THE BOOK WAS DRENCHED

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_162163

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

A NEW Social Order

EDDY ASIRVATHAM

" . . . a work of surpassing merit "

—Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri.

FOREWORD

Dr. Asirvatham has produced a book of surpassing merit. Its scope is wide, and the doctor has not narrowed his treatment. In a letter to me he claims that, "although the book is written from the point of view of liberal Christianity, there is nothing in it to which a person of another faith need take exception." I gladly testify that the claim is justified. Nothing is omitted that has any bearing on the issues discussed. The events that are happening around us to-day are drawn upon for illustration, and their significance in the framing of the New Order is convincingly set forth. The author has exalted aims for the future, and, if his exposition were slightly tinged with romance, it might be called utopian. The difficulties existing at the moment and likely to arise out of the present receive careful mention, and though one may wish that the remedies had been more fully elaborated, one feels that nothing of importance to the theme has been ignored or shirked.

Of the manner I may say a word here. It is both clear and bright. The views stand out vivid and crisp. In places I feel that a little more hesitation and a little less emphasis would have been proper. The complexities of life, always hard to understand and manipulate, are now bewildering in the last degree and sure to tax to the utmost the wisdom and philanthropy there is in the world. Nobody knows more than a tiny corner and can be quite easy when things are measured and mapped with precision and confidence. The wealth of apt quotations displayed on almost every page is extraordinary. Perhaps owing to the limitation of space, certain of these authorities do not get the exegesis that they require to bring out fully their cogency and bearing.

Dr. Asirvatham's independence of thought and freedom from what may be crudely called popular bias shine to advantage in these pages. One or two examples I shall venture to

give. Some dogmatists assert that it is easy to separate the topics that come before the legislature into those of distinctly communal or religious interest and those of national interest, and to reserve the former category by convention for disposal by the sections concerned while the latter category would be discussed on broad lines of general welfare and afford the meeting-ground of all opinions without distinction of religion or community. Practice gives no encouragement to this hope. Our author hits the nail on the head. "It is regrettable that in recent months even fresh taxation measures in the legislatures have been examined exclusively from the point of view of the members of one community or another or criticised solely from that point of view" (p. 111). Communalism, like the Hindu god Agni, is omnivorous. The next example shall be from an altogether different part of the field under survey. Lamenting the enormous extent to which the powers of local bodies like panchayats and municipal councils have been curtailed in recent years and the large number of these self-governing units that have been suspended or superseded, our author observes: "Although these measures may be regretted as being anti-democratic, they have been rendered necessary in the interest of efficiency and a fair degree of public honesty" (p. 143). As ultimate custodian of the rate-payers' interests, the provincial government is compelled now and then to exercise its drastic powers; when an observer of Dr. Asirvatham's stamp certifies that the intervention has on the whole been just and moderate, one may confidently discount the howls and execrations of the disgruntled local "patriots" and their champions in the press. Again, here is a dignified and gentle rebuke to a great name. The subject is the danger to "white" standards of health and sanitation when exposed to inroads by the proximity of coloured races. "In the light of all this, it is disconcerting to find a great theologian and thinker of the reputation of Hastings Rashdall assert that it may be necessary to sacrifice 'the lower well-being' of a countless number of Chinamen in order that 'the higher well-being' of a few Englishmen may be made possible" (129-130). Obscurantism in high places, even culpable obscurantism, is

not, alas, a rare phenomemon. Racial pride, incitement to war, approbation of tyranny in all aspects of life, however much these offend against the gentleness and compassion of Jesus Christ, have found unrestrained champions in all ages among his ministers. The robe a man wears, the profession he practises, the doctrine he preaches,—these do not always chasten his heart or cleanse his soul.

War and peace, democracy, monogamy, the proper employment of leisure, the education of the young for citizenship, justice of every kind between man and man, these and other matters of supreme consequence are dealt with at full length in chapters that hold the attention in sustained interest. In easy and compendious form the author presents his reader with the results of his laborious study, conscientious thought and high pitched aspiration. He wishes for his fellow-men the best that he can conceive. If there is a wide gap between this and what can be realised, how can he help it? To know the goal, to define it clearly and to point the way to it are achievements entitled to our gratitude and to our praise.

Servants of India Society,
Poona 4, (India)
18—3—1942.

V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI.

Books by the same author

1. POLITICAL THEORY
2. SPENCER'S THEORY OF SOCIAL JUSTICE
3. FORCES IN MODERN POLITICS

Copies can be had of

The Upper India Publishing Co.,
Lucknow

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

This book had its origin in a series of lectures delivered by the author, mostly to student audiences in India and Ceylon, during the past few years. At the request of some of his hearers, he has put them together in the form of a book omitting certain portions and adding a great deal of detail which may be of interest to the special student of the subjects discussed.

The object of the book is to rouse interest in some of our present-day social, economic, and political problems, particularly as they apply to India. In a book of this nature, it is not expected that every one will agree with the point of view expressed, however scrupulous the author may have been in understanding the various points of view before coming to his own conclusion. All that he wishes to claim is that he has stated his views honestly and frankly with the help of the material at his disposal, and hopes that such a full discussion will help his readers in reaching their own conclusions.

There is widespread dissatisfaction with the social order as we know it to-day. Some solution has to be found for the excesses of poverty, inequality, and insecurity. The resources of the world should be preserved and utilised in such a manner as to promote the well-being of every individual and nation. Every person should receive that reward which will enable him to be at his best and at the same time render the maximum possible service to society.

The author has discussed the outlines of a new social order under the terms Bread, Brotherhood, Freedom, and Justice, which may not carry the same connotation to every reader. They may mean much or may mean little. Nevertheless, they serve as convenient rallying points in organising one's thoughts on the momentous questions of the day. The

approach adopted is frankly idealistic, but not Utopian. The ideal sketched may really be called a penultimate ideal, inasmuch as it is concerned with what is possible within a measurable length of time. The author does not pretend to know anything of the ideal man in the ideal society. The idealism to which he subscribes is rooted in realism, enabling a person to be "a soaring idealist and a sober realist."

It now remains for the author to thank the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri for writing the Foreword; Dr. A. Appadorai, M.A., Ph.D. and Messrs. T. T. Krishnamachari, B.A., M.L.A., P. Chenchiah, B.A., M.L., S. P. Appasamy, M.A., and C. Devanesan, M.A., for reading the book in the original and offering many valuable suggestions; Mr. M. Balasubramanyan, B.A. (Hons.) for correcting the proofs; and Mr. R. Satakopan, M.A., B.L., for preparing the Index.

March 26, 1942. E. ASIRVATHAM.

CONTENTS

Chapter I INTRODUCTORY 1

Chapter II ECONOMIC JUSTICE 9

Chapter III ECONOMIC JUSTICE FOR INDIA ... 35

Chapter IV SOCIAL HARMONY: CASTE 53

Chapter V SOCIAL HARMONY: CLASS 73

Chapter VI SOCIAL HARMONY: COMMUNALISM ... 85

Chapter VII SOCIAL HARMONY: RACE 113

Chapter VIII POLITICAL JUSTICE: DEMOCRACY ... 137

Chapter IX POLITICAL JUSTICE: NATIONALITY ... 167

Chapter X POLITICAL JUSTICE: IMPERIALISM ... 192

Chapter XI POLITICAL JUSTICE: WORLD FEDERATION 223

Chapter XII WAR AND PEACE 251

Chapter XIII THE HOME AND FAMILY 285

Chapter XIV LEISURE AND RECREATION 325

Chapter XV EDUCATION FOR CITIZENSHIP ... 349

Chapter XVI CONCLUSION 375

BIBLIOGRAPHY

INDEX

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acland, Sir Richard	*Unser Kampf*
Appasamy, Paul	*Legal Aspects of Social Reform*
Asirvatham E.	*Political Theory*
Do.	*Forces in Modern Politics*
Barkat Ali Mirza	*Hindu Muslim Problem*
Barker, Ernest	*The Citizen's Choice*
Barnes, Leonard	*Empire or Democracy*
Do.	*The Future of Colonies*
Beni Prasad	*The Hindu Muslim Questions*
Cole G. D. H.	*Intelligent Man's Way to Prevent War*
Crowther Geoffrey	*Economics for Democrats*
Curry W. B.	*The Case for Federal Union*
Curtis L.	*Civitas Dei*
Durbin E. F. M.	*The Politics of Democratic Socialism*
Elliott and Merrill	*Social Disorganisation*
Gregg R. B.	*The Power of Non-Violence*
Huxley Aldous	*Ends and Means*
Do.	*Encyclopaedia of Pacifism*
Huxley and Haddon	*We Europeans*
Jacks L. P.	*Constructive Citizenship*
Jennings, Ivor	*A Federation for Western Europe*
Kumarappa, J. C.	*Why the Village Movement*
Madariaga Salvador De	*The World's Design*
Marrett J. R.	*Anthropology*
Mullick	*The Individual and the Group*
Muhammad Ali	*The Religion of Islam*
Pritt D. N.	*Federal Illusion*
Radhakrishnan Sir S.	*Essays and Reflections on Mahatma Gandhi*
Schiff, Leonard	*The Present condition of India*
Senart	*Caste*
Sydney and Beatrice Webb	*Soviet Communism (2 Vols)*
Simon Sir E. and others	*Education for Citizenship in Secondary Schools*
Sitaramayya P.	*Hindu Home Rediscovered*
Sivaswamy Iyer Sir P. S.	*Evolution of Hindu Moral Ideals*
Srinivasa Iyengar	*Problems of Democracy in India*
Srinivasa Sastri, Rt. Hon. V. S.	*Rights and Duties of an Indian Citizen (Kamala Lectures)*
Woolf, Leonard	*Imperialism and Civilisation*

A NEW SOCIAL ORDER

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

The age in which we are living is an age of crisis. Major wars are being fought on three continents; and the other two continents have been drawn into the whirlpool. The whole world is in a chaotic condition. Economic and social conditions are not what they should be. Capital is pitted against labour, and the landlord against the peasant. Between the various social classes, racial groups, and religious communities there is not much love lost.

In these circumstances, it is no wonder that people are beginning to lose faith in the idea of progress altogether. They are no longer prepared to hail the "glorious achievements" of the industrial revolution or even of the French Revolution. The Darwinian theory of evolution which had fostered in their minds the belief that progress was inevitable, that it was in the very nature of things, is undergoing serious modification. A spirit of profound discontent and disillusionment prevails everywhere.

In the field of government, liberalism and democracy have received rude shocks. The absolute authority of the State in all its ugliness has come to be regarded in some quarters as the only way of saving the national soul of a people. In the religious field, that social sense which was so much a part of mediæval Christendom has become considerably weakened and religion has been increasingly divorced from life. The evil has spread so fast that the Pope and certain Continental theologians are now turning their attention to a consideration of the responsibility of the Christian to the social and political conditions around him.

Just at present, placed as we are in the midst of a terrible World War, our thoughts naturally turn to the world order which is to follow it. The last war gave us such ideas as the "self determinations of nations" and " a world safe for democracy " and such institutions as mandates. But none of them during the interlude of twenty years which followed the Treaty of Versailles turned out to be an unmixed blessing. At the close of the last war a considerable part of Europe was cut up into small states in order to accommodate the ambition of new nationalities or to undo the acts of injustice committed in previous wars. All this, however, has been upset again by Germany in the course of the present war.

Even in his own life time, Woodrow Wilson, the author of the famous phrase, " a world safe for democracy ", was brought to a realisation of the fact that, instead of the world being made safe for democracy, democracy may have to be made safe for the world. Since the present war commenced in September 1939, almost every day we have heard statesmen and politicians paying glorious tributes to democracy, although they seldom stop to consider whether the democracy of their dream is to be found anywhere in actual practice.

Much was expected of the Mandatory system when it was first instituted. It was thought that all economic exploitation of defenceless people would soon cease and that the excesses of imperialism would come to an end. But the history of the mandates has gone to show that in many cases the Powers to whom the mandatory authority was given proceeded to treat their wards as their sole possessions for economic and political purposes.

In saying all this we do not mean to suggest that the years following the Great War of 1914-18 have not made any contribution whatever towards the creation of a better social order. What we do suggest is that the gulf between profession and actual practice has indeed been great.

The present war will come to an end sooner or later. What is to be the outcome of it and what kind of a world order are we likely to have? The answer to these questions depends partly upon the Power or set of Powers who are going to win the war. If it is won by Germany and her satellites, it is probable that there will be ruthless exploitation of helpless nationalities—particularly of the colonial races—and the creation of some kind of an economic union of Europe in which European economy will revolve round the German sun.

If Great Britain and her allies win, it is more than likely that Germany will be so crippled politically and militarily that she will not be able to repeat the secret rearmament programme of the last ten years, working out in minute detail the wanton ruin and destruction that she has brought to country after country. In this connection it must be said that what is needed in the interest of the future peace of the world is not the mere military defeat of Germany. That by itself will not bring about a new social order, any more than it did in 1918 when Germany was obliged to lay down her arms and sue for peace.

The progress of the war during the past two years has brought about new and unexpected alignments. On the one hand, we have an alliance between the British Empire, the U. S. A., Russia, and China, who, despite their varying interpretations of liberty, democracy, and self-determination, cling to these ideals as the life breath of their nostrils. On the other hand, we have Germany, Italy, and Japan standing for the curtailment of the liberty of the individual, the cramping of personality, the glorification of the State, and military aggression. Although the issues between the two sets of Powers seem clear-cut, yet they are not as clear as might appear at the outset. Great Britain and Russia are necessarily strange bedfellows and one may question whether they will hold together and actively co-operate with each other when the present crisis is over. Yet the future well-being of the world demands that they should remain bedfellows, working

out a synthesis between the two opposing systems of social and political philosophy which have animated them in the past. We need the yoking together of the vigorous individualism of Great Britain and the U. S. A. and the collectivism of Russia, each modifying and strengthening the other. When we turn our attention to the Totalitarian States, especially to Germany and Italy, we find that they stand for the majesty of the State, but this conception is so used as to make the common man, the worker and the peasant, a tool in the hands of militarists and those who run the governmental machinery. The so-called socialistic trends of Fascism and Nazism are only a smokescreen for the vaulting ambitions of individuals and parties drunk with power.

One of the most vital questions relating to the post-war world is, what is to happen to countries like India? Even now when the war is in progress, it is essential to know what Great Britain and her allies are thinking on the question. Great Britain has been blowing hot and cold, being unable to reconcile considerations of expediency with the claims of justice and righteousness. Ever since he came into power, Mr. Churchill, the Prime Minister, has been observing a studied silence; and, when at long last he decided to break it, it was to declare that the much-advertised "Atlantic Charter", recognising among other things "the right of all peoples to choose the form of Government under which they will live" did not apply to India. Sometime earlier, the Duke of Devonshire, the Under-Secretary of State for India, proclaimed that the administration of India in the future was to be in India, by India, and for India. But no sooner did he say that than Mr. Amery, his chief, came forward to throw the wet blanket on any ardent hopes that one might be tempted to build on the declaration of his assistant.

The new social order which we contemplate is one which would apply equally to all the countries of the world, to the European countries as well as to the enslaved colonial countries. Any order which seeks to perpetuate the domination of

more than half the world by the remainder stands self-condemned. It cannot stand justification either at the bar of justice or on grounds of expediency. Abraham Lincoln's remark that one cannot keep a man in the ditch without himself staying there to keep him down applies as much to the relations between the dominant and the subject nations of the world as between masters and slaves.

For years before the commencement of the present war, Hitler carried on a vigorous propaganda for the restoration of the former German colonies to the Reich. He was insistent that the "stolen property" should be returned. But neither he nor even the staunchest of his critics stopped to consider the claims of those from whom the original theft had taken place! In recent years and months, Japan has been conducting a systematic campaign for the recognition of her influence in Asia and Australia, which is a polite way of asserting her right to carry on a ruthless economic exploitation of these territories. The new social order of our dream has no place whatever for exploiters and the exploited. It is an order which aims at the maximum possible justice to every nation and to every people.

The basis of such an order is idealism of the highest sort, an idealism which may be defined as "faith in the power of ideas and ideals". While in the name of idealism a great many iniquities have been committed in the past, we believe that it is the duty of every right-minded person to restore it to the high place which it deserves. Idealism is in accordance with the Scriptural teaching: "Where there is no vision the people perish". Of Russian Communism a recent writer has said that it has given the people of Russia "a faith to live by and a cause to die for". Such faith and such single-minded attachment to a cause should characterise every person who believes in an ideal like the Kingdom of God. The idealist should take care that while his head soars high in the realm of ideas and ideals, his feet stand on solid ground. He should avoid both one-sided realism and one-sided idealism—a one-

sided realism which does not look beyond the tip of one's own nose and a one-sided idealism which ends in frothy sentimentalism. Realism without idealism is empty and has no foundation. Idealism without realism has no superstructure. True idealism means the acceptance of reality coupled with vision. Senor Salvador de Madariaga is right when he says : " Idealism is the tendency inherent in man to rise. The men of our age must be idealists, but that does not mean that they should not be realists. An idea which has no reality is not an idea but a fancy. Their effort upwards will take for its fulcrum the solid earth of reality."

The ideal social order contemplated by the Christian is embodied in the conception of the Kingdom of God as taught by Jesus Christ in St. Luke, Ch. 4 : 17-19. This ideal, the Christian realises, involves a continual process and is, therefore, not something which can be attained fully within any reasonable length of time. It is a dynamic, and not a static, ideal. It places before man a moving goal. It is not an ideal suitable for " the perfect man in a perfect society " contemplated by Herbert Spencer, but an ideal which will help us to realise a better social order than the one which we have at present, an order in which the glaring evils of our present-day society will be removed and which will give ample scope for the development of the personality of every individual. The keywords of such an order are Bread, Brotherhood, Freedom, and Justice.

A question which troubles the religious-minded person, and particularly the Christian, is whether such an order can be conceived apart from and without reference to religion, God or Christ. He is aware of the fact that even those who have no faith in God or religion have been passionately devoted to the cause of a better social order, actuated by their innate humanity, commonsense, and reason. What the Christian contends is that the highest fulfilment of such an ideal is

* *The World's Design. p. 6.*

possible only with the help of the Living Christ who came into the world and sacrificed himself fully in order that we might have life and have it more abundantly. In the last analysis, an ideal social order is the same as a Christian social order.

The Christian in every generation is called upon to work out the implications of his belief in the Kingdom of God in terms of the conditions around him; and inasmuch as these conditions naturally concern all human beings, he should be willing to work for the best social order even with those who do not share his belief.

As Christians, we deplore any attempt to divorce individual salvation from social salvation and to make Christianity a purely transcendental faith. In saying this, however, we gladly acknowledge the great debt which we owe to modern Continental theologians who, by their insistence on the transcendental nature of God, have recalled our attention to a sense of God's purpose, His power and justice. But we must at the same time be on our guard against the pendulum swinging clear over to the other extreme so that we may not swing from the secularised Christianity of our day to a form of escapism.

"The chief sins of our time", says a contemporary, "are not personal, but social". Even though we may not be prepared to go to the extent to which this writer goes, we are bound to say that the chief sins of our time are more social than personal. While in individual relations a good many observe a high standard of morality, in social relations consciences are not sufficiently awakened. Even the best of us exhibit a tribal mentality in dealing with questions pertaining to caste, class, community, race, and nation. The spirit of Machiavelli's *Prince* has been far too active in national and international politics, and the spirit of Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace, has been conspicuous by its absence. Everywhere in the world—particularly in the so-called advanced countries—social and moral progress lags far behind material progress.

It is our conviction that individual and social salvation are necessary to each other and that one is incomplete without the other. The Christian has a definite responsibility in bringing about a better social order and has no right to wait for it as though it would come down from heaven. It is a mere travesty of Christianity to describe it exclusively in terms of personal salvation. Individual regeneration and social passion should march together simultaneously. Kagawa is right when he asserts: "Until even the Stock Exchange is filled to saturation with God, there is little hope for genuine salvation". Sir Richard Acland claims that we want a new morality. "We have failed because of our selfishness, and we need a new standard of morality."

CHAPTER II

ECONOMIC JUSTICE

One of the prime requisites of the new social order of our dream is adequate bread for everybody. It is futile to laugh at this conception saying that it sounds too mundane. Augustus Comte has well said: "The noble things of life rest on the less noble." It goes without saying that even for the realisation of spiritual values we require a certain amount of material basis. A sadhu or sanyasi does not live on air alone. Like others, he too requires food and water.

According to many competent thinkers, the fault of the economic system under which we live to-day known as industrialism or capitalism is that it is not a system at all, but chaos. It is not an order, but disorder and confusion. It has grown without any preconceived plan or well-thought-out theory. It is the outcome of the industrial revolution of the eighteenth century, and has spread all over the world. It has spread even in India in spite of the joint-family system which provides some sort of family socialism.

Despite the claim of Prof. Hearnshaw that there is no such thing as the capitalist system and that the socialists have imagined it, we have no hesitation in saying that the system does exist and that it is inadequate to meet the social and economic needs of our time. We fully believe that, incapable as it is for bringing about all-round good to everybody, it should be replaced by something more adequate in the direction of collectivism. The chief features of the present system are private property, free competition, and individual enterprise, and every one of these, it is claimed, is necessary to bring out the best in every man. In actual practice, however, we find that capitalism has led to gross abuses. Instead of creating individualities it has created non-entities.

One of the most outstanding defects of capitalism is that it means utter poverty in the midst of plenty. The present system is characterised by over-production on the one side and under-consumption on the other because of gross mal-distribution. In an age of plenty, millions are actually starving or are on the verge of starvation. It is the story of Midas on a world scale. Whatever the machine touches is turned into gold. But the poor man, the peasant, and the day labourer have no way of getting anywhere near it. In the United States of America which has hoarded more than 50 p.c. of the gold of the world, we are reliably informed that 1 p.c. of the receivers of income obtain 20 p.c. of the national income, 10 p.c. receive 40 p.c. of the total income, while the poorest 25 p.c. receive only 3½ p.c.

Quoting from Colin Clark, Sir Richard Acland observes that in 1934, 1½ p.c. of the people of England drew 25 p.c. of the national income, 8½ p.c. drew the next 25 p.c. of the income, while the remaining 90 p.c. of the people had to be content to live on only 50 p.c. of the income. It is significant that these figures for 1934 were definitely worse than the figures for 1913.

When we turn to India, the first thing that strikes even the casual observer is the economic inequality and the poverty of the people. The country itself is rich in its resources, but the people are terribly poor. India is a land of princely glory and peasant poverty. According to the calculations made by Dr. P. M. Titus, 5 p.c. of the population in India own 35 p.c. of the wealth ; another 35 p.c. own 35 p.c. of the wealth, and the remaining 60 p.c. of the people enjoy among them 30 p.c. of the wealth. The average per capita income in India, says the same authority, is estimated at Rs. 67.5 per annum, or £ 5, as against that of the United Kingdom which is £ 76 and of the U.S.A. which is £ 142. No lover of mankind can look with complacency at the 2½ or 3 annas a day which constitutes the average income of an Indian. It has been estimated that the cost of maintaining an Indian prisoner in jail on the coarsest of diets is 2½ times the average earning of the agri-

culturist. It has further been calculated that 30 to 40 million people in India have only one meal a day.

One can give most learned reasons why people are poor. But explanation is not the same as justification. No sound social order can tolerate abject poverty. While people are starving in most parts of the world, it seems absurd to burn tons of wheat and coffee or dump waggon loads of apples and milk into the river, as is periodically done in some of the advanced countries of the world. Human values should take precedence over material gains.

