TEXT CROSS WITHIN THE BOOK ONLY

THE

ART OF DISCIPLINE, MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP

OR

PRINCIPLES OF PERSONAL EFFICIENCY, SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT AND INSPIRING LEADERSHIP

"...The precepts could well be read time and time again for they are fundamental in human relations...."

...ngton U. S. A.

"...These e... ience, are here collected, an... benefit of any one that ma... its struggles seriously t... ...ucceed and achieve them. Whether you are i... ...ment Office or a Firm ...rganization, this book ...

...ess, Madras.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
OSMANIA UNIVERSITY
PG6881

ABUL HASANAT

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY
OU_148553
UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

THE ART OF
DISCIPLINE, MANAGEMENT
AND LEADERSHIP

OR

PRINCIPLES OF PERSONAL EFFICIENCY,
SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT AND
INSPIRING LEADERSHIP

"There is one principle which a man must follow if he is to succeed, and that is to understand human nature." —Ford.

"Discipline is the resultant of two factors—the power to control others, the power to control oneself. It works first blind obedience then willing accord. Its aim is the transformation of a multitude into a unity, that unity not a dead machine, but a living organism. The man who, whether Captain of a company or General of an army, achieves the end, is the true disciplinarian"—Hanna.

"Personality is a perennial, not an annual. It requires to to be pruned, to be nurtured, and to be given opportunities for growth" —Downs.

"The new management employs not only science but humanity, and by humanity I do not mean merely or chiefly sympathy but rather a larger thing, the recognition that all men, regardless of race, origin or experience, have powers for greater things than have been believed." —Tarbell.

"Any man can do what any other man has done."
"To lead is not a privilege · it is an honour and it is a trust."
"Follow me and I will make you fishers of men"—Jesus

THE ART OF DISCIPLINE, MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP

OR

PRINCIPLES OF PERSONAL EFFICIENCY, SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT AND INSPIRING LEADERSHIP

ENTIRELY RECAST AND 90 P. C. ENLARGED

BY

ABUL HASANAT

(*Indian Police : Superintendent of Police*)

Author of :

"Crime and Criminal Justice",
The Greatest War yet to be Fought, etc., etc.

Contributor to :

International Journals on Police, Crime, Law, Sex, Sociology.

STANDARD LIBRARY, A,
Dacca, (Bengal, India.)

Price Rs. 5/- or 7s. 6d only.

Publishers :
STANDARD LIBRARY, A,
DACCA, (BENGAL, INDIA)
Chief Distributors :
NEW BOOK CO.,
KITAB MAHAL, HORNBY RD., BOMBAY.
Calcutta Agents :
W. NEWMAN & CO. LTD.
3, OLD COURT HOUSE ST , CALCUTTA

First Edition 1943
Revised and Enlarged Edition 1944

All rights reserved by the Author.

This book has been approved by Directors of Public Instruction as suitable for Prize, Library and Teachers' Reference in the following Provinces and States :

ASSAM, BENGAL, BIHAR, ORISSA, UNITED PROVINCES, HYDERABAD (DECCAN), PUNJAB AND N. W. FRONTIER PROVINCES

Printed by
N. C. BOSE
at the KAMALA PRESS,
Khulna, Bengal

Agencies being taken all over.
Obtain stock at 'our best trade discount' from either the Publishers or the Chief Distributors.

SOME OPINIONS

(On the First Edition Itself)

The book under review is highly commended to our readers.—*My Magazine of India, Madras.*

This common-sense manual, containing numerous practical suggestions, can help its readers to discipline and leadership as much as imposed rules ever can —*The Aryan Path, Bombay.*

The principles enunciated by him have been tried in the school of experience...Manner of presenting his ideas is refreshingly original and attractive. Every public library ought to equip itself with a copy of this very interesting treatise *The Educational India, Madras.*

The book is enriched by telling illustrations and observations and advice full of common good sense.—*The Bombay Law Journal.*

This book is one of sterling worth. We recommend the book for the use of everyone aspiring after leadership or departmental headship. Students will derive from its pages a great formative principle.—*The Times of Assam.*

No parents, teachers, office-heads, Magistrates, Police officers and those who have to manage a big staff should be without a copy. ... There is a refreshing novelty throughout the book and we cannot too strongly recommend it to Assam Government for its early adoption as a prize and Library Book.– *The Sylhet Chronicle.*

This interesting book, written by a policeman is a unique publication...The book deserves to be widely read...—*The Orient, Calcutta*

The book will prove a delightful and healthy reading to all and should certainly be in every high school library.—*The Progress of Education, Poona Bombay.*

The author's delineations though made in popular style are fully comprehensive and are to the point. The performance reflects great credit to the author who has displayed a very wide reading and critical aptitude and vast experience. It is really a good book on a very important topic of Social and Industrial Psychology, which is claiming the attention of the military authorities and managers of big workshops and factories who are in search of people endowed with some amount of leadership. Any one concerned with the maintenance of discipline and retention of leadership is likely to derive much benefit from a perusal of the book.—*The Science and Culture, Calcutta.*

The author claims that the work is designed to give practical hints for self-improvement and heightening of skill in managing students, office-staffs, trade employees, subordinates and one's own children. And this is no exaggeration. The [illegible] of Discipline and Leadership is an

Post Graduate Library

indispensable guide to officers and business executives and all those who are interested in self-culture. It is much better than many a foreign book on efficiency. We recommend it to all young men.—*The Free India, Madras.*

The book makes interesting reading as we follow the author through the chapters. The style is easy and sustains interest...This is a good book and deserves a place in every library. Especially it should be placed in the hands of young people.—*The New Review, Calcutta.*

This book coming from the pen of a profession different from schoolmasters has its own interest for a schoolmaster and educationist. ...The book is interesting from the beginning to the end....—*The Education, Lucknow.*

In this handy volume the author discusses in a light tone the whole secret of the art of discipline and leadership....The author analyses the different mental traits and modes of behaviour that go to make a good leader and gives advice how to develop these qualifications.—*The Modern Review, Calcutta.*

Mr. Hasanat's book is thought-provoking from end to end. He handles the problem of orderliness in society and how it is to be inspired with remarkable clarity of thought and freshness of manner. It will repay study by the office boss and his subordinate, by the teacher and the taught, by the guardian and his ward—*The Bengal Weekly, Calcutta.*

The book deals with discipline as found in every walk of life—business, schools, public bodies, army, etc. It deals with personality, how to create it and how to find it out The author has shown by numerous examples taken and picked up from all countries and spheres, how psychology can be applied in bringing out the latent power of a man or a child.—*The Criminal Law Journal of India, Lahore.*

This is an interesting and provoking book suggesting new reflections on old terms and ideas, like discipline, the right disciplinarian, inferiority complex, and others.—*The Educational Review, Madras.*

The author has dealt with the subject throughly in all its aspects including child psychology. The book is very instructive and interesting and would be useful as a practical handbook for parents, teachers, officers who have to control big staff and for every one who aspires for leadership.—*India Cases, Lahore*

The style of the author is simple and matter-of-fact. It would readily appeal to the receptive minds of the young generation in the schools in India. It would not, at the same time, fail to catch the imagination of the older generation engaged in the serious business of life.—*The Indian Readers' Digest, Bombay.*

The book has great value for those who are interested in education. A provocative volume worth possessing.—*The Amritabazar Patrika, Calcutta.*

The book has obviously been written from a scientific view-point and the subject has been dealt with exhaustively. The style is simple but forceful. It is worth reading.—*The Estern Times, Lahore.*

The reader should not miss this book thinking that it deals with an abstract subject and the method of dealing will be somewhat dull. He will have a pleasant surprise when he reads the book written in a vigorous and bracy style —*The Sunday Times Madras.*

Written in a lively style, one gets through this biggish volume without coming across a single dull or uninteresting passage. Apart from its utility in the every-day life of an individual, the book should be very useful to educational institutions, business and manufacturing concerns and all those that have to deal with large masses of people. —*The Independent, Nagpur.*

As discipline and leadership are two of the most important factors that go to make up the national character, the book deserves warm appreciation for the way in which they are dealt with Apart from its utility in everyday life of an individual. the book should be useful as a text-book in educational institutions for higher education.—*The Hindusthan Review, Patna*

These elements the fruit of hard experience are here collected, analyzed . and synthesized for the benefit of any one that may be anxious to take life and its struggles seriously to plan for successes and to achieve them Whether you are in the Army, or the police. in a Government office or a firm, in newspaper or a political organisation, this book has a lesson for you —*The Indian Express, Madras.*

The style is pleasing and entertaining. The precepts could well be read time and time again for they are fundamental in human relations. An excellent summary is included in graphic form which serves as a ready reference.—*The Federal Probation, Washington, U. S. A.*

More and more enthusiastic reviews and opinions have been and are being received from all quarters.

PUBLISHERS' NOTE

Every article that is created or produced has or has not merit; it stands out of the ruck or it is ordinary. Every publisher looks for a find he can be proud of.

It is not for us to say if this volume is or is not out of the ordinary. For, scores of people from all over the world have already assessed its value. It gives us a sense of pride that we are associated with this publication.

This edition has been thoroughly recast and so largely added to that it would appear to be a new volume altogether.

This book has very kindly been approved by Educational Authorities as suitable for Prize, Library and Teachers' Reference in the Provinces of Assam, Bengal, Bihar, Orissa, United Provinces. Hyderabad, Punjab and North-Western Frontier Provinces. It is still under consideration in many other places and we are confident it will receive similar patronage elsewhere and abroad.

The revised edition has been very kindly serialised in several issues by the Editor, The Free India, Madras, for the universal interest the topics are sure to command. The Editor in launching the serial remarked that he was doing so as nothing was more needed for youngmen all over, than making the best of themselves and that new leaders were wanted everywhere. We shall welcome requests for permission to do so from other quarters also. The topics are of paramount importance and universal interest.

Agreeing whole-heartedly with what a British Writer of eminence has sent us unsolicited (given on the next page) in favour of this book, we conclude with the hope that this edition will arouse even greater interest than the original one :

"A Leader on Leadership

"Bernard Shaw has said somewhere that most of our troubles come from our habit of thinking ten years behind the times. Mr. Abul Hasanat's troubles seem likely to spring from being ten years ahead of the times. When this war is done, Mr. Hasanat's books are very likely to become classics, because that will be the beginning of a period in which his ideas and his theories will be the current argument, and just as now we talk politics so then we shall talk personal psychology. But just now we do not, and it is therefore all the more important that those who keep an eye upon the way that things are going should read and advertise Hasanat's books. He has recently published a new work, this time on leadership. It is concise, witty, and very practical. But more than that, its theories spring from the very life blood of our times, the topic that is as much the characteristic of our age as inventions and scientific wonders were the topic of the Victorians,—the half-hidden laws of human personality, the just glimpses, workings of the human mind. Our age may well be the age of Freud—we shall all know all about it, after Mr. Shaw's ten years have gone by. Mr. Hasanat knows all that there is to know about it now.

"He believes in a very human form of discipline, and he can tell us how we can all achieve it. His idea of leadership is not a very frightening one—his leaders have no bluster. They are useful men employing a useful talent to its best advantage. And his book, after it is done with examples, tells us how we can bring out the latent talent in ourselves.

"He is a most entertaining writer, and his illustrations are of the sort that everyone will recognise as being part of their own lives. He writes illuminatingly how to give an order, and wisely on how to discipline children. He is moderate, balanced and always readable; in some passages he gives us glimpses of an awe-inspiring width of erudition; and over all the book he has cast the charm of a matured, cultured personality. He has written a book which one should buy for its usefulness in the traffic of everyday, and a book which one will keep for its permanent value."

PUBLISHERS

FROM THE AUTHOR

Dear Reader, (wherever you may be, of whichever sex and of whatever occupation),

I am desired to request you to pay a little more attention to discipline and its technique so that ..

I am sorry. Very sorry. I am not expressing myself exactly as I mean to. Let me try again :

Fondly do your fathers wish, fervently do your friends hope and feverishly do your foes preach—if only you had a little more *controlling capacity*, you would be *perfect*.

Sorry again. I have not improved matters. You see red and scarlet and orange.

"Confound the whole lot", you rightly retort—"Ye fathers, ye friends, ye foes, when did I claim perfection ? And, pray, what is your *own* horse-power ?"

I quite agree with you in your righteous indignation. I fully endorse your reply. But let's see.

We—I, you, he, she, they—*all* lack perfection but don't we ourselves wish to improve—do better than to-day—be better than we actually are ? I, for myself, do and I am sure you agree with me and endorse my statement, if only partially.

The truth seems to be :

We,—again I, you, he, she, they,—all want to be able to keep better order in and among our class, cadets, company, clerks, constables, cattle—whatever we may happen to be in charge of. Don't we ?

The question is not whether 'to be or not to be', as Hamlet asked, but *h o w ?*

You (meaning me) don't, you say, have to ask for sealed tenders for advice ! It is there for the mere asking !

Spare the child and you (meaning me) spoil the rod, i. e., undermine your 'controlling capacity'. The 'iron hand', the 'hammer and dynamite', the 'hang first and try afterwards' methods—proved ones of guaranteed efficacy—are all there. You have only to assume for yourself the nickname of terrible Tom, dangerous Dick or haughty Harry and all *does* go well with you. Never, never let anybody think you are a 'kind master', for, then you will have to give this, yield that and promise the other. Did all the 'goodness' of Lincoln or Tolstoy save them from their nagging wives ?

Well, for purposes of discipline, whether wives rank inferior to their husbands or *vice versa* is an opinion I would rather keep to myself. But apart from that, I reflect...

Yes, I have turned over tomes and tomes of literature—Army Manuals, Police Regulations, Teachers' Handbooks, Managers' Roads to Success—to find support for you. 'Discipline' almost everywhere means 'punishment' !

But there's a little rub !

We don't want to turn hated enemies, we don't want our wards and subordinates to get pleased *more* with our farewells and *most* with our funerals !

You and I can't expect to make a bigger noise than Napoleon. At least, I can't.

Didn't Napoleon use human materials successfully ? As his biographer says, no mortal ever

conquered more men than did Napoleon. He subjugated armies and peoples,—all to serve his own ambition, following the road of contempt rather than of love. He did this only too well.

He realized his mistake, perhaps too late. In his last meeting with Josephine, he is reported to have said, "Josephine. I have been as fortunate as any man ever was on this earth ; and yet, at this hour, you are the only person in the world on whom I can rely."

But the questions is : Could he rely even on her ?

Historians doubt it very much.

Perhaps, there is a golden mean.

"Discipline," some say, "is an art not a science" "There is a time," they add, "to be easy, a time to be firm, even a time to be severe, a time to have a blind eye, a time to see the slightest dereliction from duty."

Perhaps, we have to make sure *when* and *also where, why* and *how.*

Let's see. We are going to talk the matter over.

Yours sincerely,
Abul Hasanat

P. S. Do excuse this liberty of a light tone. You may have expected me to talk on 'discipline' as gravely as on 'destiny', 'doom', 'death' or 'destruction'. But I do not claim the Mosaic privilege of beginning with 'Thou shalt listen' and ending with 'Thou shalt obey.' Not in *your* case anyway, for we *are* friends. So let's discuss in friendly way. And we *shall be* serious in good time. In the meantime, do keep your patience.

CONTENTS

1.	Nature of Discipline, Management and Leadership	13
2.	Sphere and Scope of Discipline, Management and Leadership	30
3.	All—an Art that can be mastered ...	42
4.	The Right Disciplinarian, Leader ...	45
5.	Self Discipline and Self-Devlopment ...	47
6.	Self-Confidence	93
7.	Fearlessness	98
8.	"Obey-me"-Attitude	117
9.	Manner—How to Conduct Oneself ...	135
10.	Tone—How to Order Others ...	150
11	Tone—How to Order Others (contd.) ... —*Examples and Exercises*	188
12.	Sense of Proportion	196
13.	Efficient Management—Organization Supervision, Test and Inspection ...	207
14.	The Magic of Appreciation ...	233
15.	Justice and Discrimination ...	259
16.	Appropriate Handling of Human Nature	307
17.	Influencing Other People	339
18.	Post-War Organization and Leadership...	365
19.	Index	

THE ART OF
DISCIPLINE, MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP

1

NATURE OF DISCIPLINE, MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP

Afternoon. The sun was still blazing and blasting. The announcer on the radio had just given the news and views.

Battles had been raging and thousands of men had given their lives in a few days, fighting. Human discipline everywhere was being put to the severest test. Men and machines were working together—these and those competing with each other in endurance and efficiency ...

Hymns were being sung in praise of 'discipline' —that magic word. Yes, but wasn't the present misery of mankind due to a great extent to the

unscrupulous use by so-called leaders, of men drilled and disciplined into machines ? Hasn't 'discipline' also meant blind faith, superstitious belief, unreasonable fear, tyrannical overlordship—and the brutalizing of mankind and the pulling of men by the nose when the hearts are asunder and aghast ? Hasn't Bertrand Russel a lot to say against such discipline and in favour of the freedom of individual will ?

The heat was terrible. I was desperately in an argumentative mood.

The orderly announced a 'Khabarwallah'. Must be *dacoits* and a midnight encounter !

I found myself boiling for adventure !

Although the war had been about, we ourselves were in a purely non-violent atmosphere ! The utmost we were doing to our opponents was to sweat them out on the tennis field. Making them pay a trifle on the bridge-table was the most violent term exacted of the enemy.

The *Khabarwalla* did not whisper. Something amiss !

"A leopard, Sir, and a very big one at that."

The orderlies who were watching the unknown man and guarding me against any possible act of malice, laughed.

"Seen it ?"

"No, Sir, heard it".

"Yourself ?"

"No, Sir, nephew did."

"Nonsense ; hearsay evidence !"

"No, Sir, enough, to be sure. Footprints, bad smell, and a goat killed this morning. Next victims likely to be men..."

"Orderly, get the car out."

"Armed police, Sir ?"

"No, conveyance."

"Sending word to Chhota Sahab, Joint Sahab, Jungle Sahab or Jail Sahab ? They may like to come, Sir..."

"No."

There was only one quarry and I didn't want to let the *Sahabs* dispute for three years and a half as to who hit the thing on which part.

ONE LEOPARD Vs. A LEGION

The Khabarwalla was palpably uneasy by my side in the car. What if the leopard had departed in the meantime !

We arrived at the bustee.

True. There were about two to three hundred men assembled under the trees. And women and children too ! How many could I have spared from the Lines ? Here were more than enough.

The tumult was rending the sky. War cries ?

Yes. Heated debates, rankling disputes and all but civil war !

It took me twenty five minutes before order could be restored. But then, the men wouldn't move !

'Tell us, Sir, all about how you propose to get about the business."

"Last time one came, a Sahab all but spoiled the affair."

"We would have managed the affair by now but we preferred to wait for you ..."

I went on listening ...

Yes. Why not ? It's the people's war. And who but the threatened, injured and aggrieved could rise to the occasion ? The enemy was at *their* door, not mine !

But it pains me to narrate the rest. It took hours before the conflicting evidence of the existence of the beast about could be heard, the enemy located and the details of the plan of attack settled. The War Council prolonged its sitting or rather, standing. Everybody would *have* to be heard. After all, was it not they that would play the soldier and at considerable risk too ?

I must say that the legion ultimately moved—moved by themselves—a complete democratic affair—not *in file*, nor *in fours*, nor did they at any time form *a mass*. Time, which was to be our ally, played false. The sun went down rapidly.

Our men mustered strong but the leopard was also struggling for existence. It sprang and leapt—howled and growled and by the time our men were ordering one another to take post, it sized up its enemies.

And I am ashamed to say that it was not non-violently withdrawing all the time either! It worked havoc in the rear, leaving distinct claw-prints on innocent faces and writing with letters of blood a bold account of its own counter-campaign! The casualties on our side were only seven and thanks to their tough vitality, the victims all survived.

We had to leave the enemy garrisoned in a small bush but the men wouldn't leave us to go. I had to hear more!

This was a post-mortem affair, as there usually *is*. If we had but done so or acted like such! if we had not been too this or too that—if only! Oh, if only!!

"If only," I exclaimed, "If only, you men *were* disciplined!"

I cut short this part of the business and as if by way of showing how quick disciplined men *could* move, though this time away, shouted:

"Orderlies, fall in; for inspection port arms; examine arms; ease spring; carry arms; —into the car..."

Off we came....

I see some of my readers smiling. Yes, if only *they* had been there ! Lucky leopard, wait till *they* lead the charge !

In the meantime, let me assure my readers this is a true narration—and one of failure and frustration.

Here was a 'crowd' and crowds all over the world behave more or less in the same manner. It was a mass of men eager to 'manage' a thing but it failed. It failed because it lacked 'discipline'. The men worked haphazard. They had no 'leader' of their own. I was sort of a casual arrival and had no time to put them in order.

FIGHTING WATER-HYACINTH

But, have I seen other crowds faring as badly ? Oh, have I not ?

Well, take how many men get enthused when a big person arrives in state and proposes to set an example by ridding a small ditch of the little water-hyacinth that has taken possession of it. A huge army moves, innumerable hands are at work and the camera clicks. Photographs and accounts come out in the dailies and the monthlies and you see cuttings all across drawing-rooms. Very bad luck for the hyacinth—total extermination !

Go and visit the ditch for fun after three months and ten days. There it is—the water-hyacinth far better colonised with grand and great-grand-descendants spread out all over !

Why ? What is wrong ?

The enemy is never dealt with *thoroughly*.

The enthusiasm of the men boils over like Siedlitz Powder and after the great man retires or the cameraman finishes, it cools down again.

If only they go about it methodically under somebody directing them to stick to the last ! Yes, again, *if only*...

TOLSTOY'S SCHOOL OF FREEDOM

Let us take the field of education.

Formerly and a little while ago, teachers used to learn the art of whipping. And they did this too well !

Children had to cram and *cram* everything. Whether they liked a thing or not did not matter.

Psycho-analysis has exposed the evil effects. The entire mentality of the pupils was dwarfed ; anxiety, fear, neurosis and an inferiority complex ensued.

This is entirely an unwholesome position.

Let us look at the other extreme.

Complete freedem for pupils at a school was prescribed in one at Yasnaya Polyana which Tolstoy founded on his Estate. Professor Adams has given an account of the working of the school somewhat as follows.

The teacher arrives in the class-room for the lesson only to find the boys in a complete melee, struggling and fighting with one another on the floor. He bids them most non-violently to stop and after sometime succeeds in getting them to their places. He then proceeds to give them some sort of lesson. This over, he wishes to start another but many of the boys seem to have had enough and propose to break up. Entreaties and pleadings go in vain and the boys walk away as they please !

ADVOCACY OF SUCH FREEDOM

Some advocates of such forms of institutions would still argue that as education now-a-days is imparted not out of love but *at the expense of* the parents or scholars and as in reality boys *are* timely punished by way of lack of progress or failures in examination, there is no need for the police-man or jail-warder on the teaching staff.

The point really *is* : the parents or those interested *do* pay so that the wards themselves *should* profit by education. The teachers *are* expected by all concerned to *teach* the pupils and to see that they *do* progress. That the teachers *are* paid is all the more reason that they *should* fulfil the functions they are expected to do.

DISCIPLINE

This brings us to our topic—what *is* discipline ?

Telling cannot take place unless there is *listening*. *Ordering* is futile if there is no *obeying*. *Preaching* or *teaching* is useless if there is no *believing* or *accepting*.

Discipline presupposes orderliness and obedience. The converse of discipline would perhaps be confusion and heedlessness.

In the old days the word 'discipline' when used with regard to a school, meant *subjugation to control* or, in one word, *order*. It is still chiefly used in this sense.

The dictionary meaning of the word 'disciple' is "one who receives instruction from another ; follower, adherent, of any leader of thought, art, etc.". Hence 'discipline' which means among other things "trained condition ; order maintained among school-boys, soldiers, prisoners etc. ; system of rules for conduct."

The technical meaning would include *that which* enables men to act together as a body under the leadership of the senior, *that which* inculcates habit of immediate obedience, etc.

MANAGEMENT

The dictionary meaning of the word 'manage' is among others : conduct (undertaking &c.) ; con-

trol (household, institution, State); subject (person, animal) to one's control.

All these shades of meaning are readily reflected when we utter the word 'management.' We 'manage' an act; i.e., accomplish it. We 'manage' a factory or department; i.e., we control and guide the employees or hands.

What matters is not that we accomplish something or control or guide somebody; what matters is *how* we do this. We may fail altogether in which case, of course, we do *not manage*; but we may muddle through *somehow*. From muddling through to perfect management there are any number of grades of performance. *Perfection* anywhere may not be humanly attainable but the ideal *can* and *should* be *efficient management*.

This is worth dilating upon. So more anon.

LEADERSHIP

It has been stated that mankind must live and thrive in company. Loneliness seems to be unsafe for physical being and deadening to the soul. Although endowed with a flaming love for independence, man has still found pleasure in concerted action prompted by motives of convenience. But although people may like so very much to combine to do something, it is by no means true that every individual conceives of the project equally well, that everyone feels equally strongly about it, or that

everyone volunteers to put forth the same amount of effort towards its consummation. Human progress has not been achieved through a full referendum or appeal to the individuals every time something has to be done. It has been made possible because of a small minority and even a few individuals who *caught a glimpse* of things to be achieved, *developed the passion* for achieving them and then *set about collecting* people, *infusing the idea* in them and finally *persuading them* to work *as they* prescribed.

Leaders are there in every field of human activity. We cannot find ten men working of their own on a job without finding at the same time that imperceptibly one or two of these men have assumed leadership and have been leading the others. Such leadership is perhaps neither imposed from without nor even proposed formally from within but all the same it *is* there.

Leadership may, thus, be broadly described *as the relation between an individual and a group built around some common interest and behaving in a manner directed or determined by him.*

This concept of 'leadership' would seem to have two widely varying flanks of relationship. Thus, if the dominant individual holds his power by virtue of an external social convention, such as custom or law or institution, he becomes the agent of authority and the group consists not of *followers* but of *subordinates.* Such leadership accrues easily out of holding of a particular office and is circumscribed

by definite bounds in which authority can be exercised.

The various departments of the State, for example, constitute fields of work managed by so many hands guided and controlled by chiefs, central and local. Men of education and common sense employed by the State manage the work, the managers and sub-managers wielding power delegated and directing and controlling in pursuance of instructions from even higher quarters. Discipline is good, bad or indifferent, work is well-, ill- or indifferently managed, according to the spirit prevailing among the personnel at a particular time.

The higher officers are agents of authority in borrowed plumes and they exercise authority by *virtue of being in office*. The subordinates work under them but are in most cases only outwardly attached to them. Once out of office, the 'bosses' cease to interest the 'bossed'; some of the latter may only have a vague feeling of love or hatred according as the former may have behaved considerately or inconsiderately.

There is no doubt that such form of authority is a safe sort to wield and many of such offices do call for initiative and leadership. There is certainly need for better management and efficient running of them.

We shall, however, look ahead and discuss also 'leadership' in the real sense of the term. This, strictly speaking, is that form of *relationship*

between *an individual and a group where the latter follows the former from free choice and not under command or coercion and further, not in response to blind drives but positive and more or less rational grounds.*

It is indeed, very difficult to determine the dividing line of true leadership from the opposite pole, viz., the leadership of an agitator or demagogue whose position rests upon nothing more than his capacity to appeal to the members of the group through stimulating their emotions and offering suggestions to their instincts.

One phase of leadership can easily pass into another but in general true leadership implies *a following whose behaviour is the result of conscious consideration of the leader's personality, of its own interests and of the anticipated social consequences.*

Leadership, in this sense, again can be differentiated into two types : Representative or Symbolic and Dynamic or Creative Leadership.

A representative leader would, thus, be an individual who satisfies the expectations of the group by acting on its behalf. Legendary figures of this type would be heroes who fought common foes, destroyed monsters ; sages who discovered means of preventing floods or solving tribal disputes. Achilles, David, Hercules and Theseus are a few in the line. Modern examples and nearer at hand would be Gandhi, Jinnah, Nehru.

Representative leaders lead the groups from which they are differentiated on the basis of their

real or accepted distinctive powers in the traditional activities of the groups; when such powers are 'accepted' mechanically, the leaders are superstitiously believed as 'born', or 'Godsent' leaders; when such powers are derived from personal traits or developing character, the leaders are believed to be 'geniuses', 'heroes'.

In modern as well as primitive times and in all spheres—military, political, economic, technological, cultural, religious, social — leaders in the sense of *pre-eminent personalities* exercise profound influence on contemporary and subsequent generations by serving as models to emulate. They may even become 'symbols' abstracted completely from the group to typify for later generations 'the values for which it stood. Thus Joan of Arc typifies protagonism for French National independence, Emperor William I typifies moderate monarchy remote from political brawls.

'Creative or dynamic leadership' emerges when a personality becomes the propulsive force for a value or complex of values for a systematic programme, rallying about himself a group of men which on a small or vast scale creates a stronger pressure than could emanate from any one individual.

Such a programme could be directed toward spiritual ends. Buddha and Mohammad and their groups of devotees are examples of 'propulsive personalities' that carved spiritual empires within incredibly short times. Or, it could be directed toward artistic, economic, political or similar ends.

In any case, such leadership diverges from 'representative leadership' in so far as it involves an *attempt to enrich or alter the existing stock of values in the possession of a society by gaining acceptance for an innovation freshly created by the leader or, if the innovation has been borrowed from elsewhere, by diffusing it in a new light.*

Jean-Jacques Rousseau may be mentioned in this connection. He threw out forcibly the doctrine 'Man was born free, but is everywhere in chains'. Such a statement was not entirely new but he gave it such a push that it readily stimulated the imagination of his generation and the direct result was the French Revolution, which attempted to free men from their chains. The motto of the Revolution, Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité, stands to this day as a perpetual reminder to mankind of the effects of the stimulus given by him.

Externally, the strength of the 'creative leader' is embodied in the ardency of the followers who gather or rally round him ; his distinctive work in contrast with 'representative leaders' lies in the 'creativeness' of his work and contribution.

A 'creative leader', further, radiates his influence over a wider sphere. Under his propulsive force the ardent followers themselves become material of leadership and gather wider and wider followings transcending geographical bounds. Islam propounded by Mohammad became a vitalising force in the hands of the various sub-leaders and crossed over to countries with almost lightning speed. Darwin

expounded his theory of *Evolution* and Huxley and others gave it wider and wider currency.

It is unsafe to say that one class of leadership does not merge partially into another or that the two do not sometimes overlap.

Commonly speaking, there are leaders and—*leaders*; i.e., leadership is a genus of which there are a good many species, some of them strangely different from the rest. It is almost staggering to try to comprehend how various and complicated forms leadership assumes.

There have been the immortals—the men and women who have moved life to vaster issues: prophets, statesmen, poets, artists. Out of the countless millions of men and women that have lived and died so far, a few have immortalised themselves—but what a few? More numerous are, of course, those who have attained leadership in the world of practical things, men who have run states, piloted schemes of use. To match these men of action are others who have moulded and led human thought. Scientists, philosophers have been conquering fresher and fresher realms of knowledge.

The psychology of leadership is a fascinating study, for the common man cannot help wondering how men and women with the same physical endowments or even poorer ones shot up so high and accomplished what would seem to be miracles. Was it luck or pluck that carried them on? If it was mental powers that marked them off from the

common run, were these given them ready-made or they had developed these by self-cultivation ?

We shall have the high priests before us, and although it is not likely many will attain such heights, we must remember 'any man can do what any other has done.' Every man and woman has got to 'manage' something or somebody, enforce 'discipline' here or there and 'lead' now and then. There is already enough of 'bossing' and 'managing' round and about us. We only want to see what are the better ways and means.

2

SPHERE AND SCOPE OF DISCIPLINE, MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP

Discipline has its use in every walk of life. The Army, the Navy and the Air Force could not function one day without it. The police and the fire services have daily need of it. The whole aim of education *is* 'discipline'—firstly of intellect, secondly of will and lastly of general conduct.

We know of the public services with the legion of subordinates and heads. Look at the heads themselves: headclerk, headmaster, head-postmaster, head-warder, head-constable, head this and head that, *ad infinitum*. We all know of the chain, glibly spoken of, from the Viceroy to the Chaukidar—agents of the Crown !

Imagine the innumerable labourers and their foremen, the coolies and their gangmen, the survey men and their supervisors and a whole lot of *instructors, inspectors, controllers, overseers, directors,* etc., etc.

In fact, every one of us has to control others—the poor man lords it over the junior members of his family, the woman her children, if not her husband.

In fact, again, everybody is tackling his problem in some way or other.

Need anybody then dilate upon discipline and how to enforce it ? Are not things already fairly well managed ? Are not the countless millions, even where not trained in high sounding phrases by pedantic pandits or drilled about by havildars shouting in shrill voices, keeping things going ? Is not the factory working, the land producing, traffic moving ?

Yes, but think how much better they *could do* with the principles of discipline *well-understood* by subordinates and *well-applied* by the superiors !

The question of discipline actually arises, apart from the province of self-discipline, when a band of men, women or children have to work in concert and exert in a definite cause.

Voluntary co-operation among fully independent individuals where nobody *leads* but all *combine* harmoniously is the ideal form of pooling of energies, but unfortunately with human nature as it is, such co-operation can be rarely kept up for any *length* of time or in any undertaking involving unpleasant drudgery, unequal risk or more than ordinary endeavour.

In the latter cases, men have to *imbibe* discipline and some among them have to *lead* and *enforce* discipline. It is thus that leaders, supervisors, inspectors, instructors and the various heads become necessary.

These latter *are commissioned* to teach or instruct or get things going. Men placed under them may be their temporary charge but as long as they teach or command, discipline *has* to be enforced.

Human nature may not take all this in the right spirit and there will be many who will misjudge, because of their own faults or of those of their superiors. Lapses on both sides may ensue but as long as both sides play the game fairly, good results *are* inevitable. Superiors will be liked, respected and, perhaps, hated in some cases but their job *is* to *get* and *keep* things *going*, not to found a popular monarchy.

Thus, where students and subordinates are concerned, *maximum* effect in the *minimum* time should be aimed at. Any slackening in such aim is sure to lead to wastefulness, shirking, procrastination, eyewash and, in general, inefficiency.

Men and women, thus, can *usefully undertake* and *properly accomplish* a common task only when one of them continually directs the activities of all towards the same end. We have said 'usefully' and 'properly' to indicate that *non-directed collective action* is most likely to turn into confusion and disorder. It would be useless for a gang of men laying rails or making road or a rowing-crew to exert themselves if a foreman or a coxswain did not control their movements.

All who know how battles are fought know how necessary it is that someone should be in

command. What is true of the army is true of the factory, dockyard, newspaper office, the railway. Wherever men are required to work together, there must be a chief directing and supervising.

During the war of 1914, badly led divisions retreated in panic until they were taken over by a commander worthy of the name. The same personnel thereafter were revivified and completely transformed into a courageous well-knit mass. Without leadership, no military action, no national life, no social life is possible.

Then, there is the question managing *oneself*. A piece of work can be done well, badly or indifferently by a man or woman without the possibility of a challenge from outside. Time can be utilized or wasted without appreciation or deprecation from others. How much—oh. how much bigger an amount of useful work could be accomplished by human kind, if only men and women cared more about challenging themselves than finding fault with others!

There is an art of *working*, as well as an art of *getting work out of others*. There are people who know the one better than the other. There are people who know neither. There are people who know both. The last-named class deserve our salutations. *They* are to be emulated.

... ...

I see many of my readers smiling.

"It's all boring to me"—one muses, "I inherited my powers from my forbears—none need sermonize to me."

"I am a born disciplinarian", mutters another, "and my technique is perfect".

"It's in me, as a natural trait," utters yet another, "and others need only copy me."...There's a clamour all around !

Do stop, I implore you. I am not disputing your powers. I congratulate you all upon them ; only *do share* your good points with others instead of *monopolizing* them.

PERSONALITY

There are men and women who *have* natural gifts—in the shape of good personality and controlling power. Let these men and women thank God, or if they do not believe in Him, thank themselves for these.

Unfortunately, *personality* is an elusive trait—it defies precise analysis.

It is not the physically strongest only that possess it. Some of the smallest and physically weakest can rightly claim it too.

Even those who possess it are quite unable to account for it.

It is the *whole combination of a man—his whole self—physical, spiritual, mental.*

Then, again, it has its edges. One succeeds with children, fails with adults. One succeeds in business, fails in education.

But there it *is*, all the same.

And the whole world is in search of these 'personalities'.

The first thing a practical headmaster wants to know with regard to the candidate for a post on the staff of his school is whether he is a *good disciplinarian*, i. e. whether he can keep order in a class. If he cannot do this, whatever brilliant his other qualifications may be, however well he *could* teach, if only the boys *would let* him, the headmaster has no use for him. Not a few instances of such miserable failures in the classes here are known to those who have lately been through the modern schools and colleges !

There is an art of 'teaching' and rather a difficult one. There no doubt is a legion trying to teach. Here, in this country, teaching work seems to fall to lot of the unwanted ; it seems that teaching here is what educated human driftwood ultimately grounds in !

That is, of course, a pity. No nation should leave the most important job of moulding its citizens in the hands of uninterested practitioners.

That 'teaching' is a difficult art is easily realized when we try to control our children. A father is rarely a good teacher. He may know

little ; or know enough but explain badly ; or he may be too severe and impatient because teaching bores ; or he may be dangerously indulgent because he loves the children so much. It is from professional teachers that the best results can be expected.

There can be no teaching without discipline. A pupil must first learn to work Training of the will has got to precede that of the mind. It is on account of this that home-teaching is rarely very successful. Excuses are easily put forth : the child has a headache, he ate little or slept badly ; there is a party somewhere and the child has to be presented. ...The school makes little compromise and there being more children, preferential treatment is not to be had. The child is forced to find his own place in a group ; in a family he finds a place ready-made.

The heads of public instruction have, thus, got to look for right teachers, teachers with personalities. And by no means they alone !

The army authorities, the departmental heads, the public service commissions, the owners and directors of business concerns—all are on the look-out for these ready 'personalities'.

The point is—alas ! alack !! they are so few, in spite of so many claims !

And none need be sorry either that they are so few. For, if we would have to depend on "born" disciplinarians all the time, the world would have been the poorer.

Individuals, sects and even nations have imposed the humbuggism of their own powers—to the exclusion of others—upon the world and a credulous world have long countenanced it. The present day has demonstrated that good discipline is no monopoly of any one people. It can be inculcated in the West, East, South and North, equally well ; nations, rated third class, have risen to the forefront : a "sickman" has regained full vitality. Adversity and threat of a national calamity have disciplined one nation hitherto little thought of.

This is all to the good. It brings hope to all alike. Fundamentally, human nature is alike everywhere and given the opportunities, it is able to react, adapt and keep up much in the same fashion.

There has been a lot of humbug about 'teachers', 'leaders' and the whole lot of the finer section of human kind being 'born' and not 'made'. Strictly speaking, no teacher is a born teacher. Every teacher must have had some education, may not necessarily be in a formal school or college but must be somewhere. These early experiences have made him. His innate qualities are, of course, to be valued. But these alone cannot make a person a great teacher. A great teacher owes much of his eminence to environmental and cultural factors and to the conscious developing of his innate qualities.

So, also, are leaders - both 'born' *and* 'made' Qualities inherited from past generations in some

mysterious way fit and urge the child to take charge of the games and tell other childern what they have to do. One can watch anywhere how of a few persons assembled someone is *directing* matters and how many others are only allowing themselves to be led.

But there have been others, who, devoid of these qualities by birth, have yet made themselves leaders by *assiduous preparation* for leadership. They have made up for lack of some qualities by developing of some others.

Yes, but where is the scope ?—one may ask. I am an assistant humouring my boss ; I am slaving at the desk ; I am a tiny dot in the huge departmental machine ;—these may be the plaintive assertions of many. Yes, lots and lots have their pay and prospects slowly-graded and lapse of years only pushes them up.

Bismarck averred 'there can be no happiness for an official who always has his superiors and never knows freedom.' Dynamic energies like those of Napoleon, Bismarck would have kicked against departmental fetters but there is no reason to think that there is no happiness in accomplishing allotted work, however lowly, well. There is reward for initiative everywhere. Besides, one can always excel in some side line, like Bankim Chandra and Charles Lamb in letters.

Let's look at leadership in the multifarious forms it can take. One can lead in the family, in

the village or county, in the district, in the province ; one can lead in sports, business, social matters, religion, public life ; one can lead in art, science, mechanics, music, painting, writing ; in fact the field is vast and the scope is unlimited. One can follow one's bent, one's liking.

The modern world affords far more scope for leadership than the past. Let's see how.

Humanity in the course of its long history has invented but few devices for choosing its leaders.

Of these, the hereditary method has held its sway for long. It was no doubt used by the wandering tribes of antiquity where the oldest son succeeded the father. Without the order of primogeniture a community was subject to disputes between brothers and factions and schisms ensued. The high position occupied by the king of England was partly due to such prestige. It is recognized that a deposed king is still a king. Estates or businesses also pass on to families and the heads of the families may be exercising authority. The method has obvious advantages. The father can hand over readily and the first-born would naturally inherit good traditions or otherwise fit himself for leadership. Ties of honour. demand sacrifices from him and tradition secures for him the loyalty of the others.

The disadvantage has not been less obvious. Birth cannot be the sole criterion of selection nor guarantee of fitness. In fact very few of the present-day leaders claim their leadership on

hereditary score and very few are even the first-born in their own families !

This is all to the good. It has thrown leadership open not only to the later-born but also to the so-called poorly-born.

Election is another method of choosing leaders. One has to command confidence of a majority before one can step into a position of authority. Eloquence, good-nature have a lot to do in ingratiating one with a crowd. The system is not, however, free from dangers. The most popular figure may not be the ablest or even able at all. The elected leader may have to continuously worry about the vagaries of the electorate and such worry may result in vacillation, hesitation and even weakness. To elect by a majority vote the head of a business enterprise or the general of an army is to court ruin for the enterprise and defeat for the army. Besides, there are spheres like science and philosophy where the question of election cannot even arise. Silent unobtrusive researchists and thinkers can just as well lead in the domain of thought and the 'empire of the mind'.

The mandarinate is a system of choosing leaders by examinations which, if passed successfully, entitle them to diplomas and offices. The competitive examinations through which the civil servants or military officers are selected are not unknown in this country. These seem to be fair in as much as conditions are alike for all competitors. The slow graded progress is, however, a

handicap to the agile and energetic whereas the secure position of the entrants breeds sloth and stagnation. Bureaucracy is almost a curse in this one respect at least. It ensures tenure and stifles progressive thinking. Many men engaged in the various branches of administration are honestly convinced, with a sort of fatalistic pride, that they are really to carry on and manage a set of things somehow. They relagate reflection to theorists and faddists, not caring that the world proceeds apace. They work the existing regime as matter of course.

In some desperate cases, again, no one appoints a leader but he imposes himself upon the section or the nation. Cromwell was an obscure individual commanding a few cavalrymen ; Napoleon was a dwarfish Corsican ; Hitler and Mussolini rose from obscurity. There is no doubt these have the necessary qualities of a leader but their subsequent success or failure would depend on what use they make of their powers.

The truth seems to be that choosing a leader is yet a problem, one that will not perhaps admit of a perfect solution. *Acquiring* leadership, then, should always be a fascinating game. *To lead should be a privilege, an honour, a trust.*

We have spoken of 'personality' either inherited or acquired. Those who *have* it already need to improve it with the right technique and exercise ; those who have it only to a small degree (nobody lacks it completely) can develop it and make it a forceful factor in their lives.

3

ALL—AN ART THAT CAN BE MASTERED

"Discipline," they say, "is an art not a science." "There is a time," they add, "to be easy, a time to be firm, even a time to be severe, a time to have a blind eye, a time to see the slightest dereliction of duty."

True, but there's the rub! The qeustion is: *when*? And *where, why* and *how*?

This study is but one of *these questions mainly.*

Thre is no doubt that great leaders intuitively or by conscious discrimination do the right thing at the right moment. But there are others who muddle along somehow, who would have been more successful if their conduct had been regulated by a conscious performance of the art—the *supreme art of human management.*

Here, let's clear the concept.

An 'art' is opposed to a 'science' in that whereas science 'knows', art 'does'; a science is a body of connected facts, an art is a set of directions; the facts of science are the same for all people, circumstances and occasions, the directions of art vary with the artist and the task.

The distinction is not always clear. Art is *often* based on science.

The distinction is commonly apprehended as that a science is concerned with theoretic truth, an art *with methods for effecting certain results.*

We are here concerned with that shade of the meaning of art which identifies it with *skill definitely and deliberately designed to produce an intended result.*

We shall see that discipline does not come of itself. It has to be *produced* and *kept up.* That indicates TECHNIQUE.

Technique, if there is any, can be picked up. By *anybody.* I except *none.* Some may do unusually well ; but all will do well enough.

So here is our starting point.

(1) *Develop a deep driving desire to bad, to become a good disciplinarian.* Without a desire, you will drift. Without an aim, you will shoot wide of the mark.

(2) Then *plan for achieving.* Begin at once.

The following pages will unfold the technique but there is a wider field for you to study.

Your study should include ;

(a) Lives and actions of famous men who led people successfully ; Alexander, Hannibal. Caesar, Napoleon, Nelson, Wellington, Hindenburg, Foch and other War heroes ; Washington, Lincoln, Roosevelt, Gladstone, Bismarck, Kemal and other

successful statesmen ; Rockefeller and others in the field of business.

(b) Present day leaders of men and their personality ; Roosevelt, Churchill, Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini, Gandhi, Jinnah, Nehru, Chiang Kaishek and others ; Andrew Carnegie, Henry Ford, Charles Schwab, George Eastman, and others of the big business.

(3) *Come in contact for inspiration with successful men of leadership and personality.* They are there among your seniors. They are there among your juniors. Also among your friends and acquaintances.

(4) *Remember and recall to mind the different examples cited in illustration of the various points in the make-up of a good disciplinarian and leader.* You will have a ready chart at the end of this book.

(5) *Mark improvement. Conquer one weak point after another till you have become a complete master of all technique.*

(6) *Experiment, implement, perfect.* We are only chalking out a course. You are not bound to keep within. Send me striking ideas. I shall be grateful.

4

THE RIGHT DISCIPLINARIAN, LEADER

Let us make a general statement. It is not a revealed maxim but one constructed out of observation and authoritative opinion.

The right disciplinarian, leader is one

(1) *who controls and develops himself* ;

(2) *who appears to have full confidence in himself* ;

(3) *who appears to be not in the least afraid of the pupils, subordinates or followers* ;

(4) *who appears to expect them to obey as a matter of course* ;

(5) *who issues orders and instructions in precisely the same spirit* ;

(6) *and in a manner and tone which appear to admit of no question* ;

(7) *who sets the pupils, subordinates or followers to jobs which are within their power ; and ensures progress and compliance by right tests and inspections* ;

(8) *who appreciates and deprecates work rendered according as it deserves and by appropriate*

handling is able to get the best out of pupils and subordinates ;

in short, who dovetails his activities into theirs in a calm or businesslike way and keeps them going.

Let us analyse and where possible illustrate. For, principles have to be *understood* first and then *applied*. *Application* without *understanding* is apt to be haphazard ; mere understanding without *exercise*, again, futile.

5

SELF-DISCIPLINE AND SELF-DEVELOPMENT

"(I) Who controls and develops himself"—

Of all the duties that a man must face, self-development comes first. It's the basic duty because successful performance of all one's other duties depends upon it. *Everyone* should make an effort to shape his character and develop it.

It is true that there is no end of 'bossing' of other people going on already. One may manage one's employees by 'yielding' or 'nagging', by 'being led' by them instead of leading them or by showing 'red eyes' and oneself doing little. If one is to make a catalogue of people having to run others without themselves deserving to do so, one would never complete it.

There are popular leaders, again, whe *have* big followings, who *sway* people's minds but who in their own lives and affairs are incredibly unsystematic, ill-controlled.

The point is not whether they have a fair amount of success or not but that they could have achieved much more with the reorganisation of

their own lives and affairs and by exploiting their own talents to the maximum advantage.

Then there are impediments to a fuller development of personality, which could be easily removed or mitigated,

Mrs. Bernard Shaw who died sometime ago had been so moved by the prevalence of such handicaps that she left a considerable part of her personal property with a Dublin bank to provide among other things "teaching, promotion and encouragement in Ireland of self-control, elocution, deportment, arts of personal contact, of social intercourse, and other arts of public, private, professional and business life.

She says in her will :

"In the course of my long life I have had many opportunities of observing the extent to which the most highly instructed and capable persons have their efficiency defeated and their influence limited for want of any organised instruction and training for personal contacts whether with individuals or popular audiences without which their knowledge is incommunicate (except through books) and how the authority which their abilities should give them is made derisory by their awkward manners and how their employment in positions for which they have valuable qualifications is made socially impossible by vulgarities of speech and other defects as easily corrigible as simple

illiteracy ; whereas my experience and observation have convinced me that lack af such training produces not only much social friction but grave pathological results which seem quite unconnected with it, and that social intercourse is a fine art with a technique which everybody can and should acquire."...

The idea is sound. But mere private charity and effort are not enough. There should be a department run by every nation for fitting up of individual citizens in the *art of living a fuller and more useful life.*

"The new management," says Tarbell, "employs not only science but humanity, and by humanity I do not mean merely or chiefly sympathy but rather a larger thing, the recognition that *all men, regardless of race, origin or experience have powers for greater things than have been believed.*"

The first item towards self-development is *having an aim.* Call it purpose, ambition or whatever else, one must have an aim in life. It may be to excel in your own profession, to lead in some sideline, to attain social, financial, intellectual or other forms of leadership.

The power which comes to men and women because they have achieved excellence in some calling is the power which gives the greatest satisfaction.

The field, as I have said before, is unlimited. Make a list of goals, and survey them ponderingly

Art ; knowledge and scholarship ; service ; exploration ; invention ; scientific, discovery ; authorship ; teaching ; social uplift ; politics ; business ; industrial organisation ; etc., etc.

Ask yourself :

Which of these is in line with my liking ? For which am I fitted by temperament ? For which am I likely to get the maximum opportunity environmentally ?

Thus and thus, in the privacy of the inner life, every man or woman should have the opportunity of a critical self-inspection. The outcome should be selection of a goal in life, which should give a greatly improved sense of direction to efforts.

We have said you should develop a desire for being a leader, a good disciplinarian. But this is only a general direction—more than that is necessary. In what line ? In which calling of life ? You must be *precise*.

'Ambition', in the English language, has somehow acquired a derogatory shade of meaning. It has been classed with pride and "other vain vices". The commonly understood meaning of 'ambition' is "an inordinate desire of power or eminence, often accompanied with illegal means to obtain the object." The other meaning, of course, is "a desire of preferment, honour, excellence or superiority."

It is in the latter sense that we should understand and have ambition. John May re-states the

same thing in a still more acceptable form :—"a strong desire for distinction of a normal healthy kind, informed by an ideal and aimed at a manner of living and towards an end in life which develops with the years and results in richer and fuller life for both the individual and the community in which he finds himself."

"Every ship must have a compass, every traveller a map. Without, either will probably follow a haphazard course, go round in circles, travel for days and end up, may be once more at the starting place."

A conscious ambition gives direction to life, it enables us to make good and economical use of our powers instead of wasting time and energy, veering about on our course, and it enables us to keep going at times when without a plan we should undoubtedly give up.

Behind all reasonable ambitions in life, there must be close consideration of the following threefold purpose in life :

(1) to employ ones natural talents

(2) in a way interesting and remunerative to oneself

(3) and also in a way to benefit the world of men and women at large.

GET A START

The large ambition of life should have short-term ones leading on to it. They should be step-

ping stones—in the nature of a preparation for bigger things.

It's no use being a 'star-gazer'—aiming *impractically high*. Aim at something attainable—get it and reach out for farther ones.

Your aim may be the editorship of the biggest paper of your land. Start working on the staff of it or of other papers and work your way up.

You may be aspiring after political leadership of your country. Start working in your small sphere, reorganise things, attain results.

You may have to plod but as long as you have the goal in consciousness you will be plodding, however slowly, *towards it*.

PLAN YOUR CAMPAIGN

You will realize that to fulfil your ambition, you will have to 'work.' Nothing worth while comes without being worked for.

"The fool thinks everything is easy and comes in for many rude awakenings ; the sluggard believes all is impossible, and undertakes nothing ; the good workman knows that great things are possible, and prudently, little by little, he accomplishes them."

Now, there is an art of 'working'. You have to master it.

ART OF WORKING

The amount of work that is being put out in the world is stupendously large. Except for a few lazy persons, everybody is doing something for subsistence, something for recreation, something for others. But much of the work is being done *half-heartedly, haphazard,—wastefully*. All this is unprofitable. Is there a better way ?

Of course there is.

As a disciplinarian, you will have to *get work out of others*. But it is only fair that you should get *work out of yourself first*,—which brings us to the problem of self-discipline.

For a long time 'work' was regarded by mankind as a disgrace and a Divine punishment. 'In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread', is said to have been ordained by God ! All manual work and much brain work had previously to be done by slaves. Grammarians and mathematicians were slaves.

Later, theorists tried to divide men into proletarians and bourgeois, the former being wage-earners and the latter those who lived on profits. The distinction is rather obscure.

We can dismiss such artifical division of human beings as useless.

The important thing is to remember that work is honourable and it can be well or badly done.

Before we proceed further, let's see what we mean by the word 'work'. The dictionary gives the meaning of work as: "to take pains in the accomplishment of a task".

But why need there be pains in every case ? Can't one take pleasure in work ? Let's see.

A carpenter works. He takes a shapeless mass of wood and turns it into something useful. What does the farmer do ? He ploughs up the earth and grows crops on it. He has replaced the jungle that used to grow wild by some valuable crop. What does the author do ? He puts ink down on blank paper and transcribes ideas out of his brain for the delectation, knowledge or use of other men. What does the student do ? He tries to possess himself of the knowledge acquired by others before him ; he sets his mind in order.

Thus, by 'working', one transforms or moves things and creatures in ways that will render them more useful or more beautiful ; one also studies the laws governing these transformations, fomulates them, applies them. This thought ought to give one satisfaction, a sense of happiness.

