This is all well and good if the people could manage their affairs with the high character and disinterested devotion to public interests which could ensure efficiency and freedom from corruption in the absence of any official control and guidance. Otherwise Local self-government could not pass beyond the stage of generous experiments at the cost of efficiency and discipline. Popular power and popular character are not necessarily synonymous with each other. The development of popular character should be the first to aim at before the popular form could succeed. The Native States seeing the difficulty under Eastern conditions of developing popular character on a large scale have wisely given it up as a hopeless task and adopted their own lines of progress and

efficiency. But the spirit of the British Government is not compatible with absolutism. It is therefore struggling to mix up its own forms of free government with oriental forms. The only escape out of the meshes thus created is for the British to adopt quickly the forms most suited to India. *It would be a mistake however to perpetrate absolutism any longer.* We see that it will no longer do. What then does India want? It wants according to the genius of the people peace and plenty, and the people and the Government to be welded together as a composite whole by the bonds of sympathy and identity of interests. It does not care for forms of government. A system of government where the rulers and the ruled are in full and complete touch is the only solution. The Government must work the people's cause in all directions. Whatever concerns the best interests of the people in trade, commerce, arts, science and industry must become fully and completely the interests of the government. India has never known in her history separation of the government from the people and the people have never had the idea of working anything by themselves without government control and government protection. Now when they are asked to manage their affairs without the Government's active help they feel cut off from their wonted fountain of life and display want of



vitality and strength. This is looked upon as failure on the part of the people to develop capacity for self-government. But it may mean that such a system, being out of tune with the people's life in India, requires the restoring of the old and time-honoured relations between the people and the Government. For instance, the religious endowments when severed from the government control have become impossible of management by the people. But the moment the Government control is substituted as in Native States, they will go on efficiently and satisfactorily. Even so industry, trade and commerce when left to the people themselves to work out on western lines of thought and action are found to collapse, but, if they are pushed on with the aid of the Government, will show fresh signs of life and growth. Likewise the spirit of work should be one of free inter-mingling of the rulers and the ruled as indispensable parts of the government based upon a spirit of the highest Imperial unity in carrying on the great Government. It will become Imperial in the true sense and not in the narrow and restricted one. The higher officers, Indian and British and the officers of subordinate ranks as well composed of the various classes, Indian or European, should at once be made to realise a common feeling of comradeship in the administration of the country

knowing no difference of creed or caste. The Government must be the sole arbiter in the choice of men for all high offices and the officers thus selected will be animated by a spirit of complete subordination to the Imperial interests and a spirit of equality in the sense of equal opportunities to all and equal treatment to merit. All will be bound exactly by the same duties and the same rights. All this is, of course, subject to the indispensable condition of maintaining the irreducible minimum of British element in the administration of the country. Otherwise it would cease to be British Government and British administration alike; but it would be Indian administration with the British army to guard and to step in only when there are internal dissensions. We know of no government like this in the world. England is here to rule and not merely to watch a game of Indian politics. What we want is the best form of British Rule consistently with efficiency of Government and the progress and prosperity of the people and not merely an ever-receding shadow of the British Government, before a game of Indian Democracy. *The basic principle is the Imperial unity of interests and not the weakening of the power or the prestige of the British Rule.* Under the spirit of true Imperial unity the friction between the official and non-official must disappear?

The Native Princes and Chiefs will feel in this Imperial system that their ancient ideals and rights will be preserved and respected so long as they realise that they are part of the British Empire. The social and religious reformation of the country, if it cannot be directly worked by an alien Government could be helped a great deal by the sympathetic Sovereign towards attaining it. All these may appear Utopian, but in truth it is not so. No people will obey more cheerfully the mandates of the Sovereign power in all concerns of life from the biggest to the smallest than the people of India. What they require is merely to be taken in hand in a friendly spirit and shown the way. The unrest of the disloyal and seditious is bound to disappear. We are told that the worst seditionists even, do not want the British Rule to go out. On the other hand, they are fully aware that if the British go away, India will lose herself in chaos. For the British to leave India now will be comparatively nothing for England but a terrible blow to India from which she can never recover. For the British to sever from India at this time and at this juncture even as a trial and an experiment will be very like leaving the millions entrusted by Providence to Britain in a helpless stage. Let not unrest even for a moment cause any revulsion of feeling on the part

of England towards India. This is the hour of trial for England and India alike. This is the hour of danger. It requires more than ever the fullest strength and the greatest sympathy on the part of England not to forsake the great trust reposed in her of uplifting India. On the part of India, the duty to England is not less but more. What is now wanted on her part is not passive loyalty but loyalty of an active, robust kind to the British throne more than ever before. Locked hand in hand, England and India have to prove that the bonds of true Imperial unity must constitute the life of India's future and not severance from the British over-lordship. The highest good that India may yet achieve can be achieved only with Britain over us and her unlimited sympathy for India.

The Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale asks for a declaration from His Majesty, the King-Emperor, on the great occasion of the Delhi Durbar of a democratic form of government as the end and aim of the British Rule. I quite agree that the great and memorable occasion is one eminently befitting the declaration of the policy to be pursued by the Government and it would constitute the Great Proclamation of the year 1911. But the question is, what is the policy to be declared? Lord Morley himself declared emphatically that a Parliamentary form of Government for India is not his

goal. What then is it to be? I, for one, would much sooner declare it to be one of Limited Monarchy with a Council to help and with a Member of the Royal Family enthroned for ever more in Delhi, the ancient and venerable Indraprastha as our Indian Sovereign and Protector, and pledged to carry out even more fully than hitherto these gracious words of the Proclamation of 1858:

“In their prosperity will be our strength; in their contentment our security; and in their gratitude our best reward. And may the God of all power grant to US, and to those in authority under US, strength to carry out those our wishes for the good of Our people.”