A second reason for condemning the present system is the iniquitous part played in it by monopoly capital.[1] One of the justifications frequently advanced in favour of capitalism is that it is based upon free competition, which is supposed to enable every man to find his proper level in the economic world. In actual practice, however, what we find is that free-competition in the highly industrialised society of to-day does not remain "free" very long. It soon becomes closed. Capital passes from the hands of private individuals into joint-stock companies, and the result is an infinitely worse state of affairs. It is estimated that in the U.S.A. 200 large corporations control between them 50 p.c. of the total corporate wealth of that country. By 1950 it is expected that they will control 70 p.c. In olden days, property consisted wholly of definite, tangible things such as sea-shells, skulls and other such war trophies, cattle, sheep, wives and children. To-day is has become incorporeal or impersonal. It often takes the form of stocks and shares. While in the earlier days owners controlled things and were responsible for them, to-day ownership of property, as is well pointed out by Ramsay Muir, is divorced from responsibility[2] It was not unusual till lately to find bishops and clergy who are supposed to set a

1. Arguments summarised from a recent article by Ramsay Muir.

2. The operation of the quota system of controlling production in India in the case of tea, rubber and coffee recently and the amount of trading in quotas that is in vogue are cases in point. It often happens that a quota holder is not even a producer.

high moral and spiritual standard to their flock investing their money in armament factories and liquor interests. In modern society the individual in many cases does not know how his money is invested. The control by share holders is a fiction. The Directors in effect elect themselves. It is true that the joint-stock company system of to-day has made possible the gigantic achievements of modern industry. But it leads to gross over-capitalisation. Joint-stock companies are usually under a single, powerful and masterful personality and are controlled by *financial* rather than *industrial* aims. They aim at monopoly or at least the substance of monopoly by organising price rings or agreements. The outcome of all this is that a new class has come into existence comparable to the feudal class of independent barons. This is the class of directors, and the tyranny which they exercise, in the words of R. Muir, may be called the tyranny of directors. The common labourer under this system becomes a wage-slave. The second Labour Government under the late Mr. Ramsay Macdonald was brought to its knees by the "sit down strike" of bankers.

A third reason for believing that the present system requires radical change is that it leads to conspicuous waste, extravagance, luxury, and show. Reference has already been made to the burning of wheat and coffee and the dumping into rivers of milk and apples in order to keep up prices. Under the New Deal in the U.S.A. American farmers have been paid by the Government for the pigs which they did not produce. Glenor B. Winship (quoted in *World's Work*, May 1932, p. 27) says that a survey of the petrol filling stations in the U.S.A. led to the conclusion that one billion dollars were invested in 'superfluous' filling stations numbering 111,594. These useless stations and other duplication of equipment in the petroleum industry were estimated to cost motorists two cents for every gallon of petrol purchased.

The amount of money spent on advertisement is criminal. The late Professor T. N. Carver of Harvard University used to say that next to prohibition he would like to put down

advertisement by the force of the State. In the industrial society of to-day advertisement excels anything that one knows in the gentle art of telling lies. The manufacturers of a certain brand of soap claim, with what justice one does not know, that it gives the user "a schoolgirl complexion." The manufacturers of another brand give the important news that "it floats". The prevailing attitude in modern society, both among men and women, is, "I must go one better than Mrs. Jones". A telling argument which the delegate from New Zealand used some years ago at a conference for the opening of an air route between Britain and his country was: "Surely there are many ladies in New Zealand who will be able and willing to pay £20 extra per dress in order to be three weeks ahead of other ladies in fashion."

In defence of the capitalist society of to-day it is often said that some of its inherent defects and shortcomings are being corrected or limited by an application of the law of equal opportunity. This is the line of argument developed at length by Mr. Herbert Hoover, a former President of the U.S.A., in his defence of American individualism. Undoubtedly there is some truth in this argument but taken by and large in the world as a whole it is not true. "Open road to talent" is found more in its breach than in its observance. In a great many cases it is only a pious phrase. Some people are born with the proverbial silver spoon in their mouths, while a great many are born not even with a wooden spoon or a spoon made out of cocoanut shell. A good many people start life with a heavy handicap, not only natural but also artificial. Even in such a simple matter as education there are no equal opportunities. Admission to certain educational institutions is determined more by the income, social status, and political influence of the parents than by the ability of the children. When different candidates compete for a job it is not the most deserving who always succeeds. Extraneous considerations often play a prominent part. We who live in India know it only too well. Opportunity is often a matter of parental circumstance.

A new social order should rigorously enforce the law of equal opportunity. It should provide educational facilities to all who can benefit by them, enact minimum wage laws, and equalise economic differences by progressive systems of taxation. "To rob Peter and pay Paul" is not as unjust as it appears so long as it is done in a constitutional manner, for there is no way by which we can induce large numbers of people to part with their property voluntarily. Property, we all know, is much better defended than life itself. In the words of Machiavelli, man sooner forgets the loss of his father than the loss of his patrimony.

A further criticism of the present economic system is that it necessitates colonial expansion, imperial aggrandisement, and ruthless warfare. One does not need to be a Marxist to accept this line of argument. Practically every major war in modern times has been fought for economic reasons. Wars for the genuine liberation of mankind are few and far between. Imperialism in many cases means the acquisition of territory or the carving out of "spheres of influence" by the sword or by palaver or by both for the extraction of raw materials on the most advantageous terms possible, for the dumping of surplus goods, for the investment of surplus capital, for the colonisation of surplus population, and for the utilisation of the services of men of ability and adventure in industry, commerce, administration, and defence. All this means periodical warfare and unsettlement, each crisis becoming worse than the previous one. The world has yet to learn the truth that economic imperialism, as practised to-day, is a fruitful cause of warfare. Countries under the heel of imperialism naturally want to throw off the foreign yoke as speedily as possible. The imperialist countries want to cling to their possessions as long as they can. Countries which are denied a share in the imperialist exploitation secretly arm themselves, foment trouble here and there, and bring about serious international situations which they believe they can utilise to their own advantage.

One further criticism of the institution of private property is that it places an undue strain upon a person's nerves. Meaning as it does individual striving, more often by foul than by fair means, it drains a man of all his mental and moral resources. Half of one's life time is spent in equipping oneself for work and obtaining employment and the other half is spent in keeping it secure. For vast masses of people there is no joy of work or opportunity for the expression of the creative impulse. The spectre of poverty, of unemployment and insecurity, and of old age looms large in the thinking of a great many. Questions which often worry a man in his middle age are: How am I going to give my children the best possible education? What shall I do if sudden illness or some other calamity overtakes me or the members of my family? What will happen to me if I do not kotow to the superintendent of my office, to the headmaster or principal, to the member of my church committee or, very often, to his wife? What guarantee is there that old age or incapacity for work will not find me stranded in the street, begging for my daily bread? All this, it goes without saying, causes tension of the worst sort, care, worry, nervous derangement, and inability to apply oneself whole-heartedly to one's work. An old English proverb says "Care kills the cat"—and that in spite of the cat being said to have nine lives. How much more is this true as regards man who excels every other animal in the world in the matter of worry.

Summing up the defects of the present economic system, in the words of Julius Hecker, we must say that it is unable to provide economic security, national security, and freedom for self-expression. Its root is selfishness and its sum and substance is exploitation. It, therefore, needs to be replaced by some other system which can give us a greater amount of bread, brotherhood, freedom, and justice.

It is a significant sign of the times that the Pope at Rome and other dignitaries of the Christian Church are giving their close attention to the question of economic and social justice.

In a recent statement on the conditions necessary for world peace, the Pope laid down five important points. These are :

(1) The right of all nations to independent existence,

(2) Disarmament,

(3) Some judicial institution to guarantee and, when necessary, revise and correct international agreements,

(4) Peoples and rulers to recognise the just demands of nations, populations and minorities, and

(5) Peoples and rulers to be guided by universal love.

To these five points have been added five further points by the Heads of the Anglican, Roman Catholic, and Free Churches in Britain. These are :

(1) Abolition of extreme inequality of wealth,

(2) Provision of equal educational opportunities for every child,

(3) Safeguarding of the family as a social unit,

(4) Restoration of the sense of divine vocation to man's daily work, and

(5) Utilisation of the resources of the earth for the benefit of the whole human race.

Turning from ecclesiastical writers to laymen, we find that progressive thinkers everywhere are asking the question whether conscription of property, if justifiable during war time, cannot be justified in peace time too. No doubt attempts are being made everywhere to mitigate the condition of the poor by such means as minimum wage laws, progressive income tax, and graduated inheritance tax. In spite of it all, we are faced with poverty, unemployment, underemployment, and misemployment. Many of the defects of individualism are inherent in the system itself, such as monopoly capital, wage slavery, business crises, trade cycles, chronic unemployment, colonial expansion, and war ; and no amount of tinkering with them will accomplish the desired results. What we require

most urgently to-day is a scheme of national planning which will form a part and parcel of world planning. The capitalist order of society, as we know it to-day, is not capable of fitting itself into such a scheme of national and world planning.

COLLECTIVE OWNERSHIP

Progressive thinking to-day is in the direction of common ownership, and the world is painfully groping towards it. For some years now there has been a definite reaction against capitalism in favour of some form of the collectivist ideal. It may be that the very novelty of this new idea is attractive to some people ; and when the novelty is worn off, after a few years of experimentation, it may cease to enjoy its present popularity. Whatever may happen in the future, we have witnessed in our own time the phenomenal growth of socialistic ideas, finding their extreme expression in Russian communism. No one doubts that the Russian Revolution was a world-shaking event similar to the French Revolution. If the latter was an open challenge to feudalism by the progressive forces embodied in the ***bourgeois*** class, the former was a direct challenge to capitalism. Since the days of the Russian Revolution, the clash between capital and labour has become more pronounced. Whatever we may think of this Revolution, it has given us the key to the understanding of a great deal that has happened during the last twenty years following the World War of 1914-18.

One of the immediate results of the Revolution was to rouse the fear of capitalistic nations which banded themselves together in order to crush Bolshevism. Counter-revolutionary movements such as Fascism and Nazism came into being, financed in their early days by the ***bourgeoisie*** elements of the capitalist countries in their hope that these new movements could be used as a tool in destroying communism. But in the realisation of this hope they did not succeed to any marked degree. All that they succeeded in doing was to increase the dissatisfaction of both the employer and labouring classes with

liberal democracy—the one because it did not give it sufficient control over labour and the other because political equality did not find expression in economic equality. To solve this difficulty, the Fascists and Nazis have put forward the specious argument that the State represents equally the interests of capital and labour and that, in sacrificing oneself for it, one advances one's own true interests.

Whether we agree with the foregoing analysis or not, there can be little doubt that modern society is caught between a dying capitalism and a youthful socialism. Sir Richard Acland argues that the world of the future belongs to common ownership and that only under common ownership can we abolish class distinction, unemployment, inequality, and strife. According to the same authority, under common ownership the Russians have increased their industrial production between 1913 and 1938 by 800 p.c., while Britain, France, and America under private ownership have increased theirs by less than 50 p.c.. Increase in the standard of living could have been higher if it were not for the heavy military programme.

The moment the word socialism is mentioned, people often imagine for themselves a devil or a many-headed hydra. There is no reason whatever for such fear. Particular forms of socialism may be wrong, but the spirit of socialism is right and the world should not willingly let it die. Socialism in its wider implications stands for social justice and the equalisation of opportunities.

Communism is much more extreme than socialism and is more drastic in the methods which it advocates. While socialism is on the whole evolutionary, communism is generally revolutionary. The goal which it places before itself is "From each according to his ability and to each according to his need". It is interesting to note that this ideal was first discovered not by the communists but by early Christian thinkers in the second century A.D.

In spite of the vigorous propaganda against socialism and communism, these movements are attracting much attention to-day. It is symptomatic of the times that Sir Richard Acland, a Liberal M.P., is advocating a programme of reconstruction for Great Britain which is practically socialistic. The chief reason for this changed outlook is the chaos which characterises the present system, meaning as it does insecurity, want, rivalry, cut-throat competition, planless production, exploitation, and war. It is hoped that under a system of common ownership all these evils will be removed. There will be effective national planning which will be an integral part of world planning.

The goal which we posit for ourselves from the point of view of a new social order is an idealistic foundation with a collectivist superstructure. There is no necessary contradiction between collectivism and Christianity. If Christianity and socialism are to make their full contribution to the civilisation of mankind, it is necessary to socialise Christianity and Christianise socialism.

Several objections are raised to schemes of common ownership. The chief of these is that common ownership will deprive the individual of the motive for production. This no doubt happened in the case of farmers in Soviet Russia on such a wide scale that certain concessions had to be made in the direction of private property. It is a common observation that most people work because of the realisation of the fact that only by the sweat of their brow can they earn a living. It is the fear of starvation and of insecurity which induces many a man to keep his back to the wheel. When he is assured of a living, he is apt to become lazy and indolent, disinclined to put forth all his energies. The result of all this, it is claimed, is that we shall have a fellowship in poverty. Production will suffer both as regards quantity and quality.

This is no doubt an effective argument, especially when we look at men as they are. But the new social order which

we contemplate believes that we can re-make human nature, especially when people are young and pliable, by constantly appealing to such factors as honour, prestige, the satisfaction of rendering public duty, and professional pride. What the objection under consideration really shows is that by merely changing over from capitalism to collectivism we shall not bring about a new heaven and a new earth all at once. The change desired can be brought about only slowly and by painful means, making liberal use of the moral and religious idealism in the breast of every man.

Another objection to schemes of collective ownership is that they are likely to mean an undue multiplication of State authority. Common ownership, it is contended, means authoritarianism and the crushing of the individual soul. Under it there will be no opportunity for the expression of individual personality and no haven will be left for individual freedom. Instead of an aristocracy of birth, wealth or ability, there will be an aristocracy of power; and those who ascend to places of authority will not be the high-souled ones, but the most unscrupulous individuals who revel in being able to exercise authority over others. We shall be at the mercy of the wire pullers and self-seekers and there will be established an "aristocracy of blackguards."

Here again we are constrained to admit the force of the criticism. The regime set up by Stalin has been as ruthless and all-pervasive as that set up by the Tsar in its authoritarian aspect. Enough attention has not been paid in the modern world to the training of leaders who, while taking the initiative, will at the same time remain humble, pure, and undefiled, and reflect the general will of the people. While for every other profession we require thorough training and even a period of apprenticeship, we have required little or no training for the political career. Unless we can place men of sterling character and genuine ability at the helm of the State, mere change in the economic organisation can be of little avail.

A third objection to schemes of common ownership is that they cannot be brought about in a peaceful manner. They involve bloodshed and revolution. This is particularly true as regards Soviet Russia where, in spite of nearly twenty-five years of people's rule, those in governmental authority have to depend upon force, secret police, and periodical purges for the carrying out of their will.

Man is so attached to private property that in most cases he is prepared to fight to the last ditch in defending it. Schemes of government compensation and annuity do not appeal to him. Acland, however, believes that far-reaching changes in the direction of common ownership can be brought about in England now when the country is engaged in an unprecedented life and death struggle. He considers the present time to be the most opportune for effecting the desired change.

Compulsion of some kind or another seems necessary in every form of social organisation. When such is the case, it is a question whether, when every other means fails, we may not have to use a certain amount of compulsion and whether in certain circumstances at least it may not be the lesser of two evils.

In using this argument, one must remember the lesson of history that force always begets force. When force is used in getting rid of the present property owners, it will leave a legacy of hatred and sooner or later there is bound to be a counter-revolution. In liquidating the capitalist and middle classes, Soviet Russia has made violence and bloodshed permanent elements of its armoury. There is no such thing as violence during the transitional period alone.

In reply to this argument it must be confessed that it looks as though the new social order cannot be brought about except by force. But this argument does not take into account the vast changes that can be effected in people's habits and attitudes by proper education, by moral persuasion and teaching,

by religious appeal, and by gradual changes in the present economic system calculated to wean men away from their adherence to private property. Nobody to-day objects to the State providing free education, free medical and health facilities, free parks, etc. and what the future requires is an extension of these practices on a gigantic scale.

Besides, when we discuss the possibility of having to use coercion in bringing about the new social order, it is necessary to remember that the capitalistic system which it seeks to replace is not built on foundations of non-violence. It uses violence with a ruthlessness which will make Stalin ashamed of himself whenever any person or body of persons seeks to thwart its intentions. The City of London's influence, the international trade in arms, and the overthrowal of liberal governments in many countries of the world have essentially a background of force and violence.

A further objection to schemes of common ownership is that they are said to overemphasise the material needs of man almost to the exclusion of his moral and spiritual needs. Communism, in particular, is said to be anti-God and on the whole atheistic. Such critics forget that godliness among capitalists rarely gets beyond the stage of an ostentatious display of charity, public or private.

This argument does not seem to be a very strong one. The anti-God tendencies found in Russian communism in the early days were largely due to the decadent condition into which religion had fallen in pre-revolutionary Russia. Furthermore, it must be remembered that Russian communism is not the only form of communism. Even as regards Russia, in all fairness we must say that although the communist movement has been anti-religious in the sense of it being opposed to religion as a creed or dogma, it has had a definite religious spirit behind it—the religion of humanity and of human welfare. It need hardly be said that a religion which consists in the repetition of magic words and phrases and in the punc-

tilious performance of rites and ceremonies is not religion at all, but rank superstition. "To do justice, to love mercy and to walk humbly with one's God"—these constitute the essence of religion.*

When we turn from schemes of common ownership to modern capitalism, we cannot say that it is particularly marked by its spirituality or high moral standards.

We have no doubt whatever that under a system where wealth belongs to the community as a whole, where the legitimate needs of every one are satisfied, and where there is no fear of economic insecurity, evils such as theft, lying, covetousness, and jealousy will be at a low ebb. In giving expression to this belief, we do not mean to suggest that mere change in the economic structure can transform the inner life of man. As Christians we believe that character in the fullest sense of the term is possible only when there is an inner surrender of the heart to the claims of Christ and His Kingdom.

One further objection to collective ownership is the idealistic argument that private property is necessary for the expression of personality, and that it renders the invisible self of man visible. Private property, it is claimed, may be described as concrete immortality.

We are not sure whether in the new social order which we contemplate, the possession of private property is indispensable for the expression of the best in man. Even without private property one can express oneself in work well done. Work in the new social order should not only provide every man a living but also a life. It should become a finished piece of art. In the performing of it one should derive supreme joy and satisfaction. "If you want to see my monument look

* Since these lines were written, M. Maisky, the Russian Ambassador in London, has given facts and figures to prove that religion is no longer persecuted in Russia. Churches have increased, and worshippers have full access to them. Religious propaganda can be conducted with as much ease as anti-religious propaganda.

around.". Conversely, private property enjoyed under strict limitations is not an impossibility. Our motto should be the old Roman motto : " What was private was small ; and what was common was large."

Turning from an examination of the objections to schemes of common ownership to their positive contribution, it must be said that they all aim at planned production. What is produced by common effort will be enjoyed in common. Waste will be eliminated. There will be little or no exploitation of one's own countrymen or of foreigners. There will be no classes within society. All will belong to the class of producers. There will be no need for imperialism, colonial expansion, and war. Much of modern capitalistic business is not creative, particularly in India. Middlemen receive the largest share and increase the consumers' burden. Collective ownership is required for eliminating this, if for no other. This is the worst aspect of the exploitation of a weak country by a powerful one.

The keyword of the new state of affairs which we contemplate is nationalism within a system of world planning. Private property within limits, especially as regards consumers' goods, will be allowed even as Russia to-day allows private allotments of land within a system of collective farming. Producers' goods will be state-owned and state-controlled. Even in this sphere a certain amount of private property may be allowed if the owner does not employ outside labour. In order that the new system may not break down under its own weight, there will be as much of decentralised production as possible, consonant with efficiency.

The great merit of schemes of common ownership is that they will release a great fund of energy for purposes of social action. Man will lose some of his present-day liberty which includes the " freedom to starve ". Goods, instead of being produced for profit, will be produced for use. Social welfare will be the guiding principle. Instead of competition, there

will be co-operation. More and more people will work solely for the joy of work. In the words of J. Hecker, those who refuse to work will be as rare as children who refuse to play. Even the selfish will turn to productive activity because the selfishness and inactivity of one will have a reaction upon the whole community of which the selfish individual is a part. The motto will be " All for each and each for all."

In bringing to pass this new social order, religion, and particularly the Christian religion, can play a vital and vitalising part, instead of being a mere appendage of the State as it is at present. Christianity, we believe, has a revolutionary character. It should modify the environment of man as much as his desires, for both act and react upon each other. We can affect environment through desires and desires through environment. Christianity is not a quietist religion. It believes that a change of heart can bring about a change of environment and *vice versa*. Prof. Macmurray holds that communism is the heir to the Christian tradition. The two, he believes, are relevant to each other.

For ourselves, we believe that Christianity can take over communism and baptise it in the name of Christ. If this is to be done without Christianity losing its meaning and relevance, it is necessary to insist that communism should bid adieu to class war, world revolution, blatant atheism and the materialistic interpretation of history, and preserve the family based upon permanent monogamous relations. It is reassuring to be told that a new moral sense about marriage has now come into existence in Russia.

ALTERNATIVE SCHEMES

The Corporative State. Fascism through its Corporative State claims to offer an alternative to individualism on the one side and socialism and communism on the other. The Fascist propaganda has done much to advertise the merits of the Corporative State. Its organisation and working, however, are still a mystery. Outwardly, it gives the impression that it has

something to do with planning and that it is based on a collectivist rather than an individualist conception. But really it is not so. It still rests upon private enterprise. Industry is looked upon as something which concerns not only the employers and the employees, but also the consuming public. Therefore, the three parties represented on all matters relating to industry are government, capital, and labour. Prices are fixed and profiteering is limited. Yet the scales are on the whole weighted against labour. Strikes are forbidden. Compulsory arbitration is imposed for all labour disputes. Fascist Labour Tribunals are given power to punish strikers.

Prof. Ernest Barker [1] argues that the Italian Corporative State is not really corporate. It does not possess a 'legal personality'. It is not an institution of private law, but a 'public law' organ of the administration of the State. In Prof. Barker's own words : " It is a State-created and State-controlled union of the Trade Unions (or 'syndicates') of employers and employed, in some determinate branch of production, industrial or agricultural." [2] Only one trade union is legally recognised in any branch of industry, and the condition of recognition is its avowed sympathy with the Fascist regime. All the workers in the branch have to pay their subscription to it and are bound by the collective contracts which it makes. The officials are not Trade Union men, but are from the professional middle classes—mostly lawyers. Unrecognised Trade Unions may exist, but they are of no importance. " They are merely mutual benefit societies ".

Employers also have their Trade Unions. " The working class groups are depressed groups in comparison with the groups to which they are married." The whip hand is with the Fascist State. Each corporation is presided over by an officer of the State—a Minister or an Under-Secretary or Secretary of the Fascist Party. It is he who draws up tariffs, rates,

1. * For the material in this and the following paragraph, I am indebted to E. Barker's *Citizen's Choice*: Chapter on Corporative State.

2. The *Citizen's Choice*.

remuneration of services, etc. Thus the Italian corporative order smacks too much of bureaucracy.

Because of all this, Fascism is described by some writers as the last ditch of capitalism. It is the outcome of a frightened middle class. Miss Wilkinson says that the planning of Fascism is along the lines of least resistance. It is used as an instrument of big business. It is planning with the consent of the capitalist.

Those who see the advantages of the principle underlying corporation, viz. collaboration between capital and labour, but do not approve of the methods of the corporative state in Italy, advocate the conception of a corporative society where all principal occupations will be organised on the guild basis. Each industry and occupation will become practically self-governing, regulating all its affairs, the State acting only as an umpire. While this scheme sounds attractive in theory, it has to face several practical difficulties. It is not clear what are the essential occupations which should be recognised for purposes of political representation and in the general interests of society. Neither is it clear that a system like this will not encourage fissiparous tendencies, eventually leading to the atomisation of society.

Co-operation. Some writers advocate co-operation as an alternative to both capitalism and collectivism. Without going into the details of the scheme, we may say that co-operative methods of production and distribution can go a long way in improving present-day economic conditions. The Russian experiment of collective farming with individual allotments may be adopted for India, even without accepting the communist theory. In war-stricken China to-day industrial co-operatives organised by Rewi Alley are rendering yeoman service in meeting the industrial and military needs of China, and at the same time in providing work for thousands of people turned adrift by Japanese bombing. Similarly, the co-operative methods of

distribution, through the co-operative store, with its principle of dividend on purchases can help to eliminate the middleman. The chief merit of co-operation is that the opportunity for exploitation is kept at a minimum. Nevertheless it is planning within the capitalist framework. It does not make for a radical reconstruction of society.

Distributivism. Some believe that Distributivism contains the key to the eternal problem of economic justice. According to Mr. Hilaire Belloc who is a keen advocate of it, landlordism should be replaced by peasant proprietorship and capitalism by small scale ownership of property. How this new state of affairs is to be brought about and maintained, Mr. Belloc does not make clear. He wants "co-operative guilds" which will place restraints upon the return of capitalism and landlordism. But this kind of check is not likely to be very effective. In wanting to make everybody a property owner within limits and placing restrictions upon large-scale ownership, distributivism places a laudable ideal before us; but it does not say how we are to accomplish it. The encouragement of savings, the rendering of vast social services by the State, and the raising of as many people as possible to the ranks of the middle class, while admirable in their own way, are not enough to solve the problem of mass poverty and want. These remedies have been found possible in England, because of her vast Empire, but not every country possesses such an amazing reservoir of potential wealth.