There is no doubt work that falls to one's share but is very boring or irksome. If one can *avoid it* and *engage in doing something more congenial*, one should do this. Failing, one should perform it as a duty and get the satisfaction out of a duty well-done. *And* one can always have something *in addition* in the congenial line as an

avocation to make up for the lack of pleasure in the allotted drudgery.

To work successfully you must be methodical—have a system.

SYSTEM

Programme, Plan, Procedure, Syllabus, Office Schedule ... these are more or less synonymous and cover almost the same ground.

"Only by a system ... that is, by something that will work automatically, precisely, accurately ... can one secure the fullest returns from his striving,"says a great captain of industry.

YOUR OWN PERSONAL SYSTEM

A disciplinarian or leader has got to organize his own *time* and *work* and those of his subordinates and followers to the best advantage. And he has to take in hand *himself first.*

Is his own time organized ? Does he himself work on a good system ? If he does not, it is almost sure his disciples or followers will also work haphazard. They will lack the benefit of an "example" from the superior.

America has taken the lead in the developing of personal and organizational efficiency. There is a growing literature on the ways and means.

Enoch Burton Gowin has written a remarkable book entitled "Developing Executive Abilitv"

His other work of the same type is : "The Executive and His Control of Men."

Other books in the line, to mention only a few, are :

Scientific Management—Thompson.

The Principles of Scientific Management—Taylor.

Office Management—Galloway.

The Administration of Industrial Enterprises—Jones.

Although these relate to business and industry, they will come of use in any field.

ORGANIZING TIME AND WORK

The following are questions one should ask oneself :

(1) Have I strictly named hours of business ?

One will allot a certain amount of time to such things as :

(a) Meals.

(b) Bed. Relaxation.

(c) Diversion. Exercise.

(d) Social Intercourse.

These are not really as unproductive as they may seem. One gets one's physical and mental energy from food, keeps it up by diversion, rest and social intercourse. These make one fitter for making the best use of the business hours.

Eight hours for work, eight hours for sleep and eight hours for food, drink, recreation, social intercourse is a good division of the twenty four hours of a day.

There must be discipline in work. Many complain that life is short but don't these make life even shorter by wasting time immeasurably ?

The amount of work that can be accomplished by a man who is at his desk during a given period regularly each day is miraculous. Consider the fact that a writer who produced only two pages a morning would, at the end of a normal life, have a number of volumes to his credit.

Bernard Shaw relates his own tale of organized labour and heroic self-discipline :

"The telephone episode occurred in 1879 ; and in that year I had done what every literary adventurer did in those days, and many do still. I had written a novel. My office training had left me with a habit of doing *something regularly* every day as a fundamental condition *of industry as distinguished from idleness.* I knew I was making no headway unless I was doing this, and that I should never produce a book in any other fashion. I bought supplies of white paper, demy size, by sixpennorths at a time ; folded it in quarto ; and *condemned myself to fill five pages of it a day, rain or shine, dull or inspired.* I had so much of the schoolboy and the clerk still in me that if my five pages ended in the middle of a sentence I did not finish it until next

day. On the other hand if I missed a day, I made up for it by doing a double task on the morrow. On this plan I produced five novels in five years."

One cannot but marvel at the spartan self-discipline and the self-imposed regime of hard labour! The reader will be intersted to know further that the fruits of such unmitigated labour were not so enthusiastically welcomed by the world either!

Hear him retail the sad story of his initial failure:

"I had no success as a novelist. I sent the five novels to all the publishers in London and some in America. Fifty or sixty refusals without a single acceptance forced me into a fierce self-sufficiency. I became undiscourageable, acquiring a superhuman insensitiveness to praise or blame which has been useful to me at times since, though at other times it has retarded my business affairs by making me indifferent to the publication and performances of my works, and even impatient of them as an unwelcome interruption to the labour of writing their successors."

Is it any wonder that such an undiscourageable writer should have ultimately succeeded with vengeance?

You can think of a fairly well-to-do lad humouring his hobby by writing and writing interminably but Shaw had to go on with the

labour without encouragement and in extreme penury all these years.

"It was my professional apprenticeship, doggedly suffered with all the diffidence and dissatisfaction of a learner with a very critical master, myself to wit, whom there was no pleasing and no evading, and persevered in to save my self-respect in a conditon of impecuniosity which, for two acute moments (I still recall them with a wry face), added broken boots and carefully hidden raggedness to cuffs whose edges were trimmed by the scissors, and a tall hat so limp with age that I had to wear it back-to-front to enable me to take it off without doubling up the brim."

Those who may think that writers are 'born' and industry is superfluous may revise their opinion. What stoic fortitude here ?

HOURS OF BUSINESS

(2) Am I best utilizing the hours so named ? Test yourself.

For two or three days keep an accurate record in minutes of the time spent from 11 A. M. to 5 P. M. or whatever your regular hours are. Do not jot down at the end of the day but make entries by minutes. Note down even the time you waste in waiting for unready files or unprepared subordinates, in mind wandering, in even worrying. Be honest with yourself. You are not going to

show this to anybody but seeking enlightenment yourself.

Then check up this showing critically and see if you cannot eliminate waste. You *can* and *must.*

If you haven't got enough work to fill up all the time usefully take on extra work—a hobby, something in a side line or so.

READING AND CONCENTRATING

(3) Am I keeping the best hours for professional studies and work requiring concentration ?

You should. I do not believe those that can do without any reading. They may be geniuses—but leave them alone.

One may think that Edison was an uncanny inventor who worked entirely from his brain. Hear him :

"When I want to discover something," he said, "I begin by reading up everything that has been done along that line in the past. I see what has been accomplished at great labor and expense in the past. I gather the many thousands of experiments as a starting point, and then I make thousands more."

In other words, Edison *read* and *thought.* He *borrowed ideas* and *evolved* them.

Imaginative leadership cannot help borrowing from other leaders.

A FEW MAXIMS

There are a few maxims which should be borne in mind and followed by all 'workers'. These may be said to constitute the 'art of working' :

1. *It should be the birthright of every man or woman to follow his or her own liking for work, provided this is not socially harmful.*

"Blessed is he who has found his work ; let him ask no other blessedness. He has a work, a life-purpose ; he has found it and will follow it."

It is however to be regretted that society is not so organized as always to allow this. The result is a medley, a muddle. If you have a fearless son, make him a soldier rather than a clerk tied to the desk. A vast portion of the work being performed in the world is grudged, attempted to be shirked or somehow ill-done because society is expecting it out of those that find *no pleasure* in it. It's only a few that do a thing well in spite their not liking it—out of a sheer sense of duty.

So the advice is : Try to switch over to some work that is both useful and pleasant. Look for the opportunity and it will come.

But if it doesn't come ! The reply is : follow the the next maxim.

2. *What is worth doing is worth doing well.*

You cannot get away from unpleasant work, say, because you have to subsist and nothing better is turning up ; or, some work has been imposed

upon you and it is unavoidable. What then ? As a man, you have to face it, take it as your share of burden which has got to be borne, consider it as a duty which has not only not to be shirked but which has got to be well-done. You will still get pleasure out of its performance if you take this manly view.

"Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might."

In any case love your work. It's silly to waste time over regrets as to what else might have suited you more admirably. We work well, because we think well and we 'feel' well.

There's a sense of conquest in overcoming obstacles, in surmounting difficulties, in facing unpleasant tasks squarely. There's manliness in all that.

To doubly ensure that you are not shirking or indulging in weakness, you should follow the next maxim :

3. *Of two equally urgent pieces of work, tackle the more difficult one first.*

There is aid to your mental strength in that. You are avoiding the line of least resistance which most people adopt. You are *drilling your will.*

Drill is a method that extends from simple and homely endeavour to correct a minor fault of conduct to the all-comprehensive regime of a soldier preparing for active service.

Everyday, on every occasion, do something which you would normally shirk or postpone, by way of strengthening your will.

See what happens. There are two pieces of work before you. You know you will have to do both. Still your nature may be favouring the easier one. You avoid the unpleasant one. But, mind you, not for long ! It will be there staring grimly at your face ! Whereas, when you were fresh and your energies were intact, you could have finished it much easier or quicker.

All unwholesome accummulation of work arise mostly out of such self-indulgence, such procrastination. You shirk one unpleasant item to-day, there is another left over to-morrow and by the end of the week you find items have multiplied ! There would be no such multiplication, no accummulated worry in the other case. You would feel lighter and happier.

So tackle the difficult one first and timely. You gain nothing by mere putting off. So, our next maxim would be :

4. *Whatever is worth doing is worth doing timely.*

There are people who do not act except on a third reminder. If they hope they would successfully evade a work by delaying, they are mean, unmanly ; they lack a sense of honour. These are not interested in the 'art of working' but are rather

looking for an 'art of shirking'. Which does not deserve a thought even, much less, discussion.

But there are well-meaning people who think they cannot cope with what they have to do and are only because of this in arrears. They are perhaps more or less procrastinators ··· lazy to the extent of not doing to-day what could be left over for to-morrow. But, alas, there will be more morrows and more things! And arrears have a queer habit of multiplying!

So argue with yourself: I am not so dishonest that I want to avoid this work before me which should be done to-day; I do not make things easier by doing or wanting to do it to-morrow; why, then, let me finish it today, *just now*.

Doing things punctually keeps off arrears, gives relief, makes one feel light in mind. So off with the old habit, start afresh with the present motto before you.

If you want to 'do' things timely, you must 'move' timely and have others do so. *Be a stickler for punctuality*.

PUNCTUALITY

Napoleon said, "Time is everything!" That was his motto.

In the truce with Sardinia, Napoleon found the other side trying to bargain. He took out his watch, named the hour at which he had decided to attack, and said they had better make tp their minds quickly. "I may lose battles", he said, "but

no one will ever see me lose minutes either by overconfidence or by sloth "

He may have *bluffed* successfully on this occasion but he always *did* make the best use of time His favourite phrases were "at the given time" ; "at the appointed hour ."

One very common cause of bad discipline in schools, colleges and offices is the bad example shown by teachers, professors and office-heads in the matter of punctuality. If one strolls into the class or office in a lazy or hasty way, several minutes after the bell has rung, one cannot expect the class or office to be in order. Late-comers should never be allowed to proceed to their seats without being checked.

TAKE CARE OF THE SPLIT MINUTES

I had been sick of 'untimely appearances' and 'timely disappearances'. I have seen all around taking time by the tail instead of by the 'forelock'. I have found men and women attending shows and parties with as little concern for time as much for the programme and the menu. I have noticed people assembling at leisure and *meeting* when they should have *dispersed.*

I have now found it pays to *follow the Railway time-table.* I am naming *minutes* in addition to hours and deliberately making them *rather odd.* I want subordinates to see me at 11. 17 ; friends to lunch with me at 13. 17 and meetings to take

place at 14. 09 hours. Of course, this, when *I* matter ; where I do not, I observe the hour notified, although often to the extent of finding empty chairs staring mockingly at me!

I assure you matters *have improved.*

Try the experiment just for fun and see. Of course, also show, by example, that you do yourself what you expect others to do.

If you don't notice any improvement, ask for refund of the price you paid. As you may have paid nothing or little, call me names instead. But do try—at least for a short while.

Visitors and interviewers on business should be encouraged to keep to appointments and talk to the point. Bores take a lot of time by mere gossipping. It's the duty of the worker to keep clear of time-wasters.

Goethe spoke wisely when he said, "It is absolutely necessary to break people of the habit of dropping on you unannounced. They insist on your concerning yourself with their affairs and their visits fill your mind with ideas foreign to your own. I myself do not need such ideas ; I have more than I can do to carry my own to their proper conclusion."

It was Goethe's habit when a bore forced his way into Goethe's house to put up a glacial manner. He refused to speak or shortened the conversation by uttering a few monosyllables.

Coleridge has aptly said, "If the idle are described as killing time, the methodical man may be justly said to call into life and moral being, while he makes it the distinct object, not only of his consciouness, but of conscience. He organizes the hours and gives them a soul : and by that, the very essence of which is to fleet and to have been, he communicates an imperishable and spiritual nature. Of the good and faithful servant, whose energies thus directed are thus methodized, it is less truly affirmed that he lives in time than that time lives in him. His days and months and years, as the stops and punctual marks in the record of duties performed, will survive the wreck of worlds, and remain extant when time itself shall be no more."

When there is time to spare among hours of recreation, one can leisurely exchange ideas but even then a good thing would be to *learn something*. Direct your conversation to useful channels ; profit by others' knowledge.

Classify the items of work according to '*urgency*' and attend to the more urgent first.

But keep track of the minor and less urgent items also.

The maxim for ensuring that would be :

5. *Take care of small matters and the big ones will take care of themselves.*

This is an old maxim ; I have only substituted 'pennies' and 'pounds'.

It is only likely that almost everybody will have times of stress, a rush on to the agenda for work. It is then that the daily habit will be disturbed and in the disturbance small items like loose small coins will be lost.

What's to be done ? Why ? Take care of them. Don't let them be lost.

Let me relate my system of ensuring this.

I have two notebooks. One is the desk-notebook, a pad of perforated detachable slips. It is indexed and the pages are numbered. Pages when full up can be taken off.

The other is a pocket notebook with a pencil attached.

My items for note in the former are various but one may safely have the following :

(i) Long-range plan.

One's goal in life. The intermediate stages to be reached also

Having these in writing is a much better way than vaguely and confusedly carrying these in the brain.

Everytime one sees these one gets stimulated to go ahead. They work like 'suggestions' and *are* in the nature of auto-suggestions.

(ii) Self-improvement programme.

This page can be devoted to tackling of major or minor defects of character. Bad habits can be also attacked.

The best thing is to catalogue these enemies on one side but to attack only one at a time. After having completely conquered one, one should place it on the list of 'vices vanquished' so that a watch can be kept that there be no relapse.

Those who want and can undertake a Spartan regime of rigorous self-drill can start from the most persistent or the worst vice but for the majority, going from the easier to the more difficult may be more profitable. The progress will be smoother.

Self-examination for such a purpose of cataloguing of defects or vices should be absolutely *unsparing*. Your notebook is your own, not for others' inspection. So why not be frank with yourself ?

Unpunctuality, procrastination, late rising, half-hearted work, drinking, smoking, etc., etc., can all come in for treatment.

This brings us to the topic of good and bad habits.

All of us must be knowing from personal experience and observation that any act or thought tends to be facilitated by repetition. We find the accustomed act easier to do and the familiar thought the one that first comes to the mind, as most congenial and least disturbing. By repeated recurrence, almost any manoeuvre, mental or physical, may become practically automatic so much so that we may even reach a stage when we perform it almost unconsciously.

Habits make things easier. Try to do something for the first time. Not so easy. Try again.

Not so difficult. After a good many repetitions you do it almost without thinking.

It's a great thing to be able to make or break a habit knowingly. We can change with the times, take on fresh habits.

The sure way of doing so is *to repeat the act or thought* consciously on every opportunity. You want to get up early from bed ? Set a time and alarm clock to go off at the time and make a supreme effort to get up with the alarm. You may find it very very inconvenient. Next morning it will be less so. At the end of a month, extremely easy. No magic ; no miracle. The very laws of nature themselves may, by a slight exercise of fancy, be regarded as examples of habit. The animal kingdom affords any number of examples.

Whereas good habits are an asset, bad ones are a great nuisance. They boss and bully you. You don't seem to be having a will of your own, as far as they go.

It is very difficult to get rid of a bad habit. It may have been formed unconsciously, it may have been picked up from bad company, but once it has taken roots it requires a grim struggle to get rid of it.

There are very many ways for getting rid of a bad habit. Supposing, you want to get rid of the habit of sleeping at daytime. How can you proceed ?

You can make a supreme effort of the will and say 'no' when you feel like it. A friend of mine gave up the persistent habit of smoking thus.

That is what some of the *sadhus* do by way of self-mortification or self-improvement.

You can consciously struggle with the prompting of the body to lie down and rest. You can walk about in the room to counteract the lethargy that may be coming over by force of the old habit.

A less irksome way is to be in office or on the move at the particular hour so that being 'otherwise busy' makes it easier to combat the prompting of the body. This will require less expenditure of will-energy.

A still milder way would be to engage yourself in an interesting game or conversation so that the interest keeps you awake. This is only substituting the pleasure of resting by that of interesting engagement.

Another way of combating the bad habit is by somehow making the act unpleasant. If your wife or friends can stealthily fill your case with rotten or bad-tasting cigarettes day after day, you may soon lose interest in smoking. One way of weaning children off mother's milk is to apply some harmless bitter drug on the nipples of the breast. In the case we were considering, viz., that of sleeping at daytime, I don't know if importing bugs into your bed would have the effect but those

won't be sparing you at night either ! And you can't find bugs that are only day-workers !

Any way, we have detailed the several ways in which bad habits can be attacked successfully Try any or many but off with the old useless habits ! And on with new helpful ones Habit is a good servant ; but a bad master. Let it serve you instead of yourself serving it.

The power to make and break habits is one that you must acquire. It's a step in the art of self-development and self-control.

The next items on your desk notebook can be :

(iii) Important official matters for immediate attention.

Of course, if you have an office.

All important and urgent matters can be jotted down so that none can be forgotten or missed in a hurry.

You can strike out items disposed of. The detachable sheets will admit of removal of pages and bringing forward of pending items on a fresh page.

(iv) Important official matters for early attention.

Important items that have to be given attention to in course of a few days can go in here.

It is to be understood that these items are to be carried here independently of the office taking

steps to dispose of them timely. That is, you are keeping an additional safeguard as against omission by yourself or your staff.

(v) Official matters or papers being or likely to be sat over by subordinates.

I have found it convenient to make notes here of matters that are indolently or knowingly being or likely to be delayed or suppressed by the staff. Somebody asks for information that has to be dug up from old files or obtained by correspondence. The clerk concerned feels lazy and lays the matter aside. Procrastination delays action still further. He then considers it safe to suppress the matter altogether, presuming it is impossible for you to remember it. If later challenged, he can put forth excuses of 'not having received' or 'having mislaid', etc. I am sorry to have to say this. I know that most of our subordinates *are* overworked and many are above reproach but the amount of shirking or muddling is also considerable.

Take the case of matters and papers dealt with by subordinates in an office. The boss orders, 'so and so to report'. Mr. so and so does not report. What then ?

The normal safeguard as against that is the 'Forward Diary' system. All papers till they are finally disposed of and filed should be required to be put up at stated intervals. Trusted assistants must do so. For example, your original order is going to A for a report or for action by 1. 6. 44.

You may order in addition, 'B.N.F.D for 2. 6. 44.' Which would mean, 'B will please note in Forward Diary and put up matter on 2. 6. 44'.

To keep your assistants alert and mindful, you may occasionally order, 'N. F. D for 2. 6. 44-16. 33. hours'. Which would mean that the matter will have to be put up on that date and at that queer hour !

Queer ? You may think so but have a try and see how your people get to know that suppression won't do. If all combine or conspire together to defeat your ends, you may be beaten no doubt. But such a contingency would rarely arise.

The need for this item arises even more for watching how verbal orders and requests are carried out or respected. People have an over-ready zeal in saying 'yes' and running off promising compliance Then they forget or care little, thinking the matter will be forgotten by the maker himself or an excuse of lapse of memory could always be made.

Make an entry : 'A asked to do so and so on such and such date. Has he done so ?' Then make sure what has happened.

You won't have long to jot down such trifles, for people all around will soon have known that you take jolly good care to remember things.

Caution : show example yourself. I never promise anything without jotting it down immediately in my pocket notebook which is a feeder record to the desk notebook.

(vi) Private matters for immediate attention.

(vii) Private matters for early attention.

These are to be entered up and seen to on the same lines.

(viii) Matters to be pursued.

One should be able intuitively to pick out what matters are likely to be delayed or avoided by others.

This is a most interesting point which amuses me so much. Just test for yourself.

Write for small articles to be sent you per V. P. P. to as many firms as you like. Write as shabbily as you like. The parcels will come promptly. Why ? Because it is the firms' interest to be selling to you.

Now, write to as many firms, again, asking for catalogues. Some will keep silent. The heads of the firms may be perfectly eager to send you catalogues for future orders but there will be some clerks not quite so eager to take the trouble !

Once again, write for information on particular points for which some old files will have to be dug up or some messenger may have to run about collecting it. See the fun. The number of defaulters will be greater. Why ? Because it is not so much to their interest as yours. Because the clerks have even less interest in obliging you. *And* because, perhaps, the heads do not

take care of such trifles nor are they interested in keeping up any notebooks as here advised.

I have to write to many quarters for various information, to several at the same time, but, oh, the trouble in eliciting responses! Reminders after reminders will go unheeded, registered letters will mean asking for 'a copy of the original which does not appear to have been received'! I do not accuse the heads except for the lack of a foolproof system of watch. The subordinates will, of course, plead 'busy-ness'!

Looking at it deeply, I understand. Others are not nearly as much interested in obliging me without prospect of an adequate recompense as I may be expecting! I realize that and make an entry in my notebook under this item. I am determined that I must *exact* a response, whether it be 'yes' or 'no'.

There are TWO GOLDEN MAXIMS to be remembered:

(a) *What is worth initiating is worth pursuing.*

It's no use dropping matters half-way. The only caution here is that they should not be pursued to unprofitable lengths.

I have seen people so devoid of a sense of proportion that they make a hobby of chasing trifles for nothing. Time cannot be unprofitably wasted.

If I get a 'no' from any quarter, I go for trying for 'yesses' from other quarters. If I make

an enemy I leave him for ten friends that I can make in the time I might lose in quarrelling with him.

(b) *Collect your own dues.*

The emphasis is on the word 'collect'. Thank those that pay you off unasked but make a point of pursuing the unwilling. Human nature is such that it welcomes 'being paid' but dislikes 'having to pay'.

When I want something from somebody and it is lawfully to be expected, I record it under the heading : 'Matters to be pursued'. Then it *h s to come.*

The next items in your notebook may be :

(ix) Borrowings.

I should put this before 'lendings' because honesty demands that we must discharge obligations first if we want others to discharge theirs in our favour.

I record whatever I have borrowed, money, books, trifles with particulars to enable me to pay back unasked. My creditors may be good men, may be feeling embarrassed in asking back or may be forgetting. But *I* shall *remember*.

(x) Lendings.

It is to your interest to keep track of these but many don't. They lose. It may be charity up to a certain extent but may soon prove injuriously expensive.

If you want to donate, do so initially. You will feel better. You will do a good turn. But you spoil the other person's habit by whetting his appetite to profit by your lapses. I shouldn't do this.

There may be other items on your notebook :

(xi) Nice words phrases, ideas, etc.

In spare-time reading of books, in conversation with friends and acquaintances you can find a storehouse of nice words and expressions, if you are literally bent. You can make use of these in your own writings or conversation. Encage them here till you have known them thoroughly.

Then there is the question of 'ideas'. These are flitting things ; they flash across and shoot off the horizon of the mind. Why not encage them also for profitable use ?

PICKING UP IDEAS : DEVELOPING THEM

Be open-minded, ready to receive a good idea from *whatever source it may come.*

There are people who consider themselves all-knowing. Be not one one among them.

Herbert Spencer said, "There is a principle which is a bar against information, which is proof against all arguments and which cannot fail to keep a man in everlasting ignorance, ...this principle is contempt to prior examination."

Talk with men who stimulate you. Absorb ideas relating to your profession or mission and never miss an opportunity for new ideas

Use an *'idea' file or the notebook.* Ideas may germinate within your mind ; they may flash across you ; they may arise out of your reading ; on somebody else's talks. Each other person is unique, however lowly. Welcome ideas. Jot them down. Meditate upon them.

There can be other items on your notebook :

(xii) Miscellaneous information : addresses ; number of policies, passbooks, watches, cars, etc.

(xiii) If you are an author, notes for later editions of your books, etc., can be jotted.

Remember when such pages are filled up, they can be easily detached and placed in suitable files. The notebook is a handy place in which to jot down temporarily.

And, along with this notebook, should go another small pocket notebook which can be carried about anywhere and be by your side when you are resting or sleeping. This is to serve the purpose of a feeder notebook to the desk one. In this one items should be jotted down aside of the other one. These can go down as they occur and be classified later.

When you have ordered somebody to do something, promised somebody something, picked up

some idea on wayside, you can just pause for a moment to scratch a word or two in.

All this may seem queer to those who do not care so very much for the small things or who have actually very little to attend to. But to one who is determined to organize his affairs, who wouldn't let things slip out of memory, the procedure would seem to be indispensable. It will, further, relieve memory from being overburdened with unmanageably varied details.

I call these notebooks one's Eternal Pending Lists! One will die with many items still on these but let one push on ahead so that the major items will have been successfully disposed of!

THE ART OF RESTING

A worker has to have his time for resting as well. The art of resting is a part of the art of working.

Both the body and the brain get tired and have to be given rest. Work and rest must alternate. The system of having week-ends is one of ensuring social hygiene.

The eight hours for food, recreation and rest can be usefully employed for conducing to a state of body and mind that will make for *better work.*

One cannot subsist without food. Food can be taken badly, it can consist of useless stuff, it may not nourish one so wholesomely. The manner of eating and drinking, the matter of the same, as

well as the time come under rules of hygiene, which have to be observed.

Taking regular exercises is a wholesome habit. When taken by oneself, one can have a regular programme. Games indoor and outdoor can be played enjoyingly in company. Games give a sense of pleasure and also one of healthy rivalry. They also habituate one to accepting defeats without resentment or ill-feeling.

Games, further, foster a respect for the rules. These rules are binding on all participants and all agree to obey them. When a habit of this kind has been adopted by a whole nation for several generations it tends to produce law-abiding citizens. The English say of a man who is dishonest in love, business or politics 'He isn't playing the game'. Civilization itself is man's adoption of socially useful conventions. Many of the rules of games played are arbitrary but they substitute courtesy for fear and sport for war, because they enable us to foresee the reactions of those with whom we play.

The theatre, cinema, art-gallery, sea-side, places of interest provide other restful and recreating escapes from drudgery or hard work. All have their places in the health and happiness of mankind.

Social intercourse further, makes for friendly meeting of other persons, in intimate exchange of conversation, developing of mutual likings. It makes friends and acquaintances, it brings other people in closer association.

Regular hours of sleep have to be observed. Eight hours is a liberal allowance. 'Early to bed and early to rise' is a wise maxim.' Getting up before sunrise is enjoined upon all Muslims to enable them to perform the morning prayers. Prayers or no prayers, the early-rising itself is healthful. The hours of the morning are the best for brain work

Some of the big men had a wonderful power of getting into sleep at will. Napoleon could switch his brain off and pass into sleep any time.

Many people worry in bed or start thinking hard. This keeps off sleep. The result is that, of the hours in bed, only a few are given to sleep and rest.

The best thing with which to bring on sleep is to relax both the body and the mind. Take up a comfortable bodily position from which you do not like turning over or moving any of the limbs. Then banish all worry and forget serious affairs. Of course, this is easier said than done !

Take the mind back to the distant past where the causes of the present worries did not exist. Think of happy past incidents.

Or, take sleeplessness as unimportant, take up a book or some work and wait calmly for the moment when weariness produces sleep.

Or, count up one, two, three up to a hundred and back again from hundred, ninetynine, ninety-

eight to one and begin again. This is a drudgery and sleep will readily come as a way of escape.

Here is one device I have found out by experiment myself. You will find your thoughts wandering afar. They will relate now to things near at hand, now flash across to a distant place, come back again, radiating variously. *You can by will dwell on near things, consciously bringing stray thoughts radiating to distant places back.* Try this for a fun. Concentrate thinking on things inside the room only. Then after sometime on things inside one half of the room only. Therafter limit thoughts to things on the bed only. You won't have to come to the pillow before you fall off to sleep !

The man who truly loves his work returns to it after a brief rest with a curious kind of voluptuousness. There is no retiring off. Creative work, especially, is the greatest adventure we can undertake, for it satisfies our own deepest instincts. It is lifelong adventure, too. When the worker sees the end of all work he sees the end of life.

So it is that we see artists dying in harness. Dickens was on with his last novel, Edwin Drood, when he died. Goethe's year of death saw the publication of the second part of his Faust. Michaelangelo was still working on the dome of St. Peter's when he came by the end of his life. Schubert left an unfinished symphony.

There is real pleasure in work truly loved. Work, work, sweet work—there's nothing like

work. A true artist or workman will imagine paradise not as a place where winged souls do little than sing or play the harps but rather as one where he can work everlastingly at some marvellous piece of art or work with a keen appetite and rapturous pleasure of infinite duration.

INELUENCING OTHERS

We have so far discussed the art of working. One can work by oneself. One can work in company. One's role may be one of a commissioned worker, of a dictated worker, of a self-imposed worker. It is just possible for one to work without heeding much for others but that happens so very rarely.

We work more in company than absolutely alone. We have to *yield* work ; we have to *exact* work. Even when we work in company of friends or equals, we are constantly *influenced* by others ; we *influence* others also.

Everybody *acts* on the minds of others in some way or other. Where one acts positively, impinging on minds of others *agreeably* or *influentially*, one is said to have a pleasant or forceful personality.

PERSONALITY

We have spoken of 'personality.' Refer to pages 34—41. We have to say a little more here also.

The term 'personality' is too variable in common usage to admit of pointed discussion. So let's try to probe it.

Among the various understandings which attach to the term, there are five which are usefully distinct.-corresponding to the philosophical, the physiological, the psycho-physical, the sociological and the psychiatric approaches to personality.

Philosophically conceived, personality may be defined as 'the subjective awareness of the self as distinct from other objects of observation.'

Physiologically : it may be considered as 'the individual human organism with emphasis on those aspects of behaviour which differentiate it from other human organisms'.

Psycho-physically : it may be described as 'referring to the human being conceived as a given totality, at any time, of physiological and psychological reaction systems, these two at times not admitting of sharp differentiation.'

Sociologically : it may be usefully conceived as 'connecting symbolically the totality of those aspects of behaviour which give meaning to an individual in society and differentiate him from other members each of whom embodies countless cultural patterns in a unique configuration.'

Psychiatrically : it may be regarded as 'equivalent to the individual abstracted from the

actual psycho-physical whole and conceived as a comparatively stable system of reactivity.'

All the different conceptions are useful but we are more concerned with the sociological concept which treats personality *as a gradually cumulative entity.*

Webster, in this sense, defines "Personality" as: "that which constitutes a person; that which distinguishes and characterises a person; a person, especially one of exceptional qualities."

As Ballard says, in ordinary speech we identify a man's "personality" more with his soul than with his body, more with his character than with his intellect, more with his natural gifts than with his acquired habits, more with his subtler and more intangible attributes than with those grosser qualities that lie on the surface. To put it in another form, *a man's 'personality' is the man himself as a social force—the man himself in so far as he moves the minds of other men, and is in turn moved by them. To impress* and *to be impressed*—these are the main functions of personality.

'To be a person'—that is in short having a 'personality'—a person, an individual, one who stands out from the crowd, one to be reckoned with.

Personality is the sumtotal of those characteristics which are in a peculiar sense the property of the individual. Everybody is possessed of 'a personality' and such personality is as different in

each case as is handwriting, fingerprint or manner of speech.

And surely too, everybody's personality strikes others differently, however slightly. One pleases, another irritates, yet another impresses all who come in contact.

The impression made by various persons varies. One comes across scores of people whom one doesn't bother to remember. There seems to be nothing in them that might draw others towards them. If they work for us, we don't value their work so much. If we work for them we don't feel impelled to do so very much.

There are crowds of them going about in the world. Not that they are miserable ; they are not felt ; they seem to be stunted weaklings. They are more passive than active. They are more led than they lead.

The regrettable fact isn't that they *are* so but the tragedy is that they *don't try to be any better*.

That they *are* so cannot perhaps be helped. We now know that every man or woman is what he or she is because of the assortment of ancestral chromosomes which was made in the germ cell which produced him or her. We know that there are these chromosomes which are supposed to produce all the qualities of body and soul It is by the various possible permutations that the varieties of character in children of the same parents are produced. It is in this way that a man or woman gets his or her pesonality.

That is the basis on which a personality is built up. But the building up may be infinitely various. There have been such astonishing transformations of personality that one does not know which to condemn as entirely incurable.

Personality is not a fixed assemblage of characteristics leaving nothing more to be done about them.

While much stress is laid on 'born personality,' especially in reference to a teacher or leader, and rightly too, we must remember that the word is now on its way towards becoming a 'catchword'. And one characteristic of a catchword is that it tends to lose its true meaning and to acquire adventitious ones.

As Ballard aptly argues, 'personality' is not of that heaven-born order that some teacher would have us accept. It is admittedly true that there are some born teachers, teachers who can control a class the first time and need no training. If there are they are very few ; they are certainly not enough to go round. The ordinary teacher needs a little coaching and instruction before he can begin at all. Even then he begins rather badly. But it is interesting to note that after a few years' experience he is indistinguishable from the so-called 'heaven-born class.

Then, the nature of personality that makes for efficiency is itself changing. There is the masterful personality—there is the sympathetic

personality. The teacher or leader *of the future* will be less concerned with impressing his own personality on his pupils or followers than with gaining as much insight as he can into *their* personalities and trying to find in each of them the lamp that illuminates and the spring that motivates.

Therein lies the art of *true leadership.*

We must remember that inherited qualities are clearly *only* the raw material of personality, this raw material is fashioned by environmental and formative influences in childhood, and there *still remains much that we can do* to mould, correct and amend, as we choose, later in life.

"Personality is a perennial, not an annual. It requires to be pruned, to be nurtured, and to be given opportunities for growth."

There can be nothing static about something that admits of development ; and so about personality. We are not born with it in the sense in which we are born with hands, arms, legs & feet. There are three stages roughly : the *rudimentary*, the *developing* and the *developed* personality, none of those stages, again, being fixed and immutable. For, none at any stage of one's life can claim to have done all that could be done about one's personality

Just as we can sharpen our sight, and hearing, strengthen muscles and bones, polish looks and

voice, we can improve our personality also. We can *handle our possessions with more dexterity—more distinctively.*

Our personality is a constant expression of : (a) our *habitual attitudes of mind* ; (b) our *forms of action.*

The mental factors are :

(a) self-confidence ; (b) fearlessness ; (c) must-obey-me-attitude.

These are going to be explained.

They are more in the nature of a psychological background. Subordinates do not see them but they *do* feel them.

Then would be the external forms contact. The manner and tone in which one contacts others. These can be improved as also the former mental group. And one must *improve* them to make tte best of one's life.

It is easier to contact with effect those who are direct subordinates ; it is more masterful to *contact influentially* friends and acquaintances and the *unattached public.* There is technique in both.

Now, before you proceed further, pause for a moment and try to focus your mind on being what your ambition is. Forget what you bave been, be fully conscious of what you wish to be. Have the wish so deep that it has roots in your soul. Hold fast to that wish, thinking it, living it, day after day, with all your heart and all your soul. You

will become your wish—nothing, nobody can prevent that.

It may not be smooth sailing all the time, I warn you. You may get setbacks, you may wander this way or that way at times but the goal in view will guide you aright.

In learning to drive an airplane one is told to keep one's eyes fixed on a point on the distant horizon. Then no matter how the ship is buffeted by cross winds or dropped into pockets, she still comes back to her steadfast course. So long as one keeps the goal in view it is not necessary to hold the ship stiff. It can be given free play to bounds and swerve joyously with the breeze.

Michael Angelo is said to have been once given a huge block of marble which no other sculptor had been able to use. He saw within a graceful figure, one of perfect proportion, of noble features. He visualized it all, form the curly locks to the poised feet planted firmly on the ground. We can imagine the rapturous enthusiasm of the artist in trying to free his vision from the encumbering stone. We can see the chisel steadily biting in, the white chips flying by, and little by little the vision taking form and standing out! Oh, what a thrill for the artist! He must have kept the vision all the time in front so that it might come true!

There must be some of us who as boys and girls had a certain dream or vision of what they

might be, there must be some who grew up with none but who have just started having one .. to all alike it's of great import to take themselves instantly in hand and steadily carve out the pattern which should be their ennobled selves. Out of the inchoate mass of thought and ideas, out of the welter of emotion and desire, stroke by stroke, they must cut the statues—sculptured portraits which will be recognized and remembered as themselves ! Isn't it more thrilling to be working on a lump of flesh and soul-stuff than on stone ?

6

SELF-CONFIDENCE

(2) "Appears to have full confidence in himself"

Note the word "appears".

Confidence begets confidence. If you have it—good. If you have it not or have it only to a poor extent, do not betray yourself. For, this will do good neither to yourself nor to your subordinates. They will trade on you.

Many a teacher quakes inwardly as he approaches the class but somehow he manages to conceal the mental state. He faces the class with *apparent* calm and equanimity and the pupils give way to him. He gives his instructions—carries on with the lesson—with either good or bad methods—but there he is. All goes well and the pupils recognize him as a genuine teacher.

First, then, a teacher must disabuse his mind of the false and destructive impression that he is not able to learn how to govern the class. Many a time, when a headmaster tells a teacher that the order in his class has not been as *he* would permit, the latter answers, "Yes sir, the boys wouldn't do so with you, but I can't keep them in

better order; they wouldn't listen to me." And why? Mainly because he acts on the supposition that he *cannot*. He should face the situation squarely, stop his lesson, and not allow another word to be said or thing to be done until order prevails The quietest possible exhibition of a firm will that *orde shall prevail* is often quite enough to cow down any spirit of insubordination.

Napoleon was masterly in his self-confidence. It conferred on him a natural dignity that impressed all around him. When he spoke, every one listened; when he was silent, his silence was respected.

Not every time, however, was he free from anxiety: "I have known myself to argue with myself over the thought concerning a battle and have contradicted myself—when I have drawn up a plan of battle, I am the most pusillanimous of men. I magnify the dangers and the incidents, am in a terrible state of excitement even when I seem cheerful; I am then like a girl who is going to have a baby".

Yet, when he commanded, he *appeared* as if the *end* had already been achieved. His men instantly felt the stir of achievement which looked already a fact accomplished.

... ...

The disciplinarian, be he a teacher or one of those numerous 'heads' we have counted, must not

only *appear* self-confident but *keep* this *up*. This requires determination, self-control, forethought. He must not be found out, or he will be discredited. If he can maintain poise, calm and dignity for *some* time, he can do so *longer* and then the proper attitude becomes to a certain extent habitual — almost a second nature.

"Assume a virtue", advised Shakespeare, "if you have it not".

An actor on the stage merely assumes his role for the performance but the audience *are* impressed.

Doubt always makes success difficult to attain by paralyzing endeavour. No man *will* try hard when he has no hope of succeeding. Let a man act as if certain of success and this will intensify exertion and facilitate attainment. Shakespeare has put it forcefully when he makes Lady Macbeth say to her faltering husband :

"But screw your courage to the sticking-place,
And we'll not fail."

But remember we are not speaking of conceit. Confidence is not *vanity*, conceit *is*.

The characteristic I referred to is a *quiet self-possession ; with presence of mind ; ready for whatever may happen ; never fearful because never surprised ; not afraid to grapple with what opposes it because it knows its power.*

A confident man says, "I am grateful for the position given me, I am sure I can manage it well—I shall do so to the best of my ability."

A conceited man says, "I am too big for this small job. I can manage the highest in my line—but look—third-rate men, to my exclusion, are trying it."

... ...

It is rarely that anyone is put all at once in command over millions We command a small group and then we command bigger and bigger ones. Our self confidence grows it should—as the sphere of action grows

It is a right procedure in the case of human affairs. The lieutenant rises to be a general –the petty leader to be a bigger one.

So it is with things we learn to do. When we learn to cycle, to ride, to drive, to shoot or to do anything like this, we *acquire* confidence by and by. Fortunately, this happens to all except a negligible few who, perhaps, for reasons of loss of vigour, nerves, or of decay or senility, may deteriorate.

Lift your head up. If you have a few superiors you have a host who are inferior to you. When you are among others, think you have as much right to be there and to be heard as others. Rate yourself high and others will do so also.

Great men have usually had great confidence in themselves. Julius Caesar said to his pilot who was frightened by a storm, "Fear not, thou bearest Caesar and his good fortunes." Kepler cared very

little if his contemporaries read his book or not—"I may well wait a century for a reader since God waited 6000 years for an observer like myself." Napoleon felt confident that that bullet which would kill him had not yet been cast!

Marshal Foch, the victor of the last great war, declared that he had only one virtue: never despairing.

Remember 'you're young (age does not matter) and you're brave and you're bright' and just draw on your grit; it's so easy to quit:

It's the keeping-your-chin-up that's hard.

Recite the following; get it by heart. You will find it bracing.

"If you *think* you are beaten, you are,
If you *think* you dare not, you don't
If you like to win, but you *think* you can't
It is almost certain you won't.
"If you *think* you'll lose, your'e lost
For out of the world we find,
Success begins with a fellow's will—
It's all in the *state of mind.*
"If you *think* you are outclassed, you are,
you've got to *think* high to rise,
You've got to be *sure of yourself* before
You can ever win a prize.
"Life's battles don't always go
To the stronger or faster man,
But soon or late the man who wins
Is the man *who thinks he can.*"

Note the emphasis on the words "*think*" and "*can*". The *state of mind* matters a great deal.

"Integrity, poise, straightforwardness, confidence, the upward look, the learning attitude, the sense of humour, capacity for detachment—such are the hall marks of outstanding individuals A ready adaptation to all situations ; a full, entire response under all conditions ; an unwavering attitude, with unerring discrimination—such are the qualities of the strong".

We shall analyse many of these qualities

Meanwhile, let us realize that the human personality is a storehouse of such vast abilities but so little of these is actually in evidence that it is probable that if every man used to the maximum the abilities he possesses, the world would be full of Caesars and Napoleons !

7

FEARLESSNESS

(3) "Who appears to be not in the least afraid of the pupils, subordinates or followers ;"

Again, note the word 'appears'.

'FEAR-COMPLEX'

The emotion of 'fear', a most important one, has been our most ancient enemy. Primitive

humanity was unprotected against more powerful animals and stood in awe in presence of lightning, thunder and other manifestations of nature. Children in all ages and places inherit 'fear'.

We may fear for ourselves, for others ; something in this world, something in the next The zone of phobia widens and shrinks for different men and men are afraid of such diverse things as poverty, darkness, microbes, mice, dogs, lightning, insomnia, solitude, marriage accident, ghosts !

There are healthy fears—those that save us from dangers, pitfalls and from repetition of injurious acts. There are others—unhealthy and unwholesome. These dwarf our personality and prevent us from making the best of ourselves.

The second type of fear is only a pale reflection of danger, a sort of anticipation of failure, disapproval, risk. It acts as an inhibitor, deters from action or paralyzes effort It is a vague dread which may be directed in a thousand different directions.

Demons and evil spirits are not so much feared to-day as Mrs. Grundy. We are so afraid of what our neighbours will say that we do not dare to say what we think or do what we choose.

The man who is controlled by fear most of the time must yield in virtue and reputation to the man who does right because he wants to do so, and refrains from wrong because it disgusts himself.

We shall hope to see mankind freed increasingly from the domination of those needless fears by which pleasure is marred, action delayed, effort frustrated.

Fear also means a "sense of being unequal to a task." When such an attitude becomes habitual and persistent, we have what is known as:

"INFERIORITY COMPLEX"

We hear a lot now of 'inferiority complexes'! It is applied freely to cases of 'others' (not ourselves !). Let's clear up the concept

By inferiority complex we mean that *an individual is possessed of a feeling of inferiority in relation to his accomplishments, mental and physical, as compared to those of his fellow beings.* This does not mean that he produces inferior work.

Whenever the ordinary workman compares the result of his effort with the work of an expert in the field, the effect is bound to be discouraging. The perfect is always a discouragement to the good and the good to the ordinary, but that does not mean that the ordinary worker will not do his best or take legitimate pride in his best. Nor is there any reason why others should brand him as necessarily possessing an "inferiority complex."

We should rather limit the term to only those cases in which the conviction of second-rate-ness is *so acute that it actually prevents the doing of useful work.*

Such an attitude is baneful. It looks forward to failure and frustration It is a great handicap, thwarting. It is often the result of "repressive" training in early years or of lax bringing up.

MAKE THE CHILD INDEPENDENT

If you are a parent or tutor, start instilling self-reliance and fearlessness among children when they are yet young

When a child is encouraged and expected by wise parents and guardians to *think things out for himself*, to *do things for himself*, to *feed and dress himself*, to *make his own amusement*, the child's character gradually develops along the line of self-reliance. He (or she) grows up with a habit of facing difficulties, able to trust and willing to act upon his (or her) own judgment.

Foolish and indulgent as well as domineering parents spoil a child the other way. They keep the little one dependent on them —want to play too big a part in the little one's life. They like to prescribe things or help him too much.

Such a child will probably grow into a man or woman of a type one often meets —lacking initiative; lacking self-confidence and self-reliance; always needing some one to lean upon; shirking responsibility; unfit for it—all his life.

Bodily defects also affect minds prejudicially. The cripple, the hunchback, the man of diminutive

stature, the deaf and dumb—are all conscious of their defects and feel a sort of "dragging down" effect.

TURN THE COMLEX TO GOOD ACCOUNT

How if you have the dreaded complex already? The answer is: *turn it to good account*.

Many great people did.

Demosthenes, as a youth, stammered and suffered from the drawbacks that go with this defect. He was mimicked by some; jeered at by others. But he attacked the drawback and conquered it.

Napoleon was disappointed at his own small stature and protested against the limitation. He craved distinction and leadership. He obtained both.

You can accept the horrid fact and get over it. You can excel in some other way and balance off favourably. If you lack looks, perfect your manners. If you are weak in examinations, win 'blues' in athletics. You will win leadership in some field out of many that are open to mankind.

Think how many men and women in the world have ranked high in spite of some handicap or other.

We have spoken of Napoleon's short stature.

Roosevelt suffered from infantile paralysis as a youth but has become one of the world's leading statesmen. He has broken a tradition and been elected President for a third term.

Beethoven, the greatest of all European composers, was afflicted with deafness at the age of thirty-two His deafness gradually became complete, yet he wrote his greatest pieces of music after he turned deaf.

You think of poverty ?

Oh, that has been the lot of hosts. Edison hawked newspapers about, Henry Ford started penniless, Bernard Shaw went about in rags—writing and being rejected H. G. Wells clerked in a dry-goods store, sweeping and slaving.

Jamshedji Tata a Parsi boy, used to be seen in Calcutta, hawking bangles. He built up the biggest steel factory in India.

You think of 'lowly parentage'—so-called ?

Look at world's front-rank personalities—Napoleon, a common Corsican, shook the world in his time. Lloyd George, a cobbler's son, proved to be the saviour of Democracy in the last great war of 1914—18. Mussolini, a blacksmith by birth reshaped Italy. Hitler's father was a petty officer and himself worked as a house-painter. Stalin came of an unknown family of Georgia.

Are your looks unimpressive ?

Think of Abraham Lincoln. His wife didn't like the way his huge ears stood at right angles from his head and even told him that his nose wasn't straight, his lower lip stuck out and his feet

and hands were too large whereas his head was too small.

General Grant was very unimpressive. Andrew Carnegie in his Autobiography speaks of the General as follows :—

"When in Washington I had not met General Grant, because he was in the west up to the time of my leaving, but on a journey to and from Washington he stopped at Pittsburgh to make the necessary arrangements for his removal to the East. I met him on the line upon both occasions and took him to dine with me in Pittsburgh. There were no dining-cars then. He was the most ordinary-looking man of high position I had ever met and the last that one would select at first glance as a remarkable man. I remember that Secretary of War Stanton said that when he visited the armies in the West, General Grant and his staff entered his car ; he looked at them, one after the other, as they entered and seeing General Grant, said to himself, 'Well, I do not know which is General Grant, but there is one that cannot be.' Yet this was he ...

"If ever a man was without the slightest trace of affectation, Grant was that man. Even Lincoln did not surpass him in that ; but Grant was a quiet slow man while Lincoln was always alive and in motion."

Even if his personality was not really striking or impressive, he made the best of himself. He not only rose to be the Commander-in-chief of all

the armies of the United States and defeated Lee of the Confederate army, but also became the President of the U. S. A. and filled that office, the highest in the U. S. A., for two terms, that is the longest then allowed to any one man !

Gandhi who is so warmly venerated all over India and respected so widely abroad is nicknamed a 'naked fakir.' His looks are by no means so very attractive but by force of will he holds sway over others' minds.

Sir P. C Roy perhaps lacked handsome looks but didn't he make the best of himself ? His has been a life illustrating fully the adage, "handsome is that handsome does".

You think lack of University degrees should keep you down ?

By no means.

Think of the myriads of towering personalities that never crossed the gates of a college.

Muhammad and Akbar were illiterate almost literally but think how much they achieved !

Shakespeare, Lincoln, Franklin, Edison, Ford —all went without University laurels.

Churchill speaks the finest English, Rabindra Nath wrote most illuminatingly, Hitler is almost illiterate and Stalin had little schooling.

TRACE YOUR FEAR TO ITS ORIGIN

Sometimes a man is haunted by fears he cannot understand why. As he goes down the years

he probably lands up with the memory of a harsh father bossing cruelly over him in the period of helpless childhood. He had been humbled, thwarted, curbed. The anguish of frustration has lingered in the deep layers on the subconscious mind. The father is no more but others in authority, ever so amiable, strike the same sense of fear and awe in him.

What should he do ?

If he traces his fear to its origin, he can easily shake it off. The circumstances are there no more. The father is gone, he has come of age, others have little of the parental authority over him. Why then should he feel cowed down at all ?

Apply the same formula to other fears

Suppose you are afraid of darkness. Perhaps your nurse or mother shook you by the cradle and tried to curb your naughtiness by injecting a dose of fear about some demons lurking in the dark yard Some awful bogey was pointed out to your credulous mind.

You do not believe in demons any longer. Why then should you be afraid of the dark ? Sometimes, of course, such fear is so deep-roted that only psycho-analytical treatment can get at it. It is wise to undergo a course in that case.

Suggestion can go a long way towards cure. Certain practitioners advise that any effort on the part of the victim to suggest to himself that he is not afraid of the dark, only intensifies his fear by

constantly reminding him of his affliction. He can usefully replace the fear reaction by a reaction involving some other reaction He may say to himself, "It is nice to sit in the dark. I love to be alone in the dark." Darkness will then become the stimulus for a pleasant emotion.

CHALLENGE YOUR FEAR

The strong man when he finds himself checked by unreasonable fears disciplines himself in such a fashion that the reaction is reconditioned. There are men and women who *will do* what they are afraid to do, provided the fear is unfounded. If you are afraid of water, take to swimming and diving as a hobby of pride. If you are afraid of speaking in public, make it a rule to address all meetings affording an opportunity to do so.

REASON ABOUT YOUR FEAR

When you are obsessed by fears, throw a direct challenge to them. Investigate them. Are they healthy ?

If you fear others, ask why you should do so.

There is no reason why we *should be* afraid of our pupils or subordinates.

In the first place, we are not working exclusively on our own. We exclude cases of the supreme leaders who profess to lead entire nations and whose success or failure will alter the course of history.

These people have reason to be worried – 'uneasy lies the head that wears a crown". They are worried as to the future course of events, as to the spirit in which their people will serve them, as to the way in which their utterances and actions will react on the watchful world.

Napoleon was highly sensitive to public opinion in France. He was serving his own ambition and his tools were men. If these failed him, he was gone. He had no superior to whom he could or would apply for help and guidance. Such is also the case with a few present-day leaders in whose hands circumstances have left the fates of millions.

We are not speaking of *these* persons here—we are speaking of the lesser people—the numerous intermediaries that we ourselves are.

We are not expected to rule exclusively - our powers are constitutionally limited. We are expected to see that our wards and subordinates are led well in the small range of activity that is our sphere. We are not the sole shapers of policy which we take from our seniors and superiors, in our turn. Our responsibility thus narrows down—almost to the mere process of guiding and directing subordinates. And what reason is there for our being afraid of them ?

In the second place, we can look forward to help and guidance from above. As long as we are straight, our seniors will ungrudgingly support us. As against recalcitrant subordinates, we

have a powerful combine of seniors and superiors, finally merging in government itself or the management, the directorate or other high command from which we all derive authority. With such formidable power behind us, what need is there for fear or nervousness ?

In the third place, our subordinates, at any rate the intermediaries, themselves want to remain at peace with one another. They themselves look to us for support and succour. How many, oh, how many look at us wistfully for that spirit of approval which we ourselves seek from above !

AIDS TO MENTAL STRENGTH

A *clear conscience* is an unfailing source of mental strength.

Here are a few hints gleaned from a magazine article* on Discipline. The annotations are mine from stock.

(a) "You must be absolutely straight ; your men must know that your word can be absolutely relied upon."

If this is not the case, your subordinates will suspect your promises and make light of your threats. They will lose confidence in your ability and readiness to support a right cause. If they are let down the chances *are* they will let *you* down.

* Discipline—Mr. A. D. Gordon, C. I. E. I. P., Bengal Police Magazine. Vol—II No. 4.

(b) 'You must be fair to all alike—have no favourites".

This is a precious point. I shall add,—"no victims either."

Napoleon was a stickler for equality in the Army. He remained so until the end of his career. No one would be promoted unless he *deserved* promotion. Discipline, to him, could tolerate no exception.

A wounded commander-in-chief, at Eylau, where there were heavy casualties, was going to receive the prior attention of the surgeon. He forbade the surgeon : "Your business is to attend to all the wounded and not anyone in particular."

That was what Nepoleon wished done in cases of *others*. Would you like a nobler example ?

In a desperate action with the French Navy, Nelson received a severe wound on the head from a piece of langridge shot. Captain Berry caught him in his arms as he was falling. The terrible effusion of blood led others to think the wound was mortal and Nelson himself feared so. A large flap of skin from the forehead, cut from the bone, had fallen over one eye, the other being blind. He was in total darkness. When he was carried down, the Surgeon in the midst of a scene during action hardly conceivable—with a natural and pardonable eagerness, quitted the poor fellow under his hands, so that he might attend the admiral

instantly. "No !" said Nelson, "I will take my turn with my brave fellows." He would not even suffer his own wound to be examined till every man who had been previously wounded was properly attended to.

Isn't this magnificent ?

Nevertheless, even Napoleon succumbed to weakness in relation to his relatives. He placed them where *he* and *they* liked.

Yes, but nobody *is* perfect. That he kept up his just attitude most of the time *is* magnificent.