THE GANDHIAN ECONOMY

In our own country an economic programme which has been advocated in recent years is the revival of village industries. This scheme which has a definite philosophy behind it claims to be an extension of the principle of non-violence to man's economic life. It is offered as an alternative to both capitalism and communism, both of which imply violence within the nation as well as with the outside world. Capitalism rests on private profit motive and is essentially

selfish. Communism does away with profit motive, but people are to be driven to work by the whip of the State. The philosophy of the village movement assumes that the vast bulk of mankind will not work honestly for the sake of social good, honour, status, or love of work for itself. It, therefore, wants to preserve the private profit motive in a decentralised economic order in which the opportunity for the exploitation of others will be eliminated. Communism, it argues, means centralised mammoth production, with little or no scope for private profit or for individual expression. It is not impressed with the argument that under communism there will be ample scope for leisure, for, according to it, man develops himself through his work more than through his leisure. It argues that, in the modern industrial society, leisure for most people is purposeless and that, in the very nature of the case, it cannot be organised. Communism, it contends, is unable to provide all-absorbing work to most people.

It, therefore, seeks a ***via media*** between profit motive which characterises capitalism and social control which characterises communism. It believes that both of them have elements of value which need to be conserved. It wants production to be in the hands of individuals who own what they produce. Such decentralised production has no room for millionaires or even for middlemen. Goods are to be produced for local consumption by each village or each natural group of villages out of commodities which are easily available locally. Surplus produce may be exchanged with other groups or even with other countries on a just and co-operative basis.

The village industries philosophy has no objection to machinery so long as it is harnessed to the promotion of human values, but it has a general prejudice against it because of the abuses to which it has led in the past. It favours the nationalisation of heavy industries and public utility services such as railways, the motor car industry,

electric power, and mines. It is opposed, however, to extreme specialisation because it believes in enabling the individual to do all the processes of his work, thereby educating himself and developing his personality. Poverty is to be abolished by removing all opportunities for exploitation.

The key words of this movement are decentralisation in production and swadeshi in consumption. In favour of it, it is claimed that while retaining the private profit motive within limits, opportunities for exploitation and violence are avoided at the same time. The remedy suggested for all our economic ills is the introduction of small-scale industries, arts and crafts all over the country, using the legislature to prevent small-scale industries transforming themselves into large-scale industries accompanied by the concomitant evil of exploitation. Some of the industries which have already been given a new life are hand spinning and weaving, paper and gur making (sugar from palm juice), oil pressing, paddy husking, and tanning.

This system of decentralised production, it is said, is in accordance with the Indian genius. Hindu worship is individualistic and decentralised, and so was Hindu political administration. It is, therefore, argued that Indian industry too should be decentralised. "It is only through decentralised production that it is possible to promote peace amongst nations and the welfare of mankind."

Our immediate reaction to this way of solving our economic difficulties is that as a partial solution, in the peculiar circumstances in which India is placed to-day, it is a satisfactory one. But it is not satisfactory either as a complete or permanent solution. Just because machinery and large-scale production have been abused in the past, it does not follow that they should be destroyed altogether. It is possible to use them under a collectivist society in such a manner as to promote human values and at the same time serve the interests of society. Human nature being what it is, it is not possible

to persuade large masses of human beings to revert to a life of archaic simplicity or to spin their own yarn everyday of their lives. Exploitation of one man by another must be stopped altogether. But this does not mean the running away from machinery and machine civilisation altogether.

The assumption that men will not work unless there be private profit is to take too low a view of human nature, especially on the part of Gandhian economy which, in other respects, appeals to the highest in man. If men could be persuaded to give up all, and even life itself for the sake of truth, justice, and national honour, could they not be persuaded to work for the sake of a much larger good than mere private profit? The greatest merit of socialism and communism is that they believe that we can appeal to higher motives than to private profit motive —to such a motive as that of good citizenship.

Gandhian economy places undue emphasis upon decentralisation. What we want is the development of schemes of centralisation and of decentralisation *pari passu*. A study of industrial methods shows that a great many things can be produced economically only on a centralised basis; and what we are justified in insisting upon is that the profit in every case should go to the community at large. Besides, decentralised production is bound to be limited both in range and variety. A great many advantages can be obtained from large scale production. There is no reason why we should object to the gloss and beauty of machine-made goods.

Hand-made goods consume more time and energy than machine-made goods and cannot, perhaps, be produced cheaply. Gandhian economy can work well at present when vast masses of people are unemployed or underemployed, but is not likely to work so well for all time to come. It is likely to arrest Indian economic development and keep things at a primitive level. It is not in keeping with the present tempo of the world which is all in the direction of world planning and

world government. The village industries movement is likely to make international trade and commerce and international intercourse difficult, if not impossible. The most urgent need of the world to-day, both in the economic and political spheres, is some form of world planning of which national planning is an intrinsic part.

Furthermore, in placing much emphasis on every individual going through the different processes of work for the sake of his intellectual and moral development, the Gandhian economy forgets that a good many people do not have the intellectual curiosity, ability or alertness to examine for themselves the complicated processes of every piece of work and thereby profit themselves. They are satisfied with the mechanical performance of some routine bit of work. By saying this we do not mean to deny the duty of every well-ordered society to see that talent does not perish for lack of opportunity for expresssion. Under a collectivist system, for instance, a workman during his leisure hours should be given the opportunity to pursue scientific or artistic interests, if he has a natural taste for them. Such a provision is already in existence in Soviet Russia.

While the decentralised form of production has much to commend it, it is necessary to remember that so far as India is concerned, the chronic weakness of our country is inability to unite. Decentralisation in production and consumption is likely to intensify our social and political divisions.

So far as the use of compulsion is concerned, Gandhian economy claims that what compulsion it uses is justifiable compulsion or voluntary discipline and that the compulsion used by other systems is involuntary. We are not sure of the soundness of this distinction. Besides, coercion by the State is not an evil in itself. What is necessary is to place the power of the State in the hands of people who combine knowledge with virtue, a class of philosopher-statesmen, such as was contemplated by Plato, who will consider the joy of ren-

dering service to the community the supreme reward of their work. Our effort ought to be directed to the improvement of education and character in order to evolve such a class of rulers.

Some of the other points which suggest themselves to us in dealing with the Gandhian economy may be briefly stated:—

(1) The basis of the Gandhian economy is the need for the simplification of our lives and the lowering of the quantum of our needs. Its dislike of the cry of the Western economists of raising the standard of living assumes the proportions of a crusade against the articles of luxury. Over-simplification is a chief weakness of the Gandhian school of thought.

(2) Gandhian economy has no conception of a controlled economy manipulating production, prices, and the standard of living. Thereon comes the fear of coercion which it seeks to replace by a worse form of quasi-religious tyranny and inquisition into the life of the individual.

(3) It fails to take into account a phenomenal growth in population which has got to be provided for and which cannot be done so long as the existing and potential resources of the country are organised on arcadian lines.

All this criticism of Gandhian economy does not in any way mean disrespect for Mahatma Gandhi or for his economic programme. As said already, in our present helpless situation, the Gandhian economy has a great practical value. Though not a final solution, it gives us a necessary palliative. It also reminds us of the fact that in any agricultural country, cottage industries will always have a place as a means of supplementary income. The trouble with many of the educated people of India is that they are too logical to be effective. They are experts in analysis and criticism, but what the world needs to-day is the deed, the deed. Mahatma Gandhi may be illogical in some of his programmes, and methods, but he has accomplished results; and that is what really matters.

In the circumstances prevalent to-day, it is the duty of every Indian to patronise swadeshi articles in a spirit of love and service to the toiling millions of India. What we advocate is the dovetailing of village industries into a well-thought out scheme of national planning where exploitation is kept at a minimum.

While our considered judgment is in favour of some scheme of collective ownership and control with decentralised production worked into it, our care should be at the same time to preserve the best in the other systems. From individualism we should like to preserve the insistence it places upon the necessity for bringing out individual initiative and enterprise; from socialism the passion for social justice; from communism the idea of each man working according to his ability and receiving a reward according to the work performed, as in Soviet Russia to-day; from the corporative state the importance of correlating the interests of the employers, employees, and the consuming public; from co-operation the elimination of the middleman; from distributivism the ideal of every man a small property owner; and from Gandhian economy its insistence upon the expression of personality, the elimination of poverty and exploitation of others, and the simplification of standards.

CHAPTER III

ECONOMIC JUSTICE FOR INDIA

Economic justice for India is not any different from economic justice for any other country. If anything, the urgency for it is greater on account of the abject poverty of the people. Mr. M. L. Darling, I.C.S., a high government official of the Punjab, writes : " The most arresting fact about India is that her soil is rich and her people poor." Mr. Purcell, M.P. says: " The trouble with India is a stomach trouble." Writing as recently as April 25, 1941, Mahatma Gandhi says: " India's millions are becoming progressively pauperised. They are miserably clothed and underfed."

Mr. Amery, on the other hand, claims " India is prosperous. There is more revenue for the Central and Provincial Governments; and not only under those Provincial Governments carrying on under democratic institutions but there is a great deal of active social progress going on all the time."* Refuting this claim, Sir I. Rahimtullah argues that if income tax assessment be taken as a clue to India's " prosperity ", we find that out of a total of about 300 million people in " British " India, the number of income tax assessees with an income of Rs. 2,000 or £ 150 per annum and above is the amazing figure of 2,85,940, which works out at 1|10 of one per cent of the population. It is true that, as Sir I. Rahimtullah himself admits, agricultural incomes are not subject to this tax. But the number of actual cultivators with an annual income of Rs. 2,000 and more must indeed be small. To quote the same writer again, the number of those who pay a super tax on incomes of Rs. 25,000 a year and above is 4,210, but of this number 2,864 assessees are Europeans.

---

* The *Hindu* June 18, 1941.

The causes of Indian poverty are manifold and, therefore, there is no single remedy for them. Even those who are favourably disposed towards British imperialism must admit that imperialist exploitation is one of the prime causes of Indian poverty. Great Britain has sunk something like a billion pounds of capital in India and the annual drain from India to Britain is calculated to be £150 millions. According to Lord Rothermere's modest calculation, 4 shillings in the pound of every Britisher comes from India. Others put the figure much higher. Writing as long ago as 1898, Lord Curzon said: "India is the pivot of our Empire. . . . If the Empire loses any other part of its Dominions we can survive, but if we lost India the sun of our Empire will have set." Similar sentiments have been expressed by Mr. Churchill in recent times.

One of the valid criticisms of British rule in India is that it has failed to develop the manufacturing and industrial life of the country, especially as regards heavy industries. It is true that the country has a network of railways, but their development has been governed largely by military and strategic reasons. As regards the manufacture of machinery, India is in a precarious condition. Even for nails with which to nail our coffins we have to depend upon foreign lands! Positive hindrance has been placed in the way of Indian shipbuilding and motor car and aeroplane manufacture. At the beginning of the present war Australia had one shipyard, but to-day she has seven. In the face of considerable Government opposition, an Indian shipyard has recently been opened, but its sponsors complain of the stepmotherly treatment meted out to them by Government. The official plea put forth by a British official in the Indian Legislative Assembly, early in 1941, for their neglect of shipbuilding was that it could not be of much use to India in the war. Mr. Amery gave a similar reply with regard to the aeroplane industry.* It is a matter of surprise

* Mr. S. G. Shah, the retiring President of the Association of Indian Industries (1941), says: "The chemical industry for which the future is immense is still almost a dream; the motor car industry continues to remain a pious hope; and the heavy engineering industry is not being talked of at all. This attitude is in striking contrast to the policy and programme adopted and pursued successfully in some of the Dominions, particularly Australia and Canada, where they are proceeding on a planned programme."

to know that till recently even railway sleepers used to be imported from England to a country which abounds in timber of various kinds. If Indian industrial resources had been properly developed, she could have been the arsenal of Great Britain to-day, instead of her having to turn to the U.S.A. for the purpose.

It is as clear as daylight that, in spite of two hundred years of British rule, Indian manufacturing, commercial, and banking systems are underdeveloped. Industrially, says Sir A. Watson, a former editor of the *Statesman*, "India is a land of missed opportunities." The *Economist* wrote in 1936: "The proportion of the population dependent upon industry as a whole has tended to decline, and in some industries in particular, the jute and cotton industries, there has in some years been an absolute decline in numbers employed."

What industrialisation there is in the country has not alleviated poverty and slum conditions in India. The condition of the industrial worker is far from satisfactory. Housing conditions are deplorable. The death rate for the working classes in Bombay is as high as 400 per 1,000 as against 220 for the whole population of the city. There are certain factory laws, but these do not apply to small scale industries employing less than 20 persons, such as tanneries, the beedi manufacture, and carpet factories. They are outside the Workmen's Compensation Act. In Madras, we are told by Mr. Leonard Schiff that boys of five and six work for ten or twelve hours a day for two annas in the manufacturing of beedi. The same authority also tells us of children of six to ten being employed in cutting mica. Up to 1928 a Trade Union was liable to be prosecuted, but since then it has grown steadily, the total number of organised workers to-day being roughly 350,000. A vast majority of workers do not receive more than 8 annas a day. The miners and plantation labourers are especially low paid. In the tea estates of South India women are paid 3 to 4 annas a day and men between 5 and 6 annas.

The manipulation of currency, tariffs, and freight rates in the interest of Britain is undoubtedly one of the causes of Indian poverty. Sometime ago, the rupee was arbitrarily fixed at 1 sh. 6 d. Civil servants can draw their pay in London at the rate of 1£ for every Rs. 10. In the case of many goods, it is cheaper to import them from England than to manufacture them in India and send them by rail.

Side by side with the direct exploitation of India by Britain, there has gone on the stranglehold of British finance and capital. British capital enjoys practical monopoly in banking, commerce, exchange, insurance, and shipping. The Government of India Act of 1935 seems less afraid of transferring political freedom to India than of transferring economic control. It is full of safeguards for British finance and commerce. As has been humorously remarked, it provides home rule for the Viceroy, home rule for the Governor, and home rule for British finance-capital and commerce, but little or no home rule for the people of India. The attempt on the part of Indians to get the coastal traffic into their hands has met with stern opposition at every stage. Even today they have only 13 p. c. of it.

In the early days of the economic development of India Indian capital was shy, but such is not the case to-day. It is opportunity which is lacking. People naturally ask the question, what is the use of sinking lakhs of rupees in shipbuilding or the manufacture of motor cars if there is no genuine patronage by Government at least in the initial stages? Several vital industries could be started when India is in the throes of a war, but her fear is that once the war is over devices of one kind or another will be adopted for killing them.

The public debt of India, too, has been a factor in the poverty of India. It has been hanging like a millstone round the neck of India for generations. It is time that it was placed on a just and equitable basis. It is a well-known fact that not many years ago the cost of a reception given to the Sultan of

Turkey in London was charged to the Indian account. The cost of the imperial wars of Britain—wars in China, Persia, and Abyssinia in the past—were charged to the Indian coffers on the plea that the outposts of India lay in these distant countries. Till the 1919 reforms, the salary of the Secretary of State for India was an item charged to India. While the impression generally created abroad is that the public debt of India was incurred in connection with the development of the natural resources of the country, the fact is that it has been incurred largely for the conquest and control of the country. The Great War cost India £307 millions, not to mention the contribution in the form of men and materials. The public debt of India to-day is calculated to be £900 millions. A recent writer observes that while the national income of the country has grown by 1 p.c. per year, public debt has grown by 10 p.c.

The destruction of indigenous industries consequent upon serious foreign competition has certainly been one of the causes of Indian poverty. The fine Dacca muslin which was the pride of India and the envy of the rest of the world has practically gone out of existence. Before the advent of Britain, India was an exporter of cotton goods, but afterwards she became an importer. In the early days of the nineteenth century, goods to India had a free entry, but goods from India to England had to pay a heavy duty. All kinds of preference were shown to machine-made cotton goods from Manchester, practically ruining the spinners and weavers of this country. It is with a view to remedying this situation that the All-India Spinners' and Weavers' Association has come into being. It is hoped that the present concern of the Government of India for the spinners, in appointing a committee to enquire into their conditions and to give a filip to the handloom industry, will soon bear some fruit.

What has happened to indigenous cotton goods has happened also to our silk and woollen goods, to our iron, pottery, glass, and paper. It is an anomaly that in a country

where bamboo, coarse grass, and waste materials are plentiful, we have to depend upon foreign lands for paper. The continuous dumping of foreign goods and depriving the Indian artisan of his livelihood have gone too far, and all lovers of India should band themselves together for remedying this state of affairs.

They should tackle not only cases of economic injustice, but also cases of indifference and neglect on the part of the foreign government. It is a pity that rubber tyres for carts are gradually replacing village made iron tyres, thus depriving the blacksmiths of a part of their living. The only beneficiaries of the change seem to be investors in the rubber industry. The poor bullocks are not much benefited, since the cartman loads carts fitted with rubber tyres with a heavier load than he would put on an ordinary cart, and this acts as a very heavy strain upon the animals when they have to pull up on slopes. It is an equal pity that oil-pressing in the villages by age-old methods is being replaced by electrically driven machines, without at the same time providing alternative occupations to those thrown out of work. Hand-pounding of rice is being replaced by milling which destroys the best part of the rice, and gur-making by machine-made sugar which has little vitamin value in it. No new social order which is afraid of going to the root of the problem and removing every form of exploitation is worthy of the name.

The undue pressure on land and lack of co-ordination between agriculture and industry are some of the other causes of Indian poverty. Between 1891 and 1921 the percentage of Indian population dependent on agriculture rose from 61 to 73 p. c. It is calculated that 25 millions are agricultural wage-earners and 50 millions more work as part time wage earners on the land. Between 1911 and 1931 the number of industrial workers fell by two millions.

There has been an undue export of raw materials from the country ; and Gandhian economy has been agitating against it. Under the aegis of any national government in India there

will be no export of raw materials—and especially of foodstuffs, till the basic needs of the people have been satisfied. War conditions have shown clearly how dependent we have become upon foreign countries even for such essential commodities as wheat and rice. The Government of India seems to have received recently advice to undertake a "grow more food" campaign in order to tide over the present difficulty.

Agriculture is overcrowded and, not infrequently, is not a paying proposition. It has to contend against uncertainties of weather like drought and flood, resulting from the vagaries of the monsoon, plant pests, heavy taxes, and the grabbing policy of money-lenders and landlords. Even before the crop is harvested, it is in the hands of the moneylender or the middleman. The uneconomic fragmentation of land has reached *reductio ad absurdum*. The evils of landlordism are striking. In many parts of the country the benefits of improved cultivation do not go to the cultivator. The absentee landlord appropriates them himself. The cattle are poor in quality, and the yield disproportionately small. The system of manuring is unscientific and the seeds used are of poor quality. In this connection, one must pay a meed of praise to the Government agricultural researches in Coimbatore and Pusa (now at Dĕlhi) which have resulted in improved varieties of sugarcane and wheat respectively, and these have literally added lakhs of rupees to the agricultural wealth of the country. Such praise, however, has to be qualified by the observation that researches in the improvement of long-staple cotton demanded by the foreign market have indirectly resulted in the production of cotton seed which cannot be digested by the local cattle. Inadequate research has been done in cattle breeding and veterinary science in a country which has the largest number of livestock in the world.

The system of landownership is another contributory factor to Indian poverty. This is particularly true as regards Zamindari ownership. In his anxiety to set up an indigenous aristocracy which would serve as a bulwark of British

Imperialism, Lord Cornwallis transformed the tax farmers or collectors of land revenue under Moghul administration into landlords. This system has undoubtedly meant the impoverishment of the peasant in areas where it prevails. Speaking of conditions in carly times, Prof. Radha Kamal Mukerjee says: "The soil in India belonged to the tribe or its subdivision—the village community, the clan or the brotherhood settled in the village—and never was considered as the property of the king." The Punjab is better off than several of the other provinces partly because of its peasant proprietorship.

Besides the Zamindari system, there is the evil of absentee landlordship. The bulk of the benefit of improvement does not go to the peasant. Several tenancy bills have been passed to remedy the situation, but a great deal remains to be done. Owing to long years of continuous cultivation, the yield per acre is poor.

It is surprising to note that the Royal Commission on Agriculture was not allowed to investigate the question of land tenure and propose reforms. The remedy seems to be to abolish landlordism and make the State assume the ownership of land. It is a matter for regret that there is no indication of the provincial Government in Bengal giving effect to the far-reaching changes proposed by the Floud Committee in the Zamindari system of that province. Collective farming may be undertaken in areas where it is likely to be profitable. Elsewhere individuals may lease land from the State.

Heavy military expenditure in times of peace has been out of proportion to the poverty of the country. While military expenses in Great Britain between 1913 and 1928 increased by 49 p. c., the corresponding increase for India during the same period was 100 p. c. Nationalisation of Indian defence forces and the transfer of foreign policy and defence to Indian hands are reforms which need to be effected with as little delay as possible. Feeble efforts are being made,

thanks to the exigencies of war, to enlist Indians in the various fighting services.

The system of taxation in India is such as to benefit the rich at the expense of the poor. Land tax, salt tax, duty on matches, and the like fall heavily on the poor. Compared with England, the income-tax is very light in India. It is 1/14 of the total revenue. The burden of indirect taxation which falls mostly on the poor is about eight times as much as direct taxation.

The huge salaries paid to government servants in the upper cadres is out of proportion to the poverty of the country. In defence of such salaries it is often said that they are an insurance against bribery and corruption, that they are necessary for efficiency, that the best men from abroad will not be forthcoming if they are not offered attractive prizes, and that the total spent on public servants is a small fraction of the national expenditure. There is some truth in every one of these contentions. But we need to remember that disproportionately high salaries to public servants mean the setting up of false economic standards and the creation of meaningless class distinctions. The assumption that people will not be honest unless they are given a fat salary does not speak much for the sense of vocation which should be the guiding principle of every public servant. In spite of high salaries, corruption is not altogether absent. A big social gulf separates the civilian and the military man from the people of India, and everything is done to encourage it.

Indebtedness and the exorbitant rates of interest charged by money lenders are also responsible for Indian poverty. The vast majority of Indian peasants is indebted to money-lenders, whose unscrupulous ways of exacting money from their victims are well known to every student of Indian affairs. The Royal Commission on Agriculture writes: "People are born in debt, live in debt, and die in debt, passing on their burden to those who follow." Under the old system which

prevailed in India, creditors could not seize the land of the debtor, but to-day they can. With a view to giving relief to agriculturists, the Congress Government in the Madras Presidency passed the Agriculturists' Debt Relief Act. Similar measures have been adopted in some of the other provinces. Under the regime of the Advisers in Madras, a proposal was recently made to bring under control the evils attendant upon money-lending. But on account of the communal twist given to the proposal, nothing is being done for the present.

The huge palace and personal expenditure of the Indian Princes is certainly one of the contributory causes of Indian poverty. While many of these princes are only petty zamindars, they claim all sorts of treaty rights and privileges to-day. Their role to-day is to act as a brake upon Indian nationalist aspirations. Writing in 1930, Dr. Rushbrook Williams, who was in the employ of the Princes, said : " The rulers of the Native States are very loyal to their British connection and many of them owe their very existence to British justice and arms. Many of them would not be in existence to-day had not the British power supported them during the struggles of the latter part of the eighteenth and the early part of the nineteenth century." More recently, speaking in the Indian Legislative Assembly, Mr. Hussain Iman said : " Kingdoms are falling in Europe like packs of cards, and yet these Princes talk of their treaty rights and treaties, which in some cases are no more than a hundred years old." Many of them would have been " liquidated " long ago by their own people if it were not for the uniform support given to them by the British Government up to the point where things became altogether unbearable.

To any one who visits an Indian State, the contrast between princely luxury and grandeur on the one side and peasant poverty on the other is most striking. One has seen swarms of beggars at the gates of the palaces of the most enlightened Indian Princes, demonstrating most clearly within a stone's throw of each other, the vivid contrast there is

between princely glory and the colossal poverty of the common people. According to the calculations made by a recent writer, such an enlightened state as Bikaner spends 1.2 p.c. of its revenue on education, 1.5 p. c. on medical aid, and 32.6 p.c. on palace expenses. No ideal social order can look with complacency on a situation of this kind.

Injurious social customs constitute another cause of Indian poverty. It is often said that Indian poverty is due to conservatism in technique, caste restrictions, cow-worship, neglect of hygiene, the low position assigned to women, and the like. While all this may be true, we must not forget that the chief causes are economic and political. The amount of money spent on marriage, funeral, dowry, litigation, etc., is indefensible. But one has to contrast it with the huge sums spent by the Westerner on dress, drink, smoke, lipsticks, and rouge before one indulges in a facile criticism of the Indian peasant whose extravagance in most cases is the only way of escape from drudgery. According to a recent report issued by one of the Madras Government Departments, drink is the only solace for working classes in towns !

Competent observers from foreign lands have said that the Indian lacks initiative and enterprise for certain types of work, especially for work which requires the adventurous spirit. This criticism, while not wholly true, has enough force in it to make it sting. This lack is probably due more to continuous denial of opportunity than to any racial or national deficiency. As rightly claimed by Huxley and Haddon, national achievement and characteristics have little to do with ' racial ' factors. Indians were colonisers, mariners, and traders with foreign countries at a time when means of transport and communication were primitive and undeveloped. It has been calculated that while in England there are 16,000 different occupations open to youth of that country, in India there are only 40 such.

The charge that India is poor because her people are lazy needs only to be mentioned in order to be refuted.

This charge, we consider, is a libel upon a whole people. Wherever the Indian has gone as a labourer, he has won the unstinted praise of his employer. One wonders what Ceylon, Burma, and Malaya would be like to-day if it were not for the patient toil of millions of Indian peasants and workers. In India itself the peasant is proverbially patient and hard-working. If he does not turn out as much work as the average western labourer, one has to put it down to adverse climatic conditions, semi-starvation, chronic sickness, lack of tools, and ignorance.

The faulty system of education is one of the chief causes of poverty among the educated. Our education has been far too literary. It has produced expert quill drivers and contentious lawyers, but not men who would be willing to put their shoulders to work in the field or in factory or to the revival of the languishing cottage industries of the country.

Not much money has been spent on scientific research which would benefit the people of the country. It has been estimated by a recent writer that the total expenditure on "scientific departments" in India during 1933-34 was $\frac{1}{3}$ p.c. of the total Government expenditure.

The poor health and low nutrition of the people are both a cause and effect of mass poverty. According to Dr. Paul Russell, the Malaria Expert in India, one third of the people of the country are constantly under the scourge of malaria, which weakens the body and mind and shortens life. Another writer has said that while hospital accommodation in Soviet Russia is roughly one bed for 384 of the population, in India it is one bed for 3810 of the population; the proportion is roughly ten to one. Nutrition in India is subnormal.* Deficiency diseases such as tuberculosis and rickets are

* According to Col. McCarrison, a former Director of the Nutrition Research Institute in Coonoor: "Of all the disabilities from which the masses in India suffer, malnutrition is perhaps the chief. Malnutrition is the most far-reaching of the causes of disease in India." Writing in 1930 Chatterton says: "70 to 80 per cent. of the population are still living on almost the margin of subsistence."

common. Many deaths which are recorded in government registers as due to fevers are really due to semistarvation and poverty. The death rate is 23 per 1000 and infantile mortality 162 per 1000. While the average span of life is 55·6 in England and Wales and is above 60 in New Zealand and the Scandinavian countries, in India it is about 23. Women live slightly longer. Perhaps they talk their way through or put off the Angel of Death by argument for a while! Nearly half the deaths registered are of children under 10 years of age.

Protective foods are unknown to the vast bulk of the people of the country. The consumption of milk is less than half of what it should be in the interest of minimum health and is one-fourth of the consumption in England. According to a recent report of the Marketing Adviser to the Government of India, the present consumption of milk per capita in India, including milk products such as ghee, is a little over 6 ounces per day while "in other countries people consume more than five times this quantity. In India the poor do not get even 6 ounces and many of them have to go completely without milk or its products." This is an alarming state of affairs when it is remembered that many of these people try to subsist on rice or wheat flour, a little of dhal or other pulses, and small quantities of greens and vegetables when they can get them. There are hundreds of thousands who do not get even these.

In a country where fruits are plentiful, only a few can afford to buy them. To the masses they are a luxury which can only be had on special occasions. The fashionable ones, who have more money than brains, go in for tinned food of all kinds—fruit, vegetables, fish etc., depriving the people of the country of what chances they may have of earning an honest living.

Over-population has been put down as an important cause of Indian poverty. Economists are sharply divided on

this question, some holding that India is over-populated and others arguing that we have not yet reached the optimum level. In contrast with England and Wales and the Low Countries of Belgium and Holland, India is not thickly populated. "The devastating torrent of children" that Anstey speaks of with reference to India is only a poetic expression. Population in India has not risen steadily, but by jerks. There are still vast untapped natural resources. Prof. P. J. Thomas writes: "Between 1900 and 1930 population in India increased by 19 p.c. but production of foodstuffs and raw materials increased by about 30 p.c. and industrial production by 189 p.c.". The remedy is to push forward the industrial and agricultural productivity of the country, adopting at the same time all possible eugenic measures for breeding the right type of population. There is no doubt whatever that the custom of universal marriages and the universal begetting of children, coupled with the reduction in the size of middle class families on account of their economic hardships, is leading to dire hygienic results.

Whatever the causes of Indian poverty may be, the question of urgent importance is what are we to do about it? We believe that the only lasting solution is some form of collective ownership. Such a system certainly cannot usher in a new heaven and a new earth. It calls for character of the highest sort and absolute devotion to the public cause, neither of which is found in abundance to-day. To the collectivist programme realisable by peaceful means there can be no real objection except from the side of vested interests and those who believe in small-scale changes. The Hindus who form the vast majority of the population have been brought up in the tradition of the joint family which ensures a workable form of family socialism. The Muslims who practise the doctrine of the brotherhood of believers and stress the need for the sharing of material goods with the poor can possibly have no objection to schemes of collective ownership and control. Their religion is opposed to lending money on interest. The rest of India is not particularly tied down to

the institution of private property and its concomitant evils. No sacrifice is too great in the eradication of poverty. No one can call himself genuinely religious or even moral so long as he looks with complacency upon a world where there are gross economic inequalities. The argument that economic inequality is roughly an index to differences in ability and efficiency is certainly not true in a majority of cases.

It may take a long time before we can have a collectivist economic order for the whole of India. But that does not mean that we should sit with folded hands till that time is reached. One of the first things to do in the meantime is to secure complete self-government for India with complete right to protect our industries and agricultural products. The limited protection given to the iron and sugar industries has already justified itself. It should be extended to the cotton industry and ship building and motor car industries. At a time when India is struggling to stand on her own feet economically and industrially, there is no justification for providing commercial safeguards for foreign goods. Severe restrictions should be placed upon the investment of foreign capital in India and the employment of foreigners as managers, superintendents, and technicians. Such experts as are required from outside in the early days of the transition should be engaged on a contract basis and there should be no discrimination against them. The national debt and the interest on it, pension, and the like should be submitted to an impartial tribunal and placed on an equitable basis. Partnership with Britain may continue indefinitely so long as it is upon an honourable and self-respecting basis to both sides. In the new social order there is no place for exploitation of any kind. Subordination should give place to co-ordination, and authority from above to persuasion.

There should be State-controlled industries according to a system of national planning. What can be done in this direction has been demonstrated already in Mysore under the wise administration of Sir Mirza Ismail, till recently the

Dewan of that State. No time should be lost in hastening the nationalisation of heavy industries. All monopoly industries should be taken over by the State.

A well-thought-out system of village industries should be linked up with factory production. Utmost encouragement should be given to such cottage industries as weaving and spinning, paper making, jaggery making, hand-pounding of rice, oil-pressing, and tanning.

There should be minimum wage laws for all professions and occupations coupled with progressive taxation, graduated income-tax, and heavy surtax and death duties, accustoming people to the idea of "Each for all and all for each." In imposing steep progressive taxes, however, it should be remembered that if taxes are raised very high, business enterprise will suffer.

Sooner or later the Zamindari system and landlordism should go; and along with it, the autocratic and irresponsible rule of the Princes. Treaties and treaty rights have no meaning if they mean a denial of the elementary rights of citizens. In this day of enlightenment there is no justification for mediævalism and feudalism. In their own interests it is necessary for the Princes to make drastic reductions in their personal and palace expenditure and bring up their laws, general administration, and the civic and political rights of their subjects at least to the level which obtains in the rest of India.

The lowering of the salaries of Government servants is another step in the right direction. While the amount saved thereby may not be considerable, the moral value of the gesture will indeed be great. It will bring the rulers and ruled into close partnership, remove false class distinctions, set proper social standards for the country, and introduce into public service a sense of vocation, which is largely lacking to-day.

We need to have a large network of state and private institutions for the care of defectives and dependents. The

beggar problem should be scientifically tackled. No solution of Indian poverty is possible unless we adopt necessary measures to separate the unemployable from the unemployed and give them the treatment which they deserve so that they will not be a burden upon the rest of the commuity. There is no justification for the thoughtless and indiscriminate kind of charity practised in the name of religion. The amount of economic waste in India on account of religious mendicants and sturdy beggars is huge. Equally colossal is the harm done to the country by monkeys, certain kinds of birds and rats and pests of various sorts, which people as a general rule refuse to destroy.

The State should undertake vast social services. Medical aid and education should be within the easy reach of all. Prevention of diseases should be undertaken with a true missionary zeal. Nutritive food should be made available to all. Laws of healthy living should be strictly enforced. The country should be dotted with parks. Town planning should be along the most up-to-date and scientific lines. Slums and the wretched hovels in which people live in villages should be replaced by habitations more fit for human dwelling. Greater attention should be given to vocational and polytechnical education so that the educated people of the country will not be entirely dependent upon " soft-collar jobs ". Public opinion should assert itself in such a manner that all work will be regarded as sacred. Care should be taken to abolish the vast gulf there is to-day between the economic returns of those following the learned professions and those following humbler occupations. There is no use pretending that vocational education does not attract the youth of India when we attach disproportionately high salaries and status to government posts.

Transport should be nationalised and made cheaper so that there can be easy transfer of commodities within the country. As things are at present, one part of a district may be having a bumper crop and another be on the verge of starvation.

There should finally be a judicious and gradual extension of State activity in the direction of socialism, allowing neither 'brown' capital which is assuming vast proportions nor 'white' capital which it seeks to replace to exploit the people of the country.

CHAPTER IV

SOCIAL HARMONY

1. CASTE

No sound social order today can tolerate meaningless class distictions. Ancient Greece had her freemen and slaves. Rome had her patricians and plebeians. Mediæval Europe drew a hard and fast line between feudal lords and their serfs. Great Britain even today has her class distinctions, roughly dividing society into landed aristocracy, commercial magnates, and common people. For nearly twenty-five years, Soviet Russia has been trying to abolish social differences by the drastic method of liquidating the *bourgeoisie*. Her aim is to bring about a classless society by a process of eliminating everybody except the peasant and the labourer.

Social stratification has been at its peak in India for many centuries on account of her rigid caste system. To add to this form of division, there are today increasing class, provincial, linguistic, and communal differences. Of all these, caste is the most ancient, the most thorough-going, and the most difficult to eradicate.

The word ' caste ' comes from the Portuguese word *casta* which means ' breed '. It was first applied by the Portuguese settlers to the hereditary groups of Malabar. Though the word itself is relatively modern, the institution behind it is a very ancient one, unlike anything found in any other part of the world. It is the most peculiar institution of India.

It is difficult to lay down in one phrase or expression the origin of caste. It certainly was not due to the political machinations of Brahmin priests in the dim past. Some have said that it is based purely on race and heredity, the original words for caste being *varna* (colour) and *jati* (race) and others have said that it is based entirely on occupation. The fact of

the matter is that both these factors as well as other factors such as geographical separation, sectarian differences, ideas of ceremonial purity, religious status, and difference in language have all played a part in the origin and evolution of caste. When the Aryan conquerors came to India they were already familiar with a broad class system which was common to many of the peoples of the world at the time, such as the Iranians. Society was divided into three main groups or categories, the priests and the learned men, the warriors and the nobility, the merchants and the agriculturists. On their arrival in India the Aryans had to encounter the earlier inhabitants of the country, the Dravidians and the pre-Dravidians who were much darker in complexion, less intelligent, and following different social customs. They, therefore, thought of keeping themselves and their institutions as pure as possible.

To this racial division, in which was already present in a rudimentary form an occupational division, was added the detailed classification of society according to occupations. Ideas of ceremonial purity and religious status also played a part in this stratification. Castes in their origin broadly corresponded to four social classes, the priests, the warriors, the merchants, and the servants. Neither in those remote days nor since has caste been exactly coterminous with occupation. Even today it is not unusual to find members of the same caste or subcaste pursuing different occupations * and members of several castes pursuing the same occupation. Caste in its origin, to use the words of Senart, was "the normal continuation of ancient Aryan institutions taking their form according to the variations of conditions and environment which they encountered in India." To quote Senart again : "The system under which India has lived is not a purely economic organisation of trades nor a chaos of strange and hostile tribes and races nor again a simple class hierarchy, but a mingling of all these, united by the common inspiration which dominates

* Senart notes that in some places cotton beaters, oil pressers, and butchers rub shoulders in a single caste.

the functioning of all the groups, and by the community of characteristic ideas and prejudices which govern their order of precedence."

Adopting practically the same point of view, the late Mr. Paul Appasamy observes: "Generally speaking .... the organisation known as caste was in the first instance ethnic or tribal in origin but other principles like occupation, sectarian division, regional distinction, mixture of castes, migration and bifurcation have all played their part in creating the 3,000 odd castes now in existence." Mr. L.S.S. O'Malley, too, adopts the same view.

In all probability, race played an important part in the evolution of caste, but from the very beginning there has been considerable racial intermixture, as seen from the number of mixed castes that have been in existence from early days. Brahmins and others high up in the social hierarchy were allowed to marry women of the lower castes, provided the first wife always belonged to the caste of the husband. This restriction was in the interest of the family worship and sacrifice in which both the husband and wife had a part to play. Besides, caste was for a long time in a fluid state, and inter-marriages were not frowned upon in the same way as they are at present.

Even in the matter of occupation no rigid rule was observed. By adopting what were considered base pursuits certain castes went down in the social scale, and others went up by adopting the occupations of the higher castes. Other ways by which castes and subcastes went up in social esteem were the adoption of vegetarianism, the avoidance of certain forms of meat, and the adoption of such social customs of the higher castes as child marriage and the prohibition of widow re-marriage. Once subcastes or divisions within castes had climbed up in the social scale by some of these means, it was comparatively easy to get the Brahmin priests to set their seal

of approval on their new status and to invent a distinguished genealogy for them beginning with a mythical ancestor.

From the beginning, the spirit of exclusiveness which is the distinguishing feature of caste has kept not only castes but also subcastes from intermingling with each other. When we speak of such castes as Brahmins, Rajputs, and Jats it must be remembered that they are very broad divisions including a large number of subcastes which observe all the rigorous rules of caste between them. A South Indian Brahmin, for instance, is not the counterpart of the Bengali Brahmin in his social customs or as regards the rules of caste in general. Even among the South Indian Brahmins there are differences based upon sect, locality, and language.

Exclusiveness between castes as well as between subcastes is carried to the *n*th degree especially as regards inter-dining and inter-marriage. The prevailing rule among Brahmins is to marry within subcastes but always outside the *gotra* or enlarged family which is supposed to have descended from a common ancestor, especially on the male side. Even to-day marriage outside a subcaste is the exception rather than the rule.

Rules against interdining are not as absurd as they may appear at the outest, because to the Hindu every meal is in the nature of a sacrament, cementing together the relations between members of a caste fellowship. There are strict rules regarding the kind of food or drink which one may accept at the hands of those belonging to a lower caste. The general rule seems to be that *pakka* food, i.e. food cooked in ghee may be accepted from certain lower castes but not *katcha* food, i.e., food cooked in water such as rice which can only be accepted from members of one's own caste or from Brahmins. Sweetmeats cooked in ghee may be taken from anybody so long as it is whole and there is no fear of the ghee being adulterated. In South India, milk, curds, butter, and ghee may be bought from anybody irrespective of

caste, community or religion. Caste exclusiveness is observed even with regard to smoking from a common *hookah* (pipe).

The idea of pollution connected with food is carried so far that some people will throw away their food if a low caste man sees it or even if his shadow falls upon it. Those who eat unclean food, *i.e.* food forbidden to the higher castes or those who follow unclean professions are supposed to carry pollution with them. This explains the reason why we have strict rules regarding untouchability and unapproachability in South India, and particularly in Travancore and Malabar. The kitchen where food is prepared and served is to the high-caste Hindu as sacred as a temple or altar.

While the broad distinction between vegetarians and non-vegetarians is legitimate and understandable, among vegetarians themselves there are further divisions. Some object to the use of onions, some to garlic, some to mushrooms, and some to drumsticks, tomatoes, and potatoes.* Those who have worked as wardens of college hostels for Hindu students can testify to the number of cooking and eating arrangements which have to be made in order to suit different scruples.

Such diversity of practice, while making the caste system a fascinating subject of study, gives it an intricacy which it would be difficult to match. To take but one instance, the Brahmins, who form the highest caste in the Hindu hierarchy do not all agree as regards their food, profession or social customs. While the South Indian Brahmin is a strict vegetarian, the Bengali Brahmin has no objection to eating fish, and certain sections of North Indian Brahmins openly eat meat. Even as regards occupation, they are not all priests or learned men. In some parts of the country

* Certain foods are prohibited by tradition and mere custom; while to certain others there is literature in support of such taboos. Others, for instance, like tomatoes, beetroot and potatoes, were brought into India after the taboo had become firmly established on the soil, and this accounts for their exclusion from the list of permitted items. The omission of chilies in *Shraddha* ceremonies, and the use of pepper instead, is due to this reason only. Chilies (capsicum) were unknown in ancient India.

they are ordinary cultivators and field labourers. Senart observes that "it is perhaps among the Brahmins that there occurs the most complicated mixture of occupations and confusion of trades." There are among them "priests and ascetics, learned men and religious beggars, cooks and soldiers, scribes and merchants, cultivators and shepherds, masons and chairporters." Even among Brahmin priests there are different gradations, a distinctly lower status being assigned to those who minister to the religious needs of non-Brahmins or officiate at funerals.

As regards marriage customs, we find a wide variety of them. Child marriage is practically universal among the higher castes. They also prohibit widow-remarriage and refuse to give countenance to divorce, especially to women. Among some castes the custom is for a grown up woman to be married to a mere boy, the woman living with the boy's father or uncle or some other man of her choice. Among some other castes the first nuptial act is performed by some one other than the husband—by the priest among the Devadasis. Some castes allow the remarriage of the widow to the younger brother of the deceased. Among some castes it is nothing uncommon for a person to marry his sister's daughter, while others prohibit it altogether.*

Caste is seen at its worst in its relation to the so-called Untouchables who number about 70 millions of the population of India. For all practical purposes they are outside the Hindu fold, although they have taken over several Hindu customs and aspects of Hindu worship, while retaining their own peculiar customs and devotion to their local deities. According to one theory, they are the descendants of Dravidians and pre-Dravidians who refused to be absorbed into the Aryan

* It is so because it is considered that when once a woman has been given away in marriage she belongs to a separate *gotra* (marriage within the same *gotra* being prohibited) and, however near her relationship, her daughter is considered eligible for marriage. Thus Hindus generally marry not only one's own sister's daughter, but also father's sister's daughter, mother's brother's daughter, but not brother's daughter, nor father's brother's daughter, nor mother's sister's daughter.

social system. Whatever their origin may be, to them has always been assigned a very low place in society. To call them 'outcastes' is not proper, because they are as much the victims of caste on the part of the high castes as they are among themselves. Some of them, especially in South India, call themselves Adi-Dravidas, while the census reports describe them as 'scheduled castes' and 'exterior castes', and Mahatma Gandhi and his followers give them the name of Harijans which literally means 'the people of God'. The correct designation is perhaps the 'Depressed Classes', because they are depressed and suppressed in more senses than one. Their position is particularly bad in South India where the rules of caste are observed most strictly and where there is a singular lack of the middle castes like the Kshatriyas. Untouchability is practically unknown in the Punjab and the North West Frontier Province.

The number of castes and subcastes among the Depressed Classes, as among the higher castes, is legion. They practise among themselves strict rules which prohibit intermarriage and interdining. There is even 'untouchability within untouchability'. Among the *pariahs* who form one of the lowest castes in South India, we are told that those who served in the Queen's Sappers and Miners and their descendants have come to form a superior sub-caste of their own!

The treatment meted out to the Depressed Classes by the high castes is indefensible. Nothing but the humblest occupations is open to them. Even when they take to farming, it is mostly as peasants and day labourers and not as peasant proprietors. In several villages they are tied down to the land like mediæval serfs. They are the bondsmen of the landlords and moneylenders. In the villages they have to live outside the village proper in wretched hovels. Even if they can afford it, which happens seldom, custom prohibits them from putting up substantial houses or adding a second story to the ground floor. In certain villages they are expected to fly a little flag above their houses so as to warn the upper caste people against

coming near them and becoming polluted. In many parts of South India they cannot walk through the *agraharams* of the Brahmins, wear sandals, use an umbrella, or take out a marriage or funeral procession. In some places they cannot have the service of the dhoby, barber, tailor, etc., and even the burning ghat is refused to them. In some places in the South, neither men nor women of the Depressed Classes are supposed to wear anything above their waist.

There are rules not only of untouchability but also of unapproachability and unseeability, differing in their rigour from one part of the country to another. Besides these, there are social disabilities of various kinds. The Depressed Classes have little or no access to village wells, tanks, and water courses and are shut out from temples. Even in schools where instruction is provided for all children, the Depressed Classes are excluded from them and, even if admitted, are given such a step-motherly treatment that they learn little or nothing except a hatred of the iniquitous system which keeps them down for no fault of their own. Similar disabilities are found in practice in admissions to hospitals and resthouses maintained out of local funds. Till recently, in some law courts they were expected to give evidence from a distance.

Some of the social disabilities from which the Depressed Classes suffer are due to the nature of their occupations and to dirty ways of living such as carrion eating which is common among some of them. While a good many are employed as agricultural labourers and village servants and some even become artisans and small cultivators, the traditional occupations of several of the castes are scavenging, skinning of animals, leather work, cremation of the dead, and the like. The Depressed Classes themselves consider these occupations as base and grade them according to their unpleasantness. Thus the man who skins animals belongs to a lower caste than the one who works with leather.

On becoming Christians, individual members of the Depressed Classes lose many of their disabilities, but there is

no uniform practice in the matter. The sufferings of village Christians in many parts of India remain almost as bad as those of their unconverted brethren. In spite of it a good many change their faith *en masse* because they find no better way of social salvation for them.

Even after becoming Christians, or Muslims for that matter, they cannot be sure of absolute fraternal relations with their new co-religionists, because caste has invaded even the ranks of Christians and Muslims. It is true that it is greatly modified by the followers of these two religions and does not exhibit itself in all its ugliness. Nevertheless it shows itself on occasions like marriages and feasts. In some Christian churches caste is observed even at the Lord's Table, the higher castes insisting on being served before those of a humbler origin. In North India caste has practically disappeared among educated Indian Christians. While Muslims do not generally observe caste, certain broad divisions are kept up. Some adhere to their Hindu customs, refrain from eating beef, prohibit widow remarriage, and hesitate to marry freely with the rest of the Muslim community. They hold caste panchayats, worship Hindu deities alongside of Allah, observe Hindu ceremonies and fasts, and bathe in the Ganges on important festival days.

WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

We have gone somewhat into the details of the caste system because, without knowing it in all its ramifications, it is not possible to suggest lines along which improvement may be made. To condemn caste in a wholesale manner just as we condemn sin does not carry us very far.

Whatever uses caste might have had in the past, it is a hindrance to progress today. Our first duty in approaching caste is to approach it rationally. It is a pity that so much of our thinking regarding caste is mixed up with deep emotions and prejudices arising out of long-standing customs and inhi-

bitions. The educated classes of India are no doubt well-informed of the evils of caste and the helpless position to which it has reduced them both within the country and in the international world. But very few of them have the courage or the prophetic fervour to break away from it and lead a crusade against it. More than any of the living religions of today, Hinduism stands in need of a first-rate Protestant movement.

One of the first things to remember today is that there is no pure caste anywhere in India, any more than there is a pure race, and difference in social customs and occupations does not in itself mean superiority or inferiority. Caste for many centuries was in a fluid condition and free intermixture took place. Therefore, it is futile to speak as though certain castes belonged to one race and certain others belonged to another race.