(c) "Your orders must be founded on principle, that is to say, they must be such that if a man refuses to obey them you can be supported up to the hilt."

Our powers are limited as human powers have need to be. It is the *just* exercise of these powers that is expected of us.

The High Courts have supreme judicial powers. But have you noticed how often a Judge asks an advocate, "Have I powers to intervene ? Have I powers to interfere ?"

There *are* people who shoot at first sight and think later ; who are disposed to hang first and try afterwards. Right executive mood—they call it.

Yes, but then there is the world about to question you and it is worth while remembering

your subordinates have an uncanny disposition for going up 'on appeal'. And you are *not* Almighty. It will soothe you very little to find that you have acted in haste to repent at leisure.

Inconsiderate action does *not* conduce to good discipline.

(d) You should never place yourself under obligation of your subordinates.

If you want to deal with all fairly you must act independently. The man that obliges you to-day will expect a favour to-morrow. And it will be extremely embarrasing for you to deny it.

Don't borrow money : don't ask for anything you cannot repay at once without putting yourself under an obligation.

CAST OUT WORRY

Finally, there is one form of fear which we must all cast out, if we are to get the most out of the adventure of living. This is 'worry.'

We worry about what will happen in future. Let the future take care of itself.

We must enjoy every minute of our lives. We shall hope for the best and if the worst comes about, we shall grapple with it when called upon. It's no use filling up our waking minutes with sombre pictures of what may or may not happen.

The one principal cause why people toss on the bed and suffer from sleeplessness is worry.

Something has been done and bad consequences are imagined to be following. Something has to be done and failure or obstacles are visualized. Something has happened far away but is conjectured to be affecting one's own affairs adversely !

What's to be done ?

Make a heroic attempt to cast out worry. Well, if something unfortunate does come along, we shall try to mend it or endure it as an accident. Worse accidents must be happening by the score every day.

REASON ABOUT YOUR WORRY

Now, suppose you spend an hour thinking unpleasantly over what *may* befall you. What then ? Have you averted it ? And then if it doesn't come about ?

The best antidote to worry is disciplining the mind. The mind *will have* something to turn over in it. Well, then, why not engage it profitably ?

Turn it on to some work. A busy mind will keep off worries.

If there is nothing on hand, put the mind itself to work. Let it be engaged purposefully. Engage it on solving some problem.

Failing even that, why not let it dwell on pleasant memories past or anticipated ?

It is probably a simple matter to arouse rage or fear, disgust or aversion. If you want to get

into rage, you have only to think of the insults and injuries received by you at the hands of others. There will be plenty to recall.

This is an art practised by the pessimist, by the people who are obsessed with the 'persecution-mania.'

Like Mrs. Gummidge portrayed by Dickens, they say, "Yes yes, it is, I know what I am. I know that I am a lone lorn creetur', and not only that everythink goes contrairy with me, but that I go contrairy with everybody."

If one wants to feel happy one has to recall in mind the complimentary remarks others have made, the little kindnesses they have shown, the happy strokes of luck. These will be many, too.

Isn't this a better thing to do ?

Let's dilate a little upon this fascinating subject of attention and mental control.

ATTENTOIN AND MENTAL CCNTROL

We know that when a boy turns his mind from the thrills of a ball game to study his geometry, he is conscious of a decided effort and strain and a feeling of unpleasantness. After a little while, however, he manages to forget the game.

The mind is thus an instrument upon which outside stimuli of all sorts can play and produce different feelings. When a man's mind is vacant and not subject to some violent stimulus, such as

that of an empty stomach, the feelings that will stir him at any moment depend upon what holds his attention at the time. These can usually be altered when his attention is shifted to something else.

A man cannot experience feelings outside his sphere of attention, for the rest of the world is dead to him for the moment. It does, however, happen that when his feelings have been deeply aroused, he cannot turn his attention elsewhere. But with a little struggle this *is* possible.

You are cursing your servant like hell. Suddenly your sweetheart appears. Your rage melts away. If this can happen at her physical appearance, you can possibly recall her to mind and contemplate how sweet-tempered she is !

Here is an opportunity for any kind of emotion you may wish. You are lying on bed and tossing over. You have to turn your mind to the war and be obsessed with worry and anxiety. To the stock-market and be discouraged. To the insulting letters you have received to get into rage.

The happy people in the world are those who have learned to keep their minds on the things they really want—on the positive and happy side of life rather on the negative and unhappy side of it.

It is really astonishing how far the emotions can be controlled by the very simple expedient of one *looking where one chooses to look.* It is more surprising that this power is so little used.

Let's retail a story credited to the grand *Pir* Abdul Quader Jilani who is known all over the Muslim world. He was one day preaching to his disciples when a messenger arrived with the news that all his boats out with merchandise have been lost in a storm. He not only bore the bad news but cried, 'Thank God.' He went on preaching in the same mood. Sometime later, another messenger ran in to say that the boats were not his but of somebody else and that his own boats ran into safe anchor. He displayed the same mood and cried, 'Thank God.'

Now, you must be curious to know why the *Pir* had uttered exactly the same words on both the occasions! So were his disciples who asked him point-blank.

'Look here,' he is said to have explained, 'I have said so only to offer thanks to God who has rendered my mind so unperturbed. On both the occasions, I looked in and found that my mind hadn't moved either this way or that by even a hair-breadth.'

Isn't that sort of a mind worth cultivating ?

Undoubtedly such mastery of the mind involves effort and discipline but *we are* here to encourage effort.

And isn't the result *worth* achieving ?

8

"OBEY-ME"—ATTITUDE

Let us take up clause (4) now.

(4) "Who appears to expect them to obey as a matter of course."

Why should you not ? If you are placed in charge, you *are* expected to be obeyed !

Yes, but do you *yourself* expect to be obeyed ? That is the question.

Never assume that you will be disobeyed. To say, 'If he does not do this I will ..' is an infallible sign of weakness. Obedience is to be *assumed.*

Your frame of mind should be positive. Have no doubts about loyalty due.

There are no more treacherous and dangerous animals than snakes. You and I would start and shake and shiver at the very sight of them. At least I would.

But don't you see thousands of illiterate men and women all over India catching and taming them and handling them almost like playthings ?

All their so-called charms and incantations are but nonsense rhymes. They are as meaningless and ineffective as P. R. B. Rule No. 999 to the snakes !

Yet, these men and women succeed in the dangerous game by sheer courage and will. Of course, there is a technique to set beside.

So depend on yourself. If you want a charm or incantation to back your mind up. mutter or utter : "They *shall* obey me, even as I obey my superiors."

That is the psychological back-ground. Then there is technique beside :

OBEDIENCE CAN BE PRODUCED.

(a) Obedience has to be produced and maintained.

It does not come of itself. Our ego asserts itself by being 'self-regarding'.

We are broken into obeying by our parents, teachers and then society—ever so gradually. But men and women still retain their termagancy and it is by further drill and training that they are smoothed out.

Take ten assorted men from anywhere and ask them to do a thing. The reactions will be amazingly various. Take ten drilled men and order them around,—right, left, about—they carry out smoothly without question.

I opened this discussion with my experience with a legion of villagers trying to fight one leopard ! I *was* disappointed.

Take the movements of drilled men. Apparently unmeaning but how harmonious, unobstructive !

Like everything else, the disposition to obedience has to be instilled by and by. If you force things all at once, the chances are they will go awry and snap. Hence the apparently unmeaning and laborious movements of drill.

A spirit of obedience is inculcated by this means. In the military or the police, drill is looked upon as indispensable. And so it *is*.

AIMS AND OBJECTS OF DRILLING

The primary aims and objects of drilling are :

(i) Physical training of the body.

(ii) Practical training in movements on parade.

(iii) Development of a manly and soldierly spirit.

(iv) Instilling into men the use and advantage of loyalty, co-operation and team-work.

The use and advantage of drill will include : *enabling the man to bear fatigue, privation and danger cheerfully, imbuing him with a sense of honour and responsibility, giving him confidence in himself and trust in and respect for his commanders and superiors,*

increasing his powers of initiative, self-respect, self-confidence and self-restraint. of obeying all orders, or, in the absence of orders, of acting promptly and to the best of his ability and finally teaching him to work in combination with his comrades. in order to attain any given object.

No wonder drilled men do achieve so much.

... ...

The mere giving of life for the country may be prompted by the love for one's mother-country but only drilled and disciplined men can *effectively* handle the enemy. That merely a vast population all with the best intentions can do little in the face of disciplined and determined forces of the enemy is being demonstrated all over at this very minute.

The magnificent performances of soldiers doing or dying in the various fields in the greatest war now raging have been made possible only by training in discipline, drill forming the main part.

And it's not in the killing hordes only that drill and discipline will come of use all the time.

Drill is rightly spreading in schools and colleges, among boys and girls. Social services which include the so-called public services, the fire fighting works, the salvation army, the ambulance organisations and allied relief and rescue works—all are going in for it. Boy scouts and girl guides have it, both as an amusement and a training.

Obedience which is thus produced under routine and simpler conditions finally operates in times of urgency and stress.

Notice any crowd in fright and flight trampling upon the weaker members and stumbling against one another in confusion.

As against this, the epic picture of a ship going down under their feet when disciplined men of the Navy or other forces stand to attention singing apparently their last songs or saying their last prayers *is* magnificent.

Here is a great story told by Sir Walter Windham in a book published by Hutchinson : Waves, Wheels, Wings.

In January, 1897, the Warren Hastings was carrying the 1st Battalion of the King's Royal Rifles to Bombay. The Warren Hastings was having a very rough weather. Suddenly there happened a disastrous accident—afterwards described at an inquiry as an act of God.

A volcano eruption occurred on the Island of Re-union which deflected the ship's compasses. By the course set, the ship would have passed some eight miles or so from the island on its run to Bombay.

The Warren Hastings headed straight for the rocks in the dark night and inevitably struck and fell over on her side. She was badly poised and might roll over completely and sink.

Commander Sir Walter Windham, who was on it relates, "Absolute discipline prevailed among troops and crew. Bugles sounded for the men to assemble, and they formed up on the slanting troop decks without the slightest wavering or indecision, standing, steady as a rock, in utter darkness."

He then managed, with another officer, to climb down to the rocks and rig up a canvas air-chute down which women and children were slid to safety.

All the women and children had thus been off. Next day, the position of the ship changed. Troops who could swim were ordered to make for the shore.

Officers and men worked furiously in the threatening waters, hauling men to safety with ropes, swimming to save others drowning in the strong surf.

Acts of selfless courage in those dark waters were many. It was found that only two out of the 1,230 souls aboard had been lost.

It would have been a terrible tragedy if magnificent courage had not prevailed, Commander Windham commented.

It is said that the Kaiser gave orders in 1914 that it was to be told to all ranks of the German Army to emphasize what discipline really means.

And it does deserve to be relayed all over.

... ...

Take a test elsewhere. You may be in an office with clerks strewed all about and desperately eager to help you with the latest correction slips and the obscurest footnotes. Call a handful of them and say, "Will you each please look up the Encyclopædia Britannica and make me a precis of the life of Foratio ?"

Will they say, "All right, Sir" ?

I bet they will.

But will they proceed to the task at once ?

No, not these haggling bundle. They will hold a noisy conference :

Which Encyclopædia did he say ? Which volume ? Which part of the world does the man (or woman !) come from ? What will he do about it ? Does the I. B. contemplate action against Foratio's descendants ? Shall we have to make out a case for gratuity for his legal heirs ? Why don't you go and find the name ? And pray why not you ?...

Why, oh why all this evading inquisitiveness and useless chatter ? Let them go and try or say if they can't.

Of course, they will make no precis for the name does not appear there. But still such dowdy indifference and evasiveness *do* hamper work.

... ...

There was a small article, entitled "A Message to Garcia," which appeared unobtrusively in the Philistine Magazine of March,1899. It was written by Elbert Hubbard.

Let us quote the opening paragraphs :

"In all this Cuban business there is one man who stands out on the horizon of my memory like Mars at Perihelion.

"When war broke out between Spain and the United States, it was very necessary to communicate quickly with the leader of the insurgents. Garcia was somewhere in the mountain fastness of Cuba—no one knew where. No mail or telegraph could reach him. The president must secure his co-operation and quickly.

"What to do.

"Some one said to the President, 'There is a fellow by the name of Rowan who will find Garcia for you, if anybody can.'

"Rowan was sent for and given a letter to be delivered to Garcia. How the 'fellow by the name Rowan' took the letter, sealed it up in an oilskin pouch, strapped it over his heart, in four days landed by night off the coast of Cuba from an open boat, disappeared into the jungle and in three weeks came out on the other side of the Island, having traversed a hostile country on foot, and delivered his letter to Garcia—are things I have no special desire to tell in detail. The point that

I wish to make is this. McKinley gave Rowan a letter to be delivered to Garcia ; Rowan took the letter and did not ask 'where is he at ?'

"By the Eternal ! there is a man whose form should be cast in deathless bronze and the statue placed in every college of the land. It is not book learning youngmen need, or instruction about this and that, but a stiffening of the vertebrae which will cause them to be loyal to a trust, to act promptly, concentrate their energies ; do the thing —'Carry a message to Garcia.'

"General Garcia is dead now, but there are other Garcias. No man who has endeavoured to carry out an enterprise where many hands were needed, but has been well-nigh appalled at times by the imbecility of the average man—the inability or unwillingness to concentrate on a thing and do it."

This small article, according to Carnegie, has been translated in almost all written languages. About a million and half copies were distributed by the New York Central Railroad. During the Russo-Japanese war every Russian soldier who went to the front was given a copy of the '*Message to Garcia*'. And the Japanese followed suit. A copy was supplied by order of the Mikado to every employee of the Japanese Government, soldier or civilian. Which shows, incidentally, how eagerly Japan snatches at useful ideas from anywhere.

Yes, it struck an important note.

Hubbard concluded the small article thus :

"My heart goes out to the man who does his work when the 'boss' is away as well as when he is at home ; and the man who, when given a letter for Garcia, quietly takes the missive without asking any idiotic questions, and with no lurking intention of chucking it into the nearest sewer, or of doing aught else but deliver it, never gets 'laid off', nor has to go on a strike for higher wages. Civilization is one long, anxious search for just such individuals. Anything such a man asks shall be granted. He is wanted in every city, town, and village—in every office, shop, store and factory. The world cries out for such ; he is needed and needed badly—the man who can "Carry a message to Garcia."

Don't we agree with Hubbard ? I have only one comment to make. Instead of saying with him, "Civilization is one long, anxious search for just such individuals," I would rather say, *"Civilization is one long anxious attempt to produce just such individuals."*

The very proposition of the present discussion is that *this can be done.*

(b) "If you want your orders obeyed ; you must strictly obey orders given you."

Your juniors shrewdly observe your behaviour —though they will not tell you. And, as we all know, example *is* better than precept.

You must not only obey but obey with grace. That is to say, you must not criticize your seniors before your juniors nor express disagreement openly. If you do so, your subordinates will follow your example, much though you may advise them to the contrary.

"There are three things, young gentlemen," Nelson said to one of his midshipmen, "which you are constantly to bear in mind. First, you must always implicitly obey orders, without attempting to form any opinion of your own respecting their propriety. Secondly, you must consider every man your enemy who speaks ill of your king; and thirdly, you must hate a Frenchman as you do the devil."

The second and third precepts were applicable to the particular occasion; they pertain to respect and hatred of one's own country and the enemy's—the Frenchmen could reverse the saying with equal justification.

But the first one is of universal application. It is the basic framework of all disciplined bodies. Let us repeat it:

"You must always implicitly obey order, without attempting to form any opinion of your own respecting their propriety."

... ...

Sir James Outram is said to have exhibited a characteristic example of noble self-denial. He

never once faltered in the path of duty when ordered to carry out a policy, although he might personally disapprove of it. *He did not approve of the policy of invading Scinde : yet his services throughout the campaign were acknowledged by General Sir Napier to have been of a brilliant standard.* He denied himself a share of the rich spoils saying. "I disapprove of the policy of this war—I will accept no share of the prize money."

... ...

History of Islam affords a more striking story. Hearing of an attempt on the part of the christians to surprise the muslims of Medina, prophet Muhammad equipped and sent out an expeditionary force of 3000 men to intercept or prevent them. There were highly respected persons including Jafar, brother of Ali, poet Abdullah-bin-Rawaha, the great fighter and warrior Khalid in the force. But who was to command ? The prophet after deliberation gave Zaid, the slave, leadership of this army ! Zaid, the slave, of all people ! There was a little flutter for a little while but the ideal of Islam brooked no discrimination. The whole force soon obeyed him without reserve.

....

Lincoln was not given to criticizing people. General after general, during the Civil War, disappointed him and kept him pacing the floor in

despair. "With malice toward none, with charity for all", he held his peace.

He knew ; he understood. Perhaps, they were doing their best and others would fare as badly ! If he criticized them, he would arouse hard feelings and handicap them further.

But even *he* had finally to pull up a general. The latter was presumably openly criticizing him, his Government and the General's own seniors.

This is what Lincoln wrote to Major General Hooker :

"I have placed you at the head of the army of the Potomac. Of course, I have done this upon what appear to me to be sufficient reasons, and yet I think it best for you to know that there are some things in regard to which I am not quite satisfied with you.

"I believe you to be a brave and skilful soldier, which, of course I like. I also believe you do not mix politics with your profession, in which you are right. You have confidence in yourself, which is a valuable if not an indispensable quality.

"You are ambitious, which within reasonable bounds, does good rather than harm. But I think that during General Burnside's command of the army you have taken counsel of your ambition and thwarted him as much as you could, in which you did a great wrong to the country and to a most meritorious and honourable brother officer.

"I have heard, in such a way as to believe it, of your recently saying that both the army and the Government needed a dictator. Of course, it was not for this, but in spite of it, that I have given you command.

"Only those generals who can gain successes can set up as dictators. What I now ask of you is military success and I will risk the dictatorship.

"The Government will support you to the utmost of its ability, which is neither more nor less than it has done and will do for all commanders. I much fear that the spirit which you have aided to infuse into the army, of criticizing their commander and withholding confidence from him, will now turn upon you. I shall assist you, as far as I can, to put it down.

"Neither you nor Napoleon, if he were alive again, could get any good out of an army while such spirit prevails in it, and now beware of rashness. Beware of rashness, but with energy and sleepless vigilance go forward and give us victories."

That was, according to a biographer, perhaps the sharpest letter Lincoln ever wrote after he became President.

Yet, what tact and consideration shown!

Lincoln pays compliments first and enumerates the good qualities of the addressee. He promises support; he assures of assistance. He shows that

the General has not only wronged his brother officer but also infused a spirit which may now do himself (the general) harm.

That letter sold at public auction in 1926 for twelve thousand dollars!

It deserves more. It is a model for all humanity.

He truly says (I shall repeat):

"I much fear that the spirit which you have aided to infuse into the army, of criticizing their commander and withholding confidence from him, will now turn upon you."

That is worth remembering.

He is emphatic: *"Neither you nor Napoleon if he were alive again, could get any good out of an army while such a spirit prevails in it..."*

This is true everywhere, as much in the army as in any sphere where good discipline matters. And where does it not?

... ...

Just as you should obey your superiors and demonstrate your loyalty, you should do one other thing in the same line.

(c) You should preserve the authority of subordinate officers

This follows almost as a corollary. If you humble them before their own subordinates, you

undermine their usefulness and weaken their hold on the latter.

This is a very important point too. And, I shall say, often forgotten.

I have seen and known officers being bullied in public. I have seen and known the latter being adversely remarked upon in strong terms in papers open to all.

This does little good. This embarrasses and weakens the officers in relation to their own subordinates and *undermines discipline.*

The correct thing would be to talk or write to the officers *privately* or *confidentially.* It will *correct* them without humiliating them before others.

"In the army", said Napoleon, "no one must put the commander in shade...The army is a whole. Its commander is everything."

Ludwig, the biographer of Kaiser observes on Kaiser's attempt at too much interference by himself with the army :

"At first he went in for reforming everything —General Staff, manoeuvres, uniforms ; he wanted younger Generals ; he personally interfered in every quarter, they were all and each bewildered. This lasted a year. Then came the unexpected : the group he most distinguished, his own special group, began to compare the Old-Prussian tradition with the New-German fashion and got uneasy. So early as the May of 1890 Waldersee,

as Chief of Staff, confesses : It is very painful to me to be told that the Emperor is visibly losing ground within the Army. The disaffection has been gradual, but is now decidedly more widespread. The causes ? Marked preference shown for the Navy, as also for the Guards, and very little interest in the Line...Considerably less courtesy to highly placed officers than his grandfather was wont to display...Contempt for the judgment of experienced men. Frequent favouritism towards individuals, attributable only to personal sentiments, and on the other hand excessive severity towards others ..Indiscreet comments to officers upon their superiors in rank. Finally, the inclination to make himself popular at the expense of the Army. ..I write this down because it is over and over again conveyed to me from the most widely different quarters and by the men who are best capable of judging...The senior officers are not left long enough in their positions nowadays...A very evil result of this is the sense of insecurity it awakens in them, and the consequent lack of pleasure in their work .. If I hear of such grievances they must be genuine ; for as I am supposed to be a particular friend of the Emperor's, most people are very cautious with me."

These reflections of a friend of the Emperor and from the principal soldier in the army do point out a gloomy state of affairs. He resumes in still gloomier mood some months later :

"Last year, even, it went off better. Now there is greater certainty of touch, but along with it, over-estimation of his own capabilities .. The Emperor is exceedingly restless, tearing about in every direction, going much too forward in the fighting line, interfering with the Generals' leadership, giving innumerable, frequently self-contradictory orders, and barely listening to his advisers. He always wants to win, and so takes an unfavourable decision by the umpire in very bad part. I should know this, having once ignored that desire. His dispositson of troops was decidedly bad ; even the night before, it was clear that he must lose the battle, and there was marked satisfaction at this among their Highnesses and the suite...If he insisted on taking the command in war, not merely as a matter of form like his father and grandfather, there would be a disaster."

I have quoted the above at some length to show what would *at any time undermine discipline.* I do not know if these allegations were true *in toto* but if there could be a fairly exhaustive catalogue of vices which would and must sap the foundations of a disciplined organisation, it is here.

One must guard against making similar mistakes.

... ...

Praise your own officers and support them publicly, blame them or correct them privately.

This is but fair. Put yourself in their position and imagine how you would like to be treated by your own superiors. Do exactly as you yourself would be done by.

This is a golden rule. It applies everywhere.

... ...

The obey-me-attitude' of mind has to be exerted in dealing with others also—with superiors, seniors, equals, unattached inferiors, friends and acquaintances. The technique will, however, be different. The influencing will have to be subtly accomplished.

Of this, more anon.

9

MANNER

HOW TO CONDUCT ONESELF.

We have so far seen that the right kind of disciplinarian, leader is (a) self-confident, (b) not afraid of subordinates or followers and he (c) expects the latter to obey as a matter of course.

We shall now take up clauses (5) and (6) together from his make-up. They run :

(5) "Who issues orders and instructions in precisely the same spirit and ;

(6) In a manner and tone which appear to admit of no question."

These two clauses go hand in hand.

Orders *have* to be issued in a confident spirit.

Other factors which are more *observable* and which constitute *forms of action* are now under discussion.

Of these, 'manner' and 'tone' should be such as to admit of no question'.

... ...

'Manner' would include :

DRESS

You should dress properly.

When one is well-groomed and faultlessly and immaculately dressed, the knowledge of it, the feeling of it, has an effect, which, while it is difficult to explain, is still very definite, very real. It gives one more confidence, brings more faith in oneself and heightens one's self-respect. When one *'looks' success*, one finds it easier to *think success*, to *achieve success*. The effects of good clothes on the wearer is electric.

The advice of a psychologist to a man who feels things are going against him, is to "stop and shave, take a bath, and put on a smart, well-fitting suit of clothes."

It can be noticed anywhere how a man badly dressed becomes self-conscious at once upon entering into the presence of welldressed people. He feels suddenly at a disadvantage ; a sense of inferiority overtakes him and he moves and speaks as though has been *disrated*.

The effect on the other side is also noticeable. Take an audience, for example.

It has been noticed time and again that if a speaker has baggy trousers, shapeless coat and dangling footwear, note-books or money-bags peeping out of pockets, the audience at once under-rate him and much of the effect of what he would say *is* washed out. So also elsewhere.

It does not matter whether you wear European, American, Indian or Chinese clothes ; it does not matter if you spend lavishly on them. What matters *is* : whether they are *clean, well-fitting* and *well-worn.* A simple dress may look edifying, whereas a costly one, unbecoming.

Much emphasis is rightly placed on *correct* and *smart* uniforms in the military, the police and other organized forces. The superiors, there, have to show by example rather that precept that good dress is a sign of a self-confident man. It enhances powers of a disciplinarian.,

... ...

DEMEANOUR

You should be calm, serene, dignified and self-possessed.

The 'yapping' and 'barking' disposition is one extreme : the 'joking' and 'indulging' one the other. The golden medium has to be struck.

I was once travelling on a certain inland steamer. The Serang was an East-Bengal

Muslim—a huge, massive fellow, radiating awe and grandeur by his very looks. He was the boss of the whole show and commanded, what we may call, a small navy. The steamer was running to scheduled times and all was being managed. The crew was doing hard work, real labour.

I thought—here was a man running a responsible show easily and controlling his crew who had not been drilled about.

I was soon disillusioned.

At every station when the steamer had to stop, up went a terrible row. The Serang worked himself up to a fury—looked a kin of Julius Caesar or Napoleon in bad temper. He yelled out to each crew, shouted, barked and nothing would turn out to his satisfaction until he had called the names of "fourteen generations" of the poor man at work. He was painfully audible from all authority!

It was only lucky that his temper had the benefit of the soothing breeze of the river between stations. Else, I should imagine, he would have literally burst of vapoury anger or collapsed of sheer fatigue! Why he was not thrown out alive into the river by an infuriated crew was a mystery to me; but, perhaps, the latter got used to him and did not take him seriously. The disciples were more admirable than the disciplinarian, anyhow.

There is no ideal.

A disciplinarian need not be boisterous, scattering everything around him like "a bull in a china-shop" and intimidating every one, —the friend or the foe, the good or the bad, alike. Nobody likes a bully—an "irksome brawling scold" —an old cantankerous cuss. He is shunned. People pass by, making a special detour so as not to come within earshot or even sight of him.

I had once asked an extremely reasonable and senior officer if he had, while at home on leave, met a certain chief of his, who had just retired.

"Meet him! why? He was by no means such a dear old fellow that I would consider it a pleasure to meet him on a holiday. I would rather take a little deal of trouble and make a special detour so as to avoid him!"

I was not surprised. For, all I knew, many others would think so too, apart from all possibilities of personal animosity, the old cuss *did* indulge in a lot of unnecessary fuss.

Let us quote from the Article on Discipline we have previously referred to in these discussions:

"If I were to ask you what you meant by a disciplinarian it is just possible that you would conjure up in your mind—some one slightly harsh, rather cast-iron; some one prone to reprimand, to find fault, even to snap; some one without much sense of humour and with little of the gift of kindliness. But the picture thus drawn is of a martinet

with a tendency towards being a bully ; it bears no relationship to what a disciplinarian should be."

... ...

Avoid the other extreme also. A man who is always joking and 'hobnobbing' and "skylarking" with subordinates or students does not carry much weight either.

Familiarity does breed contempt.

Once upon a time, we had in our station for a guest a big officer of a department in which discipline is of paramount importance. The guest was eagerly awaited and with respects in advance.

When he did arrive, he was a sore disappointment. Of course, he was delightful in parties—his wit and repartees sent us rollicking with laughter. I named him Kerome. J. Kerome !

The trouble was : the gentleman would *not* stop joking and jesting. People who had business to negotiate, ladies who had favours to ask, had to wait and wait and then open like this :

"Now, Mr. Kerome, may I ask of you one little thing..."

He would hear and dispose of the man or the lady in a half-mocking tone and then he or she would question :

"Are you serious ?"

"Of course I am—why do you say this ?" —he would reply.

Why ? Why, Mr. Kerome ??

It is *your* tone and manner that have been all the time comic and surely you should know better.

I really hope the gentleman does not conduct business in the same demeanour !

The point is :

A man given to too much 'levity loses in public estimation. The professional Joker cheers the audience up but he is not seriously taken.

Over-familiarity may easily result in embarrassment. Even those who should otherwise respect you may be tempted to greet you by your first name, slap you on the back, poke you in the ribs, call you a good fellow, nose into your most private affairs, invite themselves to helpings from your cigarette case and while you ask something to be done, turn round and say, "Pray, why not help yourself" ?

Of course, you must have a sense of humour or cultivate one. That is a point in the make-up of a gentleman.

"That people should laugh over the same sort of jest," says ..., well, never mind who, "and have many an old joke between them which time cannot wither or custom stale is a better preparation for life, by your leave, than many other things higher and better-sounding in the world's ears. You could read Kant by yourself, if you wanted, but must share a joke with some one else."

Yes, but let those you share it with be your friends and equals who can "give and take" or even your subordinates but *moderately* and *strictly* out of office or aside of *business*.

ASSUME THE RIGHT MOOD

Remember, I am not speaking of the 'pose'. There is something bad and irritating attached to this word—an air of artificiality—insincerity - hollowness.

The Oxford Dictionary gives the current sense of the word as : "attitude of body or mind, esp. one assumed for effect as *his* philanthropy *is a mere pose.*"

A *poseur* is soon found out and labelled. He is then de-valuated.

Noel Coward in his Hay Fever portrays a family of *posedurs*. The father, David Bliss, is a novelist and the mother, Judith, an actress just retired from the stage. Simon and Sorel Bliss are the son and daughter.

Judith is always posing and never misses an opportunity for acting. The father, the son and the daughter are also always *posing*. One lady-guest remarks on the family :

"You haven't got one sincere or genuine feeling among the whole lot of you—you're artificial to the point of lunacy. It's a great pity

you ever left the stage, Judith—its your rightful home."

... ...

Apart from such extremes, the *right mood* on each occasion has *got to be* assumed.

If you have seen a film for the first time, go over your mind and recall the various actors and actresses. Do not the impressions of the cheerfulness of one, the gravity of another, the dignified air of yet another—linger in your memory ? They *do* in mine.

In private life, the actors and actresses may quite be the very opposite of what they look but the spectators *are* struck by them as they do appear. And the directors will have nothing to do with them unless they can match the occasion in *bearing* and *behaviour*. Of course, there is artificiality there. There are *directed* parts played but we must ourselves be our own *directors*.

... ...

How far familiar intercourse should exist between senior and junior officers is a very delicate question. The question is should a commanding officer mix freely in social life with his juniors, or hold himself aloof ? The reply should be unhesitatingly in the affirmative, if he has sufficient self-reliance, possesses a moderate share of tact, temper, knowledge of the world, and, above all, sympathy. For without sympathy he would be

insufferable to his juniors, and eventually would make himself thoroughly detested. It was said of Sir Charles Napier that he possessed "the rare quality of rendering the most familiar intercourse compatible with absolute authority'.

There are again circumstances which render free social intercourse at first inadvisable. For example, if the discipline of a force were generally bad and an officer were posted to it with a view to getting it into good order, a supreme officer would then be wise to hold himself somewhat aloof, until he had obtained an insight into the character of the officers and perhaps shown his teeth once, or twice ;— opportunities for doing so would be never wanting in cases of this kind. He might then begin to relax a little and without detriment to his authority gradually fall into his usual ways. If isolated from the outer world, as naval officers for example must necessarily be for weeks together, it then becomes a nice point whether a little reserve would not be advisable.

In such cases, or even generally, a little reserve would be advisable. Some leaders keep up reserve even to the point of shrouding themselves in mystery. I would not criticize them for fostering some legends even.

Kipling's *Man Who Would Be King* was an adventurer who by sheer force of character dominated several mountain tribes. He remained their chieftain till he was weak enough to fall in love

with one of his subjects and allowed her to see that he was only a man.

In all cases, we must be *sincere*, weigh the *occasion* and *conduct* ourselves as the circumstances may *demand*. If we are earnest about the matter in hand, we shall know what mood is called for.

When business steps in, stop, 'ti's no time
to jest,
And therefore frame your manner to the time.'

Napoleon was a stickler for right manner. He would not indulge in levity before subordinates.

Often he would relax a bit and place himself in an easier mood, sharing in genial conversation on the table but as soon some business cropped up, he would change his frame and adopt a graver tone.

... ...

The *calm* and *dignified* man, having learned how to govern himself, knows how to adapt himself to others. Herbert Spencer says :

"In the supremacy of *self-control* consists one of the perfections of the ideal man. Not to be impulsive—not to be spurred hither and thither by each desire that in turn comes uppermost—but to be self-restrained, self-balanced, governed by the joint decision of the feelings in council assembled, before whom every action shall have been fully debated and calmly determined—that it is which education, moral education at least, strives to produce."

The Duke of Marlborough, despite many defects of character, was possessed of a natural dignity never ruffled by an outbreak of temper. Green says :

"Amidst the storm of battle men saw him 'without fear of danger or in the least hurry, giving his orders with all the calmness imaginable'. In the cabinet he was as cool as on the battle-field. He met with the same equable serenity, the pettiness of the German princes, the phlegm of the Dutch, the ignorant opposition of his officers, the libels of his political opponents."

Pitt is said to have been another illustrious man who was never out of temper, although he combined this virtue with extraordinary readiness, vigour and rapidity of thought as well as action.

Serenity is that *exquisite poise of character* which is the last lesson of culture. People will always perfer to deal with a man whose demeanour is strongly equable. *Self-possession* connotes *self-confidence* and excludes *supe -sensitiveness.*

So, be *calm, serene, dignified* and *self-possessed* in your demeanour.

EXTERNALS OF DISCIPLINE

Observe the 'manners'. Under head 'manner' we should also consider 'manners'—the *externals of discipline.* These have to be observed in favour of superiors — demanded from inferiors.

There are various modes of paying respects—such as saluting, standing to 'attention', honorific terms of address, such as 'sir', etc. These will vary in different departments and spheres but they *are* important factors. No good disciplinarian can overlook them.

Do not talk with your seniors with hands in your pockets or in a casual listless way.

Milton Wright has written an admirable book on the Art of Conversation. He summarises what is to be done when talking with (a) superiors and (b) inferiors. I summarise him further and italicise important matters.

WITH SUPERIORS

The most difficult conversation of all is the one carried on with a superior. The superiority is one of *rank* or *position*, may or may not be of character or intelligence and this must be borne in mind *throughout the talk*, although the talk must flow easily and naturally and without embarrassment. The buck private in the army has one way of talking with his mates but quite a different way with his captain. The junior clerk in the bank has one way of talking with the other clerks but quite a different way with the president.

The consciousness of the difference in position afflicts the lesser party to the conversation with a sense of inferiority : he feels at a disadvan-

tage. To some extent, it ties his tongue and prevents a free and easy flow of ideas. Some persons resent this position, and in an effort to offset it, go to the *other extreme.* They are likely to talk fast and loud, to brag in an effort to *impress* the superior. This is more objectionable than shyness.

Your attitude should be affected by two considerations ; first, that he is entitled to deference by the mere fact of his position, and second, that the ability which has enabled him to reach that position probably also entitles him to deference. So your own superiors directly and others of their position though not in power over you,—both should claim your respects.

But at the same time, in talking with your superiors you must maintain your own integrity and independence of thought. Thus you are sometimes between two fires ; the fear of *displeasing the superior* and *sacrificing your own opinions.* You have to be tactful to the extreme.

Were we to draw up a set of rules for talking with a superior, they would be something like these :

Be respectful

Let the superior lead the conversation.

Listen more than you talk, unless the superior wishes it otherwise.

Be attentive.

Keep to the topic under discussion.

Be relaxed.

Be frank and out-spoken.

Be prompt with your replies.

Do not conceal the fact that, while you respect your superior, you have your own self-respect, too.

WITH INFERIORS

This is easier but there are *bounds*. There may be a disposition to talk *less thoughtfully* because there is *no penalty* for saying the wrong thing or saying in the wrong way.

Your inferiors are not necessarily men of lesser ability, though in subordinate positions. *Put them at ease.* Make them feel that you are *interested* in what they have to say, and *invite* them to talk. They must see that you are friendly, but at the same time they must not be encouraged to *break* down the *barrier* of the difference in rank. It is bad policy to discuss your own foibles or any other intimate matters.

Rules for talking with an inferior might include the following :

Be dignified.

Be courteous.

Be kindly.

Avoid a domineering attitude.

Praise him for any good work he does.

Avoid talking too much.

Do not be too familiar.

Never let him overstep the bound.

Never step down from your own superior position.

10
TONE

HOW TO ORDER OTHERS

Under head, "tone", we shall discuss a few things likewise.

First of all :

INTONATION

Adapt your voice to the occasion.

A good deal depends on the *tone* in which one speaks and issues commands ; in other words, on one's *intonation.*

Children and subordinates among others are most affected by our intonation. Even animals pick up the moods of speakers by it.

Have you seen a hypnotic performance ? Most of you have, I suppose.

I once took a little deal of trouble in picking up the A. B. C. of hypnotism. I was struck by the power of suggestion.

By verbal suggestion, you can be made to go to sleep ; and then ? You can be made to dance like a bear, eat with relish paper-balls for *Rasha-Gollas* and be given the fright of a snake with a dangling piece of rope. That is when you are half-asleep or in a trance. No charm or incantation is needed.

Even when you are *quite awake* and in your senses you are made to sit facing the hypnotist and asked to close your eyes.

The hypnotist then *suggests* verbally in a firm and authoritative tone :

"Your eyes are closed ; now—press your lids together tight—tighter—tighter—still tighter—they are locked—you can't pull them apart—you *cannot*,—try, however much you can to open your eyes—they *will* not open—they *cannot* till *I* wish them to ..."

You, dear reader, are actually helpless—*your* eyes have gone out of *your* control and the hypnotist controls them to the amazement of the spectators who clap.

There is no sleight of hand, no fraud, no deceiving the eyes of the audience. *Suggestion* has worked ; it has affected your sub-conscious mind, much though outwardly you struggle against it.

Such is the power of suggestion, of the hold of orders given in a firm tone and confident spirit.

... ...

On the other hand, a weak voice and infirm delivery can rob an order of its effectiveness or a brilliant speech of its charm.

We have all heard of Edmund Burke whose speeches are classic models in logic, reasoning and composition. But how did he carry with the audience ?

Chroniclers say, as a speaker, Burke was a notorious failure. They say he did not have the ability to deliver his gems, to make them glitter. The result was : he was called 'the dinner bell" of the House of Commons. When he rose to speak, the members rose to walk out for free air or sank deeper in their chairs and yawned and dozed !

This is unfortunate. Most unfortunate .. We know of no permanent defect in his throat. We see thousands of humdrum men and women act on the stage or speak on the screen with quite a moderate success.

Why shouldn't *he* have cultivated his voice and even laboured less on the composition of the speeches ?

... ...

According to a certain estimate in America, one man out of every seven who sought to become officers in the Army during the last world war was refused a commission because of 'poor articulation, lack of voice and imperfect enunciation."

This is quite probable but yet unfortunate.

It is very unfortunate that the army authorities should be of the old opinion that the speaking voice is only an endowment of nature, or that attempts to cultivate it should necessarily fail.

The voice *can be* cultivated and improved and it is silly to demand of every assorted young man a ready commanding tone.

The most illiterate and dull-headed havildar of the police would beat a very clever civilian in the matter of 'commanding' men. That does not mean that the havildar has a permanent superiority over his rival. The point is : he has *cultivated* his voice and *learnt* the *technique*.

It is most amusing to see the Civic Guard Commanders struggling to shout orders to the men. Yet, they are men some of whom are leading in business, law, politics, etc. I see nothing derogatory in this. The point is : They have never cared to develop an authoritative and commanding tone If they are *trained* and they *care* in earnest, they *will* certainly improve their voice.

Which stresses the need of our Teacher's Training Schools, Police Training Colleges and such other institutions to have within the syllabus "*coaching of officers in right intonation.*"

Of course, those who want to develop this power by themselves can also do so, with some endeavour. In fact, everybody *should*.

If people brag about their God-gifted tone, you may take courage from any number of instances of a self-developed one.

"The first time I attempted to make a public talk," said Lloyd George, "I tell you I was in a state of misery. It is no figure of speech, but literally true, that my tongue clove to the roof of my mouth ; and, at first, I could hardly get out a word."

Who was Demosthenes ? One of the world's greatest orators. But what a natural impediment had he not to overcome ! He was physically weak, had a feeble voice, indistinct articulation and shortness of breath—he was exactly lacking the very essentials of a good speaker ! Yet ! the world knows what he made of himself.

... ...

Every man can overcome handicaps and improve his enunciation and articulation by practice. Deaf mutes are trained to use accurately the muscles of their lips, and cheeks and tongues. As a result, they are able to speak, in some cases, almost as many who possess the faculty of hearing. If that be even partially so, what cannot an average man or woman do !

One cannot easily study intonation and direct it at the moment of speaking with any great success. One should rather practise in private to a sufficient extent to render one's speech of a *firmer* and *more dominant* character.

This does not mean mere shouting.

I had a private tutor for my children. His arrival had not to be announced by anybody ; he did this himself by *shouting*. The effect was, however, mighty little. The children used to go about paying little heed to his calls and he started shouting louder and louder still. But all the same, he managed giving lessons with extreme difficulty.

The contrast was supplied by another tutor at another station. This tutor came in *quietly*, *setting* his *looks* and *manner* properly and although he spoke in a *slow* voice, he addressed all *decisively* and *authoritatively*. All went well and the children respected him highly.

The Duke of Wellington, says his biographer, was in natural temper irritable in the extreme but he had been able to restrain his temper by watchful self-control. He studied calmness and coolness in the midst of danger. At Waterloo and elsewhere, he gave his orders in the most critical moments without the slightest excitement, and in a tone of voice almost *more* than usually subdued. But, we may add, his tone was reinforced by dignity and power in reserve.

There are havildars who, learning presumably like a parrot, have got into the habit of shouting to a squad of ten men as one would to a battalion. This is unnecessary, exhausting and disturbing.

I do not either mean that your voice should be dominant to an extent giving the impression you are haughty and bullying. It should be *firm* and *slow* and *deliberate*. It should be well-modulated and adapted to the subject and occasion. It should be used without strain A distinct enunciation has an important bearing upon the voice. bringing out more completely its qualities of purity and—resonance.

PRECISION

Your orders must be precise.

This is also very important

You should avoid (i) *vacillation.*

You should avoid (ii) *vagueness.*

If you have followed up what has gone before, if you have developed self-confidence and developed a desire to be fair and just, you will avoid haste in coming to decisions and when you *have* decided you will feel *happy* and *determined* about them.

"Think before you leap" so that when you do leap you can land safe. If you are in haste, you will not be able to look at a matter from all the sides. The result will be : you will hesitate to

give orders you want to or after giving them *waver* and *vacillate*. For, the sides you have *not* considered will *obtrude* on you.

AN EXAMPLE FROM SHAKESPEARE

Let us take a big person—Julius Cæsar as portrayed by Shakespeare.

Caesar has to attend the senate as a popular hero. This is a highly ceremonial occasion. He is not sure of constancy in his ranks and Calphurnia, his wife, has seen strange fore-boding dreams. She tries to persuade him not to go.

Cæsar is brave !

"What can be avoided
Whose end is purpos'd by the mighty Gods ?
Yet Caesar shall go forth ; for these predictions
Are to the world in general as to Cæsar."

Calphurnia pleads further :

"When beggars die there are no comets seen,
The heavens themselves blaze forth the death of princes."

Whereupon Cæsar flares up and utters the famous words—words that have braced up many a fading heart—words that have been treasured all over the world as precious gems. Magnificent... Immortal...

Let us repeat them : they are worth repeating many times over every day.

"Cowards die many times before their deaths ;
The valiant never taste of death but once.
Of all the wonders that I yet have heard,
It seems to me most strange that men should fear ;
Seeing that death, a necessary end,
Will come when it will come".

In comes a servant with what the 'augurers' say. They do not see much good ahead. Calphurnia pleads further and Cæsar changes his mind :

"Mark Antony shall say I am not well ;
And for thy humour I shall stay at home".

From what sublimity to what ridicule !

Yet, we may say he is superstitious—the 'augurers' weigh much with him. But let's follow the course.

Decius comes to fetch him to the Senate-house. Cæsar communicates his *decision* :

"And you are come in very happy time,
To bear my greetings to the Senators,
And tell them that I will not come to-day tell them so Decius"

Does the matter end there ? No !
There is a haggling :

Calphurnia : 'Say he is sick."
Caesar : "Shall Caesar send a lie ?
Have I in conquest stretch'd mine arm so far

To be afeard to tell greybeards the truth ?
Decius, go tell them Caesar will not come."

Decius does *not* go. He argues :

"Most mighty Caesar, let me know some cause,
Lest I be laughed at when I tell them so."

Caesar is adamant.

'The cause is in my will,—I will not come :
That is enough to satisfy the Senate."

Well-done Caesar ! That's exactly like you. Stick to it then. But does he ?

He discusses his wife's apprehensions and Decius is up at once with his contra-suggestion :

"And know it now,—the Senate have concluded
To give this day a crown to mighty Caesar.
If you shall send them word you will not come,
Their minds may change. Besides, it were a mock,
Apt to be rendered, for some one to say,
Break up the Senate till another time,
When Caesar's wife shall meet with better dream,
If Caesar hide himself shall they not whisper,
Lo, Caesar is afraid ?"

Caesar chides his wife and changes mind once again :

"How foolish do your fears seem now, Calphurnia,

I am ashamed I did yield to them,—
Give me my robe for I will go."

Mighty Caesar! *We* are ashamed that you have changed over so many times! If you had called a council, discussed the matter and then had it whatever way you liked, you would *be* more consistent.

But who are we to criticize him? Of course, he will not listen to us but the idea *is*: We should ourselves learn a lesson. Nobody, however big, can conduct himself all the time *perfectly*. That is not human.

Caesar was undoubtedly a brave man—a worthy hero—a man of his word, as he says on another occasion, "but I am constant as the northern star, ..unshak'd of motion."

He may have not done at all as Shakespeare has portrayed him. May be that was *one* instance of the few in which he changed mind quickly. But *our* point is: He should have thought over the matter *carefully* and decided *finally* without *exhibiting hesitancy* or *vacillation.*

Speaking of the impetuous Kaiser a chronicler laments: "At the Imperial Manoeuvres, completely contradictory commands to the troops would arrive on an average three times a night. No one dares to point out that this upsets the men, that important dispositions of troops are disturbed, that colossal marches result, and that the commis-

sariat is confronted with great difficulties by reason of the requirements thus created. In the actual encounter modern conditions are ignored, the one aim being to make an imposing display ; the Staff rides through the firing line, the artillery follow, and the cavalry attack is as feeble as if they were still armed with flint-locks. Everyone sees this, more or less ; but no one dares to say anything—certainly not Chief, Count Schlieffen."

... ...

We all see the atmosphere around bristling with instances of hesitancy, of vacillation.

We change our tour-programmes three times before we start ; we name for our engagements three different hours before they can take place ; we 'promise' quickly and 'regret inability' the next hour ; we amend what we say ; we withdraw statements we make ; in fact our whole course of life goes along—with a muddling lot of "about turns" and "correction-slips."

... ...

Punch published a beautiful sketch entitled 'The Decision' the other day (Sep-44). It opens :

"It's rather a difficult decision to make, sergeant."

"Very difficult decision to make, sir."

"I would say ten or twelve. What would you say ?"

"I should say ten or twelve, sir."

"I should think ten would be about the right figure."

'Ten *would* be about right, sir."

"On the other hand, it would be awkward if we needed twelve. Perhaps we ought to put down twelve."

"I should say twelve *would* be about right, sir."

"I know, I'll get a decision from the C. O. on the phone now ..Put me through to the C. O., please."

"We must be prepared, sir; these days anything may happen."

"Yes, that's true. Warm, isn't it ?"

"Very warm, sir."

"Ah, good morning, sir. Doolittle here, sir. Fine morning, sir. Little wa- -cold, sir, yes, decidedly nippy. It's about form B.F.I, sir. I was wondering what figure to put down...Fifteen, sir ? Yes, that's the figure I had in mind myself. Yes, sir, it *is* a difficult decision to make. We must be prepared, these days anything may happen... Refer to Corps, sir ? Brigadier Crackling ? Very good, sir...Put me through to Corps, please. Brigadier Crackling ..Lucky we didn't put down ten or twelve, sergeant. The C. O. says fifteen."

"Fifteen *would* be about right, sir."

"Ah, good morning, sir ! Fine morning. Little col- -warm, sir, yes, decidedly stuffy.

About Form B. F. I, sir ; a question of what figure to put down ..Eleven, sir ? Yes, that's the figure I had in mind myself. We must be prepared, sir, these days anything may happen . Command, sir ? General Snapdragon ? Very Good, sir. *Good*-bye, sir... Put me through to Command, please—General Snapdragon... No initiative, sergeant, that's what's wrong with Crackling...."

The officer goes from command to command for a *decision* ! What is significant is that he himself has no mind and seems to *have had in* mind already what is suggested ! A very good team of excellent hesitants !

... ...

Nobody between the high heavens and the muddy earth will ever object if you say—"Let me think over : I may take time."

Let us stop here for a resolution. Let us *resolve* that we shall *think over ahead* and *then* decide and *decide* firmly.

A good disciplinarian has to avoid *hesitancy* and *vacillation.* His disciples will value him according as he does so.

So let this be said of each good disciplinarian :

"His nay was nay without recall ;
His yea was yea, and powerfull all ;
He gave his yea with careful heed,
His thoughts and words were well agreed."

... ...

You should avoid (ii) *vagueness* : *Be definite, accurate, clear.*

Vagueness is also a bane to be shunned like poison. *Be definite.*

"See me to-morrow", you ask your subordinate. "All right, your honour"—he says and retires.

He spends the night arguing—when, where, why ! He wakes up with a headache, starts dressing howling for his breakfast. He trots in to your Bungalow to find you are hardly up yet. You growl he should come to office. He loiters about anxiously waiting for the hour he will meet 'your honour'. By the time he has paid respects to you, the best part of the day is gone for him.

By the eternal ! Why not name the place and hour and business so that he can save himself and yourself all the bother ?

Be definite. Ask yourself and others—why where, when, how. You will see how conveniently everybody and everything turn out—how time, that irrevocable factor in our lives, is saved, how worry and uncertainty are set at rest.

We have spoken on punctuality, at length. Refer back to pp. 63-67.

... ...

Be accurate.

Accuracy results from care. Be accurate yourself and you will be known as a stickler for accuracy.

MASTERY OF DETAILS

No disciplinarian, no leader can afford to overlook details. These form the whole, constitute the body or the organization. You can't neglect the screws and bolts that keep the machine intact.

Plans have to be worked out to minute details and while leaving these to able lieutenants, the leader has to check them up *periodically but regularly and also by surprise at other times.* Speaking of Napoleon in this respect, Ludwig says :

"This constant deliberation builds up something within him which he names the 'spirit of things' : the precision, which penetrates the touches ; the thinking in numbers, to which he ascribes part of his success and for which he has to thank his mathematical training. There is nothing too small for this brain ; for the sum total of millions of details is a plan whose scope is world embracing. If one of his officers writes to say that the Emperor's instructions have been carried out, Napoleon waves this general statement aside and demands details. Nothing is so small but he wants to know all about it and judge its importance for himself".

If a campaign is loosely conceived and vaguely planned, the chances *are* it will be badly executed and will come to grief.

... ...

If you are a writer, verify your facts and figures. I am fond of scribbling a little but let

those who do not write not think it is a play-thing to push out a piece for print. You, readers, are a clever lot and you will not spare me at all if I misquote or mistake. You may not say anything out of sheer good grace but much of what I am saying *will* be disrated.

Do we not painfully see almost every morning Mr. Y issuing a counter-statement and refuting what Mr. X stated the other day ? And by far the sharpest cut Mr. Y inflicts *is* that Mr. X had given untrue facts or inaccurate figures !

If you are a head of an office—big or small—you may notice how drafts by clerks or assistants have to be returned with spear-strokes all over. Inaccurate figures, bad grammar, bad punctuation, hazy expressions are there for you to detect, correct and reshape. Why ? The clerks depend on 'your honour's' infallible judgment, vast learning and powerful pen ! How, oh, how, can they, poor creatures encompass in language ahead what 'your honour's' master-mind may be conceiving ! Poor wretches ! Why not always do your best and save your "master", if you have any consideration for him, from petty proof-reading ?

I now return such drafts unsigned so that the clerk can sit in judgment over them and produce accurate ones. This results in loss of time immediately but ultimately in saving of it and of, what is as important,—trouble.

Try this for fun. *Tear out typed copies with mistakes and order retyping. Return drafts unsigned. Encourage good drafts, neat typing by paying compliment.*

Things *shall* improve.

... ...

There is the same case for being "clear".

Be clear.

Much of the muddle that is caused by orders misunderstood is unintentional.

UNINTENTIONAL MUDDLING

Your servant conducts himself most oddly because he misunderstood you. You conduct yourself most rudely because you misunderstood him.

You cannot expect everybody to pick up things as perfectly as you yourself would. Besides there are honest mistakes.

An intensely tragi-comic thing was going to happen the other day. There was a ceremonial parade to be inspected by a high dignitary at a certain place. It was arranged that officers should be 'mounted'. Somehow, it was decided at the last minute to have no one riding and this had to be communicated at once to the officer in command. The distance was three miles and time was short.

The chief asked a very clever and experienced inspector who was going ahead in the pilot car to carry word to the officer in command that the parade would be "dismouuted". The Inspector shook his head, jumped into the car and was off in a minute.

Can you guess what happened then ? I am sure you cannot.

The Inspector ran breathlessly and faithfully misdelivered the message. "The chief has ordered parade to be dismantled (!)". "Dismantled" is the very word he actually uttered. The officer commanding retorted, "What !" "Dismantled, your honour"—reiterated the Inspector.

You can 'dismantle' a building, of course, but a parade ? Break it up ? The officer was thinking so...

In the meantime the party came up and a very awkward situation was saved.

I warn you. The Inspector was quite honest—he is clever—but just a slip of the ear—that's what you may call it.

... ...