If, therefore, instead of resting caste on the basis of race, we rest it on heredity, there may be some justification for it. But on laws of heredity no one has yet been able to say the final word. Even the best of scientists are unable to say precisely what portion of a person's ability is due to his racial heredity, what to his family heredity, what to the geographical and climatic conditions under which he lives, what to the kind of food he eats, and what to social factors of various kinds. What all this means is that until we have a much fuller knowledge of eugenic science we cannot advocate an indiscriminate intermixture of castes as regards marriages. It may be that the South Indian Brahmin who has a very acute mind has developed it through long years of selective breeding. To require him to marry indiscriminately may lead to a terrible loss not only to the Brahmin community but also to the whole country. At the same time one notices that close inbreeding has led among Brahmins to poor physique, ill-health and shortness of life. To correct such defects the first step to take would be to widen the range of those who are marriageable—say by the abolition of the line which marks

off the various sub-castes. Alongside of it, it may also be necessary to encourage marriages between Brahmins and the gifted among Non-Brahmins who, while not neutralising the acknowledged intellectual superiority of the Brahmin, will at the same time add to his physical strength and stamina. By mating the highly intellectual type to the athletic type, we may be able to retain something of both, although we cannot predict beforehand in what proportion or strength the two excellences will be combined. Inter-caste marriages will incidentally bring the pernicious system of concubinage to an end.

What has been said about Brahmins will apply equally to the various divisions among Non-Brahmins and the Depressed Classes. In the new social order contemplated, full opportunity should be given to those who wish to break away from the traditional moulds and marry those of their own choice. The essential factors in any marriage are unity of mind and spirit between the marrying couple and the production of strong, healthy, and vigorous offspring. To accomplish this end, there should be permissive legislation enabling members of different castes or of no caste entering into marital relations without losing their right to family property or being subjected to caste tyranny.* All marriages should be registered and a marriage performed by a government registrar of marriages or some other officer who is easily accessible should have the same validity as a marriage performed by a priest.

While we do not advocate an indiscriminate intermixture of castes on the plane of marriage because of the paucity of the necessary scientific material on the question, we must express our conviction that there is no hope for India until the whole of the Indian community becomes inter-marriageable. But before this end is reached we must raise the level of

* In Baroda any Hindu is allowed to marry any Hindu. Even *sagotra* marriages are permitted if they do not come within prohibited degrees.

different castes and communities from the point of view of education, health, and clean social living. The consolidation of Hindus is particularly urgent if they are to withstand the attacks made upon them by the other religious communities; and this they cannot do so long as they allow themselves to be divided into 2,000 and odd castes and sub-castes. Many Bills have come up before the legislature from time to time to legislate for marriages between different castes, the last among these being Sir Hari Singh Gour's Special Marriage (Amendment) Bill in 1931. But they have all been rejected. "So far as the law is concerned the principle of endogamy is still secure." The Brahmo Marriage Act III of 1872 and the Civil Marriage Act of 1920 are steps in the right direction and the principles underlying them should be extended.

Interdining and free social intercourse to-day ought not to be so difficult of full realisation as inter-marriage. There is already a considerable measure of them in cities and towns and among educated people in general. We can understand and respect the scruples of a strict vegetarian who does not wish to eat with a non-vegetarian. But many of the caste rules regarding eating and drinking are based on the idea of ceremonial cleanliness. Every boy and girl in India should be taught to distinguish between ceremonial cleanliness which, in many cases, has no rhyme or reason behind it, and personal and moral cleanliness. Besides, what enters a man (food) does not defile him so much as what comes out of him such as evil thoughts and activities. The people of India must revise entirely their ideas of pollution and cleanliness in the light of the best they can learn from a study of the laws of public health and sanitation. They need to remember that it is possible for a man to be ceremonially clean to the uttermost requirements of law and yet be physically unclean.

What law has been unable to do, coffee and tea shops, restaurants, railways, and motor buses are doing in a remarkable manner. While travelling few people observe the rules of their caste regarding eating and drinking. It is a matter for

rejoicing that separate eating places for Brahmins and Non-Brahmins in some of the Indian Railway Stations have recently been abolished. It is to be hoped that other railway lines will follow suit and have a common eating place for all, but with separate sections, if necessary, for vegetarians and non-vegetarians.

In the light of what has been said, one can understand the revulsion of feeling which a highly cultured Hindu may experience when he is asked to have social contacts with those who eat frogs, rats, snakes, and even carrion. If the Depressed Classes sincerely desire to raise their social position, one of their first duties is to give up dirty habits. Yet we are told that a good many among them consider carrion-eating a delicacy which they are are loath to give up. In a matter like this, the State should take courage in both its hands and abolish the practice in the interests of public health. The most which has been done in this direction is a kind of local option adopted by the Bombay Government enabling legislation to be enacted on the subject if it is desired by a certain percentage of the leaders of the caste practising the offending habit.

If the Depressed Classes are to enjoy complete social equality with the rest of the country they must also give up their dirty professions. In this day of enlightenment when science has made much advance, there is no justification, for instance, for the crude methods of scavenging, butchering or skinning of dead animals. On our endeavour to abolish scavenging, it is necessary to educate the people of India to use bore hole latrines, and other such hygienic devices, although the attempts to popularise them in villages have not been successful so far. Government too could do something in this direction by requiring that all public institutions should introduce approved sanitary methods for the disposal of night soil and sewage.

There are many other directions along which a national government can bring about far-reaching reforms. Since the

days of the so-called Indian Mutiny, the British Government has been most reluctant to interfere with the social customs and religous susceptibilities of the people, using the argument that any piece of social legislation in advance of public opinion will either result in revolution or remain a dead letter. We are not sure whether this argument is as weighty as it appears on the surface. There is no doubt whatever that, although the Sarda Marriage Act roused a certain amount of vocal opposition, it could have been enforced if the Government was prepared to face unpopularity. In spite of the lax enforcement of the measure, the principle underlying it has now come to be generally accepted, and, in urban areas at any rate, breaches of the act are rare.

During the short period that the Congress was in office in Madras, it enacted Debt Relief and threw open certain of the orthodox Hindu temples to the Depressed Classes, and the country did not witness any general uprising. The same Congress Government helped to pass a bill, moved by Rao Bahadur M. C. Raja (a non-Congress Depressed Class leader) making it penal to deny access to secular institutions to any person on account of his birth.

All this makes us believe that only a genuinely national government which has the good of the people at heart can really solve our social problems. One of the first duties of such a government is to remove the many social disabilities under which the Depressed Classes suffer. Every village should be provided with protected water supply and if the high caste people try to monopolise them for themselves, legal action should be taken against them. As a half-way measure, where the caste feeling is strong, the high caste people may be required to construct a cistern by the side of the public well and have it filled up during the whole day for the use of the Depressed Classes. Continuation of the policy of separate wells, separate schools, and separate living quarters is bound to keep India disunited. It is time that the Hindus realised

that in their own interest and in the interest of national strength and of humanity the rigours of caste were abolished.

Public roads should be thrown open to all, and nobody should be allowed to usurp the right of excluding any one from them. Uniform rules should be applied to marriage, funeral or other private, and religious processions of all castes. In cities, police permission should be obtained for processions and a nominal fee charged. As regards temples, at least those which are supported by the State should be thrown open to all worshippers. Since there is no reliable history regarding most temples as to who endowed them and for whom it was endowed, a wise provision would be to throw them open to all who contribute to their present upkeep. Those who directly or indirectly exclude the Depressed Class children from schools which receive any kind of government or local grant should be given exemplary punishment.

If a century ago the Government could abolish thuggism, female infanticide, and sati why should it not at present abolish carrion eating, infant marriage, marriage of close relations, and the like?

Some of the indirect methods by which the State can help to loosen the bonds of caste are the provision of equal opportunity and equality before law to every individual, caste, and community in India. Even in the advanced countries of the world the State has not yet fully exhausted the possibilities of equal opportunity. As practised at present it only means free education up to a certain point, minimum wage, graduated income tax, and progressive inheritance tax. However admirable all these devices may be, they are not enough. The law of equal opportunity cannot be said to be fulfilled till every man, woman, and child is given all possible opportunities for becoming the very best that he or she is capable of becoming. We have no right to penalise a man simply because he is poor or because he comes of a humble family or caste. Our experience today is that wherever a Depressed Class man has

had education and attained a fair degree of economic independence, the rigours of caste are not applied to him. Even high caste people are glad to have social contacts with him.

Equality before law is just as important as equality of opportunity. In theory 'British' India at any rate, as distinguished from the rest of the country, provides equality before law to everybody. But in actual practice there are many aberrations. The poor man in general and the Depressed Classes in particular do not always have justice meted out to them. Low paid state officials often discriminate against them. In many cases even when they are deliberately wronged, the Depressed Class people do not have the necessary means to defend themselves in court.

In saying all this, we do not mean to suggest that the whole burden of social reform in general, and of caste reform in particular, should be shifted to the State. The correct procedure is for voluntary agencies to do the necessary spade work and create a popular demand for particular reforms before the State comes along and takes them over. Nevertheless, in a country like India, where people are accustomed to look to the government of the day for necessary leadership, the State cannot divest itself of its responsibility. It should legislate somewhat in advance of the times in order that legislation itself might serve as a lever in raising public opinion to a higher level.

Mass education can go a long way in mitigating some of the extreme practices connected with caste. In cities where the level of literacy is high, we find that caste is breaking down rapidly, especially as regards social contacts and interdining. The education of women is more important than that of men in bringing about social reforms, since it is the illiterate mother and the superstitious grandmother who often stand in the way of social progress and instil in children anti-social habits and dispositions, which they find it difficult to overcome when they reach maturity. A few Brahmin, Non-Brahmin and Depressed

Class girls thrown together in a school, college or hostel can do more to break down caste barriers than a host of government enactments.

In making education easily accessible to the underprivileged among Hindus, temples might be asked to come to the rescue. The resources of all Hindu religious institutions (i.e. temples) might be pooled and, after the needs of the management of the temples have been met, the surplus might be utilised for educational and other such purposes. It is much better to educate the future citizens of India than to feed indiscriminately swarms of lazy beggars and religious mendicants. It is a pity to have divorced education from religious institutions. If every temple is made responsible for the education of a certain percentage of children in the neighbourhood, an important step will be taken in the direction of solving the problem of mass illiteracy. To adopt a suggestion made by Mr. Paul Appasamy, the village teacher should be regarded as a local officer and paid out of a *manibam*. "The village magistrate, the village accountant, the village teacher, the village educational authority and the village health officer should form a board or panchayat for the protection and improvement of the village." They should see to it that every village is provided with proper wells, tanks, dry land, wet land, pasture land, playground, parks, latrines, places for storage of cattle manure and garbage, and godowns for the storage of grains. All this will ameliorate the awful economic and social conditions which now prevail in the villages.

Caste panchayats or councils which are even today powerful institutions in villages can play a useful role in the creation of a new social order, if they can become sufficiently enlightened. As functioning at present, they often try to bolster up obscurantist practices relating to 'impure' food, interdining, pollution, marriage, and heredity. The weight of the entire caste group is brought to bear upon any of its number who dares to break any of the customs peculiar to itself. Fines are frequently resorted to as punishment, and the money thus

realised is used for charity or communal festivities. Unchastity of women is promptly dealt with, but not the irregularities of men. In some cases purifactory penances and ceremonies are prescribed such as what happened when those who were forcibly converted to Islam by the Moplahs were readmitted to the Hindu fold. The extreme punishment is expulsion from caste which may be temporary or permanent. In most cases it is only temporary. Low castes have sometimes recourse to ordeals. Flogging the offender or parading him on the back of a donkey with his head shaved is not uncommon.

In the caste panchayat or council, then, we have the necessary machinery for affecting the social behaviour of a great number of people. Acting as it does on behalf of a large fellowship with the weight of ages behind it, it enjoys great social prestige. What is required today is to give this organisation the necessary enlightenment and impetus to tackle the outstanding social problems of the country. In order to attain this end, educated men should settle down in villages or at least keep up their village contacts so that they may serve as the friends, philosophers, and guides of illiterate *panchayatdars*. Christian missionaries and national workers fulfil this function to some extent. A caste panchayat should address itself to such tasks as the reduction of marriage expenses, the education of the community, and marriage reforms. It could also act as a guild with regard to certain arts and crafts, supervise the commodities produced, fix prices, improve trade morality, train apprentices, and device facilities for marketing. Already by organising themselves for trade, commerce, and education the Nadars of South India, for a long time occupying a low place in the caste ladder, have forged ahead and are commanding the respect of even the high castes. What the Nadars have done others can do by suitable organisation, grim determination, and a clear vision of the goal to be reached. Mr. Appasamy regrets that "the muslin and calico, the ivory and brass work, the stone and wood carving, and the carpets and shawls for which India was famous in ancient times are becoming things of the past." It is possible to revive these industries through

caste guilds, although Mr. A. S. P. Ayyar, I. C. S. does not think that the guild or occupation idea has been strong in the caste system in recent times. He writes: "The fall in our trade, the stagnation in our arts, the dying of our inventive skill, the inefficiency of our coolies, and even the indifference of our scavengers are mainly due to the inertia of caste."

By organisation along progressive lines and by concerted action, the Parsis have made themselves the leading community in India in social matters. They have secured for themselves the Parsi Marriage Act and the Parsi Succession Act to suit their needs. Other communities might follow suit. Instead of bolstering up outlandish customs and injurious social practices, castes and caste councils should obey the call of progress and bring about much needed social reforms with the least possible delay and on as large a scale as possible. The Depressed Classes through effective organisation should learn to get rid of their inferiority complex and timidity.

The educated people of India and, in particular, the educated youth have a great responsibility in tackling the problem of caste. Education has succeeded in giving people a breadth of vision which is highly desirable. But it has not materially changed their outlook towards their humbler brethren. It has created new caste and class divisions. If the young men and women of the country would organise themselves to combat the evils of caste, they could accomplish a great deal. Instead, they spend much of their time in vain speculation and fruitless controversies. The crying need of the hour is for bands of consecrated young men and women who will attack the outstanding social problems of the day in a spirit of service and sacrifice.

The country has a vivid recollection of the electrification of people's emotions caused by the 'fast unto death' of Mahatma Gandhi in 1932 over the Communal Award which sought to separate the Depressed Classes from the Hindu fold. During the days of the fast and the days immediately follow-

ing it, students and educated people in general fraternised with the low castes on an extensive scale. High caste people ate freely with the low castes and accompanied them to places of worship. It is a pity that the enthusiasm created then has not been sustained. It is the duty of the youth of the country to revive this enthusiasm and turn it along proper channels. It is interesting to note that as many as two million Hindus at the 1931 census declared themselves as belonging to no caste. While even such a negative gain is something to be welcomed, we want positive action.

Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, the first Prime Minister of Madras, who combines a soaring idealism with a sober realism regards untouchability as a neurasthenia and advocates a free-mixture of castes on the social plane. He rightly asks, if free mixing produces good results at schools, why should it not be attended by the same results in life too? He sees no reason why carpenters, weavers, barbers, traders, and Brahmins should be absolutely debarred from crossing the boundaries of their caste for a meal or a marriage. He rightly says that an "electricity of good feeling" is generated by eating together and that neither friendship nor partnership should be barred by caste barriers. He believes that "to a great extent, caste divisions based on occupation, may and must continue. But the division should not become a matter for distinction or a religious barrier even where reason and common sense dictate a step across." All work is equally noble. As regards the methods for accomplishing the desired results, Mr. Rajagopalachari writes: "Reform can be and should be achieved by the method of persuasion, by love not hatred, by consent not by force or by generating ill-will or hatred. No reform is so good as to be paid for by mutual hatred."

CHAPTER V

SOCIAL HARMONY

2. CLASS

While caste is gradually breaking down, class differences are on the increase. These differences are foreign to the soil of India and are largely the result of the impact of Western civilisation. Whatever the evils of caste may be, no one can deny the fact that, among the members of the caste brotherhood, there is a considerable degree of equality. Even today it is not unusual to find both wealthy and poor members of the same caste sitting down together to a common meal and enjoying complete social fellowship. Differences of salary and status do not obtrude themselves to the forefront. Even in considering such intimate matters as marriage relationships, worldly position does not usually stand in the way.

This happy state of affairs is passing away with the spread of the materialistic civilisation of the West. While the bases of caste are race, heredity, family relationship, and occupation, those of the class system are economic and social differences. Class is certainly more vulgar than caste. In the class system everybody's place in the social and economic ladder is carefully fixed; and while passage from the lower rung to the upper is possible in the case of exceptional individuals, rigid differences are kept up between one class and another. Emphasis is placed on such outer differences as material wealth, occupation, and position in life rather than on intellectual, moral, and spiritual attainments. The retiring scholar and the self-renouncing saint have no place in this hierarchy. At best they receive a certain amount of condescending patronage.

The main emphasis of the class system is upon material possessions and the object of constant worship, in the words of William James, is that "bitch goddess success." The

moment a man reaches the top of this ladder, there are any number of people to fawn at his feet. It is seldom that questions are asked about the way in which he has reached that place.

Invidious distinctions are sometimes made between the "new rich" and the "old-rich", between those who have inherited wealth and those who have made it for themselves. A landed aristocrat considers himself to be superior to the man who has made his money through trade or commerce or in the stock exchange. The man who is not obliged to earn his living believes that he belongs to a higher order of mankind.

The constant striving of people in a social order of this kind is to get on somehow or other and to climb up to the next higher grade. In such a struggle, little or no value is paid to moral values. The weak and the unfortunate are shoved aside in the name of the scientific law of the struggle for existence and survival of the fittest. The honest and god-fearing man is given a short shrift; and the man who succeeds is very often the clever but unscrupulous individual. In business he is quick to take the maximum advantage of price fluctuations, periodical crises, and unemployment. In politics he throws morality and good breeding to the wind, his one aim being to keep himself in power and influence.

In a class system it is individuals of this kind who often set the standard of social behaviour. They care more for outer polish than for inner worth; more for professional success than for professional honesty. They make a vulgar display of their ill-gotten wealth and turn up their noses in the presence of those who are not as well off economically as they themselves. Their women deck themselves in flimsy tinsel and expensive jewellery, competing with each other in the art of foolish spending. Often they live much beyond their means, at times driving their husbands to questionable ways of making money in order to make them live in comfort.

In a society where the class system reigns, social relations are marred by envy and jealousy. The rich man looks down upon the poor and the poor man is jealous of the rich. Between the two there is a vast gulf which cannot be easily bridged. Neither of them is truly happy. The rich man spends vast sums of money for purposes of ostentation and show and the poor man, not being able to afford such expenditure, burns with envy.

In such a society there is no democratic equality. People think of their own class interests and class safety even in the face of national danger. Living in two different worlds as they do, there is nothing to hold the rich and the poor together. At a time of war or some other national calamity, all sorts of specious promises have to be made to the poor to prevent them from breaking out into revolution. There are instances of genuine interest on the part of the rich in the poor, but in most cases it does not go beyond the stage of pity and condescension.

The circle within which the various social classes live is a vicious one. While heartily despising the vulgarity of the upper classes, the lower classes consciously or unconsciously imitate them, much to their own detriment, in such matters as food, drink, clothing, housing, and style of living in general. All this adds to the smug self-satisfaction of the upper classes and the misery of the lower.

In saying all this, we do not want to shut our eyes to certain advantages of class, but the point is that they are overbalanced by the disadvantages. Family and environment do make a man a "gentleman" in his speech and ways. Such a man is not crude in his behaviour. He knows just what to say and how to say it. He is frank without being overbearing, and polite without becoming a flatterer. He listens patiently to others where patience is required, without pushing himself to the front everywhere. He does not have recourse to subterfuge and underhand ways in dealing with people. He is calm and collected in the face of danger and does not

unduly exult over victory. Defeat does not cow him down. Yet, it must be said that "gentlemen" of this sort are not always found in the upper classes, nor are they altogether absent among the lower grades. Furthermore, by proper home and school training and adequate economic opportunities we can evolve such "gentlemen" from all ranks of society.

Class in India

What we have said in criticising the class system is not mere fancy, and can be proved with reference to India. Superstitious reverence for the high and mighty has always been present in the country. From time immemorial the common people have literally believed in a kind of divinity which hedges the king. Even today, in spite of the colossal expenditure in which the Princes of the country indulge and the questionable lives which some of them live, there is no popular revolt against them.

Similar superstitious regard is paid to the priestly class in the Hindu society. The Brahmins have always been the recipients of honour and regard as well as of material gifts. It is instructive to find that even the staunchest of Non-Brahmin leaders who burn with a righteous indignation against the Brahmin oligarchy in politics, administration, and the learned professions, feel supremely unhappy if they cannot have the services of Brahmins in such domestic affairs as the marriage.

This reverence for the king and the priest does not strictly come under the class system, which is a product of the materialistic civilisation of today. There is no doubt whatever that class differences are in the ascendancy in modern India—particularly among the city-bred, educated people. There is a mad rush after empty titles, and the men who receive them are not always noted for their sturdy independence or solid accomplishment or for their national service. Expensive garden parties and dinners are held in their honour where the *elite* of the city can meet and

hob-nob with each other and feel supremely contented with themselves.

Positions of honour and trust are often bestowed upon those who have wealth and social status, but not necessarily brains. In making appointments it is not the intrinsic worth of the individual which is always taken into account, but his family antecedents and the service of some member or other of the family to the government of the day. Government servants are divided into gazetted servants and non-gazetted servants. Some are even designated as menials. On one of the principal railway lines, in practically every one of the station compounds, the words which catch the eye of even the least observing of individuals is "Staff Menial Quarters." The Indian Civil Service upon which unstinted praise has been bestowed has not always been free from snobbery. The old jibe that this service was neither Indian nor civil nor service has enough truth in it to make it sting. One of the reasons for the alleged incivility of the civilian is the disproportionately large salary paid to him and the consequent social distance between him and the common man.

The same aloofness bordering upon contempt on the one side and fear on the other, is kept up between the soldier and the common man. Every holder of a Government post, however small and insignificant it may be, feels tremendously puffed up. In the village his word is law and nobody dare openly contradict him.

Salary and status are everything in India. A person receiving ten rupees per month more than another in a given office considers himself his superior; and, being "superior," he expects a certain deferential conduct from the other man which is given as a matter of form and not out of the depth of one's heart. At durbars, court functions, and Government House parties a rigid order of precedence is observed, and to break it is considered a major social offence. Different kinds of dress are prescribed for different occasions and one must

know the correct form for every occasion if one is not to be considered a boor.

Even in University and college circles where one would least expect to find class distinctions, one frequently finds them. Teachers are graded into two or three classes, and there are institutions where there is no free social or intellectual intercourse between these groups. Those holding the most remunerative positions as occupiers of chairs are not always great scholars. At times they are vulgar politicians masquerading as academicians and professors. Much the same may be said with regard to meaningless gradations even in the service of the Church.

Class distinctions are marked not only in Government service and the learned professions. One finds them also in the relations between landlords and peasants as well as in the relations between employers and employees. The relation between the top dog and the under dog in India is much the same as elsewhere with this difference that the under dog in India is not well organised and has not learnt to bargain collectively. In recent years powerful labour and peasant organisations have been formed in order to wrest what is due to them from unwilling hands. What immense power for good as well as ill these masses of humanity can wield, it is difficult to foretell.

In railway travel one finds class distinctions. While those who want to travel in comfort should be given a chance to do so, there is no reason why the upper class passengers should be given all the amenities of travel, while the third class passengers who contribute to the bulk of the railway revenue get few or none. There is still a large measure of truth in the biting sarcasm of Mark Twain regarding railway travel in India: "First class passengers are rude to the guard; the guard in turn is rude to the third class passengers; and the second class passengers are rude to each other."

Even to-day there are Europeans who fight with Indians when they seek admission into compartments occupied by them. Sometimes they go to the extent of wanting to throw out Indians from their seats in order that they may occupy them themselves.

Because the common people are poor, ignorant, and superstitious, they suffer both economically and socially, although in towns and cities they are no longer as submissive as before. Education has not done much to ease the situation. As a matter of fact, it has driven a wedge between the educated and the uneducated. In sympathy, outlook, and aspiration the two classes live in two different worlds, the only exceptions being in the case of those engaged in genuine national service and missionary work. The educated people as a whole fight for their own interests and use their superior position for levying a toll from the illiterate and the unfortunate people of the country.

The worst feature of the class system in India is the conscious imitation of the upper classes by the lower classes. People who at one time lived on millets which are nourishing have now turned to rice and that, too, to milled rice which has very little nutritive value. Expensive and useless beverages such as coffee, tea, and lemonade have taken the place of wholesome buttermilk and unfermented toddy. Where people used hand-spun and hand-woven cloth, they now use mill-cloth strangling themselves to death economically. Because the common people find the higher classes taking freely to liquor and smoke, their own attitude towards them has changed considerably. Flimsy tinsel and cheap imported articles are preferred to local goods which may be substantial but lack finish and brightness. The middle class people spend lakhs of rupees on tonics and dental creams, powder, scents, and the like whose intrinsic value is out of proportion to the little good they may do. Even in matters of sex morality, the middle and the lower classes are fast adopting the lax ways of the upper classes, the cinema and the dance hall contri-

buting their share to the progressive deterioration. Debt is no longer regarded as great a disgrace as before. Family loyalty and family solidarity are gradually breaking down. Money is wasted even by poor people on betting and gambling, attendance at horse races being considered a mark of fashion and betting a sure way of making easy money.

The Future of the Class System

It is argued by some that class is any day better than caste inasmuch as the divisions of class are vertical, while those of caste are horizontal. In support of this position it must be said that class makes it possible for men of ability and grit to rise above the class to which they are born. But over against this advantage we must consider the many evils of the class system to which we have already drawn attention. Class is in consonance with the individualistic order of society where each man strives for himself; and the man who succeeds is almost in every case a loss to the class from which he has risen. In the caste system, however, it is possible for a whole caste or at least for a sub-caste to raise itself through its efforts and thereby conserve its social unity and solidarity. Caste preserves communal responsibility, while class destroys it.

What we notice in India is that cities act as a sponge in drawing the ablest people from the villages leaving the refuse behind. As soon as a young man in the village is found to have some ability he is sent to the town or city for higher education, on the completion of which in nine cases out of ten he has no desire to go back to the village. If he is lucky, he is absorbed in one or other of the many professions open to him in the city and becomes practically lost to his village community. Once in a while he visits the village for arranging for a marriage or to attend a funeral or for collecting his income from his ancestral property. But for all practical purposes he is a loss to his family (other than the immediate), to the caste brotherhood, and to the village.

A large percentage of our eminent lawyers, judges, teachers and men of affairs are all men who have been drawn from the village. While they themselves, used to hardship and privation, strive hard and succeed by individual effort their children do not always keep up the tradition. They become lazy and indolent wasting the well-earned money of their parents on the cinema, motor car, and the like. This means a continuous flow of talent from the village to the city and the building up in the city of a class of people who give themselves up to a life of luxury and conspicuous waste.

So long as the institution of inheritance lasts it cannot be honestly said that wealth is an index of capacity and character in a world of competition. It is often a matter of parental circumstance. Even among those who make their money by their own striving, it cannot always be said that they are necessarily superior to their competitors. Their only superiority may be in the direction of greater trickery, hard-heartedness, and readiness to sacrifice others in promoting their own interests.

For ourselves we believe that class is a concomitant of individualism and capitalism. So long as there are vast differences in the income levels of people, we are bound to have the class system which brings in its train waste, luxury, and the vulgar display of wealth. Aristotle's remedy was to allow each man to make all that he possibly could and then appeal to his generous impulses to be liberal in the use of his wealth. This method has been tried for ages, but has not gone very far in mitigating social and economic inequality except when the method was attempted under the impulse of religion. For one man who may have a high moral sense and a sensitive social conscience, there are at least ten who do not possess either. Their motto is: "Get on or get out."

The communist way is to get rid of all social classes in one sweep by the method of liquidation. This way we consider to be too drastic. Even in the present social and economic order under which we live, much can be done

to tone down social distinctions. Educational facilities should be thrown open to all who can benefit by them by such means as state aid and money help to all who deserve it. Taxation should be so framed as to render social services of an extensive character to the poor and middle class people. Legislation should be enacted and administrative machinery devised to prevent the intelligent, the clever, and the anti-social people from levying a toll from the rest. There should be minimum wage laws, excess profit taxes, and the like with a view to breaking down the walls of economic separation between people. At a time of war we find that legislation is freely resorted to in order to eliminate all wasteful expenditure, the rationing of petrol being a case in point. There is no reason why such restriction should not be extended in peace time to all forms of display and wasteful expenditure.

What even the government of the best sort can do in breaking down meaningless social distinctions is very little, because of the fact that the instruments at its disposal are few and limited. Governmental activities in this direction, therefore, need to be supplemented by enlightened public opinion and personal example. More than any Indian living, Mahatma Gandhi, by his personal example, has raised the status and self-respect of the Indian peasant. What he has done in his own inimitable manner others can do in a limited degree. In a country like India which from time immemorial has believed in and practised the ideal of 'plain living and high thinking', there is no justification for expensive ways of living, for ostentation, and snobbery. The educated people especially should cultivate a proper scale of values placing the moral and spiritual good above material values. The man of learning, of moral grandeur, and of spiritual attainment should be the object of our adoration rather than the man who has made his pile of money overnight or a successful politician or a militant general.

American society, in spite of its tendency to worship money and worldly comfort, is comparatively free from foolish

social distinctions. This difference is due to the large degree of equality of opportunity and the dignity of labour which are widely prevalent in that country. In making appointments the intrinsic worth of the man is considered rather than his family antecedents, as is often the case in India. No one is discriminated against because of his humble origin. Government servants are not classified into heaven-born servants, gazetted servants, etc. They do not enjoy the prestige and adulation shown to them in India. They do not have innumerable peons to run errands for them and endless number of clerks to relieve them of all hard routine work. There is genuine regard for all honest labour. The educated young men and women of India should preach and practise the dignity of labour if they are not to become soft, useless, and class-conscious. They should completely identify themselves with the interests and aspirations of the poor. Government service should be taken up in a spirit of vocation, and all suggestions of pride and superciliousness should be ruthlessly destroyed. The " social distance " between rulers and ruled has no meaning whatever in a self-governing, democratic India, which is the dream of every patriotic son of the soil.

Public opinion should be so organised as to frown upon all forms of wasteful expenditure. There is no point in feeding all and sundry at weddings or in burning money in the form of fire-crackers, fire works, and bright electric lights for nights on end. Moderation and good sense should be the guiding principles in all these matters. If certain comforts and conveniences are necessary in the interest of health and efficiency, they should be freely adopted. But they should not be sought after for their own sake, especially when they result in digging a gulf between the rich and the poor.

While all honour should be given to those who deserve it, public opinion should refuse to countenance meaningless class distinctions. The proud people will liquidate themselves if there are none to fall at their feet. Superciliousness thrives on flattery. Reverence for personality should become a

burning passion with all. Expressions like cooly, cooly-labour, and 'boy' for a bearer should all be scrupulously avoided.

The only class system which is justifiable in a new social order is a system in which the different classes are engaged in different types of service to the community, each class competing with the rest in making itself as useful as possible to the life of the community. In such a system there is no place for the idle rich or for those who live on the exploitation of others. Society should become an organic unity, practising the motto, "Each for all and all for each."

CHAPTER VI

SOCIAL HARMONY

3. COMMUNALISM

In the national life of India to-day there is no problem which calls for a more immediate and enduring solution than the problem of inter-communal conflict. Even the problem of British Imperialism, or of the Princes, or of the federation-to-be pales into insignificance when compared with communalism.

Mahatma Gandhi is considered the greatest living Indian to-day, because he has given us a profound sense of national self-respect. But the man who can find a permanent solution to the problem of national unity will be considered even greater than he. Posterity is certain to regard such a man the saviour of India in modern times. National self-respect becomes a mere sentiment, devoid of all reality, if it is not augmented by national unity. So long as national unity is lacking and communal strife is rampant, we shall continue to be a subject people and an object of derision to the outside world.

The problem of communalism is on the whole peculiar to India. It is true that many of the smaller European countries, South Africa, the United States, and Canada have their problems arising from the presence of minorities in their midst. But these minorities are linguistic, racial, religious or political. In India, on the other hand, the communal problem is all these and something more.

The chief communal problem in our country is between the Hindus and Muslims. In the Madras Province, however, it is between the Brahmins and non-Brahmins, although it has never reached such proportions as the Hindu-Muslim problem in the rest of India. A further communal problem

all over the country, and particularly in the southern province, is the problem between the caste Hindu and the so-called Depressed Classes. The Christians of India as a whole have not been much affected by communalism, although it must be said in the interest of truth that in some parts of India, Indian Christian leaders have at times tried to make common cause with the Muslims and Depressed Classes against the Hindus. In some instances they have joined hands with Anglo-Indians for purposes of social intercourse and the securing of employment.

The Hindus form the bulk of the population of India. According to the 1931 census, out of a total population of 353 millions, fully 68 per cent are Hindus, 22 per cent are Muslims, 1.7 per cent are Christians, and a still slighter percentage are Sikhs. Statistics show that the Mohammedans increase faster than the Hindus. Further, Hinduism not being essentially a missionary faith, has been steadily losing its numbers to both Christians and Muslims. The Sikhs, being confined largely to the Punjab, do not constitute a serious problem for the rest of India.

The Hindus largely predominate in the centre and South of India. In the Madras Presidency they are no less than 88 per cent. They are in the majority in Assam, Bihar, Orissa, the United Provinces, the Central India tracts, Rajputana, and Bombay. The Muslims practically monopolise the North West Frontier Province, Baluchistan, and Kashmir and are considerably in excess of Hindus in the Punjab, Eastern Bengal, and Sind. They form 32 per cent in Assam, 15 per cent in the United Provinces, and 11 per cent in Hyderabad. There are more Hindus living in Indian States governed by Muslim princes than Muslims living under Hindu princes.

There is no doubt that the inter-communal problem is becoming more and more serious every day. It threatens to lead to a permanent civil war. The present generation of Indians have the responsibility of either making the future of India or of marring it for years to come. A wrong step taken

at this juncture will lead to such awful results that one shudders even to think of it.

At the bottom of the inter-communal problem is a profound sense of fear and suspicion and gross misunderstanding, and, as has rightly been said, the opposite of love is not hate but fear. The Muslims do not trust the Hindus and the Hindus in turn distrust the Muslims. The Muslim fear is that the Hindu is very clever, and possibly cunning, and that by the art of palaver, will keep the Muslim down as a hewer of wood and drawer of water. The Hindu fear is that the Muslim is fanatic and bigoted and that with the help of the sword, he will strive to establish military supremacy over the whole of India, making it a part of the larger Islamic world. Both these fears are ill-founded and are based on old prejudices.

Causes of Communal Conflict

The primary causes of communal conflict are economic, political, and psychological. The secondary or subsidiary causes are social, cultural, and religious. Even to-day, the communal conflict is confined largely to the educated classes living in towns and cities. But a good many selfish political leaders are dragging the masses into the picture in order to advance their own interests.

Economic Causes—In many parts of India, the Muslims occupy an inferior economic position to that occupied by the Hindus. In the Punjab and Bengal, where the Muslims form a considerable majority, we are told that, from the point of view of wealth, Muslims are behind the Hindus, many of the landlords and money lenders being Hindus. * In Bengal the Hindus pay more than half the taxes, although they form only 43 per cent of the population. In some form of business,

*Mr. B. K. Malik, in his book, *The Individual and the Group*, thinks that landlordism introduced by the British, whereby the Hindu became preponderately the landlord, is the main cause of communal tension in Bengal. He further thinks that landlordism is alien to the Hindu notion of group ownership on which is based the Indian village system.

however, the Muslims are the enterpreneurs, while Hindus work for them. This is particularly true in the leather industry, tanning, and beedi manufacture. In towns and cities a good percentage of Muslims are shop-keepers and traders. In the skilled trades, arts , and handicrafts, the Muslims have on the whole a better showing.

In many of the Government services, the Muslims are behind the Hindus both as regards numbers and influence. This disparity is due largely to the fact that Hindus took to western education much earlier than did the Muslims. In competitive examinations for Government service the Muslims have not fared so well as the Hindus. One possible reason for this is that the Muslim on the whole is not such an apt pupil as the Hindu, the high caste Hindu having had a much longer tradition of book learning. To remedy this inequality, the Government of India introduced some years ago a system of communal representation into the Central services, according to which 25 per cent of the posts were reserved for Muslims and 8 1|3 per cent for Anglo-Indians, Indian Christians, and other small minorities. For some years now there have been nominated to the I.C.S. a certain number of Muslims from those who take the competitive examination at Delhi, but who do not come out in the list of successful candidates. In the provincial governments, too, there is the communal rotation and nomination to such posts as those of the Naib-Tahsildar and Deputy Collector.

Of late the problem of communal representation in the services has taken a very serious turn in Bengal. Implementing a resolution of the Legislative Assembly that 60 per cent of Government appointments hereafter should be given to Muslims, 20 per cent to the Depressed Classes, and 20 per cent to the rest, the Bengal Ministry decided to reserve 50 per cent of Government posts to Muslims. The Muslim argument in support of this position is that the Muslims hitherto have had less than their share of the loaves and fishes of office and that, in the name of efficiency and under

the guise of competitive examinations, many incompetent Hindus have been appointed to responsible posts. It is further argued that book knowledge is not everything, and that what is required of an administrator is capacity to understand human beings, to enlist their co-operation, and to execute orders. While all this may be true—and there is no proof that any community has a monopoly of these qualities—, as Macaulay and Trevelyan foresaw nearly a century ago, nothing can be an effective substitute for a right type of competitive examination. The real position appears to be that the Muslims of Bengal, finding themselves in a strong position in the Ministry and the Legislature, want to turn the tables on the Hindus.

The economic struggle is so keen that certain forms of business and petty industry are monopolised by members of one community or another, and no one from outside is given a chance to get into the close preserve. Not long ago the beedi manufacturers in a certain city put considerable pressure on their workers to change over to the faith of their employers, if they wanted to continue in employment. Disputing the oft-repeated claim that the communal problem is essentially a religious one, Sir Sikandar Hyat Khan, the Prime Minister of the Punjab, has said: "The communal problem is not a religious problem, but is really a mundane, material problem."

Political Causes—The successive instalments of self-government, granted from time to time, have not been an unmixed blessing. They have accentuated communalism and whetted the desire to grab all that one can get for oneself and one's community. The Muslims have been quick to realise that political power is passing from the hands of the British to Indian hands. They contend that in the present circumstances of education, wealth, and general progress, self-government really means government by the Hindu majority. Because of this fear, the Muslims have been anxious to safeguard their position by such devices as sepa-

rate electorates, weightage, and nominations to district boards, municipal councils, etc.

The pernicious system of separate electorates was first introduced as an experimental measure after the Morley-Minto Reforms of 1909. But the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms of 1919 and the Government of India Act of 1935 have widened and strengthened it. The Macdonald Award of 1932 was really a reward to the faithful. As things stand at present, a progressive individual who wants to cut across the artificial communal barriers fixed by separate electorates cannot do so without altogether foregoing his civic right to exercise the vote. An Indian Christian, for instance, has to vote in the Christian constituency, and for a Christian, whether he likes it or not. He is not allowed to vote in the general constituency. Nor is a non-Christian permitted to seek election from a Christian constituency.

Separate electorates which are in existence to-day for elections to the provincial and central legislative chambers are spreading even to local and municipal elections. Recently separate electorates have been re-introduced into the Calcutta Corporation on the plea that the Muslims, who form only 25 per cent of the city's population, require special protection. Strange as it may seem, in the Province also where the Muslims form a majority, separate electorates are in existence. In the city, the minority is to be protected against the majority, but in the Province the majority is to be protected against the minority. Surely a case of "Heads we win, tails you lose!" An encouraging sign of the times is that joint electorates for local government elections in Sind are proving a success.

Separatism is fast becoming the bane of Indian politics. It has spread from the legislatures, district boards, and municipal councils to administrative services, and now threatens to invade even the cabinet system of government. It is argued by some that, in the place of a homogeneous ministry

representing the majority party in the legislature and the country, there should be a composite cabinet, representing the different religious and other such interests in the Province and the country, holding office for a fixed term of years. Such a change, we are afraid, will not serve the true interests of minorities any more than communal representation has served their interests in the legislative field. If, however, separate electorates are abolished, irremovable composite cabinets might be tried.

At the present moment there is very little of nobility or magnanimity in Indian politics. It is supercharged with selfishness of the worst kind. The situation has reached such a pass that vociferous minorities are able to hold up the progress by threats of sabotage. It is a clear case of a tyranny of the minority over the majority. It is easily forgotten that if minorities have their rights, so has the majority. Majorities and minorities have a meaning only in reference to genuine differences as regards social, economic, and political principles, policies, and methods. But majorities and minorities based on religious, caste, and class affiliations have no abiding place in politics.

We do not agree with interested people who claim that during the last 700 years when the Muslims have been in the country, there has always been bad blood between them and the Hindus and that there were no lasting social and cultural contacts between the two communities. What history shows is that there were long periods of peace and friendly relations between the two. In warfare the Muslims had Hindu allies and the Hindus had Muslim allies. Rulers of the two communities had no scruples in annexing territories of rulers belonging to their own religion. The Hindu Revenue Minister of Akbar devised and applied to the whole of India a common land revenue system. In Hyderabad State one often notices a conflict between "Mulki" Muslims and the "Non-Hyderabad" Muslims.

Although it is difficult to prove that British administrators have actively fostered communalism, there can be little doubt that they have made a full use of it. There was a time when they praised the Hindus as against the Muslims, but later the tune changed. Sir John Strachey was one of the first British administrators to stress the need for an alliance between the British and the Muslims. In 1888 he wrote: "There is and never was an India." As early as 1821, a writer in the Asiatic Journal said: "*Divide et impera* should be the motto of our Indian administration." This view was endorsed by an Army officer who likewise pronounced that "our endeavour should be to uphold in full force the (for us, fortunate) separation which exists between the different religions and races; not to endeavour to amalgamate them."[1] In a Minute of May 14, 1859, Lord Elphinstone who was then the Governor of Bombay wrote: "*Divide et impera* was the old Roman motto, and it should be ours." In 1926, Lord Olivier, who had been Secretary of State for India in the first Labour Government, wrote: "No one with a close acquaintance of Indian affairs will be prepared to deny that on the whole there is a predominant bias in British officialism in India in favour of the Muslim community, partly on the ground of closer sympathy but more largely as a makeweight against Hindu nationalism." Similar opinions are found in the correspondence between Morley and Minto as well in the biography of Lord Birkenhead.[2]

According to the Simon Commission, India is 'a land of minorities'. On the celebration of his eightieth birthday in 1941, the late Dr. Rabindranath Tagore wrote: "This ugly culmination of Indian history would never have been possible if communalism and provincialism and lack of mutual faith

[1] Leonard Schiff: *The Present Condition of India*, p. 166.

[2] According to Dr. Ambedkar, although no demand was made by Muslims for separate representation in the Indian Councils Act of 1892, Lord Dufferin, the then Viceroy, introduced it for some mysterious reason. In 1909 when the Morley-Minto Reforms were on the anvil, the Muslims waited in deputation on the Viceroy to press their claims, and this has been described by the late Mr. Mahomed Ali as a "command performance." Even the present move for Pakistan is said to have originated with some British members of the Round Table Conferences in London.

were not sedulously encouraged to grow to their present vicious form by some secret conclave holding the highest responsibilities in the system of administration." The Cawnpore Riots Enquiry Committee of 1931 recorded: "Every class of witness agreed in this one respect that the police showed indifference and inactivity in dealing with various incidents in the riot."

Sir P. S. Sivaswami Aiyar, the veteran leader of Madras, a moderate of moderates, and one who weighs every word that he utters, speaking to the Rotary Club, Madras, said : "So far as the members of the Hindu community are concerned, there is a general feeling that they do not get sufficient protection from the Government and that there is a desire on the part of the authorities to favour the other community. Whether this suspicion is well-founded or not, it is difficult to say. I can only say that the belief is widely prevalant that the Governmeut are not interested in promoting a reconciliation between the two major communities for the reason that the communal misunderstandings and quarrels will ensure their position as arbitrators between the rival communities..... In creating a system of separate electorates, the Government have sown the dragon's teeth and cannot escape their share of responsibility for the tension between the two major communities."*

Sir P. S. Sivaswami Iyer went on to say that as "authors of the mischief", in introducing separate electorates, the Government of India had a responsibility for undoing it and that they must take courage into their hands and carry out their duty at any cost. From all this it is clear that if the British really want to make amends for the past, one of their first duties is to "decommunalise" the communities. To say that they are not prepared to move an inch until all the communities and "interests" in India agree among themselves on the future constitutional development of the country, seems hardly fair.

---

* The *Hindu* November 5, 1941.

Psychological Causes—Some of the minorities suffer both from an inferiority and a superiority complex. The inferiority complex arises from the realisation of the fact that they are not so clever and nimble-witted as some others, particularly the Brahmins. They are not so good as their rivals as regards book learning, capacity for hard routine work, and ability to please superiors.

The superiority complex in the case of the Muslims arises from the fact that some centuries ago Muslim kings ruled India, although with the help of both Muslims and Hindu ministers and administrators. The Muslims sometimes argue to themselves that, from the point of view of physical strength and prowess, they are superior to the Hindus, and therefore there is no reason why they should be deprived of their innate right to rule.

To sum up, the primary causes of inter-communal conflict are the instinct of self-preservation, lust for power, and determination to find a place in the sun. To these are added certain subsidiary causes.

Subsidiary Causes of Communal Conflict

Social and Cultural—The social and cultural cleavage between the communities is becoming wider every day. Till a few years ago the Muslims, who on the whole do not observe caste distinctions, had no hesitation in accepting food and water at the hands of the Hindus. But now the division is becoming more and more clearly marked, as one can see in separate restaurants for different communities, particularly in railway stations. For this state of affairs the Hindus are largely to blame. Whatever merits caste might have had in the past, caste as meaning anti-social restrictions has no right to exist today. As we have noticed earlier, one can understand the feeling of a vegetarian in not wanting to eat with a non-vegetarian. But distinctions other than vegetarian *versus* non-vegetarian are meaningless.

Even in such matters as dress and the style of dressing one's hair, the communities are drifting apart. Comparatively insignificant matters such as cow slaughter and music before mosques, which can easily be kept under control, provided there is commonsense and good-will on both sides, are allowed to become the occasions for bloody communal riots. Hindu participation in Muslim festivals and Muslim participation in Hindu festivals are becoming less and less frequent. The Hindi-Urdu controversy is made to do service to communalism. Inter-marriage between the communities is rare. Relatively speaking there are more inter-marriages between Hindus and Christians and between Muslims and Christians than between Hindus and Muslims. There is a fundamental social equality among Muslims which is not so clearly marked among the Hindus.

Religious.—Instead of being a unifying factor, religion in India is on the whole a divisive factor. The Muslim looks down upon the Hindu as an idolator and polytheist. The Hindu pantheism makes no appeal to him. The Hindu, on the other hand, looks upon his own religion as highly philosophical and exceedingly tolerant, and so broad-based as to include every religious faith and sect in India. Mohammedanism, he believes, was well suited for the nomadic conditions which prevailed in Arabia in the early days, but is too elementary to suit a developed society.

Hindu worship is mostly individualistic and at times noisy. Muslim worship, on the other hand, is corporate, quiet, and orderly. Sacrifice of cows and goats which forms a part of Muslim worship is repellent to the high caste Hindu.

Many a Muslim feels that Mecca is his spiritual home, and to the extent to which his ultimate loyalty is to a place and to a people outside India, he gives the impression that he is not fully rooted and grounded in India.

What is the Solution?

Multiplication and exaggeration of differences in all trivial matters and the nursing of grievances, whether genuine

Psychological Causes—Some of the minorities suffer both from an inferiority and a superiority complex. The inferiority complex arises from the realisation of the fact that they are not so clever and nimble-witted as some others, particularly the Brahmins. They are not so good as their rivals as regards book learning, capacity for hard routine work, and ability to please superiors.

The superiority complex in the case of the Muslims arises from the fact that some centuries ago Muslim kings ruled India, although with the help of both Muslims and Hindu ministers and administrators. The Muslims sometimes argue to themselves that, from the point of view of physical strength and prowess, they are superior to the Hindus, and therefore there is no reason why they should be deprived of their innate right to rule.

To sum up, the primary causes of inter-communal conflict are the instinct of self-preservation, lust for power, and determination to find a place in the sun. To these are added certain subsidiary causes.