MAKE SURE YOU ARE UNDERSTOOD

I have been sick of servants and orderlies doing like this. I make them 'repeat what they have understood.' When they say, "Very good, sir", and start turning round, I say, "Just a minute—do tell me what you are going to do".

Try this also. Will save you trouble.

... ...

You want to hear big people on the point ? Here you are :

Christ preached to common people and spoke by parables and examples. When his disciples asked him why he did so, he answered :

"Because they seeing see not ; and hearing hear not neither do they understand". He meant to be clear.

Napoleon thought likewise. His oft-reiterated instruction to his secretaries was : Be clear ! Be clear !

... ...

INTENTIONAL EVASION

Then, there is the case of shirking and evasion.

Human nature is apt to shirk unpleasant jobs—evade them altogether or comply only by way of eyewash. Some of the subordinates must be that way bent.

Vague orders turn out very welcome to them, for they can misinterpret orders and find loopholes.

Take the Indian Penal Code for example. It is one of the world's most precisely worded codes. But look at the loopholes sought to be taken advantage of ! Colossal tomes of annotation

are there to guide you through a mess sought to be made out of an otherwise admirable code !

The great general Moltke, at the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War instructed his officers :

"Remember, gentlemen, that any order that *can* be misunderstood *will* be misunderstood".

....

SELF-DECEPTION

And people deceive themselves, evade their own will or conscience on excuses invented.

Professor William James puts in the evading nature beautifully thus :

"How many excuses does the drunkard find when each new temptation comes ! It is a new brand of liquor which the interests of intellectual culture in such matter oblige him to test ; moreover it is poured out and it is a sin to waste it ; or, others are drinking and it would be churlishness to refuse, or, it is but to enable him to sleep ; or, just to get through this job or work ; or, it isn't drinking, it is because he feels so cold ; or, it is Christmasday ; or, it is a means of stimulating him to make a more powerful resolution in favour of abstinence than he had hitherto made ; or, it is just this once, and once doesn't count ; etc. etc , *ad-libitum* ; it is in fact, anything you like except *being a drunkard.* That is the conception that will not stay before the poor soul's attention".

LEAVE NO LOOPHOLES

So do not encourage children if you are a teacher or subordinates if you are a boss, small or big does not matter, to look for loopholes in your orders and vagueness in directions. They should know *that you mean what you say* and you *should say it well.*

FIRMNESS

Be firm but courteous. Decide after due consideration ; *order* forethinking of compliance.

A military manual offers a trite little sentence for guidance of officers : "Orders must be given as orders and not as requests".

This is only sensible, particularly in the military where extreme hardship and stress may be involved.

In civil life, orders should be courteously worded but *must* be backed by firmness.

... ...

A fatal sign of weakness is to (i) repeat orders : yet another is to (ii) modify them too quickly or easily.

The teacher who goes on repeating orders in louder and louder tones has lost all chances of good discipline.

A private tutor whom I mentioned before has a string of orders for the boys to make them come : "Come ; why not come ; do come ; won't

you come ; wait till I come." The 'coming' of the boys takes place only when he has risen from his seat and moved about half-way towards the boys. Actually the boys are not to blame ; they have been used to obeying the last command. The preliminary ones they consider as mere "words of caution !"

The tutor lacks firmness : the result is prejudicial to good discipline

Teachers and guardians should remember what a great head-master wrote some years ago :

"A school is pictured by some as a troop of little angels, eager to learn, more eager to imbibe goodness, all hanging on the lips of their still more angelic preceptors. If these celestials ever do need a rebuke, shame is at once sufficient ; and shame is produced by a gentle and piercing glance, (all school-masters have eyes of forty angel-power) the victim retires to weep in silence until he is ready to receive the forgiveness the thoughtful teacher yearns to give and is only waiting till the fourth handkerchief is wetted through to give it."

But actually "school life is real earnest work, both for masters and boys, and not a matter of rose-water theories. At one time or another every evil that boys can do will have to be faced by the masters ; and every temptation that boy-life is subject to, to be faced by the boys. This requires a strong government".

... ...

PSEUDO-FIRMNESS

But—there is a vice also to be guarded against. Firmness does *not* mean 'blustering', 'tyranny'.

Those who mistake 'firmness' for these are by no means so few. You notice a whole array of them about.

Firmness is like "power in reserve." It is called upon to come in to play *only when necessary.*

It is by no means true that children who are intended to be disciplined and educated are all vicious or unbending. Many of them are timid, take an easy fright and what *these* require is *sympathy* and *understanding.*

And there are teachers and tutors who bluster and blunder to the extent of blighting eternally the prospects of the youngsters. There are.

For instance ?

We can't cite living examples, though there are many. I am too poor to be able to afford 'damages'.

EXAMPLES FROM DICKENS

Dickens has portrayed a few in his inimitable style.

He speaks from personal experience and the portraits are brilliant. Magnificent.

Here is Mr. Murdstone, the step- father of David Copperfield.

Baby David's mother sends him away on a holiday for a fortnight and when he gets back the nurse-maid breaks the news that his mother has married Mr. Murdstone in the meantime.

"Master Davy," says Peggotty (nurse-maid), untying her bonnet with a shaking hand, and speaking in a breathless sort of way, "what do you think ? You have got a Pa".

Baby David trembles and turns white. He is obviously not very happy.

David is relegated to a far off room in his mother's house and he feels the bleak change. He weeps and is uneasy in the morning.

The mother comes to console her baby. Mr. Murdstone appears and takes charge of the situation.

"What's this ? Clara, my love, have you forgotten ? Firmness, my dear ! Go below, my love, David and I will come down together."

When they are left alone, he shuts the door, and sitting on a chair, and holding David standing before him looks steadily into his eyes.

"David", he says, making his lips thin, by pressing them together, "if I have an obstinate horse or dog to deal with, what do you think I do ?"

"I don't know."

"I beat him. I make him wince and smart. I say to myself, I'll conquer that fellow ; and if it

were to cost him all the blood he had, I should do it. What is that upon your face"?

"Dirt," David mutters.

He knows it is the mark of tears as well as David does. But if he had asked the question twenty times, each time with twenty blows, David's baby heart would have burst before he would have told him so.

"You have a good deal of intelligence for a little fellow," Murdstone says with a grave smile that belongs to him, "and you understood me very well, I see. Wash that face, sir, and come down with me."

David says, in retrospect, "I had little doubt then, and I have less doubt now, that he would have knocked me down without the least compunction, if I had hesitated."

"Clara, my dear," Murdstone says, when David has done his bidding and he walks into the parlour with his hand still on David's, "you will not be made uncomfortable any more, I hope. We shall soon improve our youthful humours."

Mr. Murdstone straightened David at a stroke and he felt comfortable.

But was David improved? Let's hear him relating in retrospect :

"God help me, I might have been improved for my whole life. I might have been made another creature perhaps, for life, by a kind word at that

season. A word of encouragement and explanation, of pity for my childish ignorance, of welcome home, of reassurance to me that it *was* home, might have made me dutiful to him in my heart henceforth, instead of in hypocritical outside, and might have made me respect instead of hate him."

Don't we feel so too ? I for myself do.

That was "firmness" misapplied—the unkindest treatment for a 'new pa' on the very first meeting.

... ...

While still about Dickens, let's see another character portrayed by him.

This is Mr. Creakle, the principal of Salem House—a boarding-school to which David was sent to be disciplined.

Mr. Creakle has arrived back from a holiday. David is put up before him.

"Now", said Mr. Creakle, "what's the report of this boy ?"

"There's nothing against him yet," returned the man with the wooden leg (Mr. Creakle's A. D. C.). "There has been no opportunity."

Mr. Creakle was disappointed.

"Come here !" said Mr. Creakle, beckoning to David.

"Come here !" said the man with the wooden leg, repeating the gesture.

"I have the happiness of knowing your father-in-law", whispered Mr. Creakle, taking David by the ear, "and a worthy man he is, and a man of strong character. He knows me and I know him. Do you you know me ? Hey,"

"Not yet, sir."

"Not yet ? Hey ? But you will soon. Hey... I'll tell you what I am, I'm a Tartar."

"A Tartar", said the man with the wooden leg.

"When I say I'll do a thing, I do it," said Mr. Creakle, "and when I say I will have a thing done, I will have it done,...I am a determined character ..that's what I am. I do my duty. That's what I do. My flesh and blood—when it rises against me, is not my flesh and blood. I discard it..."

David was dismissed and he lay quaking for a couple of hours.

Did all the blustering of Mr. Creakle do David any good ?

Hear him reflecting long after he was out of Mr. Creakle's power :

"I am sure when I think of the fellow now, my blood rises against him with the disinterested indignation I should feel if I could have known all about him without ever having been in his power ; but it rises hotly, because I know him to have been an incapable brute, who had no more right to be possessed of the great trust he held, than to be

Lord High Admiral, or Commander-in-chief; in either of which capacities, it is probable that he would have done infinitely less mischief."

We agree. Baby hearts are not *made* that way; they are *broken*.

Naughty boys? Yes. By all means deal with them firmly but you don't want to be a Nero or to use a field-gun at a fly. You don't.

... ...

REASONABLE FIRMNESS

Be most careful to see that your order is a reasonable one, which *can* and *should* be obeyed, then once having given it, realise that it must be enforced at all costs. *Your reputation* is at stake with every command you give. Your subordinates are temperamentally, sentimentally and intrinsically so utterly various and different that to get work out of them some amount of firmness is absolutely necessary.

Your subordinates size you up mentally, if not openly. So if you fail to enforce one, you will probably fail with a next.

The magician shows a trick but once; a good disciplinarian gives his command but *once* also. His *next business* is to see it obeyed.

... ...

No superior officer is worth the name if he is not able to exact from his men a high grade performance of duty. The mushy leader never succeeded either in accomplishing his task or achieving popularity. The efforts of some superiors to gain popularity by being easy on the men, by overlooking derelictions, are successful only in gaining them reputation of being 'soft and negligible.'

NAPOLEON AND THE ADMIRAL

When a storm is threatening, Napoleon orders a naval review. Admiral Bruix does not carry out the order. The Emperor finds no preparations afoot and sends for the admiral. A stormy scene.

"Why did you not obey my orders ?"

"Your Majesty can see that for yourself. You would not needlessly risk brave men's lives in such weather."

Nepoleon is mad with rage : "Sir, I have given you an order. The consequences are no concern of yours. Do what you are told."

"Sire, I cannot obey."

Napoleon is furious. He strides ominously towards the admiral who also grows stiff. A terrible scene.

"You will leave Boulougne within twenty-four hours, and betake yourself to Holland. Rear-admiral Magon, carry out my orders."

That is a brief incident recorded by Napoleon's biographer.

We are sorry for the admiral but he was rightly dealt with. He might have represented to the Emperor, he might have pleaded with him but with the orders hanging over him unmodified, he was grossly at fault not to have proceeded to carry them out.

The weather ? Yes, but what if the enemy were to engage the navy in it ? Besides, the navy has to take risks anyway, if it is to achieve anything.

... ...

Neglect of duty, or inattention to orders should never be overlooked. If vigilance is constantly carried out, it will soon form habits of obedience in the most careless.

SOME MAXIMS

If we want maxims to go by, we have the following :

(1) *Consider well before giving an order but, having once given it, insist on having it obeyed.*

In a commanding officer that reverence to authority which can be placed high among a soldier's virtues will take the form of a *careful and conscientious* use of power. Knowing by experience the difficulty of obedience, he will seek, on the one hand, to enforce it by steadiness of rule, and,

on the other, to render such obedience easy by the simplicity, clearness and reasonableness of his orders.

(2) *Give no order which you do not intend to have obeyed.*

The exercise of authority is not only a privilege but a trust and one should not be flippant about it. One has to be serious about ordering and equally serious about execution.

(3) *Never forget what you have ordered.*

This is very essential. If subordinates can hold that orders given will soon be forgotten, they will take them with scant respect. Give fewer orders but count up one by one so that none goes by default.

Of this we shall speak further anon.

PERSISTENCE

Firmness also implies *persistence.* No leader ever achieved anything without persistence. The basis of this invaluable mental factor is the POWER OF WILL.

Ordinary men and women are too apt to throw their plans overboard and quit at the first sign of opposition or appearance of difficulty. You can dissuade people from their undertakings—easily and readily. Try a few words of disparagement, picture how badly they are going to be criticised by others when they come to hear of their plans and

suggest there were so many better alternative things to attempt—and you have put them off.

The victims take all this seriously, brood over it night and day and *decide* to drop their plans.

Millions behave like that. *A few don't.* Those are the men with grit, with stamina. Those are the men who could claim leadership. And they get it. They are the Columbuses, Darwins, Rockefellers, Fords, Carnegies.

Muhammad started preaching his philosophy and at once encountered opposition. Stiff. Crushing. He refused to quit.

Men with negative minds tried to convince Thomas A. Edison that he could not build a machine that would record and reproduce the human voice. Edison did not believe them ..

Men with negative minds told F. W. Woolworth he would go "broke" trying to run a store on five and ten cent sales. He did not believe them...

Men with negative minds told George Washington he could not hope to win against the vastly superior forces of the British. He did not believe them...

Men with negative minds jeered at Henry Ford when he put out his crudely built automobile on the streets. Many opined seriously it would not be practical, it would not pay. He did not believe them...

Men with negative minds tried to dissuade Wilbur Wright for seven years from the attempt to construct flying machines. He accelerated work and thought. Throughout the crucial seven years every penny he and his partner could spare was put aside to pay for plane building materials. He did not believe the dissuaders...

Bernard Shaw worked ceaselessly for nine years with little success and less encouragement. He *refused* to *quit*....

Napoleon Hill speaks of Fannie Hurst whose *persistence* conquered the Great White Way. She came to New York in 1915 to convert writing into riches. The conversion did not come quickly *but it came*. For four years she struggled in the sidewalks of New York ! She spent her days *labouring* ; nights *hoping*. She said, "I am going to win."

One patron (The Saturday Evening Post) sent her *thirty six* rejection slips before she got a story across. Millions of others would have given up the quest. She didn't. She pounded the pavements for four years to the tune of the publisher's "no", because she was dertermined to win.

Then she 'arrived.' The table turned : she had the publishers themselves to her door. Her royalties started soaring. The cinema rights to her latest novel, "Great Laughter", brought her 100,000,00 dollars, said to be the highest price ever paid for a story before publication.

... ...

All leaders must have persistence. No leader has ever done without it.

A disciplinarian is also measured up that way. If you issue a plan to-day or order a course now and drop it the next day or moment, you are not going to cut much ice with your subordinates. They themselves will help weaken you with all sorts of counter-suggestions.

So, remember, *firmness and persistence go hand in hand.* In fact, *persistence is continued firmness.*

... ...

Coming to practical advice on the point, I cannot help quoting Napoleon Hill who observes :

"There are four simple steps which lead to the habit of PERSISTENCE. They call for no great amount of intelligence, no particular amount of education, and but little time or effort. The necessary steps are :

1. A DEFINITE PURPOSE BACKED BY BURNING DESIRE FOR ITS FULFILMENT.

2. A DEFINITE PLAN, EXPRESSED IN CONTINUOUS ACTION.

3. A MIND CLOSED TIGHTLY AGAINST ALL NEGATIVE AND DISCOURAGING INFLUENCES, including negative suggestions of relatives, friends and acquaintances.

4. A FRIENDLY ALLIANCE WITH ONE OR MORE PERSONS WHO WILL ENCOURAGE ONE TO FOLLOW THROUGH WITH BOTH PLAN AND PURPOSE."

... .

MUST ALL ORDERS BE OBEYED ?

This brings us to the question : *Must all orders be obeyed ?* And, as a corollary, *must orders never be modified ?*

The admiral in the instance just cited was obviously in the wrong. Here was an imperial command with no option.

But what about an illegal or highly improper order ?

If it is an unlawful order, don't obey it. If you are asked to give false evidence or falsify an account, for example.

But if you consider the order unfair, injurious, or highly improper. make a representation for modification. If your superior persists, carry it out first and then, perhaps, complain afterwards. There is always a procedure for appeals. Avail of it, if you feel disposed.

What about *yourself* modifying your own orders ? The advice is : don't, except in very serious cases of injury or injustice.

In the above instance cited, Napoleon eventually blundered also. He overlooked what the

admiral said: "You would not risk brave men's lives in such weather!"

He asked the rear-admiral to carry on. Result?

A naval review *was* held in a raging storm. A number of chaloupes capsized, and their crews struggled in the water. The Emperor to save himself, jumped into the first boat; all who could, followed his example. Two hundred bodies were washed ashore next day!

But risks *have* to be taken, you may say.

Yes, but one who is given the power of life and death over others should pause and consider. Two hundred lives needlessly lost could have easily been saved.

Nobody would object to Napoleon's postponing the review by a few hours—*himself* doing it.

The point is, *stick to your orders generally all the time but be prepared to be amenable to good reasons.* Representations may reveal grave impropriety or injustice and it may be pigheadedness to go on unheeding. Relent, modify but resolve all the more to think well over before ordering so inconsiderately again.

... ...

ENSURING COMPLIANCE

Finally, *check* up. If there is need for issuing orders there is more for ensuring that they *are*

obeyed. Every order should, so to say, have a tail : "report compliance."

"I am a great friend of analysis"—said Napoleon, " 'Why' and 'How' are such questions, that they cannot be uttered too often."

Don't scatter orders like autumn leaves till you know not where they fall. Issue fewer orders but *make sure* they are being complied with.

We had a headmaster in our school who loved to exhibit his authority by *restraining* and *controlling* us. He was *surprized* to see a boy peeping out of the window, *mortified* by another throwing a paper ball out, *wounded* by some one whistling from somewhere *but determined* that nobody should do so again—on pain of ? Well, you know.

"Irrationally elaborate discipline, whether in the school or in the army, leads to multiplication of penalties."

We have indicated the procedure by which one can keep track of even trifles in chapter 5 in course of detailing The Art of Working. Please refer to the discussion there.

11

HOW TO ORDER OTHERS—

EXAMPLES AND EXERCISES

Let's relax a bit. We've been through a long chapter. Perhaps, boring. But all the same, *very important.*

We've 'marched' hard. Let's 'stand easy'. We've put down a heavy meal. Let's follow up with something from the Dictionary of Cooking, that will help digestion.

I am speaking of Examples and Exercises.

What! You mean, you ask, those hackneyed things in text-books on Arithmetic, Algebra or Geometry?

I plead guilty. Yes, and in Grammar too! And this is a *grammar* on Discipline.

I must quote precedents and cite authorities, you may demand.

Here you are.

We were taught 'hints on English Grammar' from—I must be exact—Rowe and Webb's handbook. We were helped with rules, principles—and then? Given examples and exercises. Any number of them!

Incorrect.	I goes.
Correct.	I go.
Incorrect.	He go.
Correct.	He goes.

I admit I don't quote *verbatim*. But I am guilty of nothing more than near-misses !

Perhaps, you won't believe.

I now quote from a book before me—one very well-known with a circulation well over 1,25,000 copies already, on the art of Public Speaking.

Under Errors in English it advises :

Wrong	Right
He *become* wealthy.	He *became* wealthy.
They *begun* to complain.	They *began* to complain.
I *brung* my purse.	I *brought* my purse.
The pipes *have busted.*	The pipes *have burst.*
He *come* home.	He *came* home.
He *has came* home.	He *has come* home.

Well. Well.. More is superfluous !

Don't laugh. These are only a few from *one* lesson. Hundreds and thousands like these there !

So, if *my* examples are as *homely*, don't grudge.

Christ taught by simple examples. Trifles of parables.

The Koran says, "God doesn't mind quoting a fly or a bigger insect for an example."

Well, why should I ? Or you ?

... ...

ERRORS IN ORDERING

REPEATED ORDERS

Example :

Wrong. Come here, my boy....Won't you come ? Do come.

Right. Come here, my boy.

Point. See that he comes on that. If he doesn't, do something worth while rather than repeat the request. That is going to do no good. *Your first and only order must be effective.*

IMPERSONAL ORDERS

Example :

Wrong. Let my breakfast be brought upstairs.

Right. (To somebody) Bring my breakfast upstairs.

Point. *Ask somebody in the second person.* Make him responsible. It's the privilege of God to say, "Let there be light." *He* is supposed to have unnumbered agencies about. Not *you*. If your wife is there and you don't apprehend 'nagging', ask *her* politely to see to this. If not, your valet, or parlour-maid or whoever-there-may-be within earshot.

LONG-RANGE ORDERS

Example :

Wrong. Hullo, who is there ? John ? Get me a tin of cigarettes, please.

Right. Hullo, John, here, please.

When he comes, let him stand 'to attention' before you. Look in his eyes and then say...

When he complies, say, "Thank you very much."

Point. *Get into the habit of speaking into the eyes, not only ears.* That will be more effective. *There* is the *direct personal* touch.

VACILLATING ORDERS

Example :

Wrong. Can a hot bath for me be arranged immediately ?

Right. So-and-so, please arrange, etc.

Point. *Leave no room for excises. Make the order imperative.* Or else, the cook will have a headache, the valet be busy otherwise, the oven will get damp or the *Memsahib* will have demanded prior attention ! So, wouldn't you wait a small hour ?

VAGUE ORDERS

Examples :

Wrong. See me in office.

Right. See me in my office to-day at 12-47 hours.

Wrong. Mend me the mosquito-net.

Right. Miss X (maid-servant), please take my mosquito-net away and put it back mended by this evening.

Point. *Don't leave it vague.* Else, you may be reminded by another mosquito-raid of having wanted something to be done with the net.

COMPOSITE ORDERS

Example :

Wrong. Miss Y (parlour-maid), please clean up my study, take out books, put them out in the sun rearrange them nicely placing the reference books together near at hand.

Right. Clean up my study. Then proceed further on completion report.

Point. *Proceed step by step, whenever you can.* Else, one part or another of the string of duties you impose will be forgotten or overlooked. And you may lose temper.

LOOSE ORDERS

Example :

Wrong. Study the rules on Leave carefully.

Right. Sit down and go through the rules now, this very minute. Or, go and study and make a precis of the whole thing and show me to-morrow morning.

Point. *Tighten orders : don't leave them loose.* Else, the addressee will conveniently forget or bluff.

Wrong request. Will you very kindly return this book for me to Mr. X. who lives next door to you ?

Right request. Will you kindly return this book, etc., and send me a token of his having received it ? Don't mind the trouble as I am anxious that he receives it back immediately.

Point. *Sharpen your request : don't leave it blunt.* Better use your own messenger in this case. Else, your friend will skip over the front pages and leave the book aside for skipping through the other pages at leisure. Result—as you are packing up, your friend X. will send in a chit and you relay it to the other friend who will send his apologies and you will relay them back to Mr. X. Well, good enough for a 'mutual apology society' but not for you when you want your obligation to return the book discharged faithfully !

DEFERRED ORDERS

Example :

Wrong. Do this sometime.

Right. Do this to-day, to-morrow or the day to be named.

Point. *Why not demand prompt attention : at least set a time limit.*

There is a funny story of affairs in an aristocratic household. Things used to move so leis-

urely that nobody could guess when any event would come to pass.

A guest arrived at 10 o'clock in the morning and was received heartily by the chief. Seeing a servant roll by leisurely, the latter cried out, "Hullo, let the lights be on." The guest was astounded.

Making enquiries in the household, the guest came to learn that it was the practice there not to expect prompt compliance of orders. The order for the lights being on were passed at 10 o'clock in the morning and heaven only knew if they would be on by 10 o'clock at night even!

UNCHECKED ORDERS

Example:

Wrong. Do this piece of job, please.

Right. Do this ... ... and report compliance by ..

Point. *Demand compliance and want to check up.*

Make a note, for experiment, of the various verbal orders and requests you make and of the lapses — the forgetting, overlooking, avoiding, eye-washing that is done. You will be staggered. You yourself forget and overlook those made on you. At least some of them.

... ...

It's no use multiplying these but as you are now in the hang of how 'orders' are to be made, you can correct your own faults and be a wiser man. Take care of small matters and big ones will take care of themselves.

Andre Maurois in his Art of Living sums up some of the salient features of 'right ordering' we have elaborated thus :

"An order must first of all be clear. A meditation may be vague, a scheme always has something of the vision in it but an order must be precise. All orders can be misunderstood ; an obscure one will never be understood. 'To do a thing well', said Napoleon, 'one must do it oneself'. This is not true, but the prudent leader will admit that few people understand and that almost everyone forgets. It is therefore not enough to give an order ; one must see to its execution and, when giving it, anticipate anything that may nullify its effectiveness. The leader who endeavours to frustrate the onset of ill luck and who strengthens the weak points in his schemes against stupidity is more apt to impose his will than one who does not take these measures".

12

SENSE OF PROPORTION

We now come to clause (7). The first part of which runs :

"Who sets the pupils, subordinates or followers to jobs which are within their power..."

The Koran says, "God does not impose upon man tasks beyond his power."

But *man* does.

Don't we notice teachers who would drill 'learning' into their children and continuously foam and fret at their short-comings ?

Aren't we aware of bosses who would remain eternally disappointed—nothing coming up to standard—nobody ever satisfying it ?

Well, well. It's a good thing to have a high standard ahead. But one should have a *sense of proportion.*

AN EXAMPLE FROM DICKENS

Dickens has portrayed beautifully how baby David Copperfield was taken in hand by his step-father, Mr. Murdstone and his sister, Miss Murdstone, to the exclusion of David's own mother. David represents Dickens himself in many ways

and the account is vivid, because it is from personal experience.

There was some talk of David's being sent to a boarding-school but in the meantime, he learnt lessons at home. (We shall italicise freely.)

"Shall I ever forget these lessons ! They were presided over nominally by my mother, but really by Mr. Murdstone and his sister, who were always present, and found them a favourable occasion for giving my mother lessons in that *miscalled firmness*, which was the bane of both our lives. I believe I was kept at home for that purpose. I had been *apt* enough to learn, and willing enough, when my mother and I had lived together. I can faintly remember learning the alphabet at her knee. To this day, when I look upon the fat block lettersin the printer, the puzzling novelty of their shapes and the easy good-nature of O and Q and S, seem to present themselves again before me as they used to do. But they recall no feeling of disgust or reluctance. On the contrary, I seemed to have *walked along a path of flowers* as far as the crocodile-book and to have been *cheered* by the gentleness of my mother's voice and manner all the way. But these *solemn lessons* which succeeded these, I remember as *the death-blow* at my peace and a *grievous daily drudgery* and *misery*. They were *very long*, very *numerous*, very *hard*—perfectly unint elligible, some of them, to me—and I was generally as *much bewildered by* them as I believe my poor mother was herself.

"Let me remember how it used to be, and bring one morning back again.

"I come into the second-best parlour after breakfast with my books and an exercise book, and a slate. My mother is ready for me at her writing-desk, but not half so ready as Mr. Murdstone in his easy-chair by the window (though he pretends to be reading a book), or as Miss Murdstone, sitting near my mother stringing steel beads. The very sight of the two has such an influence over me, that I begin to feel the words I have been at infinite pains to get into my head, all *sliding* away, and going I don't know where. I wonder where they *do* go, by the by?

"I hand the book first to my mother. Perhaps it is a grammar, perhaps a history, or geography. I take a last drowning look at the page, I give it into her hand, and start off aloud at a racing pace while I have got it fresh. I trip over a word. Mr. Murdstone *looks up*. I *redden, tumble* over half a dozen words and stop. I think my mother would show me the book if she dared, but she does not dare, and she says, softly—

" 'Oh, Davy, Davy!'

" 'Now, Clara!' says Mr. Murdstone, 'be firm with the boy. Don't say, 'Oh, Davy, Oh Davy!' That's childish. He knows his lesson or he does not know it.'

" 'He does not know it', Miss Murdstone interposes awfully.

" 'I am really afraid he does not,' says my mother.

" 'Then you see, Clara,' returns Miss Murdstone. 'you should just give him the book back, and make him know it.'

" 'Yes, certainly,' says my mother, 'that is what I intend to do, my dear Jane. Now, Davy, try once more and don't be stupid.'

" I obey the first clause of the injunction by trying once more, but am not so successful with the *second*, for I am very stupid...Mr. Murdstone makes a movement of impatience which I have been expecting for a long time. Miss Murdstone does the same. My mother glances submissively at them, shuts the book, and lays it up as an arrear to be worked out when other tasks are done.

"There is a *file of these arrears* very soon, and it *swells* like a rolling snowball. The bigger it gets, the more stupid I get. The case is so hopeless and I feel that I am wallowing in such a bog of nonsense, that I give up all idea of getting out, and abandon myself to my fate."

That is perfectly understandable. The poor capabilities of a boy taxed beyond measure !

... ...

If you are a step-father or a pseudo-tutor or even real ones, do pause to think.

A FATHER MAKES AMENDS

If you are constantly worried by children and determined to correct them with an *iron hand*, do so by all means. But before you take all the steps your urge and zeal may be prompting you to, read one of the classic pieces in American Journalism. Here you are :

"Father Forgets (condensed).

W. Livingston Larned.—

Listen, Son : I am saying this as you lie asleep, one little paw crumpled under your cheek and the blond curls stickily wet on your damp forehead. I have stolen into your room alone. Just a few minutes ago, as I sat reading my paper in the library, a stifling wave of remorse swept over me. Guilty I came to your bedside.

These are the things I was thinking, son : I had been cross to you. I scolded you as you were dressing for school because you gave your face merely a dab with a towel. I took you to task for not cleaning your shoes. I called out angrily when you threw some of your things on the floor.

At breakfast I found fault, too. You spilled things. You gulped down your food. You put your elbows on the table. You spread butter too thick on your bread. And as you started off to play and I made for my train, you turned and waved a hand and called, "Good-bye Daddy !" and I frowned, and said in reply, "Hold your shoulders back !"

Then it began all over again in the late afternoon. As I came up the road I spied you, down on your knees, playing marbles. There were holes in your stockings. I humiliated you before your boy friends by marching you ahead of me to the house. Stockings were expensive—and if you had to buy them you would be more careful! Imagine that, son, from a father!

Do you remember, later, when I was reading in the library, how you came in, timidly, with a sort of hurt look in your eyes? When I glanced up over my paper, impatient at the interruption, you hesitated at the door. "What is it you want?" I snapped.

You said nothing, but ran across in one tempestuous plunge, and threw your arms around my neck and kissed me, and your small arms tightened with an affection that God had set blooming in your heart and which even neglect could not wither. And then you were gone, pattering up the stairs.

Well, son, it was shortly afterwards that my paper slipped from my hands and a terrible sickening fear came over me. What has habit been doing to me? The habit of finding fault, of reprimanding—this was my reward to you for being a boy. It was not that I did not love you; it was that I expected too much of youth. It was measuring you by the yardstick of my own years.

And there was so much that was good and fine and true in your character. The little heart of you

was as big as the dawn itself over the wide hills. This was shown by your spontaneous impulse to rush in and kiss me good-night. Nothing else matters to-night, son. I have come to your bedside in the darkness, and I have knelt there, ashamed!

It is a feeble atonement; I know you would not understand these things if I told them to you during your waking hours. But to-morrow I will be a real daddy! I will chum with you, and suffer when you suffer, and laugh when you laugh. I will bite my tongue when impatient words come. I will keep saying as if it were a ritual: "He is nothing but a boy—a little boy!"

I am afraid I have visualized you as a man. Yet as I see you now, son, crumpled and weary in your cot, I see that you are still a baby. Yesterday you were in your mother's arms, your head on her shoulder. I have asked too much, too much."

That piece I quote from Carnegie. It appeared originally as an editorial in the People's Home Journal. Since then it has been printed and reprinted in hundreds of magazines and papers all over—millions of copies circulating!

What is the cardinal point? Let's requote: "*What has habit been doing to me? The habit of finding fault, of reprimanding—this was my reward to you for being a boy. It was not that I did not love you; it was that I expected too much of youth. It was measuring you by the yardstick of my own years.*"

... ...

That "expecting too much" is a ready source of frequent disappointment.

'Have I asked too much' should be on your lips when you are on the point of firing off abuses. It will sober you down.

"It is essential to good school-keeping that the boys should feel that there is a living and human moral force at their head—not an iron mechanism, not a Fate; that they are not parts of a machine merely, of which the head-master is only a kind of stoker or driver. A human heart must be felt to be beating under the outer case of rules and methods—heart which sympathises and understands."

... ...

UNTHINKING BOSSES

So far for children and those who may be dealing with them

What about subordinates ?

There are people who scatter orders about from on an armchair and fret and frown at each lapse.

They should pause to *consider !*

Perfection is not human ; *to err* is so.

"When Theodore Roosevelt was in the White House, he confessed that if he could be right 75 per cent of the time, he would reach the highest of his expectations."

That was the highest rating of a great man.

What about you and me ?

If you expect so much from others, others have a right to expect as much from you.

Are you up to their standard ? If you are, you have every right to expect others. If not, how then ?

Napoleon robbed hundreds of his fellow workers of health and youth, because he demanded too much of them. His private secretary would be sent for at a late hour, and would retire to bed at four in the morning. At seven again, the poor man would find new tasks ready for him, and would be told that they must be finished within two hours. During the Consulate he would sometimes begin a sitting with his ministers at six in the evening and keep up till five next morning.

True, but he did not spare himself either.

He exacted from himself prodigious labour. Many witnesses bear out his amazing powers of continued work. His mind never flagged. He was never distracted from the work at hand, never neglected the matter in hand for one which he was about to start. Good or bad news never interfered with his attention to the Civil Code ; the Civil Code did not interfere with his military campaigns. He could work for eighteen hours at a stetch, may be on one piece of work, may be several in turn.

Yes, he had excuses for demanding from subordinates what he yielded from himself. You may say so but *he* was working on his own, *he* was crowding the honours of the world and bent on changing the face of the world !

You and I, dear reader ? I personally am not out for any big noise ; at least not yet. I don't know of you.

... ...

Shakespeare makes Brutus say : 'I should not urge thy duty past thy might.'

Willam Pitt was once having essential qualities of a Statesman discussed in his presence when some one mentioned industry, another energy, still another eloquence. Pitt said that the essential quality of a prime minister was patience.

He was right. This is not only so for a prime minister, but for all whose privilege it is to lead other people. Stupidity is a factor to be reckoned with in human affairs. A true leader expects to encounter it in normal course and endures it patiently so long as it is normal stupidity. He knows that sometime his ideas will be distorted, intentions misunderstood, orders misconstrued and there will be jealousy here and there. He knows these are inevitable as men without faults cannot be found. He makes the best use of those at his disposal as far as he can.

... ...

HOW ABOUT YOURSELF ?

Some are brought up on the motto—"Never tell a man to do anything that you are not prepared to do youself." This is a good motto to follow.

The Koran asks, "Do you prescribe what you do not yourself follow ?" —The idea is : *Do unto others as you would be done by.*

All great men were embodiments of what they expected others to be or do.

We have elaborated in chapter 5 how the leader has himself to take in hand for discipline. Self-discipline is the first duty of the disciplinarian.

A widow brought in a child to prophet Muhammad complaining he was badly in the habit of taking honey. She could not afford this. Would the prophet reform the child ?

The prophet paused. He proposed the child should be brought in some days later !

Why ? The mother did dot understand.

All the same, she came again after a few days. The prophet took the child in hand and suggested he should give up the habit for his mother's sake. Poo woman, how could she afford his hobby ?

It is said the child gave it up.

Whatever he did is not the point. The point is : Why did the prophet take time ?

Can you guess ?

He took time as he was himself taking honey ! He gave up the habit himself before asking the child to do so.

Instructive. Brilliant...Isn't it ?

13

EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT—
ORGANIZATION, SUPERVISION, TEST AND INSPECTION

The clause we have been discussing has a second part. It runs: "and ensures progress and compliance by right tests and inspections."

This *ensuring* is the better part of *ordering*.

It's not much use scattering orders or having an elaborate code or regulation, if *compliance* is not secured.

Of *ordering* itself, we have elaborated the technique. Let's see how the other part can be managed well.

Apart from the few cases in which you *can* and *will* order wards and subordinates individually, they will have to be led by a system set by yourself or laid down already by the administration or organization of which you may be a part.

If you are a teacher, you have the school code to follow and enforce.

So also, if you are a police officer. You have the massive Police Regulations to follow and enforce.

So also, if you are a business manager. You have the Rules of Business to go by and make others go by.

In fact, every superior or head has to do likewise. If he has no set system, he has to *evolve* one. For, the greater the number of men under him, the greater will be the details in volume to be attended to.

"Although everything is being done on a larger scale," says James Logan, a captain of American business, "there never was a time when the smallest details of a business had to be watched so closely as at present."

How is a head going to cope with these details ?

We have so far elaborated the direct relationship between the leader or superior and his men. His manner and tone will weigh with those who come in contact with him. Apart from such direct influencing, however, he will have, if he is presiding over any biggish affair, to have innumerable subleaders and foremen working for him. The same ways and means of dealing with those immediately below them will have to be practised by these themselves.

The pooling of the output of all workers towards the accomplishment of some results has got to be done where there is anything like a biggish organization. The efficiency of the whole organization can rise or drop according as the various groups pull together or not.

There, thus, crops up the question whether a given Organization or Management is efficient or not.

ADMINISTRATIVE OR MANAGEMENTAL EFFICIENCY

It is only in comparatively recent times that business administration has been studied as a distinct function in economic life. Even after the vast opportunities afforded by the industrial revolution, business continued to be associated with the trial and error methods and dependent upon native shrewdness and energy. In England the period of laissez faire afforded vast opportunities to the greedy captains of industry to corner the market and secure inflated incomes without taking by them of any marked interest in scientific administration or management. Individualistic effort prevailed more or less over the entire world.

The race for appropriating the maximum profits naturally led to cut-throat competitions and low costs had to be ensured in order to capture wider markets. Such low costs could be attained in many cases only by the most vigorous study of methods, material and organization and a scientific approach to problems of management and administration.

The spread, again, and the growing complexity of the corporate form of business organization resulted in the development of a management group who became more or less distinct from the real owners. The supersession of the small-scale owner-manager who might have liked to squeeze out the utmost for himself gave a considerable stimulus to a detached and scientific approach toward problems of administration.

Then, again, the advances made in the social sciences have been an additional stimulus toward new view-points. The newer psychology with its analysis of personality mal-adjustment and integration, has helped the output of labour. The ethical and social obligations of handling human material to the *best interests of all concerned* have put a brake on irresponsible exploitation.

F. W. Taylor of America has been known as the father of modern scientific management but his studies have been supplemented and complemented by thousands of others working on the lines.

Interest in business administration has since been rapidly growing. Schools and colleges have sprung into existence and by 1915 there was a large and growing body of literature.

Although there was considerable interest in the principles of business administration in Europe prior to the last world war, it has become enormous since. This has in part been due to envy of the prosperity American business has been enjoying. Observers going over to America have been struck by the ruthlessness of American concerns with which they continually scrape equipment, discard methods, and look for new and more efficient equipment and more progressive methods. The contrast to them became obvious as against the affection exhibited in continental countries for old machines and old plants and the conservatism in favour of old methods.

RATIONALIZATION

Throughout Europe there thus arose a dissatisfaction with the traditional and antiquated methods, an eager search for improved practices and an unflagging effort to adapt industry to new conditions.

The watch-word became 'rationalization', a term which according to the central German body charged with the study of rationalized methods, may be defined as follows :

"Rationalization consists in understanding and applying every means of improving the general economic situation through technical and systematic organization. Its object is an increase in the standard of living by the provision of better and cheaper goods in larger quantities."

Rationalization proposes application of the scientific intellectual method not only to the problems of industrial management within the framework of existing industry but the reconstruction of economic life in the large. This movement has been in evidence in England, Germany, France, Czechoslovakia and Poland and particularly in Russia, where scientific management is considered as the essential basis of industrial progress.

India is lamentably backward in industrial progress and unless Indians take more actively to industrialization of the country, it will never come forward in line with other more developed countries.

... ...

As we are here concerned with organizations in general and not with mere profit-making undertakings, we shall devote our discussion to adminins-trative efficiency in general.

The administration of personnel is, however, most important and a most fascinating study.

It has been defined in the Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences as *the planning, supervision, direction and co-ordination of the activities of an organization which contribute to realizing its defined purposes with a minimum of human effort and friction, with an animating spirit of co-operation and with proper regard for the genuine wellbeing of all members of the organization.*

It would appear that the definition might have stopped short with the word 'friction' and that the elaboration thereafter has been the result of the ethical and social obligations now accepted.

The efficiency of an administration will be in the ratio of results achieved to the means employed.

Let us consider some instances of organizational efficiency.

As cited by Harrington Emerson, on July 4, 1870, the throne of Spain was offered to a German Prince, Leopold. This was probably part of Bismarck's plan to provoke a quarrel. Napoleon stamped his foot once too often and for the last time. The French Emperor declared

War on July 19, 1870. It is said that von Moltke was asleep when the telegram came and that when awakened, he said: "You will find the plan of campaign in the third drawer of my desk," and that he then turned over and went to sleep again. This might have been true; for, from that moment, over a million men in Germany stepped, ate, filled every minute of their time, according to pre-arranged plan and schedule. They were called from their homes and private businesses everywhere throughout the kingdoms and States; all the railroads fell in line with all their equipment. There was no confusion, no hysterics, no silly haste .. "Ohne Hast, Ohne Rast." The citizens called, found their uniforms and arms ready, provisions stored. Because the French plans contemplated mobilization in nineteen days, von Moltke had planned for eighteen days, knowing that this would place the seat of war in France, not in Germany. The French actually required twenty-one days to mobilize.

What is marvellous is not that one great nation vanquished another, not that the victory came so soon, but that von Moltke's plans were so perfect that they were carried out to the day, in spite of the desperate resistance and antagonism of a force as strong as his own, both nations having about 40,000,000 inhabitants.

That was success due to efficient planning and correct execution.

Let us turn aside from a greedy campaign perhaps wickedly planned ahead to the organization of a day-to day public-utility-concern.

In railroad operations one comes across work organized over vast areas and beyond provincial limits. Lines of track over a thousand miles long stretch from Chittagong to Peshawar, the two farthest extremities. Every switch, every curve is known: the line is studded with signal posts and punctuated with stations. Trains full with men and goods have to run long distances, engines taking in water at intervals, trucks getting deposited, bogies attached, goods dropped and picked up. Connections have got to be maintained and time-tables stuck to. The army of petty railway workmen and officers are seen at work everywhere, all doing their own parts. The organization threads all their individual activities to facilitate conveyance of men and goods over these long distances.

Here is a specimen of organizational management. I am far from suggesting that it is either perfect or that there is no waste, no dislocation, no discomfort to be met with by critical observers. No human organization *is perfect* but one can and should attain a high degree of efficiency by modern methods of check and elimination of wasteful points.

Some petty officer gets lazy at a place and some discomfort to a passenger ensues, some

station-master holds up a train and it runs late, crew-men get lazy and dishonest and passengers crowd into higher class compartments, goods due for despatch are laid aside by parcel-clerks till they are paid something—all such trifles ensue from the human weaknesses of the human personnel. They, again detract from the efficiency of the management to some extent, however small. Perhaps these can never be entirely eliminated but no organization should rest from making vigorous efforts towards eradicating them.

It is a fact that innumerable groups are at work all over and *are* managing affairs somehow but what we are considering here is *how these could get the maximum results.*

The efficiency of an organizational unit is the sum-total of various efficiencies :

Individual efficiency of the personnel : Organizational efficiency of the whole unit ; Mechanical and equipmental efficiency.

We shall say a few words on each.

INDIVIDUAL EFFICIENCY

Each individual personnel has got to be *efficient.* This is only an ideal—very rarely, if ever, to be met with in any human organization. It should be the aim of the heads to secure this condition.

First of all, they have to see that the human material that is taken in is in all respects suitable.

Selection Boards and Competitive Examinations are designed to *exclude undesirable material* and take in the *best* of the *suitable lot.*

Selection of the personnel is a highly responsible job. Upon it depends the future output of the unit. I need hardly say that *favouritism, dishonesty, neglect in exercising care and caution* are some of the evils that undermine the usefulness of appointing boards or agents. Nothing is so detrimental to the welfare of the unit as these. The selection of personnel should vest *high* and in *incorruptible* and *discerning* hands. The appointing authorities must have only the securing of the best material in mind.

Extreme care should be taken in selecting an applicant. Nine-tenths of all the harder discipline ought to be applied to exclude undesirables, men who by reason of bad character, bad and offensive habits, destructive tendencies, laziness or shirking manners are unfit to become working members of a high-class organization.

This is not to mean that we are aggressively denouncing human material. We are only emphasizing that men and women are different by temperament and inclinations and an organization has to sift and find out human material with a stock of fitness in its particular line. A blind man is not to be despised as a human being ; he may become a self-supporting, useful and successful member of society but he cannot and should not

be expected to act as the lookout on an ocean steamer.

To every human being the talent of success is nothing more than doing what he *can* do well. As Emerson says, 'the crowning fortune of a man is to be born with a bias to some pursuit which finds him in employment and happiness'.

Ability is the main criterion; but *willingness* and *character* are no less to be sought for. The master organizer, be he saint or assassin, does not admit those who would make trouble. He thus avoids nine-tenths of possible insurrection and friction. The collective spirit of a willing team brings refractory individuals rudely to their senses, so that the master has himself very little of trouble to deal with.

Selective recruitment is usually confined to material offering itself. There is a sense of competition where terms of emloyment are liberal and working conditions favourable. Apart from the material offering itself, there must be *talents* who do not come forward for one reason or another. It can and should be the look-out of the organization to *find these talents* and secure them. Except in a few cases, like the film industry, this is very rarely done.

Recruitment has to be followed up by *suitable training*. Every organization has a type of work and a course of training sharpens skill and smooths off angularities of the rough recruits. The police, the

military, the industries have their own lines of rigorous training without which even the best material will achieve much less than it actually could.

When employees have been secured and trained, they have yet to be kept in trim and efficiency. Every hand *can* put forth better effort. It will do so if *sufficiently encouraged*.

The old method was to squeeze out labour under threat or by constant nagging. This results in *grudged* labour, by no means so very fruitful. That method cannot be entirely dispensed with yet ; for love of ease and comfort is still the dominant characteristic of many. Supervision, test and inspection must, therefore, continue.

The newer method is to bring forth better efforts by understanding and sympathy. Efficiency rewards, timely appreciation, tactful handling are some of the stimulants now used with better results.

We are going to elaborate all these methods in the remaining pages of this book.

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFICIENCY

It is not enough that some well-selected and well-trained hands should be collected and left to work by themselves. They should fall nicely into defined places and all pool their labours to achieving the desired goal.

Heaping together of endless parts, screws and bolts will never make a car. Every part, every nut, every bolt must be fitted in to perform its own part in a designed body.

The organizational unit should be well-knit, every part doing its assigned duty. The hands should exert co-operatively. They must be supervised as well as cared for. *Discipline* has to be perfect and *justice* pervade all throughout. The former will make for *order* and the latter for *smooth working*.

There have been disgraceful examples of torture and injustice in the past ; there are some even now. Foremen have plundered and swindled the men placed under them, debauched wives, violated homes, because the power to employ and discharge, to promote and reduce has been blindly left with them. Trade Unionism with all its tenets of inefficiency is in large part a justifiable collectivism to cope with some of the worst outrages to which wage-earners were exposed.

The present treatise is itself an elaboration of the main heads of *discipline* and *justice* which make for organizational efficiency.

EQUIPMENTAL EFFICIENCY

"Forty years ago" writes Harrington Emerson, "I watched the workers on the Suez Canal. Many of them were girls, digging up the sand with their bare fingers, scooping it into the hollows of their

hands, throwing it into the rush basket each had woven for herself, lifting the basket to their heads, and carrying the load of 20 to 30 pounds a hundred feet up the bank and dumping it. Panama excavation is being done by steam shovels. Recently I watched one of them at work. The fingers of the Egyptian girl had grown into a thousand-times larger steel claws that dug and scraped the shattered rock and dirt; the hollow of the girl's hands had developed into a scoop containing two cubic yards, or five thousand times as much as her two hands could hold; the rush basket had grown into a train of flat cars; the shapely arm of smooth flesh covering muscle and bone had grown into a great beam moved by chains, flinging great loads onto the flat cars; and instead of the 100 feet of walking, long trains ran perhaps twenty miles to unload."

The contrast between operations now and then in one single life-time nay only a part of it, is illuminating. Human brain has replaced muscle-power with machine-power.

Roads were built so that barefooted people might travel in slow comfort. The fastest walker could average 4 miles over any considerable stretch. It took many generations before some bright mind evolved the idea that a revolving wheel would be more adapted to the road than alternating footsteps. We thus had the roller, the cart, the wheelbarrow and at last the bicycle. But even a cycle took three generations in getting efficiently adjusted.

It carried man several times faster than his legs did. But legs could not push much harder than 200 pounds nor make very many strokes per minute. So that man in his cushioned seat, with mere pressure of hand or foot, covers 50/60 miles an hour and hundreds of miles a day. Why, again, be bound by the limitations of a road ? He now flies straight on at a speed of 200 to 300 miles per hour. Who knows how faster yet he will move in future ?

Man has forced nature to help him. From the stone age to the age of steam and electricity, man has made great strides. And many more will he be making !

Muscle-power has now to be aided with machine power, wherever this is possible. Most up-to-date devices and mechanical aids have got to be availed of.

The human element in an organization may be all right, and exerting the best but equipmental inefficiency may affect results. Poor belting, poor abrasive wheels, defective machines can retard work in a factory more than any other agency. Those may just roll on without endangering anybody and it is more likely nobody will care very much for them It is for the responsible heads to see that they are immediately attended to and where overhauling is not possible, they are replaced. Otherwise, there will be waste and the out-put will be curtailed.

Just as cheap labour may not be ultimately paying, so may not false economy in the matter of equipment and machinery.

... ...

HEADS OF THE UNITS

For the head, however, there is danger in the two extremes.

If he engulfs himself in a sea of details, he will come to grief, or at any rate nerve-racking futility. It would be a sheer wasteful process for an office head to be drafting every letter, counting every pice, or ordering every messenger out.

If, on the other hand, he leaves details to others and ignores them altogether, things will come to rot.

The head, executive or leader has to :

(a) lay down a system of work ;
(b) distribute responsibility ;
(c) supervise details ;
(d) check up periodically and by surprise ; and
(e) have details checked up and supervised by others.

The head has to lay down a system of work for himself and for others. We have elaborated this part of his duty while detailing the Art of Working (56-92).

DAY'S WORK FILE

(1) Have I systematized my own *routine* and do I attend to it daily ?

Your first requirement is a well-equipped office, a well-arranged work-shop, where, with minimum time and effort, a maximum mental output can be attained.

Improved lay-out and various time and labour-saving devices are now available. The executives of the present day are introducing scientific management into their personal affairs. Are you ?

Your "*Day's Work File*" should be well-arranged and ready for you to tackle to a finish. Let not work accummulate. It has a tendency to grow and grow wildly.

SUPERVISING OTHERS' WORK

(2) Do I supervise work of my subordinates ?

See, first, if your subordinates have equipments ready, and accommodation comfortable, whether their office lay-out is such as to secure economy in labour and afford privacy for concentrated work.

Then, see if you have divided responsibility fairly and adequately.

"Analyze the career of the successful business manager," says a leader in business, "and you will find that he has done two things : by elimination and selection he has fitted competent men to the

places at which the work focusses ; by system he has so shifted detail to the shoulders of subordinates as still to keep the essential facts under his own hand.'

Speaking of Lloyd George after he took over the reins of government of England in the dark days of the last great war, his biographer says :

"He has the imagination to envisage the unaccountable forces at his disposal in the British Empire, and if need be he will use these forces to their very limits. Already he has proceeded on new lines. With that intense practicalness which goes with his spiritual exaltation he has appointed a grocer and a provision-dealer to control the food-supplies of the country, has put a ship-owner at the head of the mercantile marine, has given to a man who was a working steel-melter the unshackled control of labor, has chosen as another Cabinet Minister a young American who has made a fortune in business -staggering appointments indeed for a conservative old England. But that is only a beginning. The Prime Minister has hitherto been but the titular head of the various departments of his Government, but now he is going to be the real head, for Lloyd George has set up a prime Minister's Department which co-ordinates continually all the various Government offices. Lloyd George means to be no mere figure of dignity as a Prime Minister."

The executive sees the duties of his subordinates, not as *they* see them, but in relation of all

the different cogs and wheels to the main business. The essential thing is not so much that the chief should be able to put himself in the places of the employees as that he should be able to place these, every one, in their proper places

WATCHING DETAILS

(3) Do I watch details ?

If you are alert, you will be readily able to gather from day to day which section is lagging behind. Pull it up, not necessarily by depriving somebody of his bread,—but by *advice, tactful handling*.

You will also gather which section is doing remarkably well. *Do not remain silent.* Send "*well-done*" *messages* to it. Encourage those who are responsible for good work, individually and collectively. You will be rewarded by even better work.

Ask for 'facts' and 'figures' ; call for 'statistics'; 'returns'; weigh them and watch. These are great pointers.

While speaking of details, we have to discuss the thorny subject of management of correspondence.

MANAGEMENT OF CORRESPONDENCE

A great deal of work of an organization is tansacted through correspondence. For corres-

pondence to be dealt with *promptly* and *exhaustively*, a head of an office has to be constantly alert.

It is common experience how hard it is to get a reply from people who are not interested. You ask for some information which has to be collated at some labour and see what happens. No response. The clerk concerned hopes you will not press for it. You remind and the clerk frets. If he is honest, he will take the trouble to send it. If not, he will take another chance by sitting over. If he is caught by his own head, he will plead having 'overlooked' the matter or 'mislaid' the paper! In times of pressure subordinates even lighten their pending baskets by tearing off papers!

There are genuine cases where an office is lamentably under-staffed and consequently the hands are tremendously over-worked. Apart from that, the *shirking of labour* is the commonest cause.

For outgoing correspondence, your office should be 'exacting' replies, i. e. 'collecting its own dues'. A regular system of reminders and stronger 'follow-ups' can get replies back.

The maxim here should be: *whatever is worth initiating is worth pursuing*.

We have elaborated this on pp. 76.

The responsibility of 'pursuing' must rest with the *one that initiates*. He can watch by putting down 'forward dates' and carrying them over further. The usual reminders can then take stronger and

stronger tone, till the reply is back or action completed.

But the greatest trouble is with respect to others writing to you. You may be interested in replying to the flimsiest matter but there is your office that has to act.

Your motto should be : *Every letter deserving a reply shall be answered ; every paper requiring action will be promptly and adequately attended to.*

And you won't have this carried out unless you have a *fool-and-knave-proof system.*

The following as a system can be tried out.

1. All papers must come to the head first. He will have them sealed, dated and initialled. His deputy can do so for him, when necessary.

2. A numbering machine can work from, say, first of January, every bit of paper receiving a consecutive number.

3. The head clerk concerned will take charge of the bits numbered and enter them in his handbook.

4. He will distribute papers by number only to various officers and show disbursements on their handbooks. Those officers will note short accounts of contents against each item.

5. All papers must be attended to and replied to when necessary, within three (or five or more as the head should lay down) days of receipt except in cases where more urgent attention is called for.

6. Papers that cannot be disposed of within the given days must be put up for a further date. Dates to be carried forward in 'Forward Diaries'.

7. Officers concerned must put up to heads concerned papers disposed of with a note: All action taken. File. (In short form: A. t. File.) This note is to be initialled by the officer and signed by the head. The officer will at the same time strike off the entry in his handbook under his initial.

8 Officers will strike off balances every third day on the hand-books on a cash register basis.

9. The head or his deputy will scrutinize the head clerk's paper accounts daily.

10. Where the office is large and papers to be attended to many, respective duties can be re-allotted to sectional heads.

11. The head can watch matters or papers likely to be sat over in the manner set forth in pages 73 and 75.

The system seems rather too elaborate but it can be modified to suit local conditions. It is only a general outline.

The system is devised to ensure that every bit of paper is accounted for as much as is every penny of cash.

INSPECTIONS—PERIODICAL AND BY SURPRISE

(4) Do I inspect periodically and sometimes by surprise ?

Do so, not necessarily to "create hell" as many people do but to *correct* and *guide sympathetically*. Don't be *too fault-finding*. This chokes your subordinates up and prevents them from better work.

INSPECTIONS — BY DELEGATION

(5) Do I ask others to check up and supervise for me ?

There is an art of right delegation. Ask somebody whom you trust to go through things you want checked up and let him help you. This will sharpen powers of your deputies who may one day take your place.

... ...

DISHONEST LEAKAGE

Inspections and supervision are meant to secure compliance of orders. They are to check neglect and waste. They are also to check *corrupt practices*.

I do not know if any country is entirely free from corrupt practices of men in power or authority but India's lot in this respect is really deplorable. Corrupt practices abound in almost every walk of life. The police have got a bad name for dishonesty but there are others to beat them now. The Railway, the courts, the trades and professions—all seem to be abounding in host of underlings hankering after making their 'two pice'.

Government should surely institute a permanent 'Anti-corruption Department' on the lines of the Criminal Investigation Department and every district should have an 'Anti-corruption Committee' composed of selected district heads and representatives of the people.

Every department should be enjoined upon to hand over black sheep.

Apart from such vigilance, the main causes of dishonest dealings here should be attacked.

Illiteracy and ignorance of the people make them easy targets and dupes. They seem to be helpless against even the pettiest official or man in authority,

Some of the subordinate ranks in the police and other services are so lowly paid that they have either to starve or make money illegally. No civilized government should retain men on such absurdly inadequate pay.

Merely raising of pay will not mend matters completely. There must be a constant drive maintained against dishonesty by the superior officers.

Apart from government, there is a vicious leakage by hirelings in business and public work also. Owners of concerns are rudely taken aback by the amount hirelings want to make to the detriment of the interest of concerns and ultimately of the hirelings themselves.

There should be a reasonably high minimum wage or pay for whole-time workers. Part-time workers may supplement whole-time workers.

Apart from the reasonable pay, workers should be encouraged to share bonus or reward handsomely so that they can look upon dishonest leakage by individual workers as a loss to themselves and hand up defaulters.

Espionage is a bad thing but some system of securing information secretly of all that is happening is indispenable to all heads. Open complaints are seldom made as they are difficult to prove. Besides, the likelihood of arousing animosity is very disturbing.

A 'silent watch' system can easily be instituted in any organization. This consists in having some picked men in positions from where they are bound to 'know things' report secretly as much as the heads would like to know. These 'silent watchers' should be carefully selected and warned against divulging anything regarding their double role to anybody beyond the head who employed them on this trusted mission.

All that emanates from these watchers has, again, to be carefully sifted, for prejudice, animosity, a sense of bravado may easily lead them to exaggerate, and friendship and favouritism to minimise happenings. In any case, multiple checks can be ensured and a funny result may be *one watcher reporting unknowingly against another* so

that even watchers themselves would be in no advantageous position to do anything they liked!

To avoid exposure of the system, the heads can test and check up by surprise particular points on some excuse or other. The merit of the system is that no harm will ensue even if workers know of such a system prevailing as long as the watchers themselves are not spotted. All will then be on their guard and imagine the head almost all-knowing!

... ...

To sum up:

We started in this clause by saying that a disciplinarian or leader sets reasonable tasks to pupils or disciples. He has to display a sense of proportion. He should not ask too much. That is the point of an inconsiderate master.

We end by saying that he has to ensure compliance of what he *does ask for*. If this be not the case, orders will be disregarded, rules violated, duties neglected. Evasion and slackness will prevail. Good discipline and smooth work will suffer.

14

THE MAGIC OF APPRECIATION

Let us now take up the last, but by no means the least important clause for discussion. It reads :

(8) "who appreciates and deprecates work rendered according as it deserves and by appropriate handling is able to get the best out of pupils and subordinates."

We shall split up what the disciplinarian here has to do. He has to :

(a) *appreciate* ;
(b) *deprecate* ; and
(c) *handle appropriately and get the best out.*

Why, this is as clear as day-light! Why elaborate ?

I say this is *not*. Besides, there is the eternal question : 'How ?'

We now take up

(a) APPRECIATION

We know that the emotion of 'fear' has been exploited to advantage,—perhaps to excesses—in the matter of making people 'do' or 'refrain from doing' things. I am not doubting the efficacy of the method.

You break a horse by putting strong reins on and then by the free use of the whip and also spurs It is not amenable to discipline through other kindly means. You teach a bear to dance by placing it on a heated floor so that the poor thing has to raise its feet by turns to save them from being burnt !

You continue to use similar means of compulsion to human beings triumphantly quoting the analogy. I do not dispute.

But here you are.

Let *me* use the same means to *you*. Will *you* like it ?

If *you* do the same to *me*, *I* shall *not*.

... ...

The emotional power that has been deliberately and freely used to produce work is fear. From the earliest beginning of time men have made use of fear as a driving power. This is because it seems always to work and the stupidest man knows how to apply it. Any one will work under threat of a gun or a whip.

It must be realized, however, that fear is really a reverse, and its use drives a man backward into his work, while he wants to go in the opposite direction. Work secured through fear is grudged and usually lacks quality.

... ...

A failure to appreciate this fundamental principle, has led arm-chair penologists to prescribe *harder* and *harder* punishments.

TWO FORMS OF LEADERSHIP

Talking of LEADERSHIP, we must take note of the two forms of it.

One is LEADERSHIP BY CONSENT of, and with the sympathy of the followers. The other is LEADERSHIP BY COERCION, without the consent and sympathy of the followers.

The former is enduring ; the latter momentary. The former is based on mutual co-operation, respect and regard ; the latter on fright, tyranny and contempt.

Napoleon, Kaiser, Hitler, Stalin belong to the latter camp. Christ, Muhammad, Akbar, Washington, Lincoln, Gandhi, Churchill, Roosevelt to the other.

NAPOLEON AND NELSON COMPARED

Napoleon used human materials ruthlessly. He allowed no scruples to come between him and his object of attainment. Other people were mere tools. Basely and and selfishly he excused himself : "I am not as other men ; the laws of morality and convention cannot be applied to me .. I, alone, because of my position, know what Government is."

Well, well, he is dead and gone. But even before he was dead, he realized his mistake.

In his last meeting with Josephine, he is reported to have said, "Josephine, I have been as fortunate as any man ever was on this earth, and yet, at this hour, you are the only person in the world on whom I can rely."

But could he even rely on her ? Historians doubt very much.

Perhaps, you may say, that was a piece of flattery one occasionally indulges in in favour of a wife or beloved. But even apart from that, historians *do* bear out how little loved he actually was.

Let us consider Nelson, in this light.

"Never", says Southey of Nelson, "was any commander more beloved. He governed men by their reason and their affections : they knew that he was incapable of caprice or tyranny ; and they obeyed him with alacrity and joy, because he possessed their confidence as well as their love. 'Our Nel', they used to say, 'is as brave as a lion, and as gentle as a lamb.' Severe discipline he detested, though he had been bred in a severe school : he never inflicted corporal punishment if it were possible to avoid it, and when compelled to enforce it, he, who was familiar with wounds and death, suffered like a woman. In his whole life, Nelson was never known to act unkindly towards an officer. If he was asked to prosecute one for ill-behaviour, he used to answer : 'That there was

no occasion for him to ruin a poor devil, who was sufficiently his own enemy to ruin himself.' But in Nelson there was more than the easiness and humanity of a happy nature ; he did not merely abstain from injury : his was an active and watchful benevolence, ever desirous not only to render justice, but to do good."

Nelson was once sent to bring away the troops from Porto Ferrajo. Having performed this, he shifted his flag to the *Theseus*. That ship had taken part in the mutiny in England and some danger was apprehended from the temper of the men on this account. This was one of the reasons why Nelson was to command her. He had not been long on board before a paper, signed in the name of all the ship's company, was dropped on the quarter-deck, containing these words : "Success attend Admiral Nelson ! God bless Captain Miller ! We thank them for the officers they have placed over us. We are happy and comfortable, and will shed every drop in our veins to support them ;—and the name of *Theseus* shall be immortalized as high as her captain's."

It is said that wherever Nelson commanded, the men soon became attached to him ; in ten days' time he would have restored the most mutinous ship in the navy to order !

... ...

LINCOLN AND ROOSEVELT COMPARED

Let us look at Lincoln, a great ruler of mankind. It is said that Theodore Roosevelt used to lean back and look up for inspiration, at a large painting of Lincoln that hung above his desk in the White House, when he was confronted by any perplexing problem. He would ask himself 'what would Lincoln do in the circumstances ? How would he solve this problem ?'

"A comparison between Roosevelt (Theodore) and Lincoln along this line", (winning good-will), writes one, "will be illuminating. Roosevelt had gifts to an extraordinary degree for making of a popular idol. He was honest, courageous. frank, intellectually able, with a strong love for righteousness. His physical vigour was a trump card. In variety of interest, he was remarkable. His dynamic energy continually kept him doing things that filled the front pages of the newspapers. With friends and followers he was cordial and considerate. But any opposition maddened him. A disagreement about facts sent his opponent into the Ananias club. His 'big stick' won the site for the Panama Canal without a payment to Colombia. He was the *beau ideal of militant aggressiveness.*

"Yet, when Roosevelt ran for President the last time he carried only a few States. The American Government later paid the Republic of Panama $ 12,250.000 for her Canal-Zone rights. Any one who held opinions contrary to Roosevelt's

was to him a public enemy, to be fought ruthlessly. He remains a picturesque figure in American history, just as is Andrew Jackson, but he never lived up to his best opportunities.

"Lincoln was not mushy. He would go to great lengths to conciliate an enemy, or, what was more difficult, a friend. But when he reached a place where he must sacrifice a principle or right, he fought..."

Both these are instances of very great men handling affairs and their techniques differed. Roosevelt was successful : Lincoln was so too. The latter also fought but he held his power of fighting in reserve and would not unnecessarily create enemies. And his is undoubtedly a more abiding place in the heart of mankind.

... ...

BISMARCK'S COMBATIVENESS

Ludwig, Bismarck's biographer, comments :

"Now, when the second decade of his power opened, the decade of peace, the whole Reichstag formed front against him. The fact that he stood alone against hundreds of enemies invigorated Bismarck's lust for battle. He had not been satisfied with simply locking up his enemies' house and putting the key in his pocket. He wanted open contradiction ; he was not at ease unless he had something to grumble at ; even if he had been an absolute monarch, he would have ferreted out causes of

friction. During the next twenty years we shall see Bismarck always discontended, always complaining, and we shall know that this sense of perpetual friction is what keeps the fighter's vital forces at the stretch. The ever-renewed internal conflicts gave him fresh resolution to cope with external adversaries.

'This unwearied combativenss is the deeper explanation of his mistakes. Because Bismarck's misanthropy grew with the years, because he could never concede anything either to the position or to the talents of an opponent, because he inclined less and less to negotiate, and more and more to command, the changes the time spirit was undergoing were hidden from his eyes, and he was blind to the logical thoughts and wishes of other men than himself and other classes than his own. In foreign relationships he had never underestimated an opponent; had never risked an entry into action without superior forces, heavier guns, or stronger coalitions to back him. But in home affairs, now, he begins to make hazardous ventures. Because his unconstitutional regime has been successful, he is filled with contempt for old and new opponents, who will in the end overthrow him. Roon's cannon, Moltke's needle-guns, and the discipline of obedient Prussians had forced Europe to condone Bismarck's action in setting might above right; in the end, his own people took vengeance on him because he set might above spirit."

... ...

LINCOLN'S CONSIDERATENESS

Dale Carnegie who has thoroughly studied the methods of Lincoln in his relation to men speaks of him as given, in his younger days to rankling criticism and even to writing poems and letters ridiculing people and dropping these letters on the country roads where they were sure to be found !

One of these letters, an anonymous one in the *Springfield Journal*, ridiculing a vain, pugnacious Irish politician involved him in a serious trouble. The latter found him out and challenged him to a duel. The fighting to death was ultimately stopped only by friends intervening.

It is said this incident changed Lincoln's outlook. *Never again did he write an insulting letter.*

"With malice toward none, with charity for all", he was the most forbearing of all men. One of his favourite quotations was : "Judge not, that ye be not judged."

Does this sound different from Napoleon's whereby he claimed for himself a place on an exclusive and solitary plane ? Oh, yes, it does. And which is the more lofty ?...

... ...

CURZON'S FAILING

Speaking of Curzon, an ex-viceroy of India, Churchill says :

"The contradictory qualities which dwell in the characters of so many individuals can rarely have

formed more vivid contrasts than in George Curzon. The world thought him pompous in manner and in mind. But this widespread and deep impression, arising from the experience and report of so many good judges, was immediately destroyed by the Curzon one met in a small circle of intimate friends and equals, or those whom he treated as equals....Helpful with comfort and sympathy on every occasion of sickness or sorrow in his wide circle, unpopular with most of those who served him, the master of scathing rebuke for subordinates, he seemed to sow gratitude and resentment along his path with evenly lavish hands. Bespangled with every quality that could dazzle and attract, he never found himself with a following. Majestic in speech, appearance and demeanour, he never led. He often domineered ; but at the centre he never dominated."

Lord Ronaldshay, Curzon's biographer, agrees :

"His relations with his colleagues and subordinates were not always happy. A reputation for satire not wholly undeserved, tended to keep persons who did not know him well uneasily aloof. Lord George Hamilton, most courteous of men, sought to warn him of the folly of giving unnecessary offence. 'Try and suffer fools more gladly,' he urged him, 'they constitute the majority of mankind.... Cases have come to my notice where persons have been deeply wounded and gone from you full of resentment in consequence of some incautious joke

or verbal rebuke which they thought was harshly administered."

... ...

CONSIDERATENESS

Considerateness was the hall-mark of Jesus, of Buddha and the like of them. Not that they did not hate vice or deplore short-coming but what they did was to recognize the fact that *perfection* was not *human*. They saw *man* as the *eternal amalgam of sweet and bitter, dross and gold.*

Let's quote an illustration from Carnegie in relation to Lincoln :

"The Battle of Gettysburg was fought during the first three days of July, 1863. During the night of July 4, Lee began to retreat southward while storm clouds deluged the country with rain .. So, with a surge of high hope, Lincoln ordered Meade not to call a council of war but to attack Lee immediately. Lincoln telegraphed his orders and then sent a special messenger to Meade demanding immediate action.

"And what did general Meade do ?

"In bitter disappointment, Lincoln sat down and wrote Meade this letter. And remember, at this period of his life he was extremely conservative and restrained in his phraseology, So this letter coming from Lincoln in 1863 was tantamount to the severest rebuke.

'My dear General,

'I do not believe you appreciate the magnitude of the misfortune involved in Lee's escape. He was within our easy grasp, and to have closed upon him would, in connection with our other late successes have ended the war. As it is. the war will be prolonged indefinitely. If you could not safely attack Lee last Monday. how can you possibly do so south of the river, when you can take with you very few—no more than two-thirds of the force you then had in hand ? It would be unreasonable to expect and I do not expect that you can now effect much. Your golden opportunity is gone, and I am distressed immeasurably because of it.'

"What do you suppose Meade did when he read that letter ?

"Meade never saw that letter ; Lincoln never mailed it. It was found among Lincoln's papers after his death.

"My guess is—and this is only a guess—that after writing that letter Lincoln looked out of the window and said to himself, 'Just a minute. May be I ought not to be so hasty. It is easy enough for me to sit here in the quiet of the White House and order Meade to attack ; but if I had been up at Gettysburg, and if I had seen as much blood as Meade has seen during the last week, and if my ears had been pierced with the screams and shrieks of the wounded and dying, may be I wouldn't be

so anxious to attack either. If I had Meade's timid temperament, perhaps I would have done just what he has done. Anyhow, it is water under the bridge now. If I send this letter, it will relieve my feelings but it will make Meade try to justisy himself. It will make him condemn me. It will arouse hard feelings, impair all his further usefulness as a commander, and perhaps force him to resign from the army.

"So, as I have already said, Lincoln put the letter aside, for he had learned by bitter experience that sharp criticisms and rebukes almost invariably end in futility."

Meade ultimately *did defeat* Lee at Gettysburg.

Well, when dealing with people, although completely at our mercy, we have to remember they are creatures of emotion, they react to blame and praise as much we ourselves do. They may have causes of failure *outside their own powers.*

If we do, we shall fiind even the task of "pulling up" a bit difficult, for there would be *various* things to be considered.

"Do unto others as you would have others do unto you." This aspect of the matter we shall consider ahead.

... ...

BELOVED LEDERSHIP

It is not by force and through fear alone that you can sway people. Buddha, Christ and Muhammad conquered hearts and swayed them.

Take a modern example.

Mahatma Gandhi is a world figure but let us see what a foreigner says of him.

Napoleon Hill (American author) writes :

"We have already mentioned Mahatma Gandhi. Perhaps the majority of those who have heard of Gandhi, look upon him as merely an eccentric little man, who goes around without formal wearing apparel, and makes trouble for the British Government.

"In reality, Gandhi is not eccentric, but he is THE MOST POWERFUL MAN NOW LIVING. (Estimated by the number of his followers and their faith in their leader). Moreover, he is probably the most powerful man who has ever lived. His power is passive, but it is real.

"Let us study the method by which he attained his stupendous POWER. It may be explained in a few words. He came by POWER through inducing over two hundred million people to coordinate, with mind and body, in a spirit of HARMONY, for a DEFINITE PURPOSE.

"In brief, Gandhi has accomplished a MIRACLE, for it is a miracle when two hundred million people can be induced—not forced—to cooperate in a spirit of HARMONY, for a limitless time. If you doubt that this is a miracle, try to induce ANY TWO PEOPLE to cooperate in a spirit of harmony for *any length of time.*"

... ...

A GREATER INCENTIVE

Let's consider the magic of appreciation which is a more powerful incentive to work than 'fear'.

Professor William James says : "The deepest principle in human nature is the craving to be appreciated."

It is this urge, perhaps, that differentiates us from the animals. This urge has made civilization itself possible.

What unimaginable troubles man takes to excel, to achieve ! You see one swimming for hours in water, another fasting for days together, yet another exploring the deep seas or the high mountains ! How often do men and women risk their lives in vain attempts or even apparently useless undertakings so that others may admire—may extol their powers of endurance or virtue of excellence !! Oh, how often !!!

Don't you see most miserly people, people who have denied themselves even the barest necessities of living in order to amass money, give away considerable sums to get a *feeling of importance*. to obtain *public appreciation* ?

I know of many such people who would beg to offer money apparently for public purposes but with an eye to a Rai Bahadur or Khan Bahadurship. Do you know what these two jargons mean ? Little, if anything at all !

Yet, such is the urge for distinction that people would go any length wishing or canvassing for it !

Sordid ! Mean !! Selfish !!!

You may say so.

But we are *all* like that. It is only *human*. Dale Carnegie has expounded the 'philosophy of appreciation' in an admirable book, How to Win friends and Influence People. It is a master-piece. It shows the right way of human relationship.

There are many hints on right dealing with subordinates, although the book mainly deals with human relationship in society, in general.

... ...

If there had been no human 'urge for appreciation', people would work only in discharge of mere duties and stop there.

Do you think Pickford or Garbo or Dietrich have enthralled the world by simply obeying the mandates of the 'Director' or performing' the assigned roles ? No, not at all !

The money they get, the technical guidance they go by are *nothing* comparable with the *appreciation* of the spectators or the public in general. *This* rather than *those* has helped them in making a gift of their genius to the world. Their 'fan's pamper their ego. They inspire them to shine brighter and brighter.

AN EXAMPLE

Milton Wright has related a true story to the point :

Once there was a vaudeville actor with a clever line of side-splitting jokes. One day, just as he was eating supper, a fellow-actor called him on the telephone and implored him to take his place in a show. The time was short ...

When the actor entered the auditorium of the institute, the show was in progress. On the stage the Trio of Tumbling Turks were tossing each other about in their routine that he had seen times without number. He went backstage.

"I'm Abe Gordon', he announced to the man who seemed to be in charge of everything. 'I've come up to pinch hit for Sam Irving and his trained dogs. Mrs. Irving had a date with the stork and Sam felt he had to be there'.

" 'Good ! You follow these acrobats. We're not announcing anybody. Just go on when they come off.'

"The Trio of Tumbling Turks finished with the triple somersault that landed all three of them at the footlights, where they took a bow. Thunderous handclapping followed them as they came running off into the wings. Six curtain calls they took before the applause died down.

"A new round of applause greeted Abe as he walked on. Then the audience sat back in expectant silence. Everything was just the way he liked it. He would be good to them.

" 'I just came here from Broadway,' he began. The latest dirt they're dishing out down there is

about George Bernard Shaw and Mae West.' He procceeded to relate the anecdote, and paused at the finish for the laugh.

"There was no laugh.

"Over their heads ; I'll have to try something a little less sophisticated ; said Abe to himself. He gave them the one about the Swiss bell-ringer who became the father of quintuplets.

"Silence.

"This had never happened before. His professional pride was hurt. There was no audience in the world so sour and glum that Abe Gordon couldn't draw a laugh from it. He would try them with the good old standby concerning Pat and Mike and the Jewish piano tuner. Carefully he built it up, his dialect was perfect, his pauses were just right, and he brought out the gag line at the end with just the proper snap.

"No result.

"Now Abe began to get worried. Could he be losing his skill ? No, that could'nt be possible. It must be that these hicks didn't know what was going on in the world. He tried them with the one about the city slicker and the farmer's daughter. Never a laugh. Beads of perspiration stood out on his forehead. He snatched from his repertory the old mother-in-law joke, brushed off the cobwebs, and hurled it at them. More silence. The veins of his forehead swelled as he thundered

out the one concerning the absentminded professor and the co-ed. Still no reaction.

"Nearing exhaustion, he fired at them in quick succession the rip-roaring yarns about the amorous old maid, the piccolo player, the parrot that went to Hawaii, and what the queen said to the *general*. Then, with a roar of silence pounding in his ears, he fainted.

"Gently they carried him off stage and bathed his temples with cold water. As his eyes fluttered open he saw above him the face of Abdul, head man of the Trio of Tumbling Turks.

" 'Where am I ?' Abe murmured.

" 'Just lie still', replied Abdul soothingly. 'You'll be all right.'

" 'But where am I ?'

" 'Don't you know ? You're backstage at the River-dale Institute for the *Deaf and Dumb*.' "

....

NELSONS' DISAPPOINTMENT

We are all like that. A deaf and dumb audience *do not* inspire us.

You may say men who made history, men who immortalized themselves by sheer merit had no need for rewards or recognition. They achieved eminence in spite of prejudices against them.

Yes, but they were also human. They won admiration from some quarter or other and valued it.

Muhammad was hated by the Arabs but he needed the unfailing admiration of his wife and the small band of followers who adhered to him and adored him.

Nelson had the service of his country at his heart but he also, on innumerable occasions, found lack of recognition for services rendered, galling and exasperating and he never hesitated even to express his feelings.

On one occasion, Nelson felt himself neglected. "One hundred and ten days" he said, "I have been actually engaged at sea and on shore, against the enemy, three actions against ships, two against Bastia in my ship, four boat actions, and two villages taken, and twelve sail of vessels burnt. I do not know that any one has done more. I have had the comfort to be always applauded by my commander-in-Chief, but never to be rewarded; and what is more mortifying, for services in which I have been wounded others have been praised, who, at the same time, were actually in bed, far from the scene of action. They have not done me justice. But, never mind, I'll have a gazette of my own."

That is human nature in action! Nelson shares it with the high and the low !!

... ...

On another occasion, Nelson headed for Alexandria in pursuit of the French Navy at four in

the afternoon. Captain Hood in the *Zealous*, made the signal for the French fleet. For many preceding days Nelson had hardly taken either sleep or food ; he now ordered his dinner to be served, while preparations were making for battle ; and when his officers rose from the table, and went to their separate stations, he said to them "Before this time to-morrow I shall have gained a peerage, or Westminster Abbey."

Why peerage ? Wasn't Nelson above such cravings ?

No, for he was human.

... ...

We *think* we do something extraordinarily good and *look* for words of encouragement. We get none. We are choked off.

We *think* we *have some good points*, though many bad ones too. Our bad ones meet with sharp notice, good ones are cared for by none. Result ?

Our good points wither and bad points loom large before our eyes. Perhaps, we mend the latter to some extent but it is not these that could make us shine ! We remain on the humdrum plane, just ordinary mortals among many.

All of us look for recognition of our good points, be we butcher or baker or the king upon a throne.

I get a lot of interest and amusement out of my visitors. There are some who have copied the

western fashion of presenting visiting cards. These are printed impressively, the tags never lacking or lagging. There is one who is a B. A. (Cal.), another who is an M. A. (Dac.), yet another who is an L L. B. (Alig.) !

Amusing, isn't this ? Well, many of my friends who are just 'mat's and no more make fun of 'these B. A. s and M. A. s. But I don't.

An M. A. is not necessarily a 'Master of Ability' also, but it is not necessarily true either that the less educated a man is, the higher must be his ability !

Is there any difference if the tags be B A. (Cant.) or M. A. (Ox.) or M. C. or P. C. or V. C. or any other combination of the Alphabet ? The point underlying is the same.

Some of the other fellows don't bring in cards but they carry slips that make up in size for a deficiency in elegance ! And the space is not wasted by any means !

Here is Mr. X., Zeminder—President, Union Board,—Member, District Board —Vice-Chairman, Rural Reconstruction Committee,—Captain, Village Defence Party, etc., etc.

I take his tags up one by one and demand details of the 'etc.' He rattles on and I hear of the School Committee, Sanitary Board and wish him to be an M. L. A. next. And I do this genuinely. His functions may be lowly but *he* is legitimately proud of them. *Apparently* he has come 'to pay respects'

to me but really he wants recognition of his importance.

So do we of ours. This is only human.

We want to win praise and admiration, and so we write books, paint pictures, sing songs and toil with willing hands in study, loom or laboratory.

A considerate handler of men can make us do anything only if he seizes upon *this* weakness in us.

... ...

HANDLING CHILDREN

Does this work with children ? Oh, doesn't this ?

Children *crave* for appreciation ; Children *cry* for *sympathy.*

When a sweet little child works a sum right, he runs up to show the parents—"Daddy—Mummy, look here—I have done a sum".

This is not for *information.* The child looks up for *appreciation.* If he doesn't have it, he goes back disappointed—the drudgery dulls his faculties.

Handling of boys *is* difficult. Parents often try the wrong way.

Let's quote two instances from Carnegie :

"One of the students in the author's training course was worried about his little boy. The child was underweight and refused to eat properly. His parents used the usual method. They scolded and

nagged. 'Mother wants you to eat this and that.' 'Father wants you to grow up to be a big man.'

"Did the boy pay any attention to these, please ?

"No man with a trace of horse sense would expect a child three years old to react to the viewpoint of a father thirty years old. Yet that was precisely what that father had been expecting. It was absurd.

"He finally saw that. So he said to himself : 'What does that boy want ? How can I tie up what I want to what he wants ?'

"It was easy when he started thinking about it. His boy had a tricycle which he loved to ride up and down the sidewalk in front of the house in Brooklyn. A few doors down the street lived a 'menace,' as they say out in Hollywood—a bigger boy who would pull the little boy off his tricycle and ride it himself.

"Naturally, the little boy would run screaming to his mother, and she would have to come out and take the 'menace' off the tricycle and put her little boy on again. This happened almost every day.

"What did the little boy want ? It didn't take a Sherlock Holmes to answer that one. His pride, his anger, his desire for a feeling of importance—all the strongest emotions in his make-up—goaded him on to get revenge, to smash the 'menace' in the nose. And when his father told him he could wallop the day-lights out of the bigger

kid some day if he would only eat the things his mother wanted him to eat—when his father promised him that, there was no longer any problem of dietetics. That boy would have eaten spinach, sauerkraut, salt mackerel, anything in order to be big enough to whip the bully who had humiliated him so often."

Here the technique was not of *coercion* but of *encouragement*, of *enthusing*.

"Another father, K. T. Dutschmann, a telephone engineer, a student of this course, couldn't get his three-year-old daughter to eat breakfast food. The usual scolding, pleading, coaxing methods had all ended in futility. So the parents asked themselves: 'How can we make her want to do it?

"How can we make her want to do it?"

"The little girl loved to imitate her mother, to feel big and grown up; so one morning they put her on a chair and let her make the breakfast food. At just the psychological moment, father drifted into the kitchen while she was stirring the breakfast food and she said: 'Oh, look, daddy, I am making the Maltex this morning.'

"She ate two helpings of the cereal that morning without any coaxing because she was interested in it. She had achieved a feeling of importance; she had found in making the breakfast food an avenue of self-expression."

The technique here was of letting the child feel important. Didn't it work?

... ...

REWARDS AND PRIZES

Rewards and prizes, promotions and recognitions are the symbols of appreciation. They are useful in every sphere.

They pull you up hard in the military but don't they inspire also ? They do. The award of medals, the recognition in dispatches, the tags of M. C., D.S.O., V.C., and so on—are all intended to emphasize the better side of coercion.

So in other spheres also.

Hayward says :

"Prizes and certificates, however, constitute the most weighty arguments for good attendance ; and in London schools a *medal* is found to be the effective method of inducing children to try to be present every time. That a lump of almost valueless metal should become so powerful a motive as to call forth acts of genuine self-sacrifice on the part of pupils and parents is one of the strangest facts in the money-loving age, and gives the lie to those who see nothing but selfishness in human conduct."

Rewards in schools can be given usefully for attendance, conduct, progress, games and the like.

15

JUSTICE AND DISCRIMINATION

We are in the midst of discussing clause (8) in the make-up of the right disciplinarian, leader. It runs: "Who appreciates and deprecates work rendered according as it deserves...."

We have considered "appreciation."

Let us take up (b), "deprecation", now.

DEPRECATION

'Deprecation' *has been* the 'time-honoured' method. Our ancestors laid great emphasis on it, particularly in a topic which it is time we discussed:

MANAGEMENT OF CHILDREN

There is one part of the Art of Discipline that practically everyone must practise at some time or another in his life: the management of children. And just because that side of discipline is the commonest in the world, there is a conspiracy of silence around it. Any educated man can work out a quadratic equation; three years of his young life were spent in learning how to do it. But not three minutes of his education were given to teaching him how to bring up his children. Yet, for all the times that he will be faced with the problem of disciplining his sons and daughters, how many times will he

find the urgent need to sit down and work out a quadratic equation ?

THE IGNORANT SURGEON

Suppose your child were ill ; an operation is necessary, and you call a surgeon. He examines your child, agrees to operate, and then, just when he is about to begin, says, "Of course, I 've never really studied this sort of thing before. It will be all rather interesting, in an experimental way. I can't say how it will turn out—I haven't thought about it— but I daresay my luck will pull me through." Well, when you've recovered from your shock, you'd probably go straight to the telephone and dial for the police.

But your child's life is in your hands—his mental life, his moral and spiritual life—and you propose to work a surgical operation on it every time you discipline your boy or girl, every time you so much as speak a sharp word.

The poet Pope said that the proper study of mankind is man ; if that is true, then there can be no more proper study for a man than the management of his children.

FIT FOR A KING !

There have been many theories about it ; and, like the theories of the philosophers, it is not easy to choose between them. Some (to make your problem easier) are somewhat outdated. For instance, Louis the Thirteenth of France had a mother

who believed that children were so often naughty that the few times when they were good could be safely ignored. So Louis, when he was a boy, was made to go through a certain ceremony After the boy had partaken of the Royal breakfast, he was sent to the Royal schoolroom, and there said "Good morning" to the Royal tutors. After that, the boy kneeled down across a stool, his Royal breeches were taken down, and he was given a right Royal Birching until he was roaring with pain. And his mother gave strict orders that this ceremony was to be performed *every day of the boy's life.*

They of old, wanted their boys to be 'disciplined'—repressed, broken and reshaped. "The bones only belong to me—", a wellwishing parent would say to the teacher, "you may do whatever else you like with my boy".

The very word 'disciplining' still conjures up the idea of 'punishing'. We say—he was 'disciplined' by adversity, by misfortune—never by favourable circumstances, or by affection.

So timely was the idea that discipline was a matter of breaking the spirit that the whole notion of the Divinity was distorted to make him the model of the Punishing Father.

God was thought of as stern and even vindictive ! How firmly was it believed that He inflicted as many as *ten* plagues in quick succession to straighten the people of the Pharaoh !

And the sons of Adam also followed suit. They gave stern laws in the name of God or gods and provided for their kinsmen (and women) a double punishment—one in the hands of men below and and the other of God or gods above and hereafter !

The evolution of punishment is an interesting study and readers may pursue the topic in a recent work entitled "Crime and Criminal Justice" by the present writer.

"Thou shalt not...." was the commandment. If thou didst, well, thou wert in for trouble—and a mighty lot of it !

The entire codes were punitive, ever as they *are* now. Even now we *are* followers of Moses, the lawgiver, rather than of anybody else.

I am ashamed to say I have fondly hoped and fervently prayed that on turning over pages of tomes and tomes of literature—Army Manuals, Police Regulations, Teachers' Handbooks, Managers' Roads to Success—I would find ideas on "Discipline" I could lift for the present discussion that would not be of this sort—but ?

I turned up pages and pages found the head 'discipline to be *mostly* an elaboration of "punishment" in the various possible guises !

The whole idea was wrongly based—though *rightly* on what was current before.

Even a century ago it was commonly assumed by both parents and the school that children were "dominated by evil whims that must be eliminated".

They were regarded in the old criminological doctrine of 'total depravity'. John Wesley is supposed to have given currency to the philosophy, "the will of the child must be broken."

The prevailing conception was that childhood was not a time of real living, it was merely a preparation for later living ; the child's feelings were of little importance ; he should be seen only and not heard ; etc.

Consequently, harshness was a natural expectancy in keeping with a more rugged type of schooling. A school survey made in Boston in 1845 revealed that in a typical school of 400 children, the average daily number of whippings was 65 !

The school-master, in England, likewise, not a long while ago, was the living example of stern repression, practically based on force, whether supported by consent or not. There has been the long dull, dreary, brutal period during which the cane was his *first* and *last* resort.

Writing on school-discipline as it has been in England in the near past, Ballard in THE CHANGING SCHOOL says :

"Harrow, Winchester, and indeed all our great Public Schools, can each produce its list of masters renowned for their liberal use of the birch. It was Eton, however, that got the larger share of opprobrium, mainly no doubt because it

got the larger share of publicity. The school tradition for frequent flogging established in the earlier days by Udall and Malim was, after a period of comparative clemency, fully revived by John Keate.

"Dr John Keate was in many ways a remarkable man. Starting in 1809, a year that marks the birth of a number of great Victorians, he ruled at Eton longer than any headmaster before or since, and he ruled with greater austerity than ever did Nicholas Udall or Richard Busby. His voice never lost its harsh note of authority, nor his temper its even quality of ill-humour. His remedy for everything was flogging—flogging in the good old-fashioned English way. He flogged everybody, and he flogged for everything. He flogged Mr. Gladstone, as the reader will discover if he reads Morley. There was a time when not only Gladstone, but half the bench of bishops could claim to have received the delicate attentions of Dr. Keate. He once flogged seventy-two boys in succession for cheating in Latin verse, a tale which exceeds by nineteen the number of Harrovians who were once thrashed by Dr. Longley for missing four o'clock bell in favour of a steeple-chase. But Keate's record reached its highest mark in the school rebellion of 1832, when late one Saturday night, after the boys had gone to bed, he had them brought down in small relays and he flogged without pause till the small hours of the Sunday

morning. On that dismal night at least eighty boys paid the penalty of their misdeeds."

... ...

The Havildars have taken the cue. Shouting, extra drill, and orderly room have been their tools as much as has been the cane for the schoolmaster.

But both the efficacy and ethics of such methods are now being questioned.

We shall see why and how. We are not suggesting that the cane can be entirely dispensed with yet. It has its uses as we shall see a little further ahead.

.. ..

Apart from the time-honoured punitive deprecation we have been speaking of, there is a human disposition to indulge in :

BELITTLING CRITICISM

"There are two methods at people's disposal" says a psychologist, "whereby they can attain to a superior position or at least enjoy the subjective experience of such attainment—the exaltation of self over others, and the depreciation of others."

The commonest at the same time the most hurting is *belittling criticism*. People will run down colleagues—seniors, juniors, subordinates, friends and acquaintances not necessarily by way of malice but more by way of self-edification.

People themselves with an "inferiority complex" are sometimes the most prone to this sort of depreciatory criticism. A stammering youth while under psychoanalysis frankly admitted a tendency to criticize everybody. "If I run other people down," he owned, "I put myself in a better position."

Depreciatory criticism can disguise itself in many ways; many people say and do things in which this is manifest—to others—but they themselves may not be quite or at all aware of this.

Well, we all know of "professional jealousy". A successful man in one field will readily decry others. We know of poets decrying other poets, writers other writers, businessman other businessmen, police officers other police officers—*ad infinitum*. It is not only a case of jealousy but underlying it is often a display of self-importance.

Then, there is the case of belittling *talents* not in line with one's own.

I had written a book on Crime and Law and spent a great deal of time over literature dealing with these two. I have been criticized to a certain extent on this score. I am a 'theroist' some successful police offiicers used to preach! "I have never as much as glanced back at the Indian Penal Code since I passed the departmentals"—one would broadcast with pride, "but I am a practical man!" Well! Well!! Perhaps, there may be truth in this, for all we may know!

Successful businessmen would smile at the very mention of Marshal and Taussig and other great economists!

The *Marwaris* here demonstrate such disapproval with vengeance. They fight shy of education, fearing this will only turn their children into 'theorists'. The "school of apprenticeship" is theirs—they maintain.

Well! I don't deny they *have been* successful. But, imagine how much *more successful* could they be with a sound education to back up practice!

I do not deny barbers once performed operations and some by practice sharpened their skill. But I should strongly abhor putting myself under their razor now. I should insist on my surgeon's having at least an elementary knowledge of anatomy, physiology and antiseptics.

Nor do mere writers and researchists spare practical people either. You will hear them denouncing statesmen, administrators and public officers who are contending with difficult situations against odds. What faults are not being found with conduct of affairs!

Roosevelt, Churchill, Hitler, Stalin—all come in for criticism—some healthy, a great deal undeserved. Their reply usually is: come and try for yourselves, if you please.

A GROSS UNDERESTIMATE

Well! Here is an example. I have the greatest respect for Mr. H. G. Wells—a thinker,

ranking very high among thinkers of the world—a writer than whom perhaps none has handled more varied t pics with ability.

Yet, he often lets himself loose, denouncing administrators, disrating men of approved ability.

In his Autobiography Wells writes about Curzon and colleagues thus :

"Men like Grey, Curzon and Tyrrel present a fine big appearance to the world, but the bare truth is that they are, by education and by force of uncritical acceptance infantile defectives, who ought to be either referred back to a study of the elements of human ecology or certified and secluded as damaged minds incapable of managing public affairs."

Well may the persons in their graves be writhing in rage for sweeping condemnation hurled at their back! I wish they were alive to retort!

Democracy owes a great deal to the two veterans of the last great war, viz., Lloyd George and Lord Haig. But although both would command respect for their views, neither Haig's view of Lloyd George nor Lloyd George's view of Haig are likely to be accepted by history. Both will be deemed *much better* than they deemed each other.

... ...

Well, the right attitude should be of :

GIVING EVERYBODY HIS DUE

We are all *imperfect*. We lack something : we excel in something. We can draw attention to faults and failings when we have in mind *helping*. Even then there are ways and ways. Extreme tact is needed. We shall see this further ahead.

But remember. We *must* pay everybody his due. Everybody is in someway superior to me and in that should I learn of him.

We shall elaborate this also anon.

... ...

REPRESSIVE DEPRECIATION

To revert to punitive and repressive depreciation.

Dickens has given us the benefit of David Copperfield's schooling in his early life and the impress it left on him. We have quoted Dickens a short while ago in this discussion. It did David no great good to have been 'disciplined' like that.

Has punishment to be discarded altogether ? The reply is yes and no We are *looking forward* to a state of society and a form of social control which will render punishment unnecessary. We *are* in a state and form where it is *still* necessary. But the necessity should gradually *wane*.

The true art of discipline lies in the complete government of children or subordinates without their consciousness of restraint. The controlling

power of the teacher or superior falls away from this ideal in so far as resort to punishment becomes necessary. Hence every censure administered, every punishment inflicted implies some defect in the machinery or procedure of discipline.

... ...

DICKEN'S SCHOOLING

Let us hear Dickens on the subject again. We have seen his David describing and denouncing Mr. Creakle's methods of schooling. The boy is at a different school sometime later and this time the one of Dr. Strong. He opines :

"Dr. Strong's was an excellent school as different from Mr. Creakle's as good is from evil. It was very gravely and decorously ordered, and on a sound system; with an appeal, in everything, to the honour and good faith of the boys, and an avowed intention to rely on their possession of those qualities unless they proved themselves unworthy of it, which worked wonder. We all felt that we had a part in the management of the place and in sustaining its character and dignity. Hence, we soon became warmly attached to it—I am sure I did for one ; and I never knew, in all my time, of any other boy being otherwise—and learnt with a good will, desiring to do it credit. We had noble games out of hours, and plenty of *liberty* ; but even then, as I remember, we were well spoken of in the town, and rarely

did any disgrace to the reputation of Dr. Strong and Dr. Strong's Boys."

A very good chit. Isn't it ?

... ...

CONSTRUCTIVE PATTERN OF DISCIPLINE

In school, the development of a pattern of discipline requires careful and constructive planning. It cannot be as rigorous as the army system, for it must be adapted for usefulness with immature children drawn from a wide variety of backgrounds and cultural standards.

IMPORTANCE OF PRE-SCHOOL PERIOD

The important period to insure a stable, well-adjusted, effective adult is during the pre-school years. The school only continues the educational process started in the home.

In the home the development of a disciplinary programme should begin at birth and continue to maturity.

We say 'at birth'. This is in keeping with what some clever person has said that the first night decides who is going to be the master in the house, the mother or the newly-born child. This is putting a case strongly. It is partially true.

If the mother does not handle her child with a definite routine from the first day onwards, and

if she allows herself to be carried away by his momentary desires, then she will come to have little authority over the child. A baby whose crying in the first night induces the mother to carry him about and console him to quietness will not care to sleep alone ; one that is fed whenever he cries or gets unnecessary attention will soon dominate the whole house. The baby reacts, though unconsciously, to the treatment he gets.

GOAL OF CHILD-DISCIPLINE

The importance of the early routine should not, on the other hand, be considered entirely from the viewpoint of the parent alone. The goal should be the attainment by the child of *self-sufficiency and selfdiscipline to adjust to surroundings and other individuals without friction, to appreciate his own rights and privileges and those of others.*

This can be accomplished by giving the child from infancy *gradually increasing responsibilities* that are in keeping with his intellectual capacity. He must be shown affection, acceptance, and given security, and yet be taught from the start that he must fit into the family pattern as *an* important member of the group but not *the* important member of it. Transition to adult community living thus becomes an easy step in a steady process.

... ...

SHORT LEASE

Your child is yours for only a short time. His young life is leased to you for fifteen or twenty years. After that, you may still know your child and he or she may very well love you. But your period of control is over. The child is a grown-up man or woman, and for the rest of his or her life will put your bringing-up to the test. It is as though you were given a plot of ground, and a lease of a few years to build a house upon it and furnish it throughout. Then, just when you have moved in your last cabinet, and hung up your last picture, the lease expires. From then on, you can only watch from the outside ; you can only hope that the house you have built is one fit to live in.

Remembering that, it is not difficult to see your duty towards your child. Plainly it must be to give it a world in miniature ; a world just like the world it will have to live in, but safer, kindlier, and without the world's disasters. It is no good pretending that the world is a Utopia, where everybody has a Christian love for everyone else, where sins are forgiven. Nor is it sensible to pretend that the world is a concentration camp where bitter labour is relieved only by visits to the torture chamber. Your duty is to provide the child with a microcosm, a little world made according to the plan of the world as you know it. It must have *rewards and kindnesses, successes and failures, just like the grown up world,* but smaller and more protected. So too, *it must have punishments* on the same scale.

REFRACTORY CHILDREN

But let us suppose that you have in your charge, as parent, schoolmaster or guardian, a boy. None of your attempts to discipline him have so far succeeded. Obstinately, he persists in a course of conduct that you know will lead him to disaster once he leaves your care Regretfully you decide that you must take severe measures. Where do you begin ? Quite simply, you begin by a sharp discipline for yourself. Take yourself off to a quiet room and think the matter over. The biggest failure has been you. Having decided that, reflect that now is your last chance to save your failure from being complete. Now, what measures are you going to take ? In the outside world, disobedience of rules and laws is followed by punishment. Therefore, what punishment will *you* mete out to your boy ?

SHADES OF THE PRISON HOUSE

One thing you must NOT do ; you must not make your home or your school a prison. You may have been given charge of your boy's conduct, but you have not been given his entire life and health to experiment with. You may not waste his time in prolonged lectures nor may you steal his liberty by confining him to his room, keeping him at tasks during the time when he should be playing and enjoying himself. That is what they do to hardened criminals and your boy, however tiresome, is not that. Whatever punishment you decide upon must

take up a very small space in his day, something that will be effective without denying him the right to liberty and freedom without which his young life wife will be that of a convict. Nor should he be made a victim of your bad temper or your sulks His duty is not to oblige your moods, but to behave himself. From now on, you are not a person who has to be pleased but a *neutral instrument of justice.*

As a matter of fact, who has not met the little angel, the darling of the family, who is never punished because he is so good, and who, should any misdemeanour of his be found out, is allowed to blame it on his schoolfellows, or the servants, or even his own parents. Neither little King Louis, sitting down gingerly on his hard school seat and trying to learn through the pain of his weals, nor the little angel smirking to himself while he sees another boy disgraced for what he has done himself are examples of the Art of Discipline. But of the two, King Louis was probably the luckier ; he could grow up and forget his whipping ; but the other boy will grow up to be a liar, and not even know that he is one.

THE ROD HAS ITS USES

Since the human race began educating its boys, it has had one short, sharp and effective method of making its wishes known, and that is by administering a whipping. Solomon said, "Spare the rod and spoil the child", and it has been found

wisdom for refractory children down the ages. If you have any doubts about it, it is worth while reflecting on the people who were whipped when they were boys. Dr. Johnson boasted about it, and said it had done him a world of good. John Milton was flogged even while he was an undergraduate at Cambridge. Erasmus, the greatest scholar of his age was whipped so frequently in the Medieval manner, stripped bare below the waist, that he contracted rheumatism through kneeling so long with bare knees on stone floors. In fact, it may be said that during the most illustrious periods of any country's history, the greatest figures no sooner were old enough to wear breeches than their masters and parents were taking them down again for punishment. And, presumably, they deserved the occasional severity.

RIGHT USE OF THE ROD

Nowadays we do not think so highly of corporal punishment, although nowadays we would be happy indeed if our children turned out one quarter as good as those of our predecessors such as I have mentioned. Educationists are uncertain as to the effects of whipping on children, and are afraid of the resentment that it might leave behind. Undoubtedly, punishment *unjustly* inflicted and delivered *crudely* in the fashion of an undignified beating up is disgrace to anybody who does it. It is tantamount to treating your child as

a member of a rival gang of criminals whom your gang of grown-ups is going to terrify by violence.

But here is an instance of how the thing can be done so that your boy not only sees your point of view but likes you all the better for it. In his brilliant autobiography "Charlton" (Penguin Books 1931) which is rapidly becoming a classic, the writer tells a story of how he, in a fit of bad temper as a boy. kicked his mother on the shins. The autobiography is written in the third person throughout and it goes on : "With deliberation and sternness his father took control of the situation. He (the boy Charlton) was to proceed to the little dressing room, take off all his clothes, and wait events. After an interminable interval, and yet all too soon, his father appeared armed for the encounter, with a birch, and proceeded to administer a chastisement compared to which all that he had hitherto undergone was mere circumstance. When it was over something happened which had never occurred before. Moved by an uncontrollable impulse he demanded permission to kiss his father, reiterating at the same time many protestations of love."

That was punishment that succeeded. How was it done ?

"YOU'LL BE A MAN, MY SON"

Rudyard Kipling wrote a poem of advice to boys that ended with the words, "You will be a

man, my son." Nobody knew better than Kipling the way that a child's mind works and the best evidence of his expertness is that he wrote books that children, and particularly boys, will never tire of reading. He knew that a boy is not pleased with being a boy ; he knew that a boy dreams of himself as a man, longs to be a man, and does all within in his power to convince men that he is already one of them, To achieve the goal of being a man, nothing is too much trouble nothing is too irksome.

The boy admires the soldier ; and he knows that the soldier lives his life under discipline. He loves the sea and ships and the life of a sailor ; here, too, he knows there must be discipline. In fact, wherever he turns in the grown-up world that he longs to join, he sees discipline far stricter than any that he has to undergo.

Promise him that discipline will make a man of him, and there is no boy worth the trouble of punishing who will not take this correction willingly and like you all the better for it.

"DO AS YOU'RE TOLD"

A boy does not mind being given orders, and he finds a pleasure in obedience. If, from high spirits or sheer thoughtlessness, he argues, then he does not expect you to enter into a full-dress debate with him. He is quite happy if you say "Do as you're told." He will do it willingly. After that, may be

he can talk it over with you, and find out why you were so sure you were right. He wants you to be right. He wants to obey and feel that that is the best thing for him to do.

But all this, you say, is a fairy tale. Some boys, may be, are like that. But there are others very different.

Very well. Here is a real life record of three of those boys.

THREE DIFFICULT BOYS

Soon after the first edition of this book came out, it strayed into hands of a British writer of repute who came out on a special job to India for the first time about the outbreak of the present war. After the usual complimentary tributes, the writer (let us call him Mr. Bacon) introduces his boys thus :

"As an author, you will, I am sure, be interested to learn of the effect of your book on people's actual conduct. I can say immediately that in my case it has been so successful that I have made it a daily study. I have failed to reach your standard, I know, but where I have followed your advice to the letter, the success has been remarkable, as you will see from the following incident.

"If I may burden you with a little of the necessary background, I should tell you that I am

in charge of three boys whose father (they have no mother) has recently returned to England on war duties. They are charming, healthy and high spirited : Tom (let us call them so), who is seventeen, Dick, who is fifteen, and Harry who is an adopted son, and is fourteen. Tom and Dick, I am afraid to say, have been expelled from a very good school here for undisciplined behaviour, and Harry seems to be following in their footsteps. Their father left them in my charge (he is an old friend) with much head-shaking and warnings, and they have certainly lived up to his fears. I employ a tutor, whom I find worse than useless, being weak and lax in disciplinary matters. I myself, though I have threatened and stormed, have had little effect.

"After I had carefully studied your most illuminating book, I changed my style of address to them, as you advise. I dropped 'Please' from my vocabulary and when I wish to speak to one of them I now say, 'Tom, come here, boy !' I have taught them to stand to attention, with their thumbs in line with the seam of their shorts, and I see to it that they discharge my orders at the double, I order them to bed at an early hour and I permit no slackness in their doing their studies.

"At first they were shocked, and inclined to laugh. Now, I am pleased to say, they obey with a grave face, and seem anxious to do so. I owe

this improvement to your sound advice, and to a tightening up of my own ideas of discipline.

"But I must confess that although they do not now disobey my express instructions, their general disobedience is rather on the increase, and particularly their impertinent manner to other people including people much their elders. They are overbearing with other boys, and often fight, and are constantly damaging property which I find expensive to repair I do not seem to have any but a passing influence on them in these serious indications of ingrained insubordination."

The history of the case would indicate that the boys have presumably been brought up in a home entirely lax in discipline so that now they are so unruly. We have already indicated how children have to be taken in hand from early childhood so that they can feel that they are to fit in with other people who have wills of their own. The boys having no mother and the father being perhaps busy outside home for most part of the time, they came to grow unruly. Mr. Bacon must have come to take them in hand after they have been definitely spoiled.

He further complains, "Since reading your book I have resorted to punishment, although I do not know whether you will altogether approve of the form it takes. I have tried to appeal to their sense of social obligation, and if any one of them is flagrantly disobedient, I parade him, at atten-

tion, in front of the others and declare him 'In Coventry' and outside the family for two or three days. To signalise this (since I found mere sentence was not enough) I decreed a special disciplinary dress for the offender, trying to utilise the value of uniforms in gaining obedience. I did not carry this out as I intended, and got no further than having made a pair of short trousers of black material with a white stripe down the outside of each leg. The culprit must change into these Punishment Knickers as I have named them, while on parade, and once in them, no person may speak to him save myself The servants are instructed to carry out no orders from the boy, and he must eat his meals separately. He also loses pocket money, and must be in bed at six p. m. each evening.