Subsidiary Causes of Communal Conflict

Social and Cultural—The social and cultural cleavage between the communities is becoming wider every day. Till a few years ago the Muslims, who on the whole do not observe caste distinctions, had no hesitation in accepting food and water at the hands of the Hindus. But now the division is becoming more and more clearly marked, as one can see in separate restaurants for different communities, particularly in railway stations. For this state of affairs the Hindus are largely to blame. Whatever merits caste might have had in the past, caste as meaning anti-social restrictions has no right to exist today. As we have noticed earlier, one can understand the feeling of a vegetarian in not wanting to eat with a non-vegetarian. But distinctions other than vegetarian *versus* non-vegetarian are meaningless.

Even in such matters as dress and the style of dressing one's hair, the communities are drifting apart. Comparatively insignificant matters such as cow slaughter and music before mosques, which can easily be kept under control, provided there is commonsense and good-will on both sides, are allowed to become the occasions for bloody communal riots. Hindu participation in Muslim festivals and Muslim participation in Hindu festivals are becoming less and less frequent. The Hindi-Urdu controversy is made to do service to communalism. Inter-marriage between the communities is rare. Relatively speaking there are more inter-marriages between Hindus and Christians and between Muslims and Christians than between Hindus and Muslims. There is a fundamental social equality among Muslims which is not so clearly marked among the Hindus.

Religious.—Instead of being a unifying factor, religion in India is on the whole a divisive factor. The Muslim looks down upon the Hindu as an idolator and polytheist. The Hindu pantheism makes no appeal to him. The Hindu, on the other hand, looks upon his own religion as highly philosophical and exceedingly tolerant, and so broad-based as to include every religious faith and sect in India. Mohammedanism, he believes, was well suited for the nomadic conditions which prevailed in Arabia in the early days, but is too elementary to suit a developed society.

Hindu worship is mostly individualistic and at times noisy. Muslim worship, on the other hand, is corporate, quiet, and orderly. Sacrifice of cows and goats which forms a part of Muslim worship is repellent to the high caste Hindu.

Many a Muslim feels that Mecca is his spiritual home, and to the extent to which his ultimate loyalty is to a place and to a people outside India, he gives the impression that he is not fully rooted and grounded in India.

WHAT IS THE SOLUTION ?

Multiplication and exaggeration of differences in all trivial matters and the nursing of grievances, whether genuine

or imaginary, are not ways along which communal harmony can be achieved.* Our starting point should be the wholesome conviction that geographical, historical, and economic conditions have conspired that Indians of all descriptions should live together in harmony and unity on a basis of mutual understanding and accommodation. Our motto might well be: Each community its own social, cultural, and religious existence within well-defined and reasonable limits; all the communities one State. We do not want a Hindu Raj, a Muslim Raj or a British Raj, or any permutation or combination of these. We want an Indian Raj. The All-India Azad Muslim Conference was right when it declared on 30th April, 1940, "India with its geographical and political boundaries is an indivisible whole"

If our national leaders would only realise that our very existence as a country and a people is at stake, they would not indulge in propagating such untenable propositions as "India, a land of two nations," or a "confederation of Hindu India and Muslim India." Instead of confining the area of co-operation to members of their own caste, class or community, they would extend it to include the whole country. India does not want leaders who fan communal flame and make an amicable settlement difficult of attainment by their exaggerations and half-truths. She wants men and women filled with a passion for national self-respect, unity

* The trouble with the Pirpur Committee is that it started with certain settled conclusions and then went about collecting evidence in support of them. No one wants to justify all the legislative measures and administrative acts of the Congress Government in the provinces. But to describe them as 'Congress tyranny' is a clear case of exaggeration. Part of the trouble arose out of the inexperience of Congress in office and part of it was due to the distortions and exaggerations indulged in by defeated parties and disgruntled politicians. The singing of *Bande Mataram*, the hoisting of the national flag over public buildings, the compulsory teaching of Hindi, the hanging of the portrait of Gandhi in schools, the Wardha and Vidya Mandir schemes of education—none of these was a serious offence. But since party politicians were eager to make capital out of them, the Congress should have gone about in a more tactful manner, endeavouring to carry public opinion with it. Besides, it should have weaned itself away from Gandhiji's Hindu outlook and temperament and made itself a thoroughly Indian national movement, which it is not too late to do even now. There is no gainsaying the fact that the average Muslim regards Gandhi as an ardent propagandist of Hindu religion and culture.

strength, and justice. Once the necessary psychological attitude, viz. "the will to co-operate," is adopted, problems which appear to be insoluble are bound to vanish into thin air. Emphasis on minority claims and interests is capable of endless multiplication until India becomes a congerie of innumerable tribes, sects, and self-seekers, and no majority is left. Questions such as the creation of a Tamil province or an Andhra province, protection of the rights of non-Brahmins, etc., should all be approached from the angle of national unity and solidarity.

It is too late in the day to argue that the different communities of India belong to different racial stocks and that they can never live together in peace. The fact of the matter is that a considerable percentage of present-day Muslims and Christians are converts from the Hindu fold and are flesh of their flesh and bone of their bone. Even supposing that there is racial heterogeneity in India, it must be remembered that there has also been in the past a great deal of racial intermixture. What science teaches is that no race is pure anywhere in the world. All are mongrels. If it be true that the Celt, the Saxon, the Dane, and the Norman have coalesced into the modern Englishman, and the blood of every conceivable European nationality has entered into the blood-stream of the modern American, it is absurd to claim that the Hindu and Muslim can never unite on the racial plane and form a strong nation.

In India we must cultivate the habit of mind which says that racially we are one. History shows that even assumed racial relationship has acted as a cementing factor. The pyschological feeling that we are one is much more important than the anthropological proof that we are one. From whatever part of India we may hail and whatever be the religious community or caste to which we may belong, we feel more at home with fellow-Indians, than say with the Chinese, Japanese, British, Germans, or Russians. This may be an irrational and mystical feeling. But it is there, and we must

make the most of it if Indian nationality is to become strong and vigorous. We shall do well to cultivate a little bit of Coueism or auto-suggestion in our daily life and contacts. We should develop that habit of mind which says : " Every Indian, the Pathan, the Punjabi, the Bengali, the Gujerati, the Mahratta, the Andhra, the Tamil, and the Malayalee is equally my brother."

A wholesome affection and love for the country which gave us birth is undoubtedly an important corrective to exaggerated communalism. No Indian child should be allowed to grow up without developing an intense love for his village, district, province, and country. Indian mountains and rivers, plains and valleys, historical monuments and ruins should rouse the tender feeling of every Indian. Indian legends and stories of heroes and heroines should become the common property of all. If it be true that a naturally defined territory or geographical unit is an essential condition of nationality, it must be confessed that we have not made full use of the existing geographical unity. Except for some cracks in the Himalayas, India forms a distinct geographical unit marked off from the rest of the world. Therefore, it seems altogether futile to speak of dividing India, into Hindu India, Muslim India, Sikh India, and Christian India the result of which is sure to be a Sick India. India is our national home and the boundaries are clearly marked. This does not mean that there are barbed wires around it or a Maginot or Siegfried line shutting out foreigners. The gates are left open to all friendly people who are willing to come and identify themselves completely with us.

Pakistan is a counsel of despair. It will undo the unifying work of the British during the last two centuries, which they were obliged to undertake from the point of view of administrative convenience. If all the Muslims could be segregated from the Hindus in a naturally defined territory, there might be some justification for it. But this is not the intention of the advocates of Pakistan. They do not envisage any large-scale migration of Hindu population to the Hindu

Zones or of the Muslim population to the Muslim Zones. Under Pakistan 37 per cent. of Muslims will still be living in Hindu areas. The only safeguard proposed is that the pistol will be pointed at the Hindu minorities in the Muslim areas in order that the Muslim minorities in the Hindu areas might be treated fairly. To any one who believes in a new social order based on justice and brotherhood, any scheme of this kind is a confession of political bankruptcy. It makes no appeal to the nobler instincts of man which are found in every community. It may even be a subtle move for the Muslim domination of India by two stages. Very few will be deceived by the contention that all that the Muslims want, in pursuance of Pakistan, is one fourth of India. What is required is the providing of ample safeguards for protecting the legitimate rights of minorities, short of the dismemberment of India.

Communalism can further be combated by stressing the unity of ideas and ideals which underlie Indian culture. The consciousness that we have a mission to perform to the rest of mankind can help us to forget our differences and work together for a common purpose. Greece at the height of her glory made a great contribution to art, literature, philosophy, and politics. Rome made her contribution to law, order, and practical administration. In modern times Great Britain has contributed the immortal plays of Shakespeare, wise statesmanship, and the art of governing people through much bungling. America has made valuable contributions in the utilisation of matter for the alleviation of human suffering. India, too, can make her great contribution to mankind when she becomes the master of her soul. She can demonstrate in no uncertain terms the victory of the spirit over matter and the power of truth and non-violence in all human relations. There is already a common allegiance to the ideals behind charka—the ideals of simplicity, purity, truth, non-violence, and concern for the toiling masses. To these passive virtues we should add active, rugged virtues such as bravery, courage, frankness in speech and action, and service to others.

Specific Remedies

Economic : One of the primary causes of communalism being economic, some of the ardent spirits in the country believe that socialism may be the way out of our difficulty. When the State provides for the needs of every one who is able and willing to work, it seems reasonable to hope that the present keen struggle for existence will come to be greatly modified, if not cease altogether. To reward people according to the socially useful labour performed may be the best form of social justice, but the world has not yet devised the necessary machinery for the realisation of this end. Even if socialism is not possible in our day, a much larger degree of social justice than what obtains to-day is an absolute necessity. Among other things, it may help to assuage communal feelings. We should work for a state of affairs in which family ethics will take the place of " jungle ethics." If what Mr. B. K. Malik says about landlordism is correct, it is necessary to " unwind " that system. Continuance of the permanent settlement cannot be justified either on ethical or economic grounds. In order to reduce pauperism, lands belonging to a family should not be allowed to be sold below a minimum. Multi-purpose cooperative societies should be encouraged.

A drastic reduction in salaries attached to government posts may prove to be a blessing in disguise. The huge salaries paid to our public servants are altogether out of keeping with the poverty of the country. Great Britain does not pay its ministers and civil servants as lavishly as does India. The salary of the Japanese Prime Minister is roughly 1|5th of that received by Indian Prime Ministers in non-Congress provinces. If an all-round salary cut is brought about, it is possible that there will not be the same scramble for government posts as at present and consequent communal squabble. Government service should become a vocation which a person takes up out of a sense of duty. The satisfaction of rendering public service should become a reward in itself.

The economic causes of communalism may be partially removed by the opening of other avenues of making a living besides government posts. The progressive industrialisation of the country and the revival of cottage industries on a large scale are steps in the right direction. There should be a chain of *swadeshi* shops and industries all through the country, employing Indians of all descriptions solely on the basis of efficiency and expert knowledge.

As regards communal representation in the public services, it should be borne in mind that it is necessary to keep in proper balance the right of each community to its legitimate share of public posts and the right of the nation at large to receive its money's worth. Other things being equal, there should be a due proportion between the strength of any one community in the country and its representation in the services. But it must be remembered that the right of the citizen to be safeguarded against inefficient and worthless officials is much greater than the right of every caste and community to its exact mathematical percentage in the services. Of late the ridiculous claim has been made that the communal percentage should be observed even in the award of government contracts.

Political and National: It is the paramount duty of every parent and teacher to inculcate in boys and girls a healthy national outlook so that when they grow up they will instinctively place the national good above their own narrow, selfish good. Willingness to sacrifice for a common cause and mutual trust should become a part of their nature.

The majority community should give ample proof of its sincerity in striving for the welfare of the minorities. The minorities in their turn should give up their attitude of fear, suspicion, and jealousy and the habit of reading motives even into the most innocent of acts. Both the majority and minority communities should strive to abolish separate electorates which are a blight and a curse, and the futility of which

even their keen advocates have come to realise. All that separate electorates have succeeded in doing is to divide India into numerous warring communities and to place a premium on fanaticism, bigotry, and personal and group selfishness. If the transition from separate to joint electorates cannot be made all at once, joint electorates with a reservation of seats may be tried as an intermediate stage, with the proviso suggested by the late Mr. Muhammad Ali of requiring the successful candidate to secure a specific percentage of the votes of the different communities. In localities where members of one community or another are found in large numbers, by a slight re-drawing of the boundaries of the constituency it is possible to obtain roughly the same representation for the minorities as obtains to-day under separate electorates.* The good citizen should vote for a man not because he belongs to the same caste or community, but because in his judgment, he is the best available candidate for the office in question. Even if separate electorates are retained for some time longer, opportunity should be given to progressive individuals of all communities to vote in a general constituency. The present arrangement is such that, instead of pulling up the backward to the level of the progressive, the progressive is dragged down to the level of the backward.

People should be trained to realise the fact that there is a political etiquette just as much as there is a social etiquette. Party Government ought not to mean partisan government. No one has a right to sling mud upon one's political opponents. Hitting below the belt is unworthy of political parties as well as of individuals. Keeping on repeating a lie till it appears to be true is a game which even a party politician will do well to avoid. Negative and untruthful criticism is not only injurious to the general welfare of the country but also corrodes the soul of the person who makes it. If a community has a genuine objection to the Wardha Scheme of education, to a national flag or a national song, it is the duty of that community to

*A suggestion which I owe to Mr. V. Desika Char, M.A., a research student in the University of Madras.

evolve something better which will meet with the general approval of thoughtful people among all communities.

To allay the fears of minorities, certain fundamental rights may be incorporated in the preamble to the constitution, if not in the constitution itself, remembering at the same time that the best safeguard is the mutual goodwill and commonsense of the communities. While fundamental rights cannot be enforced in any effective way, they can give to all concerned considerable psychological satisfaction. In their very nature, they should be incapable of amendment in the ordinary manner. They should provide freedom of thought, belief, and worship, freedom to develop one's own culture and language, equality before law, equal access to public employment, to public roads, wells, tanks, schools and places of public resort, etc.* In the light of European experience, we may say that every attempt should be made to make the language of these decla-

*In this connection it is instructive to glance through the fundamental rights guaranteed by Poland to her minorities. As summed up by Mr. M. N. Dalal, the author of *Whither Minorities*, they are as follows :—

(1) Full and complete protection of life and liberty is guaranteed to all the inhabitants of Poland.

(2) All inhabitants are entitled to the free exercise, whether public or private, of any creed, religion or belief whose practices are not inconsistent with public order or public morals.

(3) In Poland, all Polish nationals are equal before the law. All enjoy the same civil and political rights, irrespective of race, language or religion. No discrimination is to be made, as regards admission to public employment, functions and honours, or the exercise of any professions or industries.

(4) No restriction is to be placed on the use of any language, in private intercourse, in commerce, in religion, in the press or in publication of any kind or at public meetings. This does not debar the Polish Government from having an official language of the State. But those who do not use the Polish are allowed to use their national language in speech or writing before the courts.

(5) Polish citizens have equal rights to establish and control at their own expense charitable, religious, and social institutions, schools and other educational establishments, along with the right to use their own language and to exercise their religion freely therein.

(6) In primary schools where there are a large number of children who do not speak the Polish language, the language of the children may be used as a medium of instruction. This does not mean that Polish language cannot be made compulsory in these schools.

(7) Jews are not compelled to perform any act which constitutes a violation of the Sabbath nor are they placed under any disability, because of their refusal to attend courts of law, or to perform any legal business on their Sabbath. But this does not exempt them from military service, national defence or the preservation of public order.

rations as precise as possible in order to make them enforceable at courts of law.

Leaders of all communities should put their heads together to evolve a national dress and national headgear. This does not mean that there should be no local or provincial dress. All that it means is that one need not be tied down to it slavishly, especially in these days of rapid transport, frequent travel, and abundant social intercourse. Attempt should be made to cultivate an Indian cosmopolitanism as regards food, drink, and social customs in general. In all these matters, the guiding principle should be, "Prove all things and hold fast that which is good."

A national language is undoubtedly an absolute necessity. Seeing that spoken Hindustani is the nearest approach to a national language, efforts should be made to popularise it. Whether the Urdu or the Devanagri script should be used is immaterial to most of us. Perhaps both scripts might be used; or better still the Roman script might be adopted. The use of a national language does not mean the destruction of the principal provincial languages. Every Indian child should be given a thorough grounding in his own mother tongue and a working knowledge of a national language as well as of an international language like the English. Such an accomplishment is not difficult of realisation when we remember that Indians are good linguists and that children in many of the smaller European countries learn three languages with great ease and are able to write and converse in all of them. In the United States of America no citizen is prohibited from cultivating his own mother tongue. But if he wants to enjoy all the privileges of citizenship, he must possess a knowledge of English.

Voltaire once boasted that the French language and literature had made more conquests than Charlemagne. National language and literature make for pride and reverence. A well-known English professor, J. H. Rose, considers common language to be the most powerful political influence.

According to another authority, M. Joseph, language is the most obvious element of nationality. More than any other factor of nationality, a common language can break down the barriers of sectionalism in India.

Psychological: Reference has already been made to the necessity of cultivating that frame of mind, especially among the educated, which looks upon every Indian as a brother and fellow-worker in the national cause. Sectionalism and communalism will die an instantaneous death if our communal leaders possess a vivid realisation of the low status to which they have reduced themselves and their country in the eyes of the outside world. Whether we belong to the martial north or the " benighted " south, whether we belong to the " Hindu nation " or the " Muslim nation ", we are all given the position of helots once we leave the shores of India. We are looked upon as " a brand of niggers " or a mere appendage of Great Britain ; and for this state of affairs we have none to thank but ourselves. No nation on earth will stand the humiliating position assigned to countrymen of ours in South Africa, Kenya, the Fiji Islands, Ceylon, and even Burma. Yet we stand helpless because we are disunited and are unwilling to think and act in terms of nationalism, even when Great Britain has declared her willingness to set us on the road to freedom.

To perpetuate communalism—whether practised by a majority or a minority—is to brand ourselves as an inferior and semi-civilized people for all time to come. There can be no doubt that communalism is a negation of nationalism. We cannot both be communalists and nationalists. Communalism means a perpetuation of fissiparous tendencies. So long as communalism takes the form of a healthy family pride and means greater effort for the educational, social, and cultural uplift of the members of one's community, without standing in the way of the development of others, there may be no objection to it. But if it means, as it often does, the dividing of India into warring communities, each community trying to secure as much as it can for itself at the expense of

others or at least without any thought of them, and each one sticking its tongue out at the others, there can be no justification for it. Communalists often draw a false analogy between family devotion and devotion to one's community. It is conveniently forgotten that those who benefit by communalism are often the most selfish and bigoted members of their community who use their communal cloak for the advancement of their own ends.

Social and Cultural: It is the duty of every educated Indian to encourage social intercourse and inter-dining between members of all communities and no community. It is high time that Hindu 'cha' (tea) and Muslim 'cha' were replaced by wholesome India 'cha'. There is no justification in our day for such exclusiveness as indicated by "For Brahmins only," in cafes and restaurants. Municipalisation of cafes and restaurants and the maintenance of a certain standard of cleanliness may help to solve the problem.

Strenuous attempts should be made to bring about a cross-fertilisation of cultures. Those who study Urdu as their mother tongue might be compelled to study a little Hindi and *vice versa.* Hindus should be encouraged to study the great Muslim poets and writers and the Muslims to study the great Hindu poets and writers. Popular lectures should be arranged emphasising the nearness of Islamic and Hindu cultures as they have developed side by side in India. It is instructive to find that the people of Java, while Muslims by religion, are Hindus by culture. The best form of Hindu dance is found among these people. A truly cultured person is one who has a catholicity of temperament and is able to enrich his own culture by the best he can find in the cultures of others. No enduring solution is possible unless serious efforts are made to evolve an Indian culture in the place of Hindu, Muslim, and Christian cultures. With the abolition of illiteracy and the spread of popular education, we may expect a wider and saner outlook and greater willingness to appreciate the points of view of other communities. Caste must go and a theism, non-

idolatrous and non-mythological, should be adopted for public purposes. Only then can we hope to forge permanent links of union.

While not actively encouraging inter-communal marriages, we should not do anything to discourage them so long as they are rooted in a unity of mind and spirit and take place under proper auspices. Until the whole of Indian society becomes *inter-marriageable*, caste and communalism in some form or another are likely to continue. More than other countries India needs a practical demonstration of the Brotherhood of Man rooted in the Fatherhood of God.

The policy of segregation in streets and wards and the setting up of parallel institutions are most deplorable. The various communities of India, through the centuries in which they have lived in close proximity with each other, have so interpenetrated one another that it is both undesirable and unworkable to separate them geographically, socially or culturally.

Communal schools should be replaced by national schools. If, during the transitional period, it is necessary for communal schools to continue, such schools should receive no government grants unless they are willing to admit at least 25 per cent. of their total strength from other communities. Indoctrination of pupils in any religious or sectarian creed should be prohibited in all State-aided schools, the proper place for such teaching being thelogical schools and colleges. When special grants are given for the education of backward communities, the children should, as far as possible, be required to study in public, as against separate, communal schools.

Attempt should be made to stamp out communal riots by strong action, knowing as we do that such riots quite often begin in a lie or false propaganda. Unfounded rumours of kidnapping or stabbing are frequently the cause of communal riots. It is necessary that those who bring about such riots should be given an exemplary deterrent punishment, while,

as a matter of fact, they are often let off easily in order to allay communal feelings. *Goondas*, or organised bands of rowdies, in every community should be liquidated. The executive should strictly enforce rights established by the courts, specially in such matters as taking out of processions to the accompaniment of music in front of mosques and the slaughter of cows in public places.

For the prevention of communal riots and the promotion of communal harmony, there should be standing "good-will" committees of men and women belonging to different communities, whose chief business will be not to act as advocates of their respective groups, but to keep the contending parties in good relations with each other. These committees may be co-ordinated under a provincial department of administration on communal harmony. Members of these communities should be people of wide sympathy free from prejudice, commanding the confidence and goodwill of every one in the neighbhourhood. They will be the "bridge builders" between the communities, solely concerned with the creation and maintenance of a neighbourhood spirit.

If communal riots are to be kept under check, it is very essential to curb the propaganda press. While a certain amount of latitude may be allowed as to where facts end and propaganda begins, restraint must be placed upon newspapers which make scurrilous attacks upon individuals, distort facts, and fan the communal flame. It is necessary to place a special restraint upon the vernacular papers.

There is no reason why each community should have its own personal law.* After making due allowances for the transitional period, the endeavour should be to enforce a common law for the whole of India, which will be rooted in justice and humanity, without doing unnecessary violence to

*If each community is allowed to retain its own personal law for sometime to come, it is best that it is withdrawn from the sphere of regulation by the Legislature and left to a body representative of the community concerned.

long-standing customs and traditions. It is true that men like Sir Akbar Hydari hold that a complete secularisation of life is no solution to communalism, because of the strong hold which religion has upon Indians. But this objection need not apply to a common law for the whole of India.

Religious : There can be no doubt that for the most part religion, as it is practised in India to-day, is a divisive factor. This does not mean, as is often supposed, that religion is the curse of India. The curse is irreligious and unworthy views of religion. Religion "true and undefiled" brings men together. But religion meaning shibboleths and catchwords, outworn rituals and ceremonies, drives people apart. True religion is a perpetual reminder of man's imperfection. We as a people cannot be said to progress so long as we fail to distinguish the essentials of religion from non-essentials—the essentials being love of God and love of man or, to state it a little more concretely, a passionate devotion to the ideals of brotherhood, justice, freedom, truth, and non-violence. What God requires of every one, whether he be a Hindu, Muslim, Christian, Sikh or Parsi is "to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with God." It is obvious that cow slaughter and music before mosques are not such heinous crimes as murder or theft. Righteousness and brotherhood are more essential than ceremonial correctness or conventionality.

In the interest of national unity and communal goodwill, it is time to call a halt to proselytism, but not to genuine conversion which is the fundamental right of every individual. Although law cannot prevent or regulate proselytism, sound public opinion can and should. Hinduism's difficulty should never be regarded as the opportunity of Islam, Christianity or Sikhism. The Hindus, in their turn, should set their own house in order as regards caste, untouchability, temple entry, and social customs in general which do not fit into modern conditions, remembering that caste and untouchability are the parents of communalism.

We should learn to use commensense or rational methods in studying Scriptures and in approaching religious questions. Blind partisanship and bigotry have no justification to-day. We have no right to reject religion just because some religious people have been bigots or fanatics. God requires not outer conformity but inner surrender. He calls for circumcision of the heart and not circumcision of the flesh. The different Scriptures of the world contain the Word of God in varying degrees, but it is high presumption to claim that God's revelation is found closed between the covers of any single book. The common cry " Religion in danger " has no meaning. It is not religion which is in danger, but the so-called religious people who are in danger of losing their souls. Any religion which has truth and vitality in it and meets the deepest desires of men's hearts can be trusted to defend itself.