"The first sentence (on Dick) of Punishment Knickers for two days, subdued them all. But the second (on Tom) was a failure. The servants obeyed my orders, but the boys themselves circumvented it in a hundred ways. Tom even escaped from his bedroom and went out into the streets, dressed as he was, and expressing his contempt for the discipline by saying, when I caught him, that he thought the Punishment Knickers were rather smart and suited him !

"I have thought of disciplinary drill, but I do not know exactly how to set about it, or what exercises will have the desired effect.

"Having read your book, I felt that I had to make a better showing and I threatened corporal punishment. This threat had effect for a day or two. But as I did not put it into practice, I feel that the boys are getting, if anything, more unruly with each of my failures. I still find that the warning that I will beat them sobers them for a while, but I hesitate about the actual performance. This is not because I fail to realise the importance of discipline being severe and strict, but because I am nervous of my own ability to carry the thing through. I am unfamiliar with the procedure, and I would be immensely grateful if you would give me the benefit of your wide knowledge."

In reply I wrote to him as follows :

" .....You outline the conduct of the three boys under your charge in the two letters. I can only guess as follows :

"(1) The boys have been brought up badly. They have been under no or little discipline.

"(2) They may have been under too strict restraint and been freed from it only since you have had them. From strict restraint to no restraint, the boys may have toppled over to the other extreme. This is common occurrence.

"(3) You may have shown extreme consideration to them at the very start as you might have thought it was worth treating a friend's sons well. This they may have taken amiss, thinking you are

a goody goody guardian whom they could lead rather than be led by.

"(4) They may be congenitally eccentric—highly abnormal prone to wickedness.

"Each or any of the above items or all of them partially may have been responsible for the bad state of the conduct of the boys. I shall be glad to hear what you say in this connection.

"The treatment may proceed on the following lines. You will decide for yourself which will suit and when to modify which.

"(1) Please alter your attitude from one of familiarity to one of gravity. Don't talk to them except on business and show that you mean business.

"(2) Take to progressive squeezing. Don't tax them too much all at once. They may, otherwise, grow desperate and think of personal violence to yourself. There are instances of even soldiers losing patience and attacking their own commander. You know best how far they could go.

"(3) Make the tasks or orders few at the beginning and make them such that disobedience is not likely. Allow no exception in securing compliance. This is very important. Your will power and hold over them will increase with each order of task you make them carry out. They will grow, naturally and conversely, more unruly with each lapse they can manage off you.

"(4) Should any lapse unfortunately occur, reimpose the original task *doubled* or *trebled* and let them feel that it is easiest to carry out at the first instance.

"(5) You know the first step in drill is *quietening*. Don't provoke retorts nor allow them to chat back. Your demeanour should be such as not to encourage discussion or lengthy replies.

"(6) Apply the taming-the-shrew technique (see just ahead in this edition) indirectly. Instead of their spoiling and breaking your things, have a few cheap articles spread over your house and when they provoke you, to a storm of rage (!), break these in their presence ! Play-act but look realistic !

"(7) If they have been subdued, ever so partially, in their relationship with yourself, don't beat them but squeeze on. It may take a little more time. If you must, use their buttocks where you can do the least harm and marks on which parts are not visible to outsiders.

"(8) In their over-bearing nature to *others*, there is no greater corrective to being done as one does. Issue a general order on servants that they belong to you and not to the boys and that the boys can't order them except through you. Make it known all around that anybody is at liberty to pay the boys back in their own coin and let a servant actually do so to demonstrate that self-defence

is the right of everybody. Make the boys complain to you of illtreatment by others.

"(9) I think the father can seriously think of putting the eldest boy into the army where he will be straightened out in no time. It is just likely that like Clive he may even shine in the army.

"A single child gets spoiled because he sees no competition or challenger. So also your boys need be matched against others also wanting elbow-space under the sun."

Shortly after receipt of my letter, Mr. Bacon wrote to me a long letter which included :

"Your advice about my boys has had effects which are almost miraculous. I began immediately I had read your letter and my first step was to behave sternly and in a business-like fashion as you recommended. I paraded the boys and inspected their rooms. I issued an order that the rooms be thoroughly cleaned immediately, and as a punishment for their untidy appearance, the cleaning must be done, by *one of the boys*. I left the choice to them. They began to protest, but I cut them very short by saying, "Boys undergoing punishment have no right to address me. Silence !"

"After a short while they selected one of themselves to do the job. Half an hour later I went into the room to find the boy on his knees with scrubbing brush and pail, working away most satisfactorily."

This was all very well for sometime but, as Mr. Bacon later relates, one of the boys refused bluntly when the three were ordered to their room. He says :

"I said, 'Very well. Since you refuse to carry out a reasonable punishment, you must be treated more harshly. I shall give you the cane.'

"I hope you approve : it seemed the only course, and you did give me permission to do so, if squeezing failed.

"I sent one of the boys to fetch the instrument of punishment, and when it arrived I made the boy whom I was to beat stand rigidly to attention. I was hesitant about where to beat him, but I remembered your advice, and chose his buttocks. However, I did not want to do any unintentional damage even to this sturdy part of his body, so I felt it wiser to have his knickers down so that I could see what I was doing. I ordered him to loosen his belt and drop his knickers to the floor, but he refused. There was a rather undignified scramble between us, but after a little struggling I got his knickers to the level of his knees. Much to my surprise the other two boys then helped me to lay him across the arm of a chair. It was an inconvenient position because his buttocks were tucked in and not easy to punish, but I delivered six strokes all of which produced some convincing yells from the boys. I may add that the eldest boy held him down most effectively during the ordeal.

"Today there is a magical transformation. They were all up betimes, they have done their lessons and they are so obedient that I can scarcely recognise them as my three terrible children. When Harry did reply rather rudely to a question, Tom said, "You ought to cane his bottom, sir. Shall I take off his knickers ?" I said that the offence was too small for such punishment, but that if it were repeated by any of them, I would fetch the cane, and apply it suitably.

"I have a feeling that you do not approve of corporal punishment. But the results of yesterday's incidents have convinced me that with my boys they learn more from a smarting rear end than by any other method. I am sure that your scientific attitude will lead you to give due weight to practical experiments. May I know your opinion ?"

Mr. Bacon found caning absolutely indispensable for this set of boys. He had occasion to stay hands for sometime. This was followed by a state of affairs of which he complained :

"My boys are growing worse behaved each day and I am most in disappointed. Meantime, the house has once more become the noisy, untidy place it was before I took your advice and tightened up discipline. The tutor that I had for them has resigned because he says the boys will not work and I will not permit him to set them his soul-destroying impositions and 'lines.' He has not

yet gone—he is a good man and I hope you will write me in time to save him."

My reply was as follows :

"I am now positive that the boys you have been unfortunately burdened with are a class by themselves. They have been spoiled from before you took over. Your attempts at putting them right probably seem to them a mockery. Their spirit has to be entirely broken. I am sorry that this may mean their ultimately developing an 'inferiority complex' but as more humane considerations have been of no avail, drastic measures are indispensable.

"While continuing to apply your own measures, why not let the teacher apply his own as well ? A change of methods and specially a *different command* may do them good.

"There is a nice point here. There is a saying that a prophet is seldom honoured by his own men. It is true. Distance lends a charm ; we judge men by the moods we find them in on casual encounters. A very jovial man may be met by you while he is in a veritable rage and the impression you will carry of him would be of a barking dog ; so also of impressions of 'gravity', 'dignity', 'triviality' and so on. This is one of the reasons why dictators keep themselves aloof, thus investing themselves with a halo of awe and mystery. I think I am lucky that I am not in company of Mohammad or Christ for

I fear I may not be thinking as exaltingly as I now do from the distance of ages and countries. Abraham Lincoln's wife did not cease teasing and nagging him, Josephine never hesitated betraying the trust of Napoleon, inspite of all the respect or the awe in which millions of the people held the two.

"These considerations lead me to advise :

"1. Your letting the teacher pursue his own methods for sometime. He should put on an artificial coating of glum and curse heaven and hell on the slightest excuse ; he should seek out causes for being angry and have nothing but talks on business with the boys. The whole idea should be to 'give them the fright of their lives.'

"2. You should warn them that you will catalogue their misdoings and report them to the teacher for disciplinary measures. You will act the relentless police and he the judge, always with a black robe to order execution, so to say.

"3. Can you separate the three ? New environments seem absolutely needed. If that is not possible, forbidding communication with one another for a limited period can be one of the measures.

"4. Be yourself as gloomy and frowning as you can all the time, in relation to them. No talk except on business.

"5. Letting the eldest into the Navy or Military may straighten him. He may even shine

there, considering the daring he is believed to have."

Then, sometime later, I received the following:

'You can imagine with what pleasure I write to tell you that the eldest boy in my care has won for himself an important scholarship for the University, and begins his new career shortly. I suppose the simple words 'Thank you' are the best that I can use to you.

"You know that I have read and re-read your book, and I would not claim to be able to add anything to it. But perhaps this is the best time to tell you of what I have found in practice, and how much they confirm your advice.

"Without the use of corporal punishment my boys would never have been brought under control; that much is beyond reasonable doubt. But the corporal punishment that I use has nothing to do with the brutal infliction of pain for the sake of pain that has so disfigured the pages of educational history in times past. Perhaps the best witness of this comes from one of my boys himself. An amused parent friend of mine reported overhearing one of my boys in conversation with his son. My friend's child had been summarily punished at school by having his ears boxed by his teacher and he returned home complaining of a headache. My boy quite solemnly gave him some advice, 'Tell your teacher to whip you on your bottom: *It doesn't hurt so much*, although you won't like it being done to you.'

"As I inflicted punishment, I am sure that it did not, and the homely phrase of the boy did accurately sum up the aim of corporal punishment in so far as it concerns sheer physical pain. Naturally a whipping is not a comfortable business for the culprit. But I have always endeavoured to see that it never achieves the point of discomfort which would make the boy alarmed as to his ability to bear it. It must never even remotely approach a torture.

"I may perhaps put it this way. It is no real inconvenience for a man to do a fortnight's simple imprisonment. Many illnesses in his life would cause him greater discomfort. But if he is a decent citizen, his attitude towards jail will be one of loathing, while his attitude towards his illness will be one of deliberate cheerfulness, if he can muster up enough spirit to be so. Clearly it is the shame of jail which keeps him out of it. So too with my boys. A hard game of Rugger might easily give them more physical hard knocks than a beating; the difference is that they are proud of what happens on the playing field, but ashamed of what takes place when they bend down across my study table.

"I emphasise this side of it when I punish them. Let us say that Harry is to be caned. Harry must fetch the cane himself. I am not using my superior physical force to assault him; *I am executing justice.* Harry may take as long as

he likes in making up his mind to face his punishment. It is usually not long, because the other boys have a ready vocabulary to urge on a coward. In a matter of minutes, Harry comes back to the room carrying the rod. I call in the other boys and such of his playmates as may be near, and from then on I say nothing. I do not magnify his importance by lecturing on his crime, nor do I diminish my own by pleading with him to be a better boy. I simply give him the order he most dislikes to hear: 'Take down your knickers.'

"Maybe Harry refuses, and then will follow a brief display of that anger which you have advised. But it is seldom necessary, and never prolonged. Once undressed, the boy knows that he is a figure of ridicule to his companions. He is not likely to indulge in bravado or rebellion with his trousers round his ankles. Then it is time to proceed with the physical part of the punishment. I am not concerned to make him suffer, but I can cause him discomfort without any risk of really injuring him.

"Nor, I am sure, it is pain which disturbs Harry. Far more upsetting is the thought that his companions before whom he wishes to appear grown-up and responsible are to watch his punishment; stage by stage, from the humiliation of having to take down his knickers to the final stroke it is this feeling that is he is not what he was in the eyes of his friends that really hurts.

"All of this is foretold in your writings; I am only glad that I have had the opportunity of proving how true they are."

... ...

I am grateful to my correspondent for the benefit of his experiments. He is still writing and many others are, on subjects treated in this book.

Will other readers join up discussions with experiments and observation on similar lines ?

RIGHT USE OF PUNISHMENT

So, as I have said, you *still* have to have punishment and deprecation, as a *power in reserve*, to be used occasionally and sparingly. A whole country can get enthused and war-minded and each may like to do his very best to resist an enemy but to get the best out of such willingness and co-operation, you have to have *order*, proceed *methodically* and restrain individual whim and caprice. Not everybody will take kindly to *your* way in preference to his own and then you will have to *step firmly in.* Of course, if you are called upon to lead them. When *other methods fail*, you have to *denounce, deprecate, disrate* and otherwise *dispose of the refractory.*

... ...

TAMING THE SHREW

Occasionally, and not so rarely, you come across a 'shrew' such that 'iron may hold with her

but never lure.' Or more often, her *male* counterpart. Or, rather, the *adult* counterparts of the three boys of Mr. Bacon. Then you *have* to act Petrucio's part and *act* it *well*.

Shakespeare has portrayed the taming of the shrew in his own masterly way. Many of us have read the play of the title. Those who have not should—for amusement, if not for instruction.

Baptista, a rich gentelman of Padua has two daughters, Katharina and Bianca—the former an "irksome brawling scold", the latter a paragon of beauty and sweetness. There are pressing suitors to Bianca but Baptista is resolved not to bestow his younger daughter before he has a husband for the elder. Katharina is violent in temper, brawling in tongue and a veritable nuisance to the house-hold. None dares woo her.

Petrucio, a gentleman of Verona comes to hear all about Katharina and takes up the challenge.

Will he woo this wild cat ?—somebody asks.

Petrucio flares up :

"Why came I hither but to that intent ?

Think you a little din can daunt mine ears ?"

Petrucio proceeds to charm the snake with a confident resolve : He is fearless and has a violent tussle on the first encounter.

He 'proposes' *roughly* but *grimly*—not the soft 'oblige me' stuff :

"Mary, so I mean, sweet Katharine, in thy bed :
And therefore, setting all this chat aside,
Thus in plain terms :—Your father hath consented.
That you shall be my wife ; ....."

And did he succeed ? Oh, Yes ! She was hustled into marriage and Petrucio gave her the fright of her life by superbly *acting* a "half lunatic, a mad-cap ruffian and a swearing Jack". He cursed all within sight, played havoc with things, ducked her down in a miry ditch from on horse-back and brought her home abjectly subdued !

Petrucio's technique was superb. Let's hear him in the first person :

"Thus have I politicly begun my reign,
And 'tis my hope to end successfully.
My falcon now is sharp, and passing empty ;
And, till she stoop, she must not be fullgorg'd,
For then she never looks upon her lure.
Another way I have to man my haggard,
To make her come, and know her keeper's call,
That is, to watch her, as we watch these kites
That bate, and beat, and will not be obedient.
She eat no meat to-day, nor none shall eat ;
Last night she slept not, nor to-night she shall not ;
As with the meat, some undeserved fault
I'll find making about the making of the bed ;

And here I'll fling the pillow, there the bolster,
This way the coverlet, another way the sheets :—
Ay, and amid this hurly, I intend
That all is done in reverend care of her ;
And, in conclusion, she shall watch all night :
And, if she chance to nod, I'll rail and brawl,
And with the clamour keep her still awake.
This is a way to kill a wife with kindness :
And thus I'll curb her mad and headstrong humour."

Katharina is shaked, bent, broken, reshaped—she has been disciplined into a cow !

Hear her speak :

".....Thy husband is thy lord, thy life, thy keeper,
Thy head, thy sovereign ; ....
I am asham'd that women are so simple
To offer war where they should kneel for peace,
Or seek for rule, supremacy, and sway,
When they are bound to serve, love, and obey..."

What a change !

Well, but remember your wife can pay you *ahead* or *back* in the same coin !

Anyhow, there is something in the technique —may come of use *some time*.

... ...

SUCCESSFUL 'ACTING'

Napoleon acted such a part often and often with success.

Often he was rough and irritable—furiously lifting a badly closing window off its hinges and hurling it into the street, lashing his groom with his whip, cursing addressees when dictating. Indeed, a man who wanted to tel scope unprecedented achievements within a short life time-might expectedly be fretting at hindrances.

More important, however, were the occasions when he simulated anger to gain some political end. Occasionally he gave the show away afterwards: "You think I was in a rage. You are making a mistake. While I have been here, my wrath has never exceeded bounds."

One day he was playing with his little nephew and gossipping with the court ladies, in the best of humours. The English Ambassador was announced. Instantly his face changed like an actor's, his features were convulsed, he turned red, and strode towards the Englishman. He literally stormed at the poor ambassador for a whole hour in the presence of numerous witnesses. In fact, the wrathful mask, the scene he made, the angry expressions he used, were *political expedients.*

Talleyrand who had more insight into Napoleon's character remarked, "He's a perfect devil. He humbugs us all, even about his passions, for he

knows how to act them, though they are really there."

... .

We are told Hitler used such technique with mastery as well. He has used it several times with success. He cannot, however, expect Mr. Churchill or Roosevelt to walk into his parlour, anyway.

Use that technique sometime, if *you can*, and when *really necessary*.

"Make a sudden sally, to bicker down a valley" but don't continuously "babble on the pebbles."

You may catch a tartar sometimes, however,—I warn you.

... ...

EMPTY THREATS

There are people who are *all threats—all the time*. This is ridiculous. The disciplinarian must always be careful to *perform what he promises*.

The teacher must keep his word. Boys are astute psychologists and they find out much more quickly than adults avow what faith can be placed in a man's word. If punishment is promised for a certain breach of discipline, *it must be administered*. This implies that 'threats' must not be 'used loosely.' 'If you do that again. I will break a precious part

of your anatomy'—is no good unless you are going to do so. In which case beware of the police !

... ...

ETHICS OF PUNISHMENT

Punishment, when actually inflicted, should be *effective*, not in the sense, as is supposed, of proved severity—but of benefit to the punished or others besides. It should *do good* rather than *harm*. The mind should be divorced from all sense of *malice* or of *bravado*. The doctor uses his knife deep into your flesh but you thank him all the same. Why ? We all know.

Thring says : "School punishment is not vengeance. Its object is its training ; first of all the training the wrong-doer ; next the training the other boys by his example. Both he and others are to be deterred from committing the offence again."

So also in other spheres. If you want to pursue the Ethics of Punishment, you can turn to writer's "Crime and Criminal Justice," a recent publication.

... ...

JUSTICE

Punishment, when actually to be inflicted, should be based strictly on justice. We do not ourselves like to be blamed unjustly.

We may, without much harm, just overdo a bit in distributing favours but in blaming or condemning anybody we must be strictly just. For, although there may be a keen competition among our subordinates for our graces, the one thing *all* without exception expect is *justice*.

Other animals like and dislike and mislike—parental affection, filial devotion, hatred of the enemy, readiness to do him harm are common. Man also shares these propensities with them.

BIAS AND PREJUDICE

Bias or *prejudice* is the mother of all unfairness and inequity. This besetting weakness of human mind is almost a universal frailty and is directly opposed to all sense of justice.

It has its background in our emotions. Although these make life interesting, they are a hindrance to the pursuit of truth and the rendering of justice.

Prejudice consists in like and dislike, proneness and aversion, favouritism and antogonism, or in other words, an emotional reaction, positive or negative. Unfortunately, prejudice—racial, national, sectarian—has been keeping men and women away from a sympathetic understanding of one another.

Freud in his Introductory Lectures on Psycho-analysis observes :

"It is a characteristic of human nature to be inclined to regard anything which is disagreeable as untrue, and then without much difficulty to find arguments against it."

... ...

Emotional associations seldom correspond with collocations in the external world. They cause us to view the universe in the mirror of our moods,—now bright, now dim, according to the state of the mirror. Those who judge by 'first impressions' are almost always wrong, those who do so by 'last impressions' are also in many cases so. For, isolated glimpses are most likely to be associated with particular emotional moods.

Why should we be so suspicious of judgment—one may ask. Because, we are *still* mostly *emótional* creatures.

Perhaps you, my dear reader, are perfect—faultless. You think so and so do I (in your case, not mine). But would you like to verify what I have said so far ?

Take the help of a dictaphone or, if that is prohibitively expensive, of a faithful spy and hear your open "character roll" from your enemies. Don't take them seriously, however.

But it's not our enemies who always judge us—one may retort.

Yes, then hear your warmest friend when you have just refused him a small loan.

I once heard an apparently sober fellow rapturously complimenting his friend :—the friend's knowledge was as wide as deep ; he was as sure as steady—he worked with lightning speed and accomplished marvels in whatever he undertook ..

I envied the friend.

It was not long after, the same fellow was found fuming against his favourite . "Don't mention him to me," the fellow entreated, "I have completely revised my opinion of him. His knowledge is only theoretical ; he is slow and hesitating; what he achieves by speed is only sham and his miracles are performed for him by others..."

Was I amazed? By Jove, I *was*.

I met the friend in question soon after. He also regretted the other had gone down in his estimation ! He hinted at something between them having gone amiss !

"You don't know," I said, "what high opinion I once found he held of you .." I repeated the previous remarks.

"Yes, but have you heard him since ?" he mournfully enquired.

"Oh shut, shut, haven't I ?"—I mused but decisively parried :

"How could he say anything else ? Never mind, tell me how is the family ?..."

He was not comfortable but the humdrum enquiry evoked a more agreeable response,

Have you ever heard a rejected suitor ? If you have, you know how the 'celestial bird' he once adored has turned out to be an ugly owl, how her voice is only suited for dirges, her wings flap in vain and her plumes are now being plucked by some detestable scoundrel !

Come even nearer.

Hear your own sweet wife - that paragon of beauty and perfection with whom you would, as she would with you, sail across the seven seas or rough the seven hells rather than apart, after she has been crossed in something on which she was desperately intent.

That is human but by no means ideal.

A sane and rational verdict should be the outcome of cool and unbiased considerations.

....

The function of passing judgment is entrusted to the *judge,* whether he be sitting on the union bench, be a justice of the peace, a magistrate, a member of the jury or a dignified Sessions or a High Court Judge. He is behaving badly and unworthily if he abdicates his judgment in favour of *anyone,* however near, or of *anything,* however dear.

A polite, but necessary convention assumes the existence of a judicial mind in those selected

to *judge* and nothing should be dearer to them than to acquire one if they are not already in possession of it. It needs a basis of intellectual honesty and firm character which can be acquired and kept up.

... ...

Let's come down to the sphere we are in.

We don't judge, one may say, we only order and execute. Yes, we do, but let's see.

In the humdrum daily life, in office, in business, in politics, and in practically everything else, where we deal with others, we *do* judge, although we do not 'pass judgment' in a formal manner. And surely, more injustice is perpetrated this way than in the formal ways of the judges.

This seems to be a tall statement. But think,—is it really so ?

Whenever we utter an opinion, criticize anyone, punish anybody, lift another, order something,—we judge. Our judgments do good ; they do harm. They may do neither but yet be a lapse from the fairness we should strive to achieve.

The *Burra Sahab* walks into the office in temper. He shouts and curses. He finds petty faults everywhere and magnifies them. He sees red and scarlet and orange. On other days he would simply correct but to-day he creates hell. Has he had a quarrel with the *Mem Sahab* or had heavy bills to pay ? Has he had gastric troubles ? God alone knows !

The irritated clerks in their turn wreak temper on the *duftry* or back home on the maids and servants, if not the wives. The rice is badly cooked, the curry is unfit for human consumption—even the tubewell water shows creeping worms inside—why, oh why, should everybody combine to make their lives miserable ?

Well, well, the earth is spinning round at the same rate and it's only you, the *Burra Sahabs* and the *Burra Babus*, that have momentarily fallen foul and gone out of harmony with everything else !

DEALING WITH EVERYBODY AS HE WOULD JUSTLY DESERVE

A mind which is stout and rightly poised refuses to succumb to such weaknesses and *deals with every matter or person in the way each would justly deserve.*

This is fairness. Such is justice. If we can *render* it, we can *expect* it. If not, we deserve to remain poor wretches that we are.

So let us keep the ideal of justice and fairness before us and live up to it. Our lapses will be exceptions and the general rule will be good discipline.

"Be not impatient in delay,
But wait as one who understands ;
When spirit rises and commands,
The gods are ready to obey."

16

APPROPRIATE HANDLING OF HUMAN NATURE

(c) The 'disciplinarian' has to handle pupils and subordinates appropriately so as to be able to get the best out of them.

This apparently follows from all that has been said before.

We might as well call this ability 'tact'. No other quality of mind is perhaps more needed by a disciplinarian than this one.

TACT

'Tact' in the dictionary is "sensitive mental perception ; *nice discernment of the best course of action under given conditions, especially, peculiar ability to deal with others without giving offence.*"

Some one has called it "a combination of intellectual quickness and lively sympathy" and again "a sure and quick judgment of what is suitable and agreeable in society."

It has been shown that discipline is an art; not a science. *The problem of discipline is the eternal problem of handling human nature.*

Methods of the disciplinarian will have to *vary*. There is not just one and only one way

to maintain discipline. There is room for *discretion*.

TROTSKY AND STALIN COMPARED

In estimating Trotsky's downfall, the authors of "The way of The Dictators" ascribe lack of tact. They observe :

"Trotsky was successful in beating off the revolution. He rendered inestimable service to his country and he raised up for himself a host of enemies. A man of drive and action needs the gift of tact to a supreme degree if he is to avoid the enmities of little men, but tact and Trotsky have never been united. Even he realised that it was no cause for wonder that his military work created so many enemies for him. 'I did not look to the side' he says. 'I elbowed away those who interfered with military success, or in the haste of the work trod on the toes of the unheeding and was too busy even to apologise."

They add: "Trotsky, vigorous and aggressive, cannot appreciate the qualities of the other. Stalin has the political tact which Trotsky lacks and some of the subtler qualities necessary.—"

SHARPENING INTEREST

The good points in men and women are there, if you care to look for them. They are

waiting to blossom towards perfection. They want the sweet caress of an appreciative hand.

Of course, you can make me yield my purse at the point of the revolver. You can make me copy out the whole of a volume by threats —of course, if I am completely in your power. But can you snub me into writing as interestingly as Dickens ? Perhaps, by appreciation and appropriate handling you can make me go a long way towards the goal but by deprecation —never !

Professor A. N. Whitehead in a discourse on "Rhythmic Claim of Freedom and Discipline" as applied to Education observes :

"There can be no mental development without interest. Interest is the *sine qua non* for attention and apprehension. You may endeavour to excite interest by means of birch rods, or you may coax it by the incitement of pleasurable activity. But without interest there will be no progress. Now the natural mode by which living organisations are excited towards suitable self-development is enjoyment. ....Undoubtedly pain is one subordinate means of arousing an organism to action. But it only supervenes on failure of pleasure Joy is the normal healthy spur for the *elan vital*."

Let's repeat the cardinal point :

There can be no mental development without interest.. without interest there will be no progress ....Joy is the normal healthy spur for the elan vital.

Has nature combined the methods of pain and enjoyment ? Hasn't it ?

Nature punishes us with burning if we handle fire, with disease if we violate rules of health. True. But nature keeps us warm with positive allurements of enjoyment.

If food, any drab and dreary kind, were forced down through our throat, we could live. We can live by 'artificial feeding'. But what grand pleasure of the palate has been associated with the primary act of gulping down the grub ! We eat to live but we enjoy to eat as well. Hasn't that made a pleasant pastime of cooking and the search for delicacies ?

Even the very act of reproduction, yet a terrible and tiresome process for the woman bas been linked up beautifully with the passions of sex, love and maternal longing for the child. Hasn't nature been gracious ?

....

Tell a child he is a dullard, continue to snub him as an inevitable failure and you will

blight his prospects eternally. Encourage him on the other hand, inspire him to make the best of what is within his power and he will respond kindly He will improve.

"When a child is robbed of his faith," says Adler, the great psychologist, "the result is that he withdraws from reality and builds up a compensatory striving on the useless side of life. An educator's most important task—one might almost say his holy duty—is to see that no child is discouraged at school, and that a child who enters school already discouraged regains his confidence in himself through his school and his teacher. This goes hand in hand with the vocation of the educator, for no education is possible except with children who look hopefully and joyfully upon the future.

Preston Search has said :

"This then is the function of the teacher—not to cram, to hear lessons, and to direct but to inspire, to suggest, to utilize, and to bless. A policy of this kind would reconstruct the school, would bring salvation to the so-called dullard or dunce, and would lift every pupil into an atmosphere of higher achievement and ethical culture Its realization lies directly before the school of to-day."

Interest cannot be coerced any more than love can. Love cannot be inspired 'to order' — anyway, sincere love cannot.

Interest is the main stimulus. Increase this stimulus and memory will sharpen, ideas will grow, will-power will develop. The night is not long enough for all the interested persons would like to *plan* ; the day is not long enough for all he would like to *do* !

....

So many children are curbed and their careers ruined because parents and guardians would force them to tread paths they are unwilling to. These are utterly callous about finding out what really interests them.

So many children are curbed and twisted uselessly and their careers ruined because parents and guardians would not follow up their bends and inclinations. The latter will uselessly try to make somebody out of a child quite without any reference to his own talent and bias. Failures and half-products are only natural in such cases.

Would you like to hear of a school-boy who was a failure in classes achieve remarkable success in life because a headmaster let him follow his bend ?

A. A. Milne, a distinguished writer, relates the story in his auto-biography :

"Alfred Harmsworth had been a boy at Henley House. He was one of those boys who seem full of intelligence out of school hours and devoid of intelligence in them. A master's natural deduction is that the boy is idle : 'Could do better' he writes in his report. Father didn't condemn Harmsworth as idle, he condemned himself for not being able to discover where this obviously clever boy's interests lay. Harmsworth came to him one day and asked if a school paper could be started, because other schools had them, and he knew a little printer round the corner who would do it very cheaply. Father said that a school paper was a good idea, but it took up too much of a headmaster's time. Perhaps one day when he was less busy....

"That's all right, sir," said Harmsworth eagerly. 'I'll do it all. You shan't be bothered I promise.'

"Now I think that nine headmasters out of ten would have pointed out that, even as it was, this boy was continually failing to pass the necessary examinations, and that there was an obvious use which could be made of his spare time. Father was the tenth headmaster. Here, at last, was something which the boy was keen

on doing. Then let him do it. So the first number of the Henley House School Magazine was published: 'Edited by Alfred C. Harmsworth. On that day, one may say, the Northcliffe Press was born.'

That good-for-nothing school-boy went his own way and founded the Daily Mail and owned the Times and several other papers. He was later known as the Viscount of Northcliffe.

... ...

Ziegfeld, the most spectacular entrepreneur who ever dazzled Broadway is said by Carnegie to have gained his reputation by his ability to "glorify the American girl."

Often he would take some little drab creature that no one ever looked at twice and transform her on the stage into a glamorous paragon of mystery and seduction. Knowing the value of appreciation and confidence, he made women feel beautiful by the sheer power of his gallantry and consideration. He raised salaries, sent congratulatory telegrams and deluged every chorus girl in the show with flowers.

A transformation—comp'ete and mysterious —was thus effected !

Napoleon Hill very aptly observes :

"Criticism is the one form of service, of which everyone has too much. Everyone has a stock of it which is handed out, gratis, whether called for or not. One's nearest relatives often are the worst offenders. It should be recognized as a crime (in reality it is a crime of the worst nature), for any parent to build inferiority complexes in the mind of a child, through unnecessary criticism. Employers, who understand human nature, get the best there is in men, not by criticism, but by constructive suggestion. Parents may accomplish the same with their children. Criticism will plant FEAR in the human heart, or resentment, but it will not build love or affection."

"Heaven protect us from the "sincere friend" whose sincerity consists only of depressing us, who carefully warns us of the evil that is being spoken of us and seems afflicted with a peculiar deafness regarding the good !"

Napoleon Hill himself has done miracles. One, which is particularly encouraging to the afflicted and instructive to parents is the story of his own son, Blair.

This boy was born without normal hearing capacity. It was dreaded he might turn into a deaf mute.

What could he do about it ? Somehow he would find a way to transplant into that child's mind his own BURNING DESIRE for ways and means of conveying sound to the brain without the aid of ears !

We shall skip over the remaining part of the story. The result ultimately *was* : Step by step, the boy won his full hearing capacity !

The treatment was superb :

"I planted in my son's mind the DESIRE to hear and to speak as any normal person hears and speaks. That DESIRE has now become a reality. I planted in his mind the DESIRE to convert his greatest handicap into his greatest asset. That DESIRE has been realized. The modus operandi by which this astounding result was achieved is not hard to describe. It consisted of three very definite facts ; first, I MIXED FAITH with the DESIRE for normal hearing, which I passed on to my son. Second, I communicated my desire to him in every conceivable way available, through persistent, continuous effort, over a period of years. Third, HE BELIEVED ME."

Try this in your domestic sphere.

Compare your wife's cooking to that of Juliet, the sweet girl next-door and warn her you will never be satisfied with her performance

till she attains Juliet's standard. God help you !

Try the other.

Remark how well your wife cooks and to what height of culinary skill she is gradually soaring.

She may be in the lowest grade *actually*. You may be secretly lunching and dining out at present. But you can be sure she *will* improve. You may find her making a burnt offering of herself on the stoves in her effort to come up to your expectation !

Dorothy Dix advises the method of appreciation in disciplining wives, (if you ever *can* discipline them) :

"Every man knows that he can jolly his wife into doing anything, and doing without anything. He knows that if he hands her a few cheap compliments about what a wonderful manager she is, and how she helps him, she will squeeze every nickel. Every man knows that if he tells his wife how beautiful and lovely she looks in her last year's dress she wouldn't trade it for the latest Paris importation. Every man knows that he can kiss his wife's eyes shut until she will be as blind as a bat, and that he has only to give her a warm smack on the lips to make her dumb as an oyster.

COMPLIMENTS MOVE HEARTS

A certain public-spirited man sent a fat cheque to a band of women who were doing some social work. The women were grateful ; their finances were easier now.

Another sent a lean one, apologized for the smallness of the sum and wrote to the women, telling how much the community owed to their unselfishness, how much it appreciated their labours. He made their work, and not *his cheque* the chief thing. When his letter was received, it was read and re-read by each of the women in turn. Some of them wept. They were spurred to renewed zeal for their mission. They preserved the letter as a treasure from which to get occasional inspiration !

True, the women were not selfish—they did not do what they were doing for the sake of good name or wide fame—but they were human. They were not beyond the "magic spell of appreciation." No body, high or *low, is.*

... ...

Does this work in business ?

Let's see.

Dale Carnegie speaks of a man in business who had, for years and years, criticized and condemned his employees without stint or

discretion. Kindness, words of appreciation, and encouragement were alien to his lips. He finally altered his philosophy. Three hundred and fourteen employees in his establishment were now turned from enemies to friends. His organization was now inspired with a new loyalty, a new enthusiasm, a new spirit of team work.

... .

AROUSING ENTHUSIASM

Andrew Carnegie is said to have been paying Charles Schwab a million dollars a year ! But the latter was said to have been no genius, nor to have known very much more about the manufacture of steel than other people.

Schwab himself said he was paid this large sum for his ability to deal with people.

"*I consider my ability to arouse enthusiasm*" he is said to have stated, "*the greatest asset I possess, and the way to develop the best that is in a man is by appreciation and encouragement.*"

By the eternal ! These words should be inscribed in gold and the plate hung up all over ! They should be noted by *blustering bosses, nagging wives and howling husbands.*

"'Well-done' messages praising a subordinate or even a rival for some piece of good work, pay the biggest dividends on small outlays."

A distinguished writer, A.A. Milne, contrasts two of his own bosses :

"Through the thirty years of my friendship with him (E. V. Lucas), beginning from the days when he first came into the Punch office as Acting Editor, I was encouraged by him to think that I was a good writer. Anybody who likes may differ from him, including myself at times, but I know that I am a better writer for his appreciation than I should have been without it. Owen (Seaman) was as guarded in his praise as a preparatory schoolmaster who fears always the retort : 'If my son was as clever as you said, why didn't get a scholarship ?' When I had written half-a-dozen articles, he would say, 'Isn't it about time you wrote some verse again ?' which in a way (let us look on the bright side) was a compliment to my verse; and after three sets of verses he would say, 'It's about time you did another series, isn't it ?' which could be taken (thank you, Owen) as a compliment to my prose. If these were compliments, they were all that I extracted from him. But E. V. knew that you can't be light and gay and offhand and casual and charming in print

unless you are continually reassured that you are being some of these things. If I had any value to Punch it was because sometime I was some of these things, and E. V's praise helped me to give the air of doing it all easily—which is the only air to give writing of that sort."

....

VALUING GOOD POINTS

But—you may ask if there be no noticeable good point ?

No noticeable good points ?

They are there all round. Look for them and you will count them by the scores.

Emerson said, "Every man I meet is in some way my superior, and in that I can learn of him.'

Can't you and I say so ?

Developing an eye for good points is a matter of practice only. By trying this every day and on all occasions one can almost be fault-blind. One can then command loyalty and devotion and unconsciously create friends all over.

... .

Not only that.

You should not think that simply because you are senior and your position is high, your

juniors and subordinates are necessarily inferior to you in ability and judgment. Some of them *are* better. They feel so too but will not tell you !

That does not mean that you should yield your place of superiority. No. No .

Stay where you are, expect loyalty and obedience from your juniors but encourage them to help you with their *opinions* and come up with *suggestions*. There is a *better* way for *everything that is being done* and you may not in your hurry notice it. Call upon your subordinates to exercise their brains, to look for new ways and suggest them for your consideration. Of course, the *final decision* must be *yours* but do not *reject* suggestions off-hand but do so, where necessary, with grace so that the man suggesting can keep on thinking.

USING TALENTS

Days are long gone by when people used to come to the same man, the priest, prophet or medicine man, for making enquiries about the stars, contents of heaven or hell, movements of angels or evil spirits, for taking orders as to their private conduct, both spiritual and mundane, and also for seeking advice on bodily ailments

and mental worries. We now go to scientists and even then to various specialists. We now go to the sociologist for enlightenment on social matters. We now go to physicians and even then different specialists for different ailments.

There is general knowledge. There is specialized knowledge. The former is common, open to all. The latter is uncommon, confined to a few.

A leader has got to *harness talents* to his service.

It would be foolish and futile for any one leader to claim *all knowledge*, although there is no dearth of such fools. But true leaders who have been successful *employ* talents and *profit* by them.

The prophet of Islam was himself illiterate. He could not count hundred. He had no schooling. But he took the earliest opportunity to have by his side such able lieutenants as Abu Baker, Omar, Uthman and Ali. These four stood by him devoted, unflinching and served him with their best. Abu Baker's prudence, Omar's zeal, Uthman's wealth and Ali's valour—all helped the prophet—and it was not long before Islam was felt as a growing power. The discipline displayed by the followers was unique.

Akbar was illiterate too. He ruled over perhaps the vastest people of diverse creeds, of all the Muslim emperors of Delhi. He was a most successful ruler. His people worshipped him as a god.

Akbar harnessed to his side the famous Naba-ratna (nine geniuses). Abul Fazl, Faizi, Todarmal, Birbal were towering geniuses in their own lines and the advisory cabinet worked faithfully to his credit.

Was Akbar's credit any the less ? By no means. His was the position of a leader who *sought out* specialized knowledge and *availed* of it. His was the supreme task of co-ordinating and pooling counsels. No wonder he succeeded admirably.

Napoleon was a rare leader. His handling of the generals and marshals was unique. Their sentiments towards him were a mingling of hatred and love, whereby they were chained to his service more firmly. Berthier and Duroc were wholly devoted to him. Their love for him was compared with that of a child and a dog. Ney spoke of himself as a loaded musket which was to be fired when and where the Emperor would like.

Napoleon nevertheless employed the others who were not so attached to him.

He recognized each one's strong points. He extolled Desaix's mental balance. Moreau had "more instinct than genius." Kléber sought glory as a means of enjoyment. Masséna was not really courageous until he was under fire. Murat had not "a spark of intelligence, but what dash !" He was characterized as "a duffer and a hero !" Napoleon could not break away form these useful tools, although almost all of them had learned the weight of his anger. He kept them chained to his chariot by all means — honourable and shady.

The point really is : *He did recognize specialized talents and use them.* So does each leader worth the name.

Andrew Carnegie, as I have said, is reported to have stated that he, personally, knew nothing about the technical end of the steel business ; he did not particularly care to know. He found available the specialized knowledge he required in the individual units of his "Master Mind Group."

Henry Ford is not a man of "education" in the popular sense.

He once said, "I can summon to my aid men who can answer ANY question I desire to ask concerning the business to which I am devoting most of my efforts. Now, will you kindly tell me, WHY I should clutter up my

mind with general knowledge for the purpose of being able to answer questions, when I have men around me who can supply any knowledge I require ?"

That is how Henry Ford uses talents.

Napoleon Hill emphasizes this point with regard to Henry Ford :

"It is a well known fact that Henry Ford began his business career under the handicap of poverty, illiteracy, and ignorance. It is an equally well known fact that, within the inconceivably short period of ten years, Mr. Ford mastered these three handicaps and within twenty-five years he made himself one of the richest men in America. Connect with this fact, the additional knowledge that Mr. Ford's most rapid strides became noticeable, from the time he became a personal friend to Thomas A. Edison and you will begin to understand what the influence of one mind upon another can accomplish. Go a step further, and consider the fact that Mr. Ford's most outstanding achievements began from the time that he found the acquaintances of Harvey Firestone, John Burroughs, and Luther Burbank, (each a man of great brain capacity), and you will have further evidence that *Power* may be produced through friendly alliance of minds."

Hitler is not much of a cultured man but he *is* harnessing talents to his mission.

....

MEETING TO DISCUSS

Conferences and meetings are excellent venues of hearing opinions without being committed any way. Do not gag mouths so that the members only 'yes' you. Reserve your opinion and let them come up. Toss on your opinion as a mere 'suggestion' from 'some quarter' and they will offer candid criticism. You will find this a good corrective to your own 'strickiness'.

... ...

INVITING SUGGESTIONS

I am told Mr. Ford encourages every body to come up with 'suggestions' for 'improvement' of matters *direct* to *himself* and even a Coolie can run right up to him if he has an 'idea' to offer.

This *is* getting *the best* out of our juniors.

....

I am used to issuing an "appeal for ideas". I quote one here. It is addressed to police and other officers under my charge but the principle will apply everywhere.

BETTER WAY SUGGESTIONS

"To

"All Police Officers and Office Clerks.

"It is a matter of common knowledge that the efficient working of the Police Organization entirely depends on due observance by Police Officers of rules and regulations in force and orders and instructions issued from time to time. Those regulating police work are detailed and elaborate and members must implicitly go by them as long as they stand in force.

"It should not, however, be supposed that they are all perfect. There is a better way for all that is being done and should be a matter of individual and collective research as to how things could be better managed and outspoken frankness as to what difficulties are being actually felt in honest working of a rule or order.

"I would invite all members of the Force to give some thoughts in this direction in the ordinary course of their business. The general

principles underlying such a constructively critical examination of methods of work should be, among others :—

(a) Observation of what is there ;

(b) Scrutiny of what is there;

(c) Comparison with methods in analogous professions ;

(d) Imagining what could be better.

"I shall be glad to receive, addressed to me direct, suggestions and criticisms from individual members whenever they may have anything to say in respect of any branch of police work. All communications should be without reserve and resultful ideas will bring recognition to their authors."

I am glad to say my officers *do* respond.

... ...

A certain American business-magnate used to show foreigners details of his equipment and how the various plants worked smoothly. some of his companions were taken aghast! Was it a good policy to show others the good points ? They might easily copy and compete !

The magnate heard whisperings and ex-

plained. By the time the foreigners would be copying, his own methods will be greatly scraped in favour of newer and much better ones!

Such should be the progressive outlook of every organisation. There shall be room for improvement every time and as long as one cares for *better ways* and *newer methods* one need not be anxious about copyrights!

....

Andrew Carnegie had a flair for leadership, a genius for organization. It is said he learnt a lesson early in life from a simple incident. Dale Carnegie relates it:

"When he (Andrew Carnegie) was a boy back in Scotland, he got hold of a rabbit, a mother rabbit. Presto! He soon had a whole nest of little rabbits—and nothing to feed them. But he had a brilliant idea. He told the boys in the neighbourhood that if they would go out and pull enough clover and dandelions to feed the rabbits, he would name the bunnies in their honour.

"The plan worked like magic; and Carnegie never forgot it."

Let us hear Andrew Carnegie in the first person. He recalls:

"I treasure the remembrance of this plan as the earliest evidence of organizing powers upon the development of which my material success in life has hung—a success not to be attributed to what I have known or done myself, but to the faculty of knowing and choosing others who did know better than myself. Precious knowledge this for any man to possess. I did not understand steam machinery, but I tried to understand that much more complicated piece of mechanism—man."

Can't you and I take the lesson ?

....

DEALING WITH CREATURES OF EMOTION

When dealing with people, we should remember we are not dealing with creatures of logic. We are dealing with creatures of emotion, creatures bristling with prejudice and motivated by self-esteem, pride and vanity.

Henry Ford observes :

"There is one principle which a man must follow if he wishes to succeed, and that is to understand human nature. I am convinced by my own experience, and by that of others, that if there is any secret of success it lies in the ability to get another person's point of

view and see things from his angle as well as from your own."

While there are pupils and subordinates who would demand severe handling, this in other cases may do more harm than good.

Owing probably to prejudices, and the influences of the speculators, Nelson was treated, on his return from the West Indies in a manner extremely uncomfortable to himself. He carried out his duties on the *Boreas* with strict and sullen attention and when orders were received to prepare the ship for being paid off, he remarked, "It will release me for ever from an ungrateful service, for it is my firm and unalterable determination never again to set my foot on board a King's ship. Immediately after my arrival in town I shall wait on the First Lord of the Admiralty, and resign my commission."

The friend to whom he remarked thus tried to dissuade him from the step but failing in this attempt, the friend communicated secretly with the Lord who interviewed Captain Nelson at once and by kind and gracious treatment effectually removed his resentment.

Nelson's face was thus saved and the welfare and honour of England bound up so inextricably with the future services of Nelson were also assured.

The old way should have ignored Nelson's sentiments but there they *were*. It is easy to ignore or slight them but there are times when tactful handling does become an imperative necessity.

SENSITIVE PEOPLE

There are people who are sensitive to an extreme degree. They do not take kindly to rebukes and reprimands. General Leonard Wood is said to have died of disappointment, because he was not allowed to come with the army to France. The blow to his pride is said to have shortened his life Thomas Hardy is said to have given up writing fiction for ever, mortified at bitter criticism of some of his works.

TROUBLED PEOPLE

Then there are people who momentarily pass through misfortunes, through bad health or troubled mind, through private *crises*—when their standard of work may fall off temporarily. It is best to let them have time to recoup.

Carnegie says :

"Letting him (the other person) save his face! How important, how vitally important

that is ! We ride roughshod over the feelings of others, getting our own way, finding fault, issuing threats, criticizing a child or employee in front of others, without even considering the hurt to the other man's pride ! Whereas a few minutes' thought, a considerate word or two, a genuine understanding of the other person's attitude would go so far towards alleviating the sting."

Firing employees is not much fun. Getting fired is much less fun. You can call up an employee and say garvely, "Look here, Mr. X., we had employed you only on a temporary term. We are sorry I see no more assignment for you. So good-bye !"

The man goes out let down. He goes with no love for you.

Instead—you can call him and proceed sympathetically :

"Mr. X, you have done fine job. That time I sent you on that difficult assignment you came through with flying colours. You have the ability and you *will be* wanted. We would be so glad to be able to retain you but you know the vacancy has unfortunately fallen through. I shall help you whenever you require my help. Good-bye !"

The man will go off feeling a lot better. He will not feel let down.

... .

That reminds me of a story current of a fortuneteller who appeared before a king.

"Oh, Emperor, I see your family members will all die before you."

The king grew furious. He ordered the poor fellow's execution !

Another turned up a few days later and exclaimed, "Emperor, I see a gloriously long life for you. You will live the longest in your family."

The king beamed with joy. He gave this man a big reward !

Why, they both said the same thing ! The one was *tactless* ; the other was *tactful*.

... ...

REFUSING PEOPLE

Refusing anybody anything calls for tact. Expressing disagreement does so too. Whether you are refusing a suitor your hand, a politician a vote, a friend company or a businessman your trade, you should do it tactfully. You may have to reject an application, deny a favour, express a disagreement. You may do all this curtly or with grace. Of course, your subordinates will keep silent but you will forfeit their goodwill, if you are inconsiderate.

Here are a few points given by a writer but apply them *as the case may be* :

Make your refusal clear, definite and final.

Explain your reasons.

Express your regret that you cannot comply with the request.

Accompany your refusal with some tribute to the other person.

Real tactfulness in the majority of situations is more a matter of heart than of the head. If you feel it is not worth wasting time over politeness, your subordinates will consider it not worth while giving their goodwill or attachment to you. And by no rule of the Regulations or Order of the day can you *compel* this.

... ...

CORRECTING FAULTS

Even *faults* may demand correction through methods other than *condemnation*.

"There is nothing else", said Schwab, "that so kills the ambitions of a man as criticism from his superiors. I never criticize anyone. I believe in giving a man incentive to work. So I am anxious to praise but loath to find

faults. If I like anything, I am hearty in my approbation and lavish in my praise.. In my wide association in life, meeting with many and great men in various parts of the world, I have yet to find the man, however great or exalted his station, who did not do better work and put forth greater effort under a spirit of approval than he would ever do under a spirit of criticism."

You mean "indulgence"? —You may retort.

No, by no means.

Handling of faults *is* a delicate art. some do this successfully; many others *aggravate* them.

We have to let others save their faces. Their self-respect, their pride, their vanity may be wounded if we are too hasty about putting them in the wrong.

We can draw attention to faults and have them corrected— tactfully and adroitly. Do we do so ? Very seldom.

Let's see Bernard Shaw's technique – one that he applied on one occasion. He does not refrain from slashing men and society on the slightest provocation but on this occasion he did appear in a magnificent role.

Bernard Shaw was somewhere presiding a competition among school-children. He gave almost equal marks to every boy :—

Master A writes an excellent hand and has only to improve his spelling.....

Master B spells perfectly and has only to improve his hand-writing.....

Master C is prodigious in mathematics and has only to mind his literature.....

Master D is a literary luminary and has only to apply his mind to figures.....

Make the superb handling of boys.

He *gives credit first* and *expects improvement later.*

....

Can't we do so ?

I have an abiding admiration for a high officer whose inspection remarks were an embodiment of the above principle. Didn't he find faults ? Of course, he did ; he was there to find them.

But the adroit manner in which he gave *credit first* and *expected improvement* later was all his own. His remarks rang in our ears – they touched our hearts– surely one who admired us *in* what good points we had, had every right to expect improvement in other directions. Men felt encouraged to stake their very lives to come up to his expectation ! If they didn't, that was their misfortune.

"Give a dog a bad name and you may as well hang him."—Try the reverse and see what happens.

17

INFLUENCING OTHER PEOPLE

The 'disciplinarian' or 'leader' has to handle pupils or followers appropriately so as to be able to get the *best* out of them. We have so far seen *how*.

But he has to handle *others*.

Except for supreme leaders, all have to contact and work with a host of superiors, seniors, equals—friends, acquaintances and strangers.

The technique so far elaborated relates mainly to subordinates and followers. It will be at many points ineffective with the host we have just catalogued. They are independent of us, nay, some may be holding authority over us! There can be no question of ordering them about.

We shall have to render *obedience* to *superiors*, *respect* to *seniors* and due *consideration* to equals. May be, but there is a way of commanding them all.

This is not the usual domineering sort of *commanding* but *commanding* in the sense of *subtly but powerfully influencing* them.

How is that to be managed?

AN EXCELLENT BOOK

If you want to know all about it in detail,

I can do no better than refer you to that masterpiece in the line, How to Win Friends And Influence People, by Dale Carnegie. It handles the topic superbly.

That is a book which is superb in so far as dealing with equals or seniors goes. The principles enunciated there do not hold much good in respect of exacting loyalty from subordinates in serious pursuits like warfare. Discipline cannot be enforced with sweet words in every case. If that author had dealt with the topic of discipline in his own masterly way, I would have had no need to write this book at all.

The train dispatcher does not flatter the conductor but gives him definite orders. The army commander orders his men to attack in the face of grave dangers. When the orders are obeyed, he praises them; when they are not, grave consequences follow and he has reason to be angry and to deal severely with the refractory.

There are times when one should say "yes" and be "sweet" and times when one should say "no" and be "glum". Life is made up of situations and circumstances calling for 'yesses" and "noes" and the person who would negotiate through life successfully has to learn to use each in its proper place.

The very theme of the present book is to indicate how and when.

Subject to the above criticism. the book by Carnegie is one which may be studied with very great profit.

A FEW TIPS HERE

I am here to give a few tips only, on the particular point under discussion.

Out of the great deal spoken by psychologists on the subject, I could construct an easy formula. It is :

CALCULATE, CONCENTRATE, CONTACT, COURT, CONVERT, COMMAND AND CARRY.

It might look like an incantation but I am explaining.

CALCULATE

Calculate ? What ?

Calculation consists in weighing the *prospects* of the objective, casting about for the *correct* approach.

You must focus attention on the problem before you, visualize how it can be accomplished and then proceed systematically step by step.

If you want something done or some proposal accepted, you should analyze the line of approach and find out *who are* the men to get on to.

You have to look for the *people that matter*; avoid approaches to wrong quarters.

It is useless to proceed haphazardly, or to be half-hearted. That way lies failure.

Sometimes the matter rests on adjustments in lesser hands and we go about troubling big bosses to no effect. That is a wrong calculation.

I was once going to Bombay to attend a conference and had started late so as to be just in time. Lazily or thoughtlessly I had sent in no intimation to Howrah for reservation of a berth. Airily I wlaked on to the Bombay Mail well ahead to occupy a comfortable berth! That was not to be! There was the eternal string of reservation cards hung up on doors!

I turned round to the railway officials and demanded my right of accommodation.

"You can have a seat, sir, but no berth as you gave no previous notice," was the reply, "they are all reserved ahead." I went from officer to officer to hear the same stereotyped reply. No high officer would admit my appeal!

Well, I had saved myself a post-card and a little trouble by not writing ahead, and

the whole lot of railway officials were bent on punishing me for the omission !

I saw no hope.

A petty official was just seen triumphantly conducting passengers on to their seats. He was dictating, so to say, where each had better go and feeling quite *important*. I decided upon tackling him.

"Good evening, sir, you must be in charge of all these arrangements," I said, knowing fully well he was only small fry. "No, sir, but can I help you ?" he responded.

I repeated my story of omission and ended by saying it was quite within his power to fix me up.

"Sorry, sir, you see all fixed up well ahead but I shall try for you. It must be an upper berth, if at all."

I pleaded a long journey but thanked him for even that.

After some brisk running about which seemed to indicate he had been ransacking the earth from pole to pole, he put me into a comfortable lower berth, pleading I must go up if the gentleman meant to occupy it did actually turn up ! The emphasis was on the word 'actually' ! I thanked him for all he did

and remarked he had done for me what his bosses had failed to do. He seemed pleased.

No person did turn up to displace me and I travelled in comfort all the way. I noticed, however, that there were several other gentlemen who never turned up and a good many berths were going vacant !

Well, the berths were going there all right but what avail could they have been to me if for the *apparent* congestion I was to wait for the next train ?

The petty official had done me a favour and I was grateful for it. The big officials "regretted" and I do not care for them.

CONCENTRATE

So *concentrate*. Firstly, on the men *that matter*. Secondly, on the *correct procedure* of approach.

Thirdly, concentrate your attention *positively* towards the objective.

Concentration has been defined in this sense as "the habit of planting in the mind of a definite aim, object or purpose, and visualizing the same until ways and means for its realization have been created."

We have detailed "the obey-me-attitude" of mind you will have to have while dealing with subordinates The same frame of mind should be assumed and will-power exerted, you imagi-

ning success in your objective as *already attained.*

You should, however, never seem *outwardly* to be *dictating.* Equals and unattached acquaintances resent being dictated; seniors and superiors are only likely to get furious.

What is needed in these cases is supreme tact.

CONTACT

After having fixed the right men, you have to approach them.

That is—you must *contact* them

There are people who develop a fear of contacting persons. This is a sort of 'stage-fright' or 'nervousness' in advance.

This usually happens with persons of shy temperament who have not seen much of society. The antidote to such shyness is *mixing* and *more mixing* with people of all sorts. The man or woman who wants to excel in the art of 'personal contact' must break away from home and plunge right into society. Embarrassments may be occasioned in the beginning but they will soon wane.

Besides, those things you do wrong are very often the key to racial success in men with personality to carry them off. Bernard Shaw

is famous and courted for his rudeness. Dr. Johnson's table manners were execrable, but he was always being asked to dine out. Society likes good manners ; but it likes *men* better.

There is a rhyme which is worth remembering by those who feel awkward in society, and who are afraid of meeting people.

"I wish I loved the human race,
I wish I liked it's ugly face,
And when I'm introduced to one,
I wish I thought "what jolly fun".

That's a bitter little rhyme, and there is scarcely a person of intelligence who has not felt just that way many times in his life. He knows he ought to like people, but he knows equally well, that he doesn't. And he secretly, may be, envies the jolly type that seems to be happy whoever he is with. But for all that, his intelligence tells him he's among bores or fools or worse, and he can do nothing to alter what he feels.

If you feel that way, don't try to alter your emotions. Only, don't show them. That is easy enough. You should not think of showing extreme grief to a mixed group of people. Don't show extreme dislike, or extreme boredom.

And for those people who are worried because they do not seem to be getting out and about and meeting people, there are two

pieces of advice. One is that if they are going to do anything in this world that depends on other people, then they had better set about meeting as many as they can that will be useful to them. The other is that having met the useful people, there is no harm whatsoever in dropping the rest.

There are others who have mixed a lot among equals but cringe before seniors and superiors. They cannot dispel the uneasiness of having to ask for something or make some proposal.

What is there to be done ?

The remedy here lies in acquiring a positive frame of mind such as we have outlined in the chapters on 'Self-confidence' and 'Fearlessness.'

The great thing here is to 'take courage' and hazard an interview. After all, it is men or women you are going to contact, not beasts of prey that will spring at you. What then if your quarries are not so very responsive ? You can try others or again.

Our sub-conscious mind is a wonderful storehouse of experience. You find stored up there the experiences of success as well as failure. The trouble is that we recall our painful experiences more readily than the others.

We recall in our mind a ghastly accident we came by and our hearts beat faster and our hair stands on end. We recall an unfair treatment accorded by someone and we feel nervous and shy off from contacting another.

If this happens so readily, the encouraging effect of happy and successful contacts must also brace us up. So on the eve of an interview or any undertaking that may give you a feeling of doubt or misgiving, recall in your mind an occasion when you succeeded, picture in detail how you called, how you talked, how you overcame nervousness and how you finally succeeded in your objective. As you do so, your bearing, your conversation will create an atmosphere of success and doubts and nervousness will disappear. You will look success, talk success and command success.

You have to approach your quarry when he is in *good mood*. When a man is in temper or in sorrow, he is not in a very agreeable mood. If you happen to come across a man like that you should come away with your proposal still in your pocket. Wait for a better opportunity.

In all cases you should take care to probe ahead and find your quarry in a favourable mood. We are all governed by our moods and a *happy and agreeable* temper of your quarry is likely to help you much.

Your next attempt should be to bring him on to a still happier and more agreeable mood.

COURT

That is — you must *court* him.

Look for an opening and start by prefacing the interview with a pertinent, but not too blatant a compliment. *There is always something worth appreciating about a person :* his tidy room, his neatly arranged working table, the huge pile of files he is about to work on, his choice of pictures exhibited on the walls.

If you have contacted a man in this happy mood, you are lucky. If he is indifferent, you should yet hope to interest him and bring him round to a happy frame of mind.

The art of conversation is well worth cultivating. Milton Wright, an American author, has written an admirable book, entitled "The Art of Conversation." It gives tips as to how to start, carry on with, and terminate a conversation successfully.

In any case, the ability to converse well grows with carefully developed and not haphazard experience.

The first step to take after 'contacting' is then, to '*court*'.

This is the usual 'courtship' for friendship and not 'marriage', although the latter is also usually the outcome of supreme tact in personal contact.

You have to court because all are creatures of emotion and even the haughty and cold like to be courted.

You must understand that people who really count are people of importance and they want others to realize that they are so.

Having this thought in your mind, you will naturally be prepared to give these people due *importance.*

Carnegie observes :

"There is one all-important law of human conduct. If we obey that law, we shall almost never get into trouble. In fact, that law, if obeyed, will bring us countless friends and constant happiness. But the very instant we break that law, we shall get into endless trouble. The law is this : *Always make the other person feel important.* Professor John Dewey, as we have already noted, says that the desire to be important is the deepest urge in human nature : and Professor William James says : The deepest principle in human nature is the craving to be appreciated". As I have already pointed out, it is the urge that differentiates us from

the animals. It is the urge that has been responsible for civilization itself."

The truth is that almost every man you meet feels himself superior to you in some respect ; so the sure way to a man's heart is to let him know in some subtle way that you recognize his importance in his little world. Of course, you must do this sincerely.

If you have genuinely complimented your quarry, he will have been neutralized from an attitude of hostility, rendered agreeable from one of indifference and more favourable from one of friendliness.

You will then have to bring him under your influence.

CONVERT

That is—you must *convert* him.

You cannot convert a man by cogent arguments alone. You can perhaps sway him *intellectually* but you will still have to win him over *emotionally*.

Everybody feels enthusiastic about things or topics in which he is most interested. Talk in terms of the other man's interests and he will be interested in you.

I was once travelling by train to Bombay. I was alone for quite a distance when an Anglo-Indian gentleman rushed aboard. I thought I found a companion to talk with.

Soon I found he was as good as none. He smoked, looked this way and that and mused and contemplated. All my questions were summarily disposed of in short sentences. It seemed futile to expect any long conversation out of him.

I soon found in the papers that the Bombay Government had been enforcing the prohibition laws with some sort of harshness. The Government had my sympathies but I guessed the silent gentleman across the berth must have some strong views on the subject. By God! —He really had!

I had only to open by suggesting that the laws might presumably be hitting some people hard and off went the human bomb! He literally burst and kept on drumming into my ears how silly all that move was, how inhuman to patients who were dying without stimulants in the short interval between the doctor's signing his certificates and the authorities scrutinizing the paper, how unsuccessful the move in America had proved, and finally plunged into a scathing analysis of the character and conduct of each member of

the Bombay Ministry ! All my entreaties in favour of the attempt were swept aside. He wasn't stopping for even a second to hear what was being urged in extenuation of the attempt.

I was caught badly. I hoped he would stop. He did not till he had to drop down at a station and even as he was passing out of the door, he threatened he would organize an agitation against this most inequitious move.

I don't know how far he went and I didn't care. All that I realized was that I had broached his pet subject and almost inadvertently touched the trigger whereupon he exploded !

This will happen with everybody more or less !

Suppose you are seated in a compartment of a train. You may have been riding for sometime and have a long trip ahead. You feel like talking with somebody—that is the gregarious instinct within you.

The gentleman sitting on the berth opposite you may be an elderly man with sombre looks. He seems deeply absorbed in the study of his newspaper as if avoiding a talk with you.

You may be boiling to get him interested in talking to you!

"I beg your pardon; have you a match?" you say, by way of breaking the silence.

The venerable gentleman nods, fishes for a box of matches in his pocket and hands to you. You say, "Thanks". He nods, smiles and dives deep again into his paper!

"A long tiresome ride across the country", you remark again, "don't you find it so?"

"Yes, pretty tiresome", he agrees and lapses back to his paper!

You try other topics,—politics, education, crops,—but nothing seems to interest him! You feel disappointed.

This, however, only means you have not yet touched upon something close to his heart, something that *will* arouse his interest.

Suddenly while remarking on the weather you opine that the I. F. A. shield that was going to be played was getting an ideal weather. Lo! The man gets interested.

"What do you think of the Mohan Bagan?" he asks animated. You are complimentary. Then he becomes eloquent!

"Have you heard of a boy named Asoke?" he queries.

You guess the boy is the gentleman's ward. Yes, he happens to be!

Now the gentleman expands and pours forth the story of the boy! He describes how the boy was trained, how he climbed on to the top and was now heading for the captaincy of the Mohan Bagan. The boy possesses strength, speed and above all skill—but that is what people around say!

Although you may not have heard of him at all, you also say so! How Mohan Bagan has done so long without this prodigy may be a mystery to you but you have only to go on nodding to let the old man talk on and on—unendingly.

You have done nothing consciously but in a process of groping to find something that would interest this gentleman, you have aroused his instinct of attraction, which, in this particular case, lies in his attachment for his dear son.

The same holds good with regard to other things and ideas people are fond of.

The Cobbler who mends my shoes for two pice may know of nothing else in the world, but when I mention how good he is at his profession, he leaps up in joy and accounts for his proficiency through hard work and keen observation.

The point we are illustrating is that in bringing your quarry down to an agreeable mood, you have to open with some *sincere appreciation* and follow up by *arousing* his interest. Everybody is warm about something or other and a successful negotiator does take care to find *that* out.

It is said that whenever Theodore Roosevelt expected a visitor, he sat up late the night before, reading up on the subject in which he knew his guest was particularly interested. Roosevelt knew that the royal road to a man's heart is to talk to him about the *things he likest most*.

The point here is that before you broach your own subject, you should care more for the other man's, so that he may be in a frame of mind favourable to your's.

You have to go a long way by *admiring, interesting* and *agreeing* with the other man before you even mention what you have in mind and then do so *adroitly*.

Don't *begin* by announcing, "I am going to *prove* or *convince* or *convert*". That will be a challenge and he will try to argue out. Propose easily and subtly and get him to agree on preliminaries, yourself agreeing with him readily on most of his points also. Show respect for the

other man's opinions ; don't tell him he is wrong.

Do not think that because your argument is logical it must be convincing. In the first place, a logical deduction is not always a true one. You may have started from false facts, and then argued perfectly correctly to a false conclusion. And do not think that you are too clever to do anything of that sort. For three centuries during the Middle Ages the most brilliant brains of Europe argued incessantly (and very cleverly) without once trying to check their facts. They drew some remarkable conclusions One was that the earth was flat, and the other was that nine angels could probably, though not certainly, stand on the point of a needle.

Then remember that logic is not a fixed, final thing. What one usually calls logic is a system formulated and taught by the Greek Aristotle. But nowadays an entirely new school of logical thought has grown up, and men such as Bertrand Russel are among its leaders. They deny that Aristotle's logic is logical even in itself. And they have invented an entirely new system of thinking, that rests for its evidence on mathematics.

Well, however fascinating such a subject may be, there is no room for it here, except as a warning...logical arguments are not certain

to win. And don't get annoyed if they sometimes fail to convince.

If you arouse discord and ill-feeling towards you, you connot win the other man over to your way of thinking with *all the logic in the world !*

In trying to *convert* the other person, you have to remember that the best way to get a person to do anything is *to make him want to do it.*

In doing so, you have further to remember that you have to generate in him a "wish" to do what you propose.

SATISFYING PRIMARY WANTS.

This can be achieved by showing him how he can thus obtain gratification for one or more of his great primary wants. Perhaps it may not be wise to explain in so many words exactly what you are doing. But *somehow* you *must* do it. You must generate in him (or her) the "wish" or "will" to do the thing.

And we can generate the wish only by appealing indirectly and tactfully if need be to some *primary want.*

To understand human nature you need, first of all, to know the basic human "wants." You

may call them, if you prefer, *motives* or *organic appetites* or *states of tension* in the nervous system which can be relieved only in some particular manner. But the term 'wants' is most convenient for all purposes.

There are certain primary wants underlying all human nature. A list of them is given here:

"PRIMARY WANTS (AND NEEDS) OF EVERY NORMAL MAN AND WOMAN (Set out in a form convenient for reference.)

1. For BODILY COMFORT.
2. For a SENSE OF SECURITY.
3. To ESCAPE.
4. To PROPITIATE anyone who has power to injure; to INGRATIATE oneself.
5. To be (a) NOTICED, (b) ADMIRED, and (c) LIKED by others of one's kind.
6. To HURT and INJURE—To OVERCOME and DOMINATE—To feel SUPERIOR.
7. To ATTRACT, PLEASE, and MATE with one of the opposite sex.
8. TO LOOK AFTER and PROTECT someone (e. g. Child or mate) who is relatively weak.

9. For the COMPANY and FELLOW-FEELING of others of one's kind.
10. To be LIKE OTHERS of one's own 'pack' or "set" especially its leaders.
11. To CATCH and CAPTURE.
12. To FIND OUT, to KNOW, to UNDERSTAND.
13. To RETURN to FAMILIAR PEOPLE, PLACES, and CONDITIONS."

These, it is believed, are primary, inborn, hereditary wants in man. They account, together with habit, for all man's behaviour and feelings. Satisfaction of them accounts for pleasure; non-satisfaction of them accounts for unrest, discontent, and unhappiness. They are great primary forces which drive men to action—action of any and every kind. All our behaviour is directly or indirectly, an expression of one or another of these great primary wants, or of some habit which had its origin in these wants.

If we wish to understand why a man (or woman) feels or behaves in a particular way, the best thing to do is to discover which of these great primary wants is expressing itself through such feelings or behaviour.

Let's consider some examples.

I read in the papers sometime ago how the principle we are explaining worked even with

an animal. And man is also an animal, though of a superior type.

A man was counting up his notes in the open when suddenly a monkey snatched a few and climbed right on top of a tree. He (the monkey) was handling the notes curiously and entreaties and threats to return them were of little avail ! Everybody despaired of the man getting back his notes in tact when one among the crowd put forward an excellent idea. A bunch of banana was obtained and offered to the monkey. It was not a minute before the monkey threw down the notes and went straight for the bunch. He got what he wanted and let the man have what *he* wanted !

The monkey's initial move was a result of item No. 11 of the list quoted and the subsequent one of item 1.

To cite further from the animal kingdom.

I was coming on transfer to Khulna from Dacca where I was spending my leave.

I had a lot of luggage to carry and had, besides, a horse. At about midnight we boarded a steamer and got comfortably on. After a while my syce came dejected and said the horse was refusing stubbornly to come on board. He was on the jetty and had only to cross a few yards of a planked passage on to the steamer.

I came out and found the situation almost hopeless. The horse kicked and jumped and tried to bolt in any direction but that of the steamer. The jetty people said he had got a fright by looking at the river. We tried by blind-folding, by baiting, but nothing availed. It was almost decided to leave the horse behind for an attempt sometime later.

Suddenly a hackney-carriage-driver came to our help. He untied one of his horses and brought it near mine. Then he paraded it in front of mine and conducted it on board the steamer. My horse cast off all nervousness and walked straight behind it!

The horse here was readily influenced by items 5, 7, 9 and 10 of our list quoted.

Carnegie writes : I go fishing up in Maine every summer. Personally I am very fond of strawberries and cream ; but I find that for some strange reasons fish prefer worms. So when I go fishing I don't think about what I want. I think about what they want. I don't bait the hook with strawberries and cream. Rather, I dangle a worm or a grasshopper in front of the fish and say : "Would not you like to have that ?"

"Why not use the same common sense when fishing for men ?"

You won't take long to convert a man or woman to your idea unless it is directly hostile to his interest, by a strategy or plan built around his or her 'basic wants'.

The conversion may go slow or be partial and then you have to COMMAND and CARRY.

COMMAND AND CARRY

To close a deal there must be *pressure* in the shape of finally overcoming procrastination, hesitation, evasion and so on. You may convert a man but still he may not *actually act* as you desire. If he were your subordinate you would only categorically *want* him to do a thing or conduct himself in a particular way. If he is not, you have to influence him equally powerfully but not curtly. The pressure must be neither too high in which case it may annoy him; nor too low in which case it will be ineffective. Pressure of the right degree is another name for taking advantage of the other man's *psychological favourableness* in bringing a negotiation to a successful end.

The closing of a deal is naturally the most difficult part of the entire transaction. The ground-work preparatory to reaching the closing stage must have been properly laid. The master negotiator prepares the way carefully, step by

step, through proper attention to the processes already described.

As at every step you have to assume finally that your prospect *is* going to *agree* and *act*, no matter whatever he may be saying or doing to the contrary to delay agreement or action. Let him know by every word uttered and every movement made that you *must command and carry* him. You will need quite a stock of arguments and *quick-fire suggestions* to overwhelm your prospect!

Master-salesmen and master-negotiators know and practise the *art of personal contact* and step right ahead triumphantly. The diffidend, the hesitant, the hap-hazard are left behind.

18

POST-WAR ORGANIZATION AND LEADERSHIP

We have come to the end of our discussions. But before we conclude, let's have a glance at the world in turmoil.

Things cannot go on as they are ; or, humanity will perish. For civilization to endure, humanity *has* to reorganize itself ; a new leadership *has* to come into play. Let's have a look at the shape of things, that is to be.

THE DEVASTATING WAR THAT IS ON

Great has been the war that is being fought still. The crack of guns, the roar of cannons, the hum of planes and the crash of bombs are attaining the maximum intensity as I write these lines (25. 4. 45.) and the ring around an enemy is getting tighter. Perhaps, before I finish this chapter, organized conflict in the West will come to an end. (It did on 8. 5. 45). Bloodshed on other fields will also end this year or the next or the year after.

But so has war done all the time ! Humanity has been seeing disputes and conflicts and the resort to physical might, clannish violence, armed attacks and devastating wars in order to settle

them. Humanity has seen death and devastation over and over again and been shocked and exasperated ! A section has been clamorous about peace being maintained and the majority has at least wished this could be done ! But Peace and War have so far meant the same thing, now in *posse*, now in *actu*. They will continue to do so unless humanity is more earnest, unless it starts practising what it professes, unless it ceases to sabotage its own efforts at maintaining peace by covert preparation for war under excuses subtly described as moral or obligatory.

MOVE TO END WAR

A feverish stir is already noticeable among the allied nations to organize humanity on the well-advertized multiple freedom. This is welcome.

To honour a dead man, let's credit the late President Roosevelt with the largest share of goodwill in this direction. The broadcast speech which he was to have made the other day has been published after his death. It runs :

"Mere conquest of enemies is not enough. We must go on to do all in our power to conquer doubts, fears, ignorance, and greed which made this horror possible.

"Today, we are faced with the pre-eminent fact that if civilization is to survive we must cultivate the science of human relationships - - the ability of all peoples of all kinds to liv together in the same world at peace.

"Let me assure you that my hand is steadier for the work that is to be done, that I move more firmly into the task, knowing that you - - millions and millions of people - - are joined with me in a resolve to make this work endure.

"That work is peace and an end to the beginnings of all wars and an end for ever to this impractical unrealistic settlement of difference between governments by mass killings of people."

These are noble sentiments and they will find an echo in millions and millions of hearts in this war-weary world !

To me it seems that human devices based on the existing plane of human organization are bound to come to nothing, that hundreds of 'Frisco,' meetings are bound to end in fiasco, unless human society is reconstituted on a basis of 'Social Justice,' and a 'New Science of Human Relationships' comes to obtain. Pride and prejudice, greed and hatred have got to be replaced by worthier feelings.

A NEW WAR TO BE WAGED

This book itself, from its general trend, for the examples I have drawn from history, from lives of great military leaders, would tend to give the impression that all I have spoken of Efficiency, Organization and Leadership is calculated to foster the 'military spirit' as they call it. If that has been the impression, I shall say, 'yes'—*but for a War of a different sort,* one in which lives will be saved rather than destroyed, one in which all the methods of war will be diverted to an objective worthy of humanity.

Of this more anon.

WAR AS IS KNOWN

Let's first take stock of what has so far been done about wars like the present one and we shall then know what to do *in future.*

The earlier men were hunting men. The martial tribes came to be distinguished and in chiefs and the peoples sheer pugnacity and love of glory came to mingle with the more fundamental appetite for plunder.

Modern man inherits all the innate pugnacity and all the love of glory of his ancestors. But all inheritance may not be good.

THE SO-CALLED BENEFITS OF WAR

History has been a glowing record of wars and warriors. It has so far appeared that no victory has been possible save as the resultant of a totality of virtues, no defeat for which some vice or weakness has not been responsible.

Fidelity, cohesiveness, tenacity, conscience, inventiveness, economy, wealth, vigour, heroism — there is not a moral or intellectual point of superiority that doesn't count in war !

Well, virtues are virtues anyhow ! They are so in peace as well as in war.

Mankind, they say, was nursed in pain and fear ; so, a transition to a 'pleasure economy' may be fatal to a being not striving against its disintegrative forces !

Yes, but, where is the pleasure economy except for a few ? What about the vast majority of mankind who are still in want and hunger, pain and fear ? What's the sense in adding to the misery already there ?

Historians who have been recounting the so-called glories of wars already fought are joined by apologists who look forward to those that may yet be fought. We are forcefully told : War is a sort of sacrament ; it benefits the conqueror as well as the victim by requiring

human effort to be stretched to its highest dynamics ; its horrors are nothing compared to the lifeless world of spineless clerks and soft teachers, of joy-hunting and free mixing, of consumers' leagues and producers' trusts, of 'industrialism unlimited and feminism unabashed;' militarism is the great preserver of ideals of hardihood, risks and prizes, of brilliant examples of self-sacrifice, endurance, supreme efforts of conquering obstacles. In short, we are told *personal efficiency*, *scientific management* and *inspiring leadership* are fostered by nothing more than they are by a war.

Much of this is true but the horrors of war, the cruelties and barbarisms are truer still ! We shall see how the excitement and enthusiasm for a 'Destructive War' can be diverted into a 'Constructive war' !

This is not the place for a full-dress debate for and against war. That has gone on eternally ; and so has war !

The point is not what can be *said* on the side of abolishing war but what should be *done* about it. Apologists for war have so far won ; the living world has seen two on the mightiest scale raging in course of a quarter of century ! If these two suicidal follies have not opened the

eyes of the living generation, nothing else will !

What I am going to suggest here is that whatever action we may be taking to stop future wars, the following broad lines will need to be seriously considered :

WE MUST CEASE TO GLORIFY WARS AND DEIFY WAR LORDS

Unfortunately for humanity, stories and histories have served to glorify any evil thing and to hide its irrationality and horrors behind the emotional claptrap of glory. History has been a bath of blood.

WARS AND WARLORDS OF THE PAST

The Iliad is one long recital of people who fought and killed one another. Greek history is a panorama of imperialism—war for war's sake. It's horrible reading.

The citizens were supposed to be warriors and the piratical motives of pride, gold, women, slaves and excitement moved them. "The powerful exact what they can," said the Athenians, "and the weak grant what they must".

Alexander's career was piracy pure and simple. His orgy of power and plunder has, however, been made romantic by historians !

The poor people that suffered defeat paid in blood and shame. Dead men tell no tales and people do not like chroniclers to record their shame! Attila, Chengiz Khan, Tamerlane—all made big noises in their way. Napoleon's career was one of extreme futility. He stalked haughtily over Europe to send unnumbered people to untimely graves True, he was ultimately humbled but not before he had spilt enough blood. Bismarck set might above right and went a long way too. Roon's cannon, Moltke's needle-guns and the unquestioning discipline of the Prussians helped him on till his own people took vengeance on him and cast him aside.

Only a few names fill the pages of history whereas the vast unnumbered souls that fought for or against them and died and fell tell no tales! Never will they live again to recount the miseries they were forced to embrace!

The toll of lives untimely lost is *rising*, not *diminishing*, from age to age. While past wars counted casualties by thousands, the present ones are doing so by millions! The best of each nation is lost, the flower of manhood is sacrificed. Whether this side wins or that, the dead are gone; the crippled, the maimed and the shocked are left with shattered limbs and deranged brains! The Tom, Dick and

Harry that died and suffered will never be known except as the 'unknown warriors' whose fall will be mourned for a time and then forgotten. The loss to civilization, to humanity, is every time horribly enormous !

THE ETERNAL TUG

Men who have fought successfully have felt elated ; those who have done so unsuccessfully have felt sour and bitter. Nations composing the former have cherished the glory and meant to repeat or monopolise it ; those composing the latter have resented the shame and meant to reverse the results soonest possible. So the eternal tug has gone on and proposes to do so !

ROOM FOR SOBRIETY NOW

As the war has progressed, records have appeared. After it closes, tomes and tomes on it will be written all over the world. Mr. Churchill is said to have already been offered about half a million pounds by an American publisher for writing up a history of the present War. Presumably he will accept the offer and he *will* write it well.

Perhaps, if I am not mistaken, he will do just as well as have writers all the time ; he

will even do *better* in the accepted manner of presentation. He will recount the trials and tribulations, the heroic deeds, the valour of the common man and woman and, justifiably to himself, the inspiring leadership he and his colleagues have displayed in winning the admirable victory. His story as well as those by a host of others will certainly add to war literature of the world. But *for once let these not make human effort to maintain peace more difficult! Let these not play upon the emotions of the present and future generations in order to breed more wars! Let these not boil blood and raise temperature to breed further hostilities!*

If the allies are winning, so did the other side look like at one time. Britain was saved by a hair-breadth after the fall of France. Russia had nearly gone. The world had given it a lease of six months to fight and crumble. The other side has drunk its cup of misery. It has found its punishment.

For, after all, what is the moral of history? Which nation has never seen adversity? The eternal tug has gone on and *will* go on, unless peace is *now won* as well as war.

(2) IF THIS WAR HAS BEEN JUSTLY FOUGHT, PEACE MUST ALSO BE JUST AND FAIR.

War has ever been a dangerous game and

the results have always looked uncertain. Accidents play a great part, though not so much as design.

WHEELS OF FORTUNE

In 1860 when Foch was just a young cadet, he had the mortification of seeing his France over-run by the hordes of Bismarck. He is said to have been deeply shocked and have resolved he would avenge the fall of France. Well, he lived long enough to be able to defeat Germany in 1918. Another young man, Hitler, resolved to avenge this defeat and noisily moved ahead. In 1940 France fell and this haughty man had the impudence of dictating terms dramatically in the identical manner ! Little did he realise that 'he laughs best who laughs last' !

That man has just fallen and his Germany abjectly surrendered. The allies can do with Germany whatever they like. But for once it will be worth remembering that human earthly existence is not just coming to an end.

Well, Bernard Shaw and Mahatma Gandhi have already raised their voices in favour of peace being just and they will find echoes in the hearts of millions of sober people all over the world.

If history has any lesson, it has this : *Nations rise and fall ; Victories change hands and glories wax and wane.*

If the world is reconstituted on the abiding bases of Freedom, Equality and Justice, peace will endure. If not, it will not.

(3) HUMANITY CANNOT ENDURE HALF FREE AND HALF SLAVE.

If humanity is not to perish, it has to be free in all parts of the world. If keeping other people under subjugation *pays* one nation, it will excite greed of others.

FREEDOM FOR ALL

If certain nations have made great strides in the present era, others did sometime ago as in cases of Egypt, Greece and India. The modern achievements of the nations now forward are an asset to the world. But can anybody think that independence has been a monopoly of any one nation in particular ? Or, that it will be retained by it perpetually, unless all retain theirs ?

Well, if history teaches us anything, it is : *that each nation prizes its own independence and does not throw it away ; that greedy eyes and unclean hands have only snatched this precious possession forcibly or by deceit ; that*

slavery is a shame equally to those that have lost independence and to those that have taken it away ; and that *such robery and deception will be repaired in course of time unless they are made impossible.*

'Friscoes will end in fiascoes unless these lessons are minded by nations high and low, by those that win and those that lose !

Wendel Wilkie had the courage to admit this stark truth when he said : "This war that I saw going all around the world is, in Mr. Stalin's phrase, a war of liberation. It is to liberate some nations from the Nazi or the Japanese Army, and to liberate others from the threat of those armies. On this much we are all agreed. Are we yet agreed that liberation means more than this ? Specifically, are the thirty-one United Nations now fighting together agreed that our common job of liberation included *giving to all people freedom to govern themselves as soon as they are able, and the economic freedom* on which all lasting self-government inevitably rests ?

"It is these two aspects of freedom, I believe, which form the touchstone of our good faith in this war. I believe we must include them both in our idea of the freedom we are fighting for. Otherwise, *I am certain we shall not win the peace,* and *I am not sure we can win the war.*"

(4) BETTER WAYS MUST BE FOUND FOR ADJUSTING DIFFERENCE AND SETTLING DISPUTES.

The division of humanity into free groups each claiming sovereignty has been wasteful to a certain extent and attended with frequent differences and disputes. May this be a passing phase to be soon coming to an end !

CONTACT BETWEEN GOVERNMENTS

The chief contacts between governments have been those of war, threat of war and preparation for new wars. Untill recently, historians and writers, politicians and statesmen thought of war, as we have said, as the source of all glory worth recording and worth living and dying for.

DIPLOMATIC SYSTEM

The 'diplomatic system' has obtained among states. Diplomatic practice is based on the assumption of 'sovereignty'. A state on this assumption is a closed system of government and entirely without responsibility to other states. The world of states, in other words, is an *anarchy*, and not a *system*. But states must exist side by side and come into contact *sometimes*. So, they keep officials, ambassadors and others,

to reside within other states to adjust contacts. They come naturally to suspect things and spy upon possible hostilities.

States in this relationship are still armed bands. Since war and preparation for war involve secrecy and secret bargains, diplomacy has come to be associated with covert design and cunning conspiracies.

ARMED DEFENCE OF VARIOUS STATES

'Armed defence' has been a popular slogan for states. States arm themselves against other states ; all governments seem to remain prepared against other governments.

The open profession is, of course, that a state is armed only for defence ; that aggression is no policy of its own ! But other states must also be armed in defence and a weak defence is no defence.

The trouble lies in that each state is regarded by itself as the sole judge of what constitutes adequate defence in its own case. The Germans may double their armaments and yet declare they are inadequately prepared against the French and *vice versa* !

This must be an absurd system. It is bound to breed the very war it seeks to avoid.

Nations must be prepared to put up disputes to an International Court of Justice whose decisions should be enforceable by an Enforcement Agency to be set up. The only vexatious element of such trials and decisions may be that a system of higher appellate courts may have to be provided as any judgement by judges selected without reference to the wishes of the disputants may be considered harsh and erroneous and a trial of luck in some higher court may be vehemently sought.

ARBITRATION BY CHOICE

An alternative course may continue to be 'Arbitration'.

In this system, there is little coercion.

The disputants agree to refer the case to a *third person* commanding confidence of both. They can bind themselves to obey the decision of this third person.

This system has grown up in Islam to be to be known as the 'Salis' system. 'Salis' in Arabic means 'third-party'.

It has the singular merit of avoiding coercive trials and judgment by judges not selected by disputants. The question of appeal does not arise as the judge selected is one of their own choice.

To improve upon the system and to make sure that it does not inherit the 'folly of ignorant jurors', a panel of internationally reputed men and women of character, judgement and integrity may be prepared so that each of these persons can be expected to understand and weigh evidence and decide without fear or favour.

To avoid deadlock in the case of the disputants not being able to choose a single person, each may be allowed to choose one and these two choose a third person to form a tribunal. When these two themselves fail to agree upon a third person, they can 'draw' or 'toss' for one, it being entirely immaterial who among those on the panel comes to be third judge. The three can then proceed to hear and decide by a majority.

To avoid the risk of evasion or disobedience by disputants of any award so made, it can be agreed by all concerned that such an award will be enforceable by others through the Enforcement Agency.

RISK OF BEING SURPRISED

One great misgiving may be that in case of only partial disarmament, the peace-loving countries will be liable to be attacked by armed

states by surprise. It has been asserted that if England had been adequately prepared, Germany would not have started the last two wars.

Let's concede for the sake of argument that if England, France and China were adequately prepared, Germany, Italy and Japan would have desisted from attacking. But this is exactly the system of 'armed defence' and its vicious cycle we have disposed of a little while ago.

What would have happened in the case supposed ?

The three peace-loving countries would have to arm to their teeth to prevent a *mere possible offensive* on the part of the other three ! People would be taxed and taxed and remain interested in arming only, ever suspecting that the three others were outstripping them Those others, in their turn, would be perfectly naturally haunted by a suspicion of these three taking the offensive and thus might legitimately double their efforts ! A vicious cycle of arming and more arming would result and then also of *keeping* armed *indefinitely* !

Then, again, is it true that two men suspecting each other's bonafides and armed dangerously will never get a smash-up simply because

both are armed ? The chances are that a *mere* illusion will set the spark and draw the two to a mortal combat.

we are just celebrating the great victory achieved by the allies in Europe. It has been an up-hill task —this removal of a great menace to humanity in the German cult of a super-race and greater might. Things have been very very difficult and at times hopes have flickered and vast has been the price paid in toil and trouble, sweat and blood ! But, all the same, right *has triumphed* over might and the wages of sin have been damnation and disgrace !

Alike have this war and the last, the two mightiest conflicts humanity has ever seen, shown that the forces of evil, however well-drilled and efficiently regimented, triumph but for a short while and the enduring spirit of moral rectitude comes to sway.

We are just celebrating the victory of decent mankind over a scourge, of civilization over barbarism. And in both the last two great wars there is enough to claim for the justifiable edification of the common men and women of the world.

Both these wars have been fought and won by common men and women. Common men and common women, unaccustomed to drill, to

concerted parades and going differently about their own interests have, on a call of duty, joined hands together. The men have gone forward and fought—though not always as efficiently as the drilled hordes of the enemy—but hard enough and unto the last. They have given their best, millions giving their lives away so that mankind may live and civilization endure. In many a battle, amid reverses, in such blazing hells that never raged on earth before, the rags and blemishes of democracies have been washed away. Beaten here, beating there, now in agony of shame, now in shining splendour of glory, democracies, palpably unprepared and completely surprised, have valiantly fought on and forged ahead And it has been the common man, rising in numbers as if from slumbers, out of shops, trades, schools, mines, factories, sports and amusements .. leaping out of hearths and homes ..it is the common humanity as if still dozing and just out of beds—that has gone forth and faced the steel and fire of the enemy with the shining armour in the enduring sense of moral rectitude.

We pay homage to the great stream of common soldiers drawn abruptly from peaceful vocations and leisurely avocations, who have fought so valiantly in the great struggle for humanity, to those countless dead and the millions living. Let them show evermore that those who who

can take up arms can leave them aside just as well for the cause of peace.

The establishment of a true International order depends on the recognition of an international law which rests not on the power of the so-called powerful states but on the immutable rock of justice and truth. It is the moral basis of such law that will find an echo in the human heart everywhere.

(5) PROGRESSIVE FEDERATION OF FREE UNITS MUST ULTIMATELY KNIT ALL TOGETHER INTO ONE WORLD-STATE.

FAILURE OF 'THE LEAGUE'

It would appear that the failure of the League of Nations has been due mainly to the refusal of its member states to abrogate their national sovereignties. Each state had continued to claim absolute sovereignty and its government had used the League for the pursuit of its own interests.

Another defect has been, as we have already said, that decision had to be unanimous and weak resolutions had resulted in place of decisive action, it being open to members to secede from the League whenever it suited them.

The result unfortunately was that in place of a body commanding respect and enforcing

decisions, the League had been a mere association of independent states. International affairs could not be administered in any international spirit but were only watched and allowed to shape themselves.

FREE UNION PROPOSED

The first step needs be the *representative character* of the Reformed League Assembly by having there representatives of the people rather than nominees of governments. A Federal Parliament thus composed should supersede the composing unit governments in respect of certain wide and international functions of the character of defence, trade, communications, etc In local matters the units should be supreme but matters of dispute could be handled decisively by the federal structure. The union should be flexible and capable of growth and should go on constantly recruiting more members. In fact, it should grow so steadily that units outside may consider it more advantageous to join than remain ontside.

I am not here to delve into details as they are being discussed at the various world-assemblies at present.

SOME OBJECTIONS

I can dispose of a few objections that seem likely to be urged.

The first is the alleged inequality of racse and nations.

'Imperialism', 'Trustee-ship', 'Mandates' and 'Colonial Government', etc., have been thought necessary because of the apparent 'inequality' of the different groups of humanity. It has been commonly assumed by European peoples that they know what is good for the Asiatics and Africans. Benevolent alien control has been thought to be conducive to the uplift of the so-called backward peoples.

Germany and Japan have only gone farther than others and claimed not only the leadership of the world but also racial superiority and destined supremacy over other peoples. They only claimed a sort of super-lordship over lords of lesser majesty !

Well, if their arrogance had shocked the world, the lesser types might also scratch their hearts and shed this vice for good.

EQUALITY OF RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES

The only valid relationship of races and groups at different stages of development that should obtain is of *fundamental equality of rights and privileges*. Just as the state is composed of persons at various stages of physical and mental develop-

ment, so should be the grand humanity composed of different groups of them without prejudice.

The relation of races, controllers and controlled, which is glibly camouflaged under Trusteeship and the like, has been proving one of the toughest blocks to amicable international organization. Imperialism and the 'white man's burden' have got to go.

Wendel Wilkie says :

"A true world outlook is incompatible with a foreign imperialism, no matter how highminded the governing country. It is equally incompatible with the kind of Imperialism which can develop inside any nation. Freedom is an indivisible word. If we want to enjoy it, and fight for it, we must be prepared to extend it to every one, whether they are rich or poor, whether they agree with us or not, no matter what their race or the colour of the skin "

Pax Romana, Pax Britannica and similar ideas have been tried and the Germans and Italians lately attempting to impose the so-called fruits of civilization on other groups of peoples. A time has come when *imposed peace* has to give way to *peace* among free peoples maintained by the interest and active co-operation of all. If we must have pan-something, it must be Pan-Humanism.

ONE WORLD-STATE ULTIMATELY

It can be reasonably hoped that ultimately and as soon as the peace-loving peoples can and do combine as we have indicated, each state will be looked upon and will function as fundamentally and essentially a part of a single governmental system covering the whole earth. Each government will be an instrument by which its citizens will be in a position to *assist* rather than *assault* the citizens of other states. Spying and other preparations for war will be deemed unnecessary and futile The conception of 'defence', a psychological cover for arming, will go.

In the new conception of the world-state system, there will be police-forces for the suppression of crime or private violence and an International Enforcement Agency on the same model for enforcing international decisions. Disarmament results in diminishing and abolishing fear so that states will cease to fear neighbouring states as we cease to fear our neighbours when we cease to think *in terms of comparative strength.*

President Roosevelt in his report to Congress visualized this Universal Organization.

"The Crimean Conference was a successful effort by the three leading nations to find

common ground for peace. It spells the end of the system of unilateral action and exclusive alliances of power and all the other expedients which have been tried for centuries and have failed. We propose to substitute for all these a universal organization in which all peace-loving nations will finally have a chance to join. I am confident that the Congress and the American people will accept the results of this Conference as the beginnings of a permanent structure of peace upon which we can begin to build, under God, that better world in which our children and grand children—yours and mine, the children and grand children of the whole world—must live."

(6) LOVE OF THE KIND MUST SUPERSEDE OTHER ACCIDENTAL AFFILIATIONS

The great truth, if there *is* any, is that the entire mankind on earth is *one* species of the animal kingdom. Whether the folk-tale of the origin of man as detailed in various religions be accepted or the more reasonable and truer account of Evolution is believed, the fact remains that it is only some accidental differences that have divided mankind from mankind. *Nature* recognizes *one species* only and the *earth* is its birth place.

What atrocious prejudices has not man himself developed in relation to himself on the merest accidents !

SOURCES OF DISTINCTION

Let's take some of these accidents.

BIRTH : All men and women are born in the same physiological process. We share the process with the beasts. And our bodies are only "a few gallons of water, a few pounds of carbon and lime, some cubic feet of air, an ounce or two of phosphorus, a few drams of iron, a dash of common salt, a pinch or two of sulphur, a grain or more of each of several hardly essential ingredients" ! Break a man of Siberia and another of Ceylon, one of China and another of California and you get the same components.

BLUE-BLOOD FANTASY

Yet people will nurse the fad that blonde-haired, blue-eyed, pink-skinned Nordics are to be worshipped as the lords of humanity and preach all the humbug about racial purity, physical prowess and mental superiority ! While confronted with the foolish dogma of the so-called Nordics, other Europeans will retort that all

Europeans have been subjected throughout their history to such a mixing with other 'races' that they are definitely mongrels. On the other hand, some whites themselves will not shake hands with the dark except with gloves on !

There have evidently been profound local separations and modifications in the ages past but none so complete and enduring as to break up the species. As geographical conditions have changed and communications improved these variations have resumed communication with others, mingled with one another and produced mongrel races. Except possibly in the case of certain very isolated peoples, racial purity is a myth.

In view of the preposterous claims made for the alleged superior races, it has to be pointed out that the great advances in human history have been made by people of the most diverse races. The greatest advance of all, that from barbarism to civilization, by means of inventions and written records, have been made by dark-haired people somewhere in the near or Middle east.

Look at the hatred and jealousies and the grave problem constituted by a great block of the Indian population itself comprising millions of the so-called 'depressed classes' ! If humanity is to live, these senseless barriers must be wiped

out. If India is to progress, the castes must vanish. Must men and women completely indistinguishable from one another live and die in compartments and segregation? Why? oh, why?

THE ONE THING THAT HUMANITY MUST RECOGNIZE IS THAT MANKIND IS INDIVISIBLE. THAT A MAN AND WOMAN BORN HOW THEY MAY BE, IN WEDLOCK OR OUTSIDE IT, IN WOMBS OR TEST-TUBES, ARE MAN AND WOMAN ALL THE SAME, THAT HUMAN LIFE IS SACRED AND HALLOWED IN THE EAST AS IN THE WEST, IN THE NORTH AS IN THE SOUTH; THAT THEY ARE ENTITLED TO ALL THE RIGHTS AND POSSESSED OF ALL THE POTENTIALITIES OF HUMANITY.

If some are brothers, others are cousins. If man comes to look at humanity from this point of view much of his pride and prejudice will go and go they must:

SEX DIFFERENCES

The physiological differentiation of the species into the male and female sexes is the work of

nature and individuals born or even their parents have had no choice in the matter. *Of accidental differences, this is a great one.*

while differentiating children into males and females, nature has forced them back to each other in the indispensable need for the one to seek company of other, in the inescapable requirement of the two in reproducing themselves.

Comparative muscular weakness of the female, the stronger nature of the maternal instinct than the paternal pre-occupying her to child-bearing and rearing, her softer mental make-up, etc, tended to the man's taking to out-door work, to combating nature, to collecting means of subsistence, procurement of necessaries amid difficulties and defence of the home against intrusion naturally toughened the man and the comparative ease of living softened the woman.

In former ages, the law of superior strength seems to have been the rule of life; not only so—but during the greater part of the duration of our speices, the law of force has been the avowed rule of general conduct. The 'Subjection of Women' to their stronger partners must have seemed as natural as anything else.

'Man'-made laws and religions have sanctified the subordination and tried to perpetuate it. The Purdah system, the discrimination in

the matter of choosing partners and renouncing them, the exclusion of women from governmental activities have all accentuated the difference. With the rising consciousness of women, they have been feeling acutely the irrationality of one-sided self-effacement and obedience and the injustice of the denial of equal opportunities for living fuller lives.

Now that we are recognizing the supreme need of re-valuing old ideas and customs in the light of reason and at least pretending to regulate the affairs of society in general according to requirements of justice, we have to accord our mothers and sisters and wives the freedom that should be theirs. We can reiterate what we have said once before :

HUMANITY CANNOT ENDURE HALF FREE AND HALF SLAVE.

In India, the evil of subordination and seclusion is yet a horrid reproach. It should be clearly evident to all concerned that the *difference of sex is accidental, like the difference of colour, and that there are no grounds for forming any conclusions about the limitations of women, as we really know almost nothing about the possibilities of their nature.* Men who will shrug their shoulders in horror and rage might well think for once that they themselves could as easily have been born women and then suffered

from the liabilities they are now imposing as men !

There will be no dearth of men, and perhaps also women, who will point disapprovingly to the so-called turmoil in the sex-world in the west, to the frequent clashes and easy divorces, to the looser sex-living and the illegitimate birth-rate, but then they must remember that the enforced morality of convicts cannot compare with the accepted morality of the free, that if women are falling, it is also men who are sharing the fall, that if divorces are frequent, submission to intolerable conditions elsewhere is none so virtuous.

The emotions connected with the paramount instinct of sex have probably played a greater part, both for good and for evil, in the history of mankind and I have studied Sex Sociology in several separate treatises. We are concerned here with the question of Liberty for All and we have no right to deny it to half the population of the world.

There is one problem connected with this that forces itself here. It is that almost everywhere in the human world, the economic dependence of the wife on the husband or male members must be embarrassing to the former and

encumbering to the latter. Strangely, however, this is a unique feature and the rest of the animal kingdom in its entirety does not share the burden so one-sidedly. Other animals mate and reproduce, in many cases enjoying life-long companionship like ourselves, but in no case has the one to feed the other and both look for food for the young in their helpless stages. Perhaps this is the price being paid by the human male to the female for taking away her liberty and rights.

There is undoubtedly food for thought in this for those who would keep their womenfolk in convenient bondage as well as those who would grant them complete liberty but assume their economic liabilities The former curb the natural expression of human personality and the case of the latter, again, becomes tragic when the women claim not only their liberty but that they should go on being fed and pampered with what men term luxuries !

We must come to a better readjustment of the relationship. To my mind, *complete personal autonomy consistent with social welfare should be the lot of each man as well as woman and equal opportunities for earning livelihoods just as well.* This will lighten the economic burden of the man and mitigate the

economic slavery of the woman, marriage and founding of families resting on free choice of partners and their active co-operation.

CULT OF PATRIOTISM

BIRTH-PLACE : The new friendly conception of international intercourse finds a chief obstacle in the assumptions which give rise to the inherited conceptions of "Patriotism" and "Nationalism" of modern times.

If one's birth-place has to be hallowed, surely everyone's birth-place comes to be hallowed in turn. But the point is why should yours or mine claim our exclusive admiration ? I could easily have been born in China or Mexico !

Then, again, if one's country is conceived to be civilized by isolation and segregation, then naturally the fear of foreign influence could be believed to be 'patriotic.' But no civilized country has developed its civilization by itself.

It should be the inherent right of free men to move unmolested and unhindered all over the earth and settle anywhere. The new international politics has to recognize the common interests of the ordinary folk as the same, whether they live in China, Greece or Mexico. Common interests need no defence by armed

force ; but they need the co-operation between peoples of different places.

When men and women come to realize and own freely that they are 'citizens of the world' and admit and insist that all are members of a 'common humanity', the 'patriotism' and the narrow petty 'nationalism' will disappear.

"Glory is not his who loves his country : Glory is his who loves his kind".

THE COLOUR PROBLEM

COLOUR : Colour of the skin has, again, given rise to prejudices. White, yellow, fair and dark colours with variations in pigment have divided mankind and a lot of unpleasantness in the world is due to the assumed superiority or inferiority of the various colours.

It is certainly true that certain races, imbued with notions of capitalistic or of race-superiority look down upon the coloured people with callousness.

Such an attitude has naturally led to disquieting situations. Not only this, the world of peoples is so markedly divided that colour-prejudices may conceivably render all peace-plans nugatory.

The problem of the Negroes in America has not been equitably tackled. Wendel Wilkie is

candid enough to admit : "It has been a long while since the United States had any imperialistic designs towards the outside world. But we have practised within our own boundaries something that amounts to race imperialism, the attitude of the white citizens of this country towards the negroes has undeniably some of the unlovely characteristics of an alien imperialism —a smug racial superiority, a willingness to exploit an unprotected people. We have justified it by telling ourselves that its end is benevolent. And sometimes it has been. But so sometimes have been the ends of imperialism. And the moral atmosphere in which it has existed is identical with that in which men—well-meaning men—talk of the 'white man's burden".

Colour, again is an accident. Long residence in different climates and environments may have given rise to differences in the externals, just as it is possible that the Anglo-Saxon race in Australia centuries after may undergo such marked ethnological changes as to make it difficult to trace its origin.

We take pride in the achievements of the whites and let them know that others have not only potentialities but have abundantly proved their worth sometimes.

Man is not free to choose his colour any more than his place of birth. Is there a greate stupidity than that he should gloat over a mere accident ?

THE HAVES AND HAVENOTS

POSSESSIONS—Earthly possessions have great inequality among individuals. The rich and the poor are to be found everywhere.

So among nations. Small and weak nations are living side by side with big and powerful ones. The latter may look down upon the former with contempt or derision but there they are and have to be.

Some of the possessions of individuals may not have been earned and deserved. So also of nations. Much of them may not be enduring for long. The 'wheels of fortune' revolve round and round and if they indicate anything it is that the 'haves' and 'havenots' are not eternally separate classes but change places quick enough.

What family has not poor relations ? What nation has not seen adversity ?

Perhaps no nation can claim a more glorious past than the Egyptians. But what adversities haven't they seen !

The rise and decline of the Roman Empire has been a popular theme with writers and his-

torians. The chequered history of India, at one time holding the torch of civilization, shows vicissitudes of no less magnitude and the millions in bondage yet are struggling to get free. The British isles have themselves seen waves of invasion and there are distinct traces of the class domination of foreign conquerors.

Well, the rich and the poor alike constitute humanity. So do prosperous nations and the poor.

Certain nations have made great strides in the modern era ; certain others have done so in the past ; certain others, again, will make so in ages to come. As long as ups and downs continue to affect nations, it is immaterial to humanity which sections at one period go up.

The essential requirement for humanity as a whole, is that 'ups' are not *correlated* invariably to 'downs' ; that those who prosper do not do so *at the expense* of others, that progress and prosperity be the lot of *all* its members and not particular sections.

What has humanity got to do ? We shall see ahead.

CULTURAL INEQUALITY

ATTAINMENTS :—What has been said about possessions applies equally to attainments.

Wheels of fortune have revolved and so have 'wheels of civilization'. Humanity must be proud of achievements of some modern nations in the realm of thought, culture and refinement. But these have been no monopolies of any particular peoples.

The world owes so much to Greek thought. The Egyptians, Romans, Chinese, Arabs have likewise all contributed vastly to the civilization of mankind. Adverse fortunes may have reduced their present activities. But, then, they are not to be despised by any means.

SOLUTIONS ATTEMPTED AND MAY YET BE TRIED

We have found no distinction so real and abiding as to justify pride and prejudice.

The supreme need for humanity is Leadership of the type that will efface such pride and prejudice from the face of the earth. The world is crying for new Saviours !

There have been some noticeable attempts levelling up inequalities.

(a) The 'blue-blood' fantasy and the 'multi-colour' problem have been exploded and solved by some moves, mostly religious, and among religions notably Islam.

The Prophet of Islam has obliterated races and castes and given an illegitimate child right

to lead a prayer. Slaves have married princesses and founded dynasties to rule. Arabs, Persians, Chinese, Indians, Russians, Negroes, Turks, Mongolians—in fact all sects and races meet on the same platform and can freely embrace one another as equals and *inter-marry without prejudice.* Blood is blood and a Muslim is a brother to another Muslim.

Such brotherhoods extend among followers of other religions as well.

The point is : why not extend it beyond creeds and embrace all humanity ?

(b) Nondistinctive names by mere adjustment of alphabets as in America go a long way in throwing titular names back to the common fold. They can obliterate the castes by taking away placards of vanity as well as of inferiority !

We do not call the son of a thief or drunkard a thief or drunkard by any means. We shall *not* likewise give a common baby of the same flesh and blood an earldom or lordship or kinship with Brahma. We require hundreds of Mahatmas to wipe out the insensible caste system everywhere. Will these consider how foolish it is for the so-called scheduled castes to tag with their very names placards of inferiority !

Roosevelt has no copyright in his name. A negro can assume that name if he pleases. Nor do Roosevelt's children deserve any special consideration because of their father. Distinctions won in life belong to those who win them. It is as foolish to have lords and earls and counts to beget younger ones as to have all the variegated 'villains' of the numerous nether-castes to beget 'villains'!

The greatest requirement in India is of a move in the direction of pruning insensible titular tags from human names and replacing them by nondistinctive names.

(c) Free mixing, common messing and living together are some of the salutary measures to combat the prejudices of sects. As in travelling we are huddled together irrespective of caste or creed, or in schools and colleges we are taught together, so should we mix freely, mess together and live jointly. Without forcing those who *want* to live apart, we can usefully amalgamate hostels and hotels, classes and companies so nondenominatively that the individuals get a thorough mix-up and shed prejudices against one another. Constant association is likely to breed liking of one another.

(d) Literature has had a profound influence

on the life and conduct of man. Whether as pious fiction of the mythologies, or fulsome flattery for kings, nobles and knights, or the poetic effusion of emotion, or the delineation, as now, of the feelings and activities of the common man and woman—it has influenced human mind powerfully at every age. It is through literature, again, that common man and woman can be welded together into thinking of one another as brothers and sisters.

A little while ago, the immortal Bengali reformer-writer, Sarat Chandra Chatterjee, was accused of having in his writings almost totally ignored the co-existance in Bengal of the sister Muslim community. Nothing could show the readers of his books except in a very few places that his characters had anything to do with those Muslims who were perhaps living next-door or at a stone's throw. He had urged in his defence that he was having a free way with his own community as far as exposing ills and abuses went but that he feared the Muslim community would not tolerate him talking freely. I cannot deny that he is partially right in his contention. Bankim Chandra seems to have left a legacy of ill-feelings,—at least so the Muslims think. Well, whatever may have been the result in stray cases, there is no better

way to preaching brotherhood and love than through the medium of literature.

I distinctly remember with pride and a sense of gratitude the great event of Sarat Babu promising that to end of his life, he would write with none but Muslim characters ! He was not spared to implement his promise but what a boon would it have been to have him in his masterly way to show with sympathy interesting slides from the social life of the Muslims ! Who could thrill spectators and charm the audience better ?

There is no dearth of master writers yet in both the communities and I shall be looking forward to their wielding their pens to bring about communal understanding.

This is about a local affair but the literary world at large can do likewise to weld humanity closer and closer. With what deep insight and sympathy did Shakespeare portray lives and doings of people of diverse races and climes ! How powerfully did the immortal Stowe expose the barbarities of slavery in her Uncle Tom's Cabin ! She rendered incalculable service to the cause of the emancipation of the slaves. How wonderfully does Pearl Buck depict before us Chinese life with all its charms and failings !

(e) Amusements, sports, journalism and other forms of persuasive publicity can also be so arranged and tuned as to cultivate and promote continued harmony among all classes.

(f) Alexander took a commonsense step towards fusing East and West arranging mass-marriages between Greeks and Persians. Akbar took a very bold step in showing an example himself and preaching inter-marriage between Hindus and Muslims—a step so naturally human.

Unquestionably there is nothing better for humanity than to *call in to play the greatest leveller of prejudices humanity can find This is blood relationship. The widest freedom in marriage has to be encouraged amongst the peoples of the East, West, North and South, amongst those of diverse colours and creeds. The only valid condition is the free choice of the parties and limit is the biological species known as homo sapiens.*

Let new citizens arise with close relationship, transcending artificial barriers of caste, creed and clime.

USES AND ABUSES OF CREEDS

The services of religions in knitting together men and women beyond frontiers have got to be recognized. They have been of immense value to mankind.

Christ sacrificed his life in the cause of love

and brotherhood. Christians all over feel proud of his leadership.

The prophet of Islam did his part so well, as we have just seen. Islam recognizes no artificial division of mankind.

Buddha preached love to mankind and even extended it to the lower organisms. He banned 'Himsa' (hatred) and we can be proud of him as well.

Socialism with its tenets and practices have sought to efface inequality of possessions. Its founders command admiration none the less.

But there has been *one great rub* all the time. It has been the problem of problems.

Creeds have, unfortunately, after trying to efface 'inequality' with one hand, created 'inequality' itself with the others. So we have had the 'warring creeds' with their 'jarring prejudices' against one another. Crusades have been fought, blood has been shed and votaries have gone mad with what they call 'righteous contempt of the others' !

Christianity promises 'salvation' to Christians, Islam to Muslims and in their honest zeal votaries forget that outside their folds others may be living as righteously and as deservingly !

The great leaders of religions have been

pious men and men of vision. They have had truth before them and faith in their mission. But somewhere there seems to have been an honest mistake Otherwise, these honest men could not have knit together mankind and in the same process created dissension ; they could not have disseminated love in one section and encouraged contempt for others.

A NEW CREED

This palpable paradox has to be sloved. It is the problem of problems. Perhaps, if the leaders and founders were living to-day, they would be glad to substitute the entire humanity as an object of love and help for the narrow sections they led.

But *we* are here to arrive at a grand synthesis. *We* can have a creed, if creeds we must have ! And let it be :

"LOVE MANKIND"

In no other way is there salvation for mankind—peace on earth.

Of all the emotions, love alone effaces pride, prejudice, hatred, selfishness, greed and discord. Love alone urges sacrifice, sharing of fortunes as well as misfortunes. Love alone brooks no distinction and permeates differences.

(7) SERVICES TO MANKIND *MUST* SUPERSEDE SERVICES TO SUPERNATURAL AGENCIES.

THE SUPERNATURAL STRUCTURE

The great institutional forms of religion—at any rate the vast majority of them, present a confusing pantomime of supernatural agencies who dominate the minds of men and women and exact devotion and duties. A supernatural body of agents functioning beyond our ken has been conceived and nursed with a mingled sense of hope and fear. And out of a multitude of personal gods and goddesses functioning like human agencies but on bigger scales the transition to 'ONE GOD' has been slow and late.

But even after the idea of 'ONE GOD' has dominated mankind, that of minor supernatural agencies has not been abandoned altogether. If there is a God, He must like to function. If He is to function, He has to do so through agents. These agents are the numerous spirits, angels, and the myriad of similar invisible beings.

The Hindu, Jewish, Christian and Islamic Scriptures dilate on the existence of these agencies and belief in them is an article of faith.

Existence indicates functioning also and the various roles given to these have also got to be believed in. The wishes of God as to how mankind should conduct themselves are detailed minutely and so are His dislikes. These along with the existence, functions and doings of His agents are taken for granted. They constitute, so to say, the axioms and definitions like those of Euclid to geometers. The business of intellectual divines down the ages has been to deduce from the data already assumed, conclusions in accordance with the wishes of the respective churches.

Followers of religions are furnished with a compact and complete criticism of life. They are also told how the world began and how it would end. They are told that material existence is but base and fnsignificant and nature is, to all intents and purposes, the playground of the angels and the demons. They are told that the earth is the centre of the visible universe, and that man is the cynosure of things terrestrial. They are told that the course of nature is capricious and that it is and could be altered by intervention of the spiritual beings, good and bad, according as one set or the other comes to predominate at a particular point of time. And the *Sum and Substance* of such philosophy of life is to produce the conviction that men and women have only to shoot across the short span of life

to the more enduring world of the HEREAFTER, to enjoy bliss or suffer punishment.

The conceptual structure so carefully and artistically built up seems, however, to be losing ground before the critically acute and intellectually honest section of mankind. The manifold development of human knowledge has been attended with a vague sense of dissatisfaction with the conception outlined above. The modern world of science and thought is slowly but steadily discovering that it rests mostly on *dogmas* in which it is hard to continue to believe consistently with intellectual honesty.

SCIENCE AND RELIGION

The notions of the beginning and the end of the world entertained by our ancestors seem no longer credible.

Bishop Butler accepted with unwavering trust the chronology of the Old Testament, describing it as 'confirmed by the natural and civil history of the world, collected from common historians, from the state of the earth, and from late inventions of arts and sciences !' But the Bishop's grand-children now will laugh at his cock-sure assertion. Since he believed and preached, a whole science of Geology, with astounding revelations regarding the life of the

ancient earth has been formulated. It is showing at least this much with overwhelming evidence that not for six thousand, nor for sixty thousand, nor for six thousand thousand but for untold millions of years, mother earth has been the theatre of life and death !

Nature has so long bristled with angels and demons, djinns and fairies ! Their traffic has been thick and whims unending. Some of these supernatural beings were believed to have lustful eyes on men and women ! The theory of 'virgin birth' is related to such conception of mortal women having united with supernatural beings ! On the side of demons also carnal advances to mankind have been assumed.

The sad story of 'witchcraft' in the middle ages would fill a volume. Witches were believed to cause death or fnjury by spells, potions, etc., to raise storms and blast crops and cattle, and to obtain infernal aid in gaining wealth, gratifying lust and knowing future events, to travel through the air on broomsticks and transform themselves into animals !

All these have taken an exit before the probings of modern knowledge. They have had their toll in the shape of human misery—mental unhappiness and physical torture. They tell a woeful tale of human folly !

It is now seen that nature far from being capricious and amenable to whims of spirits is the expression of a definite order witn which nothing interferes, and that the chief concern of man is to learn that order and conduct himself accordingly. The all-pervading laws of nature are supremely grand !

It is now very certain that the earth is not the chief body in the universe, and that the world is not subordinated to man's use. "A few stars are known", says Sir James Jeans, "which are hardly bigger than the earth but the majority areso large that hundreds of thousands of earth could be packed inside each and leave room to spare ; here and there we come across a giant star large enough to contain millions of millions of earths. *And the total number of stars in the universe is probably something like the total number of grains of sand on all the sea-shores of the world.* Such is the littleness of our home in space when measured up against the total substance of the universe".

The Scriptures interpret natural phenomena in terms of a loving God's provision for the care and comfort of human beings. This is like the child's explanation that the river is so amenable to sympathy for us that it has bent and bent round to place the town on its bank ! Well, the river has gone its course in accordance with laws of nature and it is only man who has built these towns on its bank.

The sun is supposed to have been a divine contrivance of giving us light. Well, it *does* give light no doubt ; it has given light for untold millions of years before any living being evolved and will do so if even all the living beings were to cease to exist ; it is giving light on high seas and mountain peaks without reference to man's use ; it is emitting light in a huge volume to be wasted on mere space and on other planets for no conceivable convenience of mankind !

Living organisms are adapted to take advantage of natural phenomena who go their own courses. We take advantage of the current when we go down-stream or of the wind when we sail with it but to think these were provided to carry us up and down is simply childish.

Man has, in his own fancy, taken up the the position of a favoured child whereas nature is as cruel or as kind to it as to any other item of its contents. We are a part of nature and we have to think so.

The philosophy of a short earthly existence of man on his way to an eternal life was conceived in full faith but only on an honest surmise.

IMMORTALITY AND THE HEREAFTER

The supposed 'immortality of the soul' and the 'hereafter' have been called the impregnable

citadel of all mystical and dualistic notions. The selfish interest of the human personality is determined to have a guarantee of his existence beyond the grave at any price !

Science points to the same process of reproduction shared by man with many animals, anatomy and physiology describe similar organs with similar functions—and yet when a dog is dead it is said to cease to exist and go back to the elements but man is not. He must for his own delectation nurse hope of a continuity of his existence to be culminating in an everlasting life hereafter in bliss or torment !

The dogma has found its rigid form in Christianity wherein an article of faith runs : "I belive in the resurrection of the body and an eternal life". Man is further said to 'arise on the last day as Christ is alleged to have done on the Easter morn, and receive a reward according to the tenour of his earthly existence.'

THE IRRATIONALITY OF SUCH BELIEFS

Judging against the mass of accumulated knowledge in the different branches of natural science, we find the kinds of faith that prevailed and prevail to-day full of traditional superstitions. Men and women are found to believe

things that shock outsiders horribly. The Christian belief in Creation and Chronology, in the Trinity, in the Immaculate Conception, in the Redemption, in the Ressurection and Ascension of Christ and so forth leave the non-christians cold. But equally fantastic are some of the beliefs held by Hindus, Buddhists, Jews and Muslims with regard to a great mass of things One section has to try its beliefs on another to see how childish they are likely to be thought by latter.

Each, however, of these sections relishes its own beliefs and denounces those of others. To the sincere believer each of the articles of his faith is an indisputable truth and anythings contradictory is heresy and damnable error !

Incalculable has been the injury which irrational superstition has done to credulous humanity and ceaseless the conflict of confessions and professions of faith ; of the wars which peoples have waged against one another with sword and fire, religious wars have been the most frequent ; of all the forms of discord that have shattered the happiness of mankind religious differences have been the bitterest. Think of the millions who have lost their lives in Christian persecutions, in the religious conflicts of Islam, in the grim process of the Inquisition, in the burning orgies of witch-craft or the Hindu rite of Suttee !

MY EXPLANATION OF RELIGIONS

My explanation of religions is that *religions are systems of thought and conduct devised by very honest men to ensure social order and that in each, grains of truth are mixed up with honest mistakes and ignorant errors No system monopolises the truth to the exclusion of others. None specialises in untruth either.*

Let me explain.

Prophets and founders of religions have been honest leaders of mankind. They have striven to find solution of the riddles of life and the complexities of the social order. Their knowledge was limited by the knowledge of the era in which they flourished.

This explains why the Scriptures, claimed as revelations direct or indirect from God, fail miserably in their accounts of human history, natural geography and universal astronomy. If God has been sending messages Himself, why, oh why are these contradictions among Scriptures, most childish explanations of natural phenomena, and the intolerant militarism urged on one section against other sections of the humanity, as if only one section was God's sole concern at the time ?

EVOLUTION OF THE IDEA OF GOD

This is not the place for a long resume of the progress of human thought from diverse

deities to one God Suffice it to say that men and women professing Theism who shudder to doubt even a minor article of conventional faith will profit by the knowledge that the idea of ONE GOD itself is a comparatively recent development and that for millions of years He was unknown to mankind. Mankind in the very early stages of its advent had to struggle for bare existence with the destructive forces of nature. He had to react *to his environment* to save himself before he could think leisurely to understand the world. A certain vague sense of wonder and bewilderment haunted him all this time. He came to deify the forces of nature and tried by means of various magic performances evolved out of imagination to control and to compel, or to coax and appease them. In course of time mythologies and other more intellectual explanations were attached to the primitive rituals.

The conception of order in nature which must have at the outset appeared so very capricious grew with the growth of order in human society. The regularity of natural phenomena suggested a 'law' and the idea of law led to that of 'lawgivers' and then 'A Lawgiver'.

Thus, *polytheism* peopled the world with a variety of gods and goddesses. *Fetichism* saw

such subordinate deities in the lifeless bodies of nature, in rocks, in water, in the air, in human productions like pictures, statues and idols. *Demonism* saw gods in living organisms—animals and men. Hellenic polytheism in the myriads of ancient Greek myths marks its highest stage.

Triplotheism is associated with 'three' as a symbolic number which was often considered sacred. The Tri-murti of the Brahmanic religion conceived as a 'divine unity' made up of three persons—Brahma, the creator ; Vishnu, the sustainer ; and Shiva, the destroyer, finds a parallel in the Trinity of Ilu, the mysterious source of the world, in the Sun-worship of the Chaldean magi, whose three manifestations were Anu, primeval chaos ; Bel, the architect of the world ; and Aa the heavenly light. The latest parallel to be found is in the dogma of 'Trinity' which comprises three of the chief articles of faith in the Christian creed—the notion of One God being made up of *three* different persons : God, the Father, the omnipotent creator of heaven and earth ; God, the Son, Jesus Christ ; and the Holy Ghost, a mystical being.

Amphitheism conceived of two different gods ruling the world. God and the Devil are believed engaged in a perpetual struggle like rival emperors ! The Loving God, or good principle, is the source of all that is good and beautiful

and the world would have been perfect if His work was not being continuously thwarted by the Devil, the source of all that is bad and ugly.

The conception of Devas in conflict with Ashuras in the Hindu religion, of the Evil, Satan, who figures very prominently in Christianity and Islam is allied to this Amphitheism.

Monotheism found its chief exponent in Islam, the latest of the Mediterranean group, which tolerates no partner to God and no relationship with man except that of the creator to the created, Islam, however, conceives of innumerable supernatural agents like angels and a whole world of Djinns !

Most of these theisms including the latest and purest Monotheism, have 'humanised' God ... that is, God has been conjectured as feeling, thinking and acting like man. This is *anthropomorphic theism.* Hence the conceptions of his liking prayers and submission, disliking indifference and haughtiness, punishing mankind on this earth by natural visitations and reserving more punishment in the shape of hell, and rewarding mankind on this earth by graces and favours and in the others with heaven.

Such has been God shaped and reshaped, multiplied and singled by man. Such have been

the spirits believed also by man. As if the creator of the Universe of which this earth is but a tiny grain of sand among unnumbered sands on all the sea shores of the world, had no other concern than of foaming and fretting at petty faults and getting mightily pleased at our flattery !

This revolting idea of flattering and gaining favours has struck thinking minds as supremely odd.

That it is man that has shaped and reshaped God in various colours has been forcefully put by Bernard Shaw thus :

"Take the situation in detail as it develops through the Bible. The God of Noah is not the God of Job. Contemplate first the angry deity who drowned every living thing on earth, except one family of each species, in a fit of raging disgust at their wickedness, and then allowed the head of one human family to appease him by 'the sweet savour' of a heap of burning. flesh ? Is he identical with the tolerant, argumentative, academic, urbane, philosophic speculator who entertained the devil familiarly and made a wager with him that he could not drive Job to despair of divine benevolence ? People who cannot see the difference between these two gods cannot pass the most elementary test

of intelligence ; they cannot distinguish between similars and dis-similars."

I have examined only one set of religions but these have been the latest and most powerful group. Other religions could be scanned the same way and be shown to fare no better. Their contradictions, illogicalities — their hocus-pocus of beliefs and rituals would appear to the thinking mind to be no less odd.

THE IDEA OF THE HEREAFTER

The supposed 'immortality of the soul' and the 'hereafter', the 'impregnable citadel' of all mystical and dualistic notions will also be found to be a fond hope only of humanity.

Among thoughtful physicians the conviction that the existence of the soul (whatever it may be) came to an end has been common for centuries. The establishment of the theory of evolution and the cellular theory, the astounding discoveries of ontogeny and experimental physiology and the marvellous progress of the microscopic anatomy of the brain have gradually stripped the fond theories of 'immortality' and 'hereafter' of one base and then another. They are now reduced to a stage of

practically having no legs to stand upon. Although Christianity gave the dogma of personal immortality great popularity, Budhism that embraces 30 per cent of the entire human race, the old popular religion of the Chinese, the reformed religion of Confucius and what is more significant, the earlier and purer religion of the jews do not vouch for it at all. Other religions range on both sides, some avowing, some denying.

Although the conception of a blissful paradise can be excused as due to extreme fondness of a loving God to provide for comforts of mankind, that of hell cannot be excused on any account. The idea of everlasting torment in hell as depicted in the scriptures must be revolting to all sense of justice and decency. The short span of human earthly existence has been rendered so difficult with temptations so overwhelming, that occasional failings of man can not merit even a millionth part of the torment said to be provided. Well might even the devoutest votary of God exclaim ! "Lord ! Lord !! 'if Thou art true, Thy hell is not ; if Thy hell is true, Thou art not."

Let mankind live a useful life, do the utmost good he can in the brief space of life and then look for eternal rest in the cessation of all physiological functions at death.

Well, isn't death as natural as life anyway ? All this would seem to the great majority of mankind as preposterously destructive. They may be conceivably asking : isn't this dangerous scepticism ? Isn't this attacking the very foundation of human faith—a faith that has sustained mankind so long ? Is science so infallible that it can reject age-long traditions on its findings ?

These are legitimate questions and have got to be answered.

I say this is dangerously sceptic but if we can find a worthy substitute to fill the void, we shall profit.

I say this is certainly attacking the foundation of faith but of faith based on hearsay and make-belief. I admit that humanity has found solace in faith but it has found a great deal of sorrow as well.

The question is : Are these the beliefs we have arrived at after due deliberation ?

I need hardly say that we have not *embraced* these faiths but have *inherited* them : we have not *adopted* a religion but have been *merely born into it.* This is the general case with very few exceptions.

Human credulity has been astonishingly wide. There is no belief, however, grotesque and even villainous, that cannot be made a part of human nature if it is inculcated in childhood and not contradicted in the child's hearing. The same remark would apply to blank, ignorant, and superstitious adulthood as to childhood.

To stress how far human credulity can go, Aldous Huxley remarks sarcastically .

"To save the Sun (which might, one feels, very safely be left to look after itself) a million of Hindus will assemble on the bank of the Ganges. How many, I wonder, would assemble to save India ? An immense energy which, if it could be turned into political channel, might liberate and transform the country, is wasted in the name of imbecile superstitions. Religion is a luxury which India, in its present condition, cannot possibly afford. India will never be free until the Hindus and the Muslims are as tepidly enthusiastic about their religion as we are about the Church of England. If I were an Indian millionaire, I would leave all my money for the endowment of an Atheist Mission !"

The point I would make is this that not only India but the world at large except perhaps Russia has been wasting a lot of energies in the name of imbecile superstitions. Old religion in the various guises *is* a luxury which humanity cannot possibly afford.

SOCIAL EQUIVALENT OF RELIGION

The first point I would make is this : why not let God and His legion alone ?

For millions of years He has not bothered to publicise His Unity. Man has shaped and reshaped Him and fought and died for Him. That would have been all right perhaps but man has *fought and killed for Him also* : Bloodshed so abhorred by the loving God has been *allowed* freely and even sanctified in His name ! If anybody could be accused of culpable negligence, it is God who refuses to advance convincing proofs of His existence and allows strife and conflict among mankind.

The truth seems to me to be that mankind has been groping in the dark still. His quest has been : given the universe, let's find the most probable hypothesis to account for it.

Theism has been one and pantheism another. Let there be many more discussed and scanned. It may happen that God Who has moved from multiplicity to unity may further move to complete nullity ; may be He will divulge His Majesty unmistakably ; may be human mind will come to find a better hypothesis. But let us for once keep our minds free and get rid of the fear that doubting of a single article of traditional faith will mean damnation.

It is here where religion differs sharply from science. Science is human : observe, try, record speculate logically, try out your speculation, confirm or correct, communicate to other investigators, hear their communications, compare, discuss logically, establish and so onward—this, for all practical purposes, is the method of science. Science will state that as far as latest observations confirm and evidence goes, the sun is so big or that the earth is round and moving. For your satisfaction it will place the evidence before you. If you do not care to believe, it will neither molest you nor force you. If you believe, it will not guarantee that later discoveries may not modify what has been said.

Religion, however, seems to brook no criticism nor admit modification. This is an intellectual blemish which modern man cannot deny.

But many will perhaps be asking, "If we discard the belief in the Day of Judgment and the Punishment to come, will not man and woman tend to do as they please ?"

There are and will be bullies to take advantage of the goodness of man and woman and to upset social order. But haven't we protection under the Law already ?

This brings us to Criminal Sociology which I have studied at length in a separate treatise. Suffice it to say here that we must uphold the

Rule of Law, both nationally and internationally.

RATIONAL CODES OF CONDUCT

Legislation by order of God has long ceased but our laws continue to multiply. So far, man has been made for Law ; now law will be made for Man. In place of the often irrational religious codes, we shall have rational codes to go by. And every word of the law will be debated and weighed and nothing taken for granted.

We are already moving and breathing in an atmosphere of law. You rise in the morning and take your bath but have you thought of the elaborate legal procedure which has preceded the simple process of turning on of the tap? Landowners have had to be compensated, the rights of millowners and of navigation and fishing have had, perhaps, to be considered, wayleaves obtained, streets opened and so on. But that is only the beginning of your day's contact with the law. Elaborate laws regulate the electricity which turns on your fans, the gas or coke which cooks your breakfast, and whilst at breakfast you enjoy the protection of the Food and Drugs Acts. When you move out on the street and board a bus, tram or train, you are on rights and under obligations. You are not aware of

law's influence any more than of the air that you breathe. But there it is; we all owe so much to law and its benign if stern, rule.

Whatever our personal ethics, our social ethics must be based on a respect for law a law that we shall ourselves lay down for our own good. It will be flexible but as long as it stands it will stand squarely against all, high or low.

My contention is: why should so much of man's interest and enthusiasm centre round an unknown and perhaps unknowable agency? Have not we any better use for them?

So far no beings superior to mankind have been found on good evidence to exist. If they still do, let them. It is futile to think that they would bother about what we think or do about them. If *good* evidence is obtained of their existence, we shall believe. If people are prone to believing without evidence let them. In the meantime, however, let's find some SOCIAL EQUIVALENT OF RELIGION in which all can join.

In the preceding section of this discussion, we have found that 'love of mankind' might supersede all other accidental affiliations Let us similarly avow: SERVICES TO MANKIND MUST SUPERSEDE SERVICES TO ALL OTHER AGENCIES.

LOVE MANKIND—RENDER SERVICES TO HUMANITY

That religion can exist without belief in any supernatural agency is evident from Buddhism as originally taught by its founder. It has perhaps stood alone in having no doctrine of God or spirit, although later Buddhism has deviated from its beginning in this respect. Those who clamour that as soon as we have a godless religion, we shall start cutting one another's throat and robbing and raping may take note that Buddhism, if we leave its excesses in certain respects, has been most humane in its tenets and practices.

Auguste Comte has already combined the two tendencies of man towards having a religion and at the same time distrusting traditional theology. In his opinion the progress of human knowledge has passed through three stages—the theological, the philosophical and the scientific.

Agreeing with him in this respect, I hold that all the religious impulses of man which have been important and led to social progress in spite of erroneous beliefs and deeds, can be easily and without dispute, diverted to HUMANITY, *love for it* standing for the respect towards supernatural agencies and *services to it* for the formalistic rites of the various religions.

The new creed and rites can weld together

the entire human race, without distinction of colour and country. It will be open to those holding diverse religious views to unite on this common plane so that as enthusiasm for the new waxes, that for the old may wane.

What should be the goal before the human being ? The individual can recognize that his life alone is of no consequence except in so far as his life contributes to the well-being of other human beings on this earth. The socially conscious individual comes to realize that his very coming into this earth has been due to sacrifices by others, his life made possible their by concession and help. Hitler with all his later-life fury began life as a helpless baby. Any adult boy or girl about his house could have slapped, kicked or throttled him to death. His living was made possible by sacrifices of parents, help of relations and the sympathies of his contemporaries. Such debt we all owe to other members of humanity.

The most important tenet in Confucius' moral creed is to be found in the idea of "reciprocity." It is thus worded in his Doctrine of the Mean : "What you do not wish others should do unto you, do not do unto them." In a negative form this is indeed the golden rule of Saint Luke, "As ye would that man should do to you, do ye also to the likewise." In all

treatments of fellow-beings Sakya's injunction also is "to put oneself in the place of others"

I dare say there is hardly a reader of this page or anybody anywhere on the face of this earth who could not do more than he is doing to-day in either interesting himself in human welfare or contributing towards human happiness. He or she need not be persons of importance. There is enough for everybody to do under the very nose.

The brotherhood of the entire mankind for which the world is crying so desperately can only be established when each man and each woman acts as a fellow-man and a fellow-woman; when he or she feels, no matter what his or her situation, that a moral obligation rests upon him or her to serve not only the immediate community but the great community of mankind according to their ability and the opportunity.

(8) HUMAN ENERGIES MUST HAVE A 'MORAL EQUIVALENT OF WAR.' We have just considered a 'SOCIAL EQUIVALENT OF RELIGION.'

A NEW WAR

But there are people who shudder to think of a state of society in which all the finer qualities of manhood—courage and endurance

will have no play. War which stretched human personality to its highest dynamics will there be no more. What then will prevent mankind from degenerating into a herd of sheep or goats ?

This is a gloomy fore-caste indeed ! But it isn't true.

We shall have a war—greater than any so far fought and one that will know no end. *Humanity will wage it ceaselessly all the time to come* !

The enemies ranged on the other side are many and more formidable than Hitler, Mussolini and all the War-lords that have troubled mankind, put together.

Man and woman living and to come will have to bring all the reserve of emotional force to bear on winning and we must have an enormous increase of personal dynamic for every soldier.

So there isn't going to be a long long holiday in which humanity will stroll leisurely or sleep off valuable time ! We aren't going to have a sheep's paradise for anything !

If war will stop, we shall reinvent it to redeem life from flat degeneration. A permanently successful peace economy cannot be a simple pleasure economy. We must be so busy

profitably to mankind that there will be no idle brains—no devil's workshops—anywhere.

We have seen that there is not much evidence to assume existence of supernatural beings. If they are there, they must presumably be busy about their own affairs.

At any rate, a false sense of dependence on charity from above or of fear from displeasure of unseen and invisible beings has so far kept mankind in a perpetual state of hope and dread. Not that its efforts have been paralysed but a great deal has been wasted :

The great attachment mankind has felt towards supernatural beings can now be released for the *betterment of mankind* We now know—may not be for certain—but at any rate on far more reasonable grounds than our predecessors did that we form a tiny speck of living matter along with other members of the living organism and that we die and share the same fate. Our fond hopes for a life to come apart from other members of the animal kingdom may all be wishful thinking.

The question of questions is :

Given a short life on this earth, what best use can we make of it ?

There will be clamorists who will at once jump up and say—Well, this is a dangerous

philosophy—this is encouraging people to be gluttons, to be joy-hunters, to be sordidly selfish and morbidly acquisitive to the exclusion of all finer feelings, to the utter callousness as to what happens to others :

Yes, on first sight that seems to be the case. Let's probe it.

The gluttons would have been happy indeed —those who have enough to 'eat, drink and be merry' on would indeed rest fully satisfied, had it been a fact that they were isolated beings standing on their own.

No, no ! Feelings, base and noble, still move mankind. If a person could have his fill, fully conscious of the fact that his father and mother who denied themselves so much to bring him into the world, his brothers and sisters who took so much trouble to help him grow, were going without food, and still feel happy, perhaps we might say that this philosophy *was* dangerous. But no ! Not many persons can do so. *And this failure is human.* We can take pride in it.

THIS IS ONLY RECIPROCITY

There is no end of kindnesses we receive in life from those outside us. So pay we must back in kindnesses.

It is for this discharge of our obligation that we formulated the creed, "Love Mankind" ; it

is for this that we have laid down the new rite, "Serve Mankind"! The former will ensure peace and harmony; the latter fill our lives with work.

And such work will have no end!

Men and women are now proud of belonging to a conquering nation, and without a murmur they lay down their belongings, their very lives. But who can be sure that other conquests may not be even more alluring?

I cannot help quoting Lord Wavell who is himself a War-lord but feels quite the humane way.

"It has always seemed to me", said he at a Luncheon in London, prior to coming over to India as Viceroy, "a curious fact that money is forthcoming in any quantity for war but that no nation has ever yet produced money on the same scale to fight the evils of peace—poverty, lack of education, unemployment, ill-health. When we are prepared to spend our money and our efforts against them as freely and with the same spirit as against Hitler and when we pay our school-masters at a much higher rate and lawyers perhaps at a somewhat lower rate, we shall really be making progress. In the country to which I go (meaning India) those evils of poverty, lack of education and disease have to

be met on possibly a greater scale than anywhere else."

I am considering what Lord Wavell said regarding India in respect of *humanity at large.*

COMMON ENEMIES

Our common enemies are a legion ; some of them are as tough as any mortal enemy. The combination forms an *axis* of formidable strength and bitter will be the struggle and long. Who knows how long !

HALF OF HUMANITY IS STILL STARVING.

HALF OF HUMANITY IS STILL GOING ALMOST NAKED.

HALF OF HUMANITY STILL GOES WITHOUT A ROOF THAT CAN PREVENT RAIN AND PROVIDE TOLERABLE COMFORT.

COLOSSAL IGNORANCE STEEPS MILLIONS AND MILLIONS OF HUMAN SOULS WITH THE SAME CAPABILITIES LYING UNUSED.

LIGHT OF REASON AND THE GUIDANCE

OF KNOWLEDGE ARE STILL DENIED TO HORDES OF PEOPLE.

DISEASE AND PESTILENCE, PHYSICAL AND MENTAL ILLS STALK HAUGHTILY OVER THE EARTH AND STRIKE NOW HERE,NOW THERE AND MOST OF THE TIME AT MANY BACKWARD PLACES.

Well, if you want formidable enemies to try your strength, isn't here quite a number ?

It may be possible for a people in a country to eat, drink and be merry but this is beastly—not human, when crores of people of the same humanity are going without a morsel, dying for want of food, clothing !

BENGAL FAMINE

It was just over a year ago that men and women in Bengal died by millions for want of food ! Food was lying here and lying there but could not reach their mouths ! Hoarding and black-marketing went on little checked.

what sadder commentary on human callousness is needed ?

DIVERT ENERGIES TO NEW WAR

Let us divert all the methods of the last war to this new war.

"In the more or less socialistic future", says the eminent psychologist, William James, in elaborating his idea of a 'Moral Equivalent of War', "towards which mankind seems drifting we must still subject ourselves collectively to those severities which answer to our real position upon this only partly hospitable globe. We must make new energies and hardihoods continue the manliness to which the military mind so faithfully clings. Martial virtues must be the enduring cement ; intrepidity, contempt of softness, surrender of private interest, obedience to command, must still remain the rock upon which states are built — unless, indeed, we wish for dangerous reactions against commonwealths fit only for contempt, and liable to invite attack whenever a centre of crystallization for military-minded enterprise gets formed anywhere in their neighbourhood."

Let the *civic passion* towards ills of poverty, disease, ignorance, superstition, undeveloped humanity, etc., be roused to a pitch. It is there already but needs only to be accentuated by right propaganda so that the spark may be blowed on till the whole population gets incandescent, and on the ruins of the old morals of military honour, a stable system of morals of civic honour builds itself up. The war fever has so far moved whole peoples ; let *constructive interests in bettering humanity* move us none the less !

The martial type of character can be bred without war. Strenuous honour and disinterestedness still abound in society. Everybody will heartily welcome Americans, Britishers and others spread all over the world, to India, China and other backward places selflessly fighting disease, ignorance, want, pain and relieving humanity. Everybody will heartily welcome the idea that instead of people flocking to places of pilgrimage they look up famine-stricken or flood-washed places to put in money and labour to the succour of the suffering.

If conscription must there be, let there, instead of military conscription, be a conscription of the whole youthful population in each country to form for a number of years a part of the army enlisted against Nature. The military ideals of hardihood and discipline would then be wrought into the growing fibre of the people.

SOCIAL LABOUR CORPS

we should have a Grand Social Labour Corps and as many divisions as there need be. Detachments will be sent out here, there, everywhere—now to cut jungles, now to clear slums,—here to clean drains, there to build roads,—earthquake, flood, famine, etc., demanding divisions after divisions in the human warfare against nature; we should help our brothers

and sisters—may be our cousins at a distance but in so doing help ourselves.

So could the traditional religions help. They could lend churches, temples and mosques for imparting the light of education. These might also be stalls for distributing charity.

If loving christ were living to-day or the practical prophet of Islam or the founders of Hinduism or Buddhism, it would be worth while sitting at their feet drawing their attention to the ills humanity is heir to and begging of them to *lead this war of all wars.*

The Blue-print for the Betterment of Humanity has to consider *needs first.* India will need food, cloth, shelter and education. So will perhaps China. Indians and Chinese will have to help themselves. And help from outside must needs come also and will be welcome from any quarter.

To-day it may be India and China, to-morrow Greece, the day after, Mexico—be whereever it may—humanity has got to respond! And it *will* if the creeb of "Love Mankind" and the ritual of "Serve Mankind" have been brought strongly home to it

Let me wind up now what I have said, for my readers. They might have long been wondering why I have digressed into a topic which

seems hardly in keeping with the tune of the present book. But isn't it really ?

PERSONAL EFFICIENCY

I have called attention in this book to the fact that human personality has immense potentialities. "Personality," Some one has said, "*is a perennial not an annual.* It requires to be pruned, to be nurtured, and to be given opportunities for growth."

The supreme waste of humanity is this tragedy of *undeveloped personality.* The world is crowded with people who use only 30% of their own capabilities.

I can only say that vast reserves of power are there in every man and woman and suggest that everybody try to use them to the utmost. what thought or idea will prove the key to open the mind of a particular reader to that incoming tide of force which will translate itself into vision and achievement, I can not definitely state.

I can only say what I believe for myself, that any man can do what any other man has done :

This is a great message of hope to everybody.

Your full power ! who can say what this

is ? who can set limits to what one can achieve if one tries confidently ?

I have indicated methods of self-control and self-development (ch 5). We can help ourselves and others. Training, knowledge, help and incentive can be imparted so that the lowest and the highest, the cabin boy as well as the Admiral, will both do their best, so that no savable time will be wasted or effort lost !

The Russian soldier of to-day and the miracle of the Russian army present spectacles of what has been done out of the slovenly peasant-fighter of the Czarist regime.

I am a believer in the completest Personal Autonomy' consistent with social welfare so that each may pursue his bent. Talent is the aptitude for doing a thing well and it requires a favourable environment to grow. Compulsory regimentation is the very antithesis of such environment and the grave of diverse talents.

The conscripted soldier is an anachronism of which we must get rid. A political scheme that cannot be carried out except by conscripts is never a sound one. When the cause is just and the appeal moving, free men and women will stream in of their own free choice.

The individual must have rights—rights which common man and woman, all over the

world, will share. He must have freedom, work and food, cloth and shelter. He must have subsistence allowance when out of employment or disabled due to age, accident.

Until that stage has been reached, a 'sufficiency bar' could be placed on those unnecessarily rich to afford the poorer section their bare sustenance.

SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT

In the domain of human management, I have stressed on the marvels of modern scientific Management. It prevents waste, ensures economy of effort and lets brain free play. But above all, as Tarbell says, "The new management employs not only science but humanity, and by humanity I do not mean merely or chiefly sympathy but rather a larger thing, the recognition that *all men*, regardless of race, origin or experience, have powers for greater thing than have been believed."

The old-time method of running the human engine was to push and drive it by outside force the birch-rod for the boy, the lash for the man. Now men are looking for the lever that turns on the power. *That lever is interest and enthusiasm* and he who can arouse these works the lever and brings stupendous energy into 'play'.

INSPIRING LEADERSHIP

The whole world is now looking for a new group of pioneers who have the capacity to conceive no plans, new ideas, new inventions; men and women who have the courage and the initiative to blaze new trails in the humdrum walks of life.

These new leaders will be wanted in every field, in every human venture, old and new.

Then there is the leadership for *holding peace* and *the betterment of humanity.*

Of all the human quests and adventures, what can be more alluring than the Making Of Better People? Of what avail is all else unless we can develop a saner, nobler, kindlier human race? What is civilization, if humanity is not to share it equally?

MY APPEAL

I shall ask my readers to join the war yet to be fought for the uplift of humanity I have just outlined.

My range of invitation is none so wide. These pages will be read by a limited number but the war I am speaking of requires unnumbered soldiers—from as wide a region as the entire humanity...living and yet to be born!

Perhaps, my readers will take my case up, will join themselves and invite others to join—perhaps those that are in a position to flash messages and relay them to far corners of the earth will like to do so but there it is—this 'war' will have to be fought by *volunteers all over.*

This perpetual war will demand sacrifices as hard as any but free minded men and women will join it with the strength of a *morality* of *initiative*, not a morality of submission, the enthusiasm of *hope*, not of fear, a vision of things *to be done* rather than of things to be left undone. Leaders as well as the common man and woman will be inspired by the vision of what human life *can be*, and will be happy with the thrill of going forward to create it !

END

INDEX

A

Abdul Quader Zilani, Pir 116
Achilles 25
Adams, Prof. 19
Administrative Efficiency 209
Aims and objects of drill 119
Akbar 105, 324. 408
'A message to Garcia' 124
Anti-corruption Committee 230
Appeal for Ideas 328
Appreciation, the magic of 233
Arbitration by choice 380
Armed defence of various states 379
Attention and mental control 114
Authority of subordinate officers 132

B

Ballard, T B. 86. 88
Beethoven 103
Belittering criticism 265
Beloved Leadership 245
Benefits of war so-called 369
Bengal famine 440
Betterway suggestions 328
Bias and prejudice 301
Bismarck 38, 212
Blue blood fantasy 391
Boisterousness 139
Borrowing 77
Buddha 26
Burke, Edmund 152

C

Caesar, Julius 96
Calculation 339
Carnegie Andrew 104, 319, 325 & 330
Carnegie Dale 124, 330, 333 340, 349, 350, 362
Casting out worry 113
Challenging fear 107
'Changing School' 263
Chatterjee Bankim Ch 38. 406
Child discipline, the goal of 272
Churchill, Mr. 105, 373
Clasification of work-long-range plan-self improvement programe- important official matters for immediate or early attention-of other sorts-private such matters-matters to be pursued-two golden maxims-borrowings-lendings-nice words, phrases, etc-misc. informations-other notes. 67
Coleridge 67
Compliments 318
'Colour Problem, 599
Conceit 95
Concentration 344
Contact 345
Converting 351
Commanding and carrying 363
Contact between govt. 378
Confidence-teacher's 93
Correspondence management of 225
Creative leadership 27
Cultural inequality 402
Cult of patriotism 398
Correcting faults 336
Courting 349
Conversation with superiors-rules for such-with inferiors-rules for such. 147
Consideration 243

Constructive pattern of discipline 271
Coward, Noel 142

D

David 25
Day's work file 223
Dealing with creatures of emotion 331
Deferred orders 193
Demeanour 137
Demosthenes 102, 154
Deprecation 259
Description of leadership 22
Details, mastery of 67, 165
Dickens, charles 83, 197, 270
Diplomatic system 378
Discipline 21, 45, 109, 139, 272
Dishonest nature of-how to combat 230
Dix, Dorothy 317
Dress 136
Drill, use and advantage of 119
Dues, collection of 77
Duke of Marlborough 146
Duke of Wellington 155
Dynamic Leadership 25

E

Edison, Thomas 60, 103, 182
Efficiency-Administrative or managemental-individual-organizational-equipmental 215
Efficient management-organization, supervision, test and inspection 207
Emerson, Harrington 212
Emotions 302, 331
Emotional Association 302
Empty threats 299
Ensuring compliance 186
Equality of rights and privileges 387
Equipmental efficiency 219
Eternal tug 373
Ethics of punishment 300
Evolution of the idea of God-Polytheism-triplotheism-Demonism-Feticism-Amphitheism-monotheism-anthropomorphic theism 419
Explanation of religions 419
Externals of discipline 146

F

'Father Forgets' 200
Fear among children 101
Fear complex 98
Fear, types of 99
Fearlessness 98
Firmness-reasonable-some maxims-persistence 170
Foch, Marshal 97
Ford, Henry 105, 325
Fortune, wheels of 375
Free Union 386
Freedom for all 376
Freud 301
Frivolity 140

G

Gandhi 25, 105
Gandhi and beloved leadership 246
George Lloyd 103. 152. 154
Goethe 66. 83
Grant General 104

H

Habits-Good ones-how to form 70
" Bad ones-how to break 70
Handling children 255
Handling human nature 307
Hastings, warren 121
Haves and havenots 401
Heads of units 222
Hercules 25
Hill Napoleon 315 326
Hitler 41 91 103 105
Hobnobbing 140
Hours of business 58

How to conduct oneself 135
Hypnotism 151

I

Ideas. picking up 78
Immortality and the hereafter 416
Irrationality or such belief 417
Idea of the Hereafter 424
Incentive how to get it 247 308
Individual Efficiency 215
Inferiority complex 100
Influencing others 84
Influencing other people-few tips-calculation-concentration contact-courting-converting-commanding-carrying 339 364
Inspections periodical and by surprise-by delegation 228
Inspiring leadership 447
Interest arousing it 308
Interviewing successfully 345
Intonation 50
Inviting suggestions 327

J

Jean-Jacques 27
Jinnah 25
Joan of Arc 26
Justice 300
Justice and discrimination 259

K

Kaiser 22 132
Keate, Dr. John 264
Kipling, Rudyard 144 277
Knowledge-general and specialized 323

L

Lamb, Charles 38
Leadership-Nature of 22
Leadership representative or symbolic dynamic or creative-psychology 22
Leadership-two forms-Napoleon and Nelson-Lincoln and Roosevelt-Bismarck-Curzon's failing 235-241
Lendings 77
Letters deserving answers 227
Lincoln's letter 244
Loopholes in orders 171
Longrange plan 68
Love of mankind 410
Love of the kind 390
Lowly parentage 103
Ludwig 165

M

Management of personnel scientific 21
Manner-how to correct oneself 135
Meetings to discuss 327
Mental factor of personality 90
Mental strength-aids to 109
Michaelangelo 83. 91
Milne, A. A. 313, 320
Mohammad 26, 105, 128 182, 206
Moltke, Von 170, 213
Moral equivalent of war 434
Move to end war 366
My appeal 447
Management 21
Managemental efficiency 209
Management efficient 207
Management of children 271
Management of correspondence . 225
Management of personal affairs 212
Management of work 61
Management of interview 345
Management of Scientific 207

N

Napoleon 38. 64. 82, 94. 102 103. 108. 110. 111 130. 165. 179. 187 204. 212. 324
Nehru 25
Nelson 110. 127. 251. 332

New war to be waged 378
New creed 410
Nice words, phrases 78
Notebook items 79

O

Obedience 118
'Obey-me' attitude 117
Official matter 72. 73
One-world state 389
Ordering others-how to do it-examples and exercises-errors-repeated orders-impersonal orders-long-range orders-vacillating orders-vague orders-loose orders-deferred orders-unhecked orders 188. 194
Organizational efficiency 219
Origin of fears 105

P

Pattern of discipline constructive 271
Periodical inspections 228
Persecution mania 114
Persistence 181. 184. 186
Personal efficiency 47
Personality 34
Personality-philosophically physiologically—psychiatrically 84
Pitt, William 146
Precision-example from Shakespeare-matery of details-clearness-muddling-intentional evasion 156
Pre-school period-importance of 271
Post-war organization and leadership 365
Power of will 181
Primary wants 358
Pseudofirmness 173
Psychology of leadership 28
Punctuality 64
Punishment 259
Punishment, the right use of 275

R

Rabindranath 105
Rationalization 211
Reading & concentrating 60
Reasoning about worry 113
Reasoning with fear 107
Reciprocity 258
Refractory children 274
Refusing people 335
Repressive depreciation 269
Resting the art of 30
Rewards and prizes 258
Right disciplinarian 45
Right mood 142
Rod, right use of 275
Roosevelt 102. 356. 389
Rousseau 27
Roy, Sir P. C. 105
Russel, Bertrand 14

S

School of Freedom. Tolstoy 19
Science & religious dogmas 413
Scientific management 446
Search Preston 311
Self-confidence 93
Self-deception 170
Self-development 47
Self-discipline 47
Self-improvement-programe 68
Sense of proportion-example from Dickens-'Father Forgets' unthinking boses 196
Sensitive people 333
Serenity 146
Service to mankind 411
Sex differences 393
Shades of the Prison House 247

Shaw Bernard 57. 58. 103. 183. 345
Shaw. Mrs. Bernard-her will 48
Shakespeare 95 105. 205
Sharpening interest 303
Short lease 273
Silent watch system 231
Skylarking 140
Social equivalent of religion 428
Sources of distinction 391
Spencer Herbert 145
Split minutes 65
Stalin 103. 105
State of mind 98
Strictness 327
Successful acting 298
Supervision-day's work file-supervising others' work-watching details 223
Surprise inspections 228
System 47. 207

T

Tact 307
Taiming of the Shrew 294
Tata. Jamsedji 103
Taylor. F W. 210
Technique for discipline 43
Theseus 25
Three difficult boy's the story of 279
Tolstoy 19
Tone-how to order others intonation-hypnotism week voice 150
Trotsky & Stalin 308
Troubled people 333
True leadership-art of 89
Types of fear 99

U

University degress 105
Unthinking bosses 203
Uses Q abuses of creeds 408
Using talents 322

V

Vacillation 156 191
Vagueness 156. 191
Valuing good points 321
Voice. how to improve 181

W

War and Warlords of the past 371
War. as is known 368
War-socalled benefits of 369
Washington. George 182
Wells H. G. 268
Wheels of Fortune 375
Wilkie. Wendel 377. 388
William I-emperor 26
William James. Prof 170
Woolworth. F. W. 182
Workers. a few maxim for 61
Wright. Milton 147. 148 349
Wright. Wilbur 183

Y

Yasnaya Polyana 19

Z

Zaid 128

Other well-known & popular Works by Mr. Abul Hasanat

(1) THE GREATEST WAR YET TO BE FOUGHT

A challenging, thought-provoking work onc
construtive sociology.

Price Rs. 2/-

The writer pleads for a "SOCIAL EQUIVALENT OF RELIGION" and "MORAL EQUIVALENT OF WAR" in the new Creed of "Love Mankind" and "Serve Mankind."

*

He shows the way to abolition of Wars, Freedom for all, world federation and invites mankind to wage a perpetual war against undeveloped humanity, against poverty, illiteracy, disease and unhappiness, etc.

*

He pleads for Willing Accord in place of Blind Submission; a Morality of Initiative in place of a Morality of Abstention ; a Life of Hope rather than of Fear.

*

Humanity in turmoil may well turn to this book to find something worth doing.

(2) CRIME AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Foreword by SIR HARI SINGH GOUR, M. A., LL. D.

Scope: Criminal Sociology: Criminology; Penology; Criminal Jurisprudence and Law; Criminal Investigation etc.

Pages 915—Chapters 25—Appendices 3—Exhaustive Index—Rs. 6/- only.

Hundreds of reviewers all over the world have scanned its pages and judged its worth. They have been profuse in praise. The book has been prescribed as a Text-Book for the Master of Law classes and as a Reference-Book for the Bachelor of Law classes and classes in Sociology, Criminology and Moral Philosophy in several Universities and is in great demand from as far off as Canada and America.

The work surveys the entire field; it takes the reader round and round the earth and up and down the ages. It is edifying as Philosophy, stimulating as Science, interesting as detective fiction.

SOME OPINIONS:

It deserves warm appreciation and a large circulation. Since the appearance long time back of the late Sir Syed Shamsul Huda's text of Tagore Law Lectures on a subject covering partially the same ground, no book has been issued from the Indian press which is so comprehensive in its scope, so accurate and sound, and withal so compact and practical.—*The Hindustan Review, Patna.* This book is alike useful to the Lawyer, the Legislator, the Police Officer, the social Reformer, as also to the students of law and sociology. The subject has been dealt with in such a fascinating manner that once a reader has taken it up to study it will be impossible for him to leave it half-read or half-finished—*The Calcutta Law Journal.* ...is sure to be of immense help not merely to the police and members of the legal profession but also to the general public...the author deserves specia

commendation for the masterly manner in which he has treated these difficult problems —*The Illustrated Weekly of India, Bombay.* Encyclopaedic in conception and exhaustive in execution...clear and complex statement of the many and different aspects of crimes and criminals. The book reveals great industry and discriminating criticism. In Appendix B (an appendix which reminds one of Bernard Shaw's prefaces), he has collected together and summarized the data and conclusions on the subject. A book which ought to be in the hands of every Police Officer and Magistrate, every Lawyer and Politician, every Social Worker and Legislator in this country.—*The Hindu, Madras.* It is a great deal more than a technical work describing how to catch and secure the punishment of the criminal. It seeks to provide an outline of criminal sociology, and it discusses the science of criminology and penology, criminal law and jurisprudence, and of course, criminal investigation. The author possesses a philosophic as well as a practical mind.—*The Howard Journal.* I shall value this book very highly and I have hopes that at some time in the indefinite future I may come to India for personal study of some of the conditions your book describes.—*E. H. Sutherland— U. S. A.* Your book seems to be written from a thoroughly scientific point of view. I am glad to note also that you recognize that "Poverty is the chief-cause of crime."—*Dr. Maurice Parmelee, Washington.*

Crime and Criminal Justice is an extremely readable book. While the author has dealt with special reference to the great penal and criminal code of India, his view is decidedly and necessarily international. I have no doubt that this book will command a great deal of attention from both students and professional men of criminology over the whole world —*The Federal Probation, Washington, U.S.A.*

(3) CONTROLLED PARENTHOOD

Or, All About Birth Control and Promotion—Price Rs. 3/-

The book is profusely illustrated. It is highly informative containing latest scientific truths regarding Contraception. It also discusses ways and means of promoting Fertility.

(4) JABTE-TAULID (Birth Control—Illustrated Urdu Edn.) Re. 1/-. (5) JANAM-NIYANTRAN (do do—Illustrated Hindi Edn.) Ans. -/14/-. (6) JANMA-NIYANTRAN (do do —Illustrated Bengali 3rd Edn.) Rs. 2/8/-. (7) JANMA-NIYANTRAN (Abridged & Simplified Bengali Edn) Ans -/10/-

(8) JAUNABIJNAN OR KAMASAMHITA

The Encyclopaedia of Sex in Bengali—acclaimed as a masterpiece, 3rd Revised & Enlarged Edn. fully Illstd Rs.6/4.

(9) ALL ABOUT SEX Eng Edn. of Book No. 8. (Under Preparation). (10) MATRI-MANGAL, JANMA BIJNAN O SUSAN-TANLUV. Bengali 2nd Enlarged Edn Illustrated—Rs. 4/-. (11) BIBAHA MANGAL—Illustrated—Bengali Book on Marriage Welfare— Edited by A. Hasanat—Rs. 2/4 (12) KABIR PREM and other short stories in Bengali—Rs. 1/12. (13) TARIKAT—a Bengali treatise on Sufism—Re. 1/-.

(14) BANGLA BHASHAR SAMSKAR

Striking suggestions for simplifying Bengali language. Rs 1/12.

Extremly useful for Parents, Schools and Colleges

THE ENGLISH NURSERY SCHOOL

By Mr. A F. M. Abdul Haq, M A , Dip. Ed M R S.T. (London)
Inspector of Schools, Presidency Division.

Highly appreciated by the Press and Educationists ; greatly in demand everywhere. No school or college should be without it. Rs. 2/-.

STANDARD LIBRARY. A, DACCA. BENGAL.

Agencies being taken all over India & outside. Write.

(Write for complete catalogue.)

Note—Print-mistakes have crept in here and there and the standard of production of this book has not been as desired owing to war-time abnormal conditions. We apologise on this account.—Publishers

OTHER OUTSTANDING BOOKS BY

ABUL HASANAT

CRIME AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

•

CONTROLLED PARENTHOOD

•

THE GREATEST WAR YET TO BE FOUGHT

(For particulars see end of this book)

WRITE TO US FOR OUR LATEST PUBLICATIONS

Standard Library, A.
Dacca, Bengal, India.