The educated and cultured people of India can do much to promote communal harmony by a respectful and sympathetic study of each other's religions. It is their business to arrange for periodical inter-religious gatherings and conventions where the best in all faiths can be studied and pondered over. Only by such methods can true tolerance be promoted—not tolerance which is another name for indifference, but tolerance born of mutual sympathy, study, and understanding. The French proverb says " To know all is to forgive all." The trouble to-day is that most people are communally minded in action and sentimentally nationalistic. An urgent need of the hour is for a social and religious revolution both in thought and action.

If within living memory, Hindus have endowed Muslim mosques and Muslims have endowed Hindu temples, is it impossible to expect such fraternisation to-day? We may take part in the religious festivals of each other so far as it may be practicable without giving rise to any offence or even objection.

An enlightened priesthood in all the communities is a paramount necessity of the day. Special attention should be paid to the proper training of priests, moulvis, and pandits in

view of the fact that half-educated and fanatical priests can easily rouse people's passion into a frenzy.

While sectarian and religious indoctrination in schools is to be condemned, children should be given the best possible moral and spiritual training. For this purpose the various Scriptures and songs and devotional literature of India along with the lives of the great men and women of all communities should be freely used.

Every enlightened Indian will do well to avoid the specious argument, " I am a Hindu, Muslim or Christian first, and afterwards an Indian." In ordinary circumstances the two loyalities — loyality to one's religion and loyality to one's country — do not clash. If and when they do clash, the good citizen should prefer the higher loyalty to the lower. When the highest principles of one's religion come into conflict with the claims of one's family, caste, community or nation, one should undoubtedly decide in favour of the former. One should obey God rather than man. But there is no justification for widespread belief that a good Hindu, Mussalman or Christian should consider every public question first from the point of view of its probable effect upon the material interests of his own community and only secondarily from the angle of the nation. It is regrettable that in recent months even fresh taxation measures in the legislatures have been examined exclusively from the point of view of the members of one community or another or criticised solely from that point of view.

Communalism and provincialism are two of the greatest stumbling blocks in the path of India's national progress. In whatever constitutional changes that may be made in the near future, special care should be taken not to abandon the degree of centralisation which we enjoy today. To substitute confederation for federation, as some suggest, is to undo the good work of the past and to open the flood gates of separatism, sectionalism, and communalism. Mere condemnation of communalism and provincialism will not destroy them. We must

study and ponder over them in order that we may remove their root causes and substitute for them a healthy nationalism which has for its motto "live and help others to live," as well as a healthy feeling of racial integrity which will enable us to look upon all Indians, irrespective of their physical, linguistic, and religious differences as equally our brothers.

It is fortunate that Indian nationalism, even today when the nationalist fever is running high everywhere, is not the aggressive type of nationalism found in the western world. It is midway between the European concept of aggressive nationalism and the federal concept of world citizenship. The problem for the future is to reconcile the claims of legitimate nationalism with the demands of internationalism. This task can be undertaken only by those who are absolutely free from communal inhibitions and national and racial prejudices.

CHAPTER VII

SOCIAL HARMONY

4. RACE

H. G. Wells rightly remarks : " I am convinced that there is no more evil thing in the present world than race prejudice." Although such a conviction is fairly wide-spread, very little is being done to cure the evil. The problem is particularly vexing in countries where the Anglo-Saxon people have come into contact with those who have a deep pigmentation. In the U.S.A. which is rightly described as " the melting pot of races ", the Negro has long since ceased to be a slave, at least technically in the eyes of the law, but has not yet been " melted." Even to-day his position is far from enviable. In the southern States of the country he is a social outcast, and practically all over the country he is shut out from any kind of social contact with the whites. Writing on the race question as it pertains to the U.S.A., Dr. J. Myers, himself an American, says :

" Some of the most glaring denials of brotherhood in modern life are to be found in race relations. The exploitation of the backward peoples and other races by the economic imperialism of our Western civilisation has gone too far to offset the preaching of the Gospel of love and brotherhood by our missionaries.

" In America we have committed every crime against the native Indian whom we have all but exterminated, after robbing him of his lands. We have failed in brotherhood toward many of our immigrant races. And after originally

importing the Negroes as slaves from Africa, we have subjected them to every form of injustice.

"Jesus' principle of brotherhood is hardly a term that can be applied to the present relations between whites and blacks in our so-called Christian land. In almost every field there is injustice and discrimination against the Negro including disproportionately meagre educational opportunities, the poorest living quarters, often mere hovels, the highest death rate, the lowest wages, discrimination in employment, making him the 'last to be hired, the first to be fired', discrimination in membership in many labour unions, the colour line in most of our churches, restrictions in travel accommodations, exclusion from hotels and residence districts, and the thousand and one disabilities imposed by the white population."

The conditions described above are not peculiar to the U.S.A. alone. Similar, if not worse, conditions abound in South Africa where the whites who number to-day 1 to 3 of the population, after dispossessing the Negroes of all their desirable land, are now effectively excluding them from political franchise and economic opportunity. A South African saying common among the Negroes is: "When the white man came he had the Bible and we had the land; now we have the Bible and he has the land."

The treatment meted out to Indians in South Africa is not any better. Although India and South Africa belong to the same Empire which boasts of standing for liberty, democracy, and justice, the Union Government has enacted humiliating and discriminating legislation against Indians, who are compelled practically to live in separate quarters and are effectively shut out from skilled occupations and learned professions. Various measures have been passed preventing them from acquiring desirable land. The social gulf which separates them from the whites is as deep as it is iniquitous. Even well-bred, cultured Indians are treated like "coolies". Yet General Smuts, the

ardent champion of democracy and one of the founders of the League of Nations, justifies the present situation saying that Indians are happier in S. Africa than in their own country! The Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri says* that General Smuts was surprised to learn that in India, legislation was based on the equal rights of every citizen. To quote Mr. Sastri again, in South Africa " Indians have no admission to hotels ; there (are) rickshaws and carriages reserved for 'Whites only' ; and even in Post Offices Indians (have) to go to a separate counter and await the pleasure of the person behind it." " Boys and girls (are) trained to look on the coloured people as inferior to themselves and to believe that there is no harm in treating them as such." The conclusion to which Mr. Sastri, himself a former Agent of the Government of India to South Africa, is driven is that if Indians wanted to preserve their self-respect they must stay away from countries such as South Africa.

Thanks to the vast population of India, the fate which has befallen the Negroes in South and East Africa has not overtaken Indians. Besides, the climate of the country has been against European settlement in India on any large scale, with the result that the European has been merely a bird of passage here. In spite of it he has managed to control the political and economic life of the country most effectively and use it to his own advantage. It is a well-known fact that Indians are discriminated against in appointments to higher posts, the recent vigorous protest of Indian medical men in connection with war service being a striking case in point. In the neighbouring country of Ceylon the bulk of the fertile up country has passed into the hands of the European cultivator for almost a song, with detrimental results to the indigenous population. To mention only one of these undesirable effects, the streams and rivulets passing through the estates have been so clogged up by work connected with the

*The Hindu, November 7, 1941.

estates that almost during every monsoon the country has to face the calamity of a major flood.

In social relations neither in India nor in Ceylon do we have "the Jim Crow attitude" which prevails in the U.S.A. and South Africa. As in these latter countries, we are not forced to travel in separate railways or tram-car compartments or go to separate cinemas and eating places. We are not asked to give way to the white man or woman walking along public thoroughfares or side walks. Yet the relationship between Europeans and Indians is not too friendly and indirect methods are frequently used for keeping up the superiority of the white man. While administrators like the late Lord Willingdon have gone out of their way to break down racial barriers, the vast bulk of Europeans prefer their own clubs and hotels and their own company. The relation between them and Indians in general may best be described as "armed neutrality." Long residence in India does not entitle them to speak with authority on the country, because they know no more of India than does the elephant in the jungles of Travancore or Mysore which may live there for over a hundred years—and that, too, continuously without periodical furloughs. Towards the ignorant and illiterate among the masses their attitude is one of condescension and pity mingled with a certain amount of contempt. The educated and cultured people of the country, on the other hand, are regarded as trouble-makers. Because of these and other reasons rooted in political pride, cultural differences, and differences in social habits, the European in India for the most part lives in a world of his own creation, several Christian missionaries and social workers being honourable exceptions. The milk of human kindness is far from overflowing in the relation between Europeans and Indians. But the responsibility for such a situation is not entirely that of the European. Accustomed to long years of foreign rule, the Indian has not yet learnt to stand on his own feet and assert his dignity without being

discourteous or overbearing. He has yet to shed a great deal of his "inferiority complex and timidity".*

The latest recruit to extreme racialism in Europe to-day is Germany, which with her characteristic thoroughness and ruthlessness, has been endeavouring to stamp out the Jews from the face of Europe. Even Jews who have rendered meritorious service to Germany and brought fame and distinction to the country have either been hounded out or allowed to die a slow but painful death in concentration camps. A great many have been driven out of their jobs, and their property has been looted or confiscated. Even those suspected of having a slight percentage of Jewish blood in their veins have been brought under the ban imposed by the Nazis.

There is no doubt whatever that if Germany should win this war, she would endeavour to put her extreme racial theory into operation. To Hitler and his followers, the Germans belong to the super-human 'Nordic race' and everybody else is sub-human and, therefore, it is right to exploit them to the utmost degree possible. The coloured races in

*Speaking from his intimate knowledge of people of various races in India, a friend of the author who has read the MS., but does not agree with the view presented, says: "The reason for the Indian adopting a subservient attitude towards the European is more due to economic factors than to psychological inferiority feeling. In fact a clerk who prefaces every sentence with a 'your honour' in addressing his European superior feels in seven cases out of ten that he knows more than his superior and curses his *karma* for having to play the part of an underling. It is evident that even among the domestic servants of the whites, the domestic in many cases has a contempt for his master and some of his ways, but has no desire to quarrel with him because of the economic pinch."

As regards Indo-British social relationships, the same friend says that there are roughly three classes of Europeans in India (1). The superior service men who are taught to despise Indians and not to mix with them freely. The influence of good breeding and education which they may have had is neutralised on joining the Services. (2) Men employed in the inferior Services, as well as commercial employees. Many of these are typical of the cockney and have to be educated afresh in India in the Anglo-Indian Club atmosphere. (3) The better educated—often university men—who have no aversion to mixing with Indians on equal terms. The bar in their case is really a marked difference in the social habits of Indians and Europeans, which makes easy entertaining difficult. But this difficulty is gradually breaking down.

In all fairness it must be added that there are many instances of genuine friendship and fellowship between Indians and non-Indians, for instance between a good many missionaries and educated Indian Christians, at the Theosophical Society headquarters at Adyar, and in Asrams. The underlying causes in all these cases are religious affiliation and mutual sympathy.

particular are an inferior lot and should be satisfied with being hewers of wood and drawers of water. †

* The first thing which a new social order should do in removing race prejudice and racial discrimination is to disseminate scientific knowledge regarding race. In their illuminating volume *We Europeans*, Drs. Julian Huxley and Haddon have made it abundantly clear that the term 'race' is a pseudo-scientific rather than a scientific term and that it is time we gave it up in favour of such a non-committal term as "ethnic group" or people. Long before human beings, in their tribal stage began to disperse and develop certain special characteristics on account of geographical and climatic conditions and isolation, they were completely mixed up. Inter-mixture had taken place on a large scale through immigration, conquest, capture of wives, tribal adoption, tribal conversion, slavery, etc. Even to-day we find that the native people of Australia, "though deeply pigmented and undoubtedly primitive in many ways, show the same character of hair as Europeans". A great majority of the much despised Negroes of Africa, contrary to all expectations, possess certain Caucasian traits. It is not as though these traits become levelled up after several generations. They are thrown up generation after generation—and sometimes after a considerable interval—in accordance with the Mendelian law of inheritance, depending upon the particular combination of unit characters.

Speaking in non-technical terms, what science shows clearly is that there is no pure race anywhere in the world, although within a given broad division there may be pools which may be pure in the sense that they breed true. These the authors of *We Europeans* classify under primary sub-species and secondary sub-species.

---

† According to Professor Hermann Gauch of Germany: "The Non-Nordic is not a 100 per cent human being; he is, in fact, not a human being at all, if compared with the animal, but merely an intermediary, a link... he comes next to the man-apes." Dr. Ley, a Reich minister says: "We deny the Pope's maxim regarding a homogeneous human race. Jews are parasites. Germany's main tasks in the future are to get rid of Jews and to gain colonies." A Nazi advertisement reads: "The Jews are our misfortune. Hitler is our saviour." According to the sentiments of a Nazi celebrity: "Every telegraph post is to be adorned with the head of a Jew."

* For many of the facts in this chapter, I am indebted to *We Europeans* by Julian Huxley and A. C. Haddon.

Besides, purity in itself does not mean superiority or inferiority. There are superior as well as inferior stocks which are 'pure.' The family known by the pseudonym 'Jukes' in America is a pure stock because it breeds true. But it is certainly not a superior stock. It has furnished America more than its quota of criminals, drunkards, women of ill-fame, and other such undesirable persons.

It needs to be shouted from the housetops that there never was any such thing as the 'Aryan race', Max Muller having been responsible for the spread of this initial error. Max Muller himself, with the acquisition of further knowledge, did his best to undo the effects of the mistake he had made, but it was too late. The Nazis to-day speak of themselves as belonging to the "Aryan", "the Nordic" or "the Germanic" race, without stopping to consider whether such a race ever existed at all. Many of them use the appellation merely "to rationalise emotion and to bolster up the appeals of prejudice". Some of them are accommodating enough to include modern Japanese and Turks within the Nordic fold. What science teaches is that there was a language or group of languages which may be called the Aryan language as well as a culture, which may be called the Aryan culture, but never a single race of people known as the Aryan race.

The physical qualities which the Nazis associate with the 'Nordic race' such as long heads, blue eyes, long and wavy hair, and blonde complexion are not particularly marked among modern Germans. None of the prominent Nazi leaders to-day including Hitler, Goering or Goebbels answers to the description of the 'Nordic race'. The fact of the matter is that the German population to-day is very much mixed, composed of Nordic, Eurasiatic, and Mediterranean elements. The type of 'Nordic' pictured by the Nazis as having lived in the past and whom they want to revive now is found more or less in a 'pure' form in Northern Scandinavia. But he is not particularly noted for leadership, initiative, and originality which the Nazis claim are the special prerogatives of the

Nordics. As a matter of fact, they are given more to introspection and suicide than almost any other sub-species of mankind. Incidentally it may be said that among Europeans, the Germans have the highest suicide rate ; and if we include Austria within Germany, the highest record for illegitimate children.

What is true of the 'Aryan' or 'Nordic' race is equally true of other broad divisions of mankind such as the 'Semitic' race, the 'Slavonic' race or the 'Mongolian' race. None of these is an ethnic unity, their bonds of union being primarily linguistic and cultural. They are made up of several elements whose unit characters have combined in different ways. In certain respects it is possible to find some of the sub-species within them possessing, say Caucasian characters combined with Mongolian, Slavonic or Semitic characters. The combinations and permutations are too many to go into any detailed discussion of them here.*

Even the 'Jewish race' which is often described as a pure race is not pure at all. It is not even a race. Ripley says "the Jews are not a race but only a people after all." The authors of *We Europeans* show in a detailed manner that the Jew belongs to a socio-religious group which varies greatly in physical characters. Even before their dispersion from Palestine, they were mixed up, and since then the intermixture has been even greater with the local population of the territory occupied by them. The typical "Jewish" nose is found only in the case of 15 per cent of adult male Jews in New York City. What holds the Jews together is not any racial bond, but religious, social and cultural traditions buttressed by "external pressure of various kinds, . . . a long historic memory, . . . and sense of common suffering." From the biological point of view, therefore, it is as illegiti-

* In the words of Huxley and Haddon: "In the vast majority of existing peoples and more especially in those of Europe, most individuals present combination of characters which are to be traced to a variety of sources." "White is connected with black and also with yellow through every gradation of type, and in each case along several distinct main lines of crossing."

mate to speak of the "Jewish" race as of the "Aryan race."

To all this the confirmed believer in racialism may say, whatever scientists may aver to the contrary, do we not find certain broad divisions of mankind possessing certain characteristic physical features, mental qualities, and emotional make-up? The first difference which strikes the outer eye is the difference in colour, the chief colours being white, black, brown, and yellow. The physical features of a yellow person (the Mongolian) are no doubt different from those of a white person, but when we probe into the question further we find that even as regards these features there are different gradations between the two races, both merging into each other at several points.

Besides, colour and physical features are no index to a person's intelligence and ability. Colour has been developed in strict relation to geography and climate. Black has had a survival value in lower latitudes, yellow in dry zones, and various shades of white in temperate areas. Even differences in skull shape do not prove anything. The Nordics are supposed to be long-headed and the Alpines round-headed. But history does not prove that long-headed people are all level-headed or that round-headed people are all block-headed! Those who have made a distinct contribution to the history of mankind have not been particularly long-headed. The great explorers of England were more round-headed and darkish in complexion than a Nordic has a right to be. Neither Shakespeare nor Napoleon had a Nordic head or a Nordic complexion. Goethe, Beethoven, and Kant do not conform to the Nordic type.

It is reassuring to be told that neither head shape nor the size of the brain has anything to do with intelligence. If a person is inordinately proud of his large head, it may not be wrong to assume that part of it may be clay and part of it swollen! Even head shape, says Professor Boas of Columbia

University, is not an unmistakable test in classifying race. In his investigations in America, he has found that the new environment in some unexplained manner modifies the head form of immigrants from various parts of Europe to a very remarkable degree. It is a matter of common knowledge that Americans in recent years have greatly improved in physical stature—in height and weight—on account of the special attention paid to food and hygiene. A Nazi apologist in searching his head for an explanation of the large number of round-headed people among Germans has come to the novel conclusion that whether a person possesses a round head or a long head depends upon the kind of pillows provided for him when he was a baby, soft pillows resulting in round heads and stiff pillows in long heads !

From all this what follows is that a great deal of cheap talk about the immutable laws of nature and of the inherent and eternal superiority of, say the " Nordic race ", over other people can be easily avoided if people will take pains to remember that what often passes for racial difference is really due to difference in physical environment or social heredity. Until and unless we have exhausted all the possible explanations that we can derive from differences in geographical and climatic conditions, in political and economic organizations, in social customs and traditions, in culture, and in religion and morality, as well as from differences arising out of such conditions as poor feeding, exposure to unhealthy surroundings, and subjection to diseases like hookworm which retard growth, we have no right naively to assume that all our differences are in the blood and that we cannot alter them, however much we may try. Who can say authoritatively that the Negro, for instance, is so poorly equipped by nature that he is bound to be a servant and slave all his life ? Lord Bryce has observed that the American Negro has developed more in sixty years than the Anglo-Saxon has done in six centuries. In countries like Brazil, Peru, and Jamaica where there is no intense prejudice against the Negro and where opportunity for development is not lacking, the advancement which he

has made is remarkable. Realising, then, that the ascertained facts relating to race are very scanty, the part of wisdom is to say that the Negro is retarded, but not necessarily primitive.

Speaking further of racial differences, it is well to remember that many of them are superficial. They are physical and outward and, therefore, striking. Colour, says Marett, is almost certainly developed in strict relation to climate. But our mental and moral differences are not so marked. It is probably right to say that in the higher reaches of mind there is no Western mind and there is no Eastern mind; there is simply mind. This is not to argue that our customs and traditions and the environment in which we live do not affect our mental life. All that we are concerned to show is that 'race' does not leave as marked an impression upon our minds as upon our bodies. There is no essential connection between physical characteristics and mental development. According to the investigations conducted by Prof. Karl Pearson, there is no correlation between stock and mental character. Besides, it must be borne in mind that individual differences are greater than racial differences. The difference between a Shakespeare and an English Tom, Dick or Harry, we venture to think, is greater than the difference between say the Nordic race and the Negro race.

Differences in themselves do not constitute superiority or inferiority. To say that a race horse differs from a draught horse is not the same as saying that the one is superior to the other under all conceivable circumstances. If, in the past, races which were imbued with an aggressive spirit carried everything before them, it does not mean that they will continue to do so always. It is conceivable that circumstances will so alter in the future that races imbued with passive virtues will enjoy the advantages now enjoyed by the aggressive types.

If there are differences, there are also resemblances. Crows are black all the world over. Human nature is pretty

nearly the same, everywhere. Races do not differ significantly in psychological endowments. "Race", says M. Demolin, "is not a cause; it is a consequence." In his book on *Anthropology*, Marett observes that, judged simply by his emotions, man is very much alike everywhere, from China to Peru. Elsewhere in the same book, the writer notes: "Whereas customs differ immensely, the emotions, one may even say the sentiments, that form the material of morality are much the same everywhere." Dr. J. H. Oldham gives it as his considered opinion that the basal qualities of the human mind are the same among all peoples. There are the same dominant instincts, same primary emotions and same capacity for judgment and reason. To quote Ratzel: "Vari ations are numerous but not deep."

If human beings have a common human nature, what are we to say of the allegation that there is an instinctive prejudice on the part of one race towards another, especially if one of them happens to be coloured? Much of this prejudice, we believe, is not instinctive at all. It is the result of early education and social suggestion. With reference to England, Rev. H. A. Popley says: "Boys and girls hear a great deal of the faults and vices of other peoples before they learn of their virtues. We know the Italian is dirty and the Frenchman a frog-eater long before we know of the imperishable art culture of Italy or the literary treasures of France. In regard to the coloured peoples, the contrast is still more striking. Most English boys know only of the 'Black Hole of Calcutta' and the treachery of Nana Saheb, and nothing of the greatness of Asoka and Akbar. These instinctive prejudices must be inhibited in youth by proper education." Moreover a whole nation like the French are comparatively free from the strong colour feeling evinced by some other people.

As a matter of fact, we find that when the coloured are few in number and do not offer any serious competition in the economic field, or are not a thorn in the side of the

dominant white race in the political world, there is hardly any prejudice. The case of the Maoris is an illustration in point. A truth which comes out clearly from all this is that when the dominant white races play the game fairly and squarely by the coloured, the latter as a rule respond in a most generous manner. It is in this direction that Mr. Basil Mathews looks for a cure for our racial hostilities.

Even if we grant that there is an instinctive dislike because of colour, we have to reckon with the fact that there are many instances of positive attraction. Huxley and Haddon write : " In suitable social environments, blacks, whites and yellows may exert a powerful sexual attraction on each other." While in the U. S. A. and S. Africa social barriers have been kept up for economic and political reasons, we find that elsewhere there is no universal prejudice against large-scale intermixture between the whites and coloured people, the predominantly hybrid population of Portugal, South America, and Mexico being illustrations in point.

At this point we may pause a while and ask the question, what does science say regarding the intermixture of races ? Huxley and Haddon hold that among the European peoples those who have made the greatest amount of contribution in the realms of both thought and action are people of mixed origin like the British, the Germans, and the French. But each of them consists of minor subdivisions of one 'primary race', or of a sub-species. Where the intermingling parties belong to widely divergent stocks, it is held by writers like W. McDougall and J. A. Thomson that the offspring is generally of a poor quality. Marett, on the other hand says : " That the half-breed is an unsatisfactory person may be true; and yet until the conditions of his upbringing are somehow discounted the race problem remains where it was." What the result will be in the case of any intermixture between races will depend upon the combination of unit characters; and on this we have no reliable information as yet.

Huxley and Haddon, writing much later than Marett, say that there is no firm conclusion with regard to wide crosses and that there is no biological foundation to the supposition that half-castes are always unreliable and that they share the defects of both parents and some of their virtues. The poor performance of half-castes in the case of very wide crosses is often due to social discrimination and economic disadvantages. It is possible that "very wide crosses may give biologically 'disharmonic' results in later generations by producing ill-assorted combinations of characters." [1].

"Further, if it be true that some ethnic groups possess a low average level of innate intelligence, to allow crosses between them and more intelligent types is a retrogade step." [2] But for solving the problems of the future "it may well be that new combinations of characters" resulting from wide crosses may be required. The unfortunate fact, however, is that on all this we do not have enough scientific data at present. In the meanwhile it is well to remember that "the question of 'race mixture' turns out not to be primarily a matter of 'race' at all, but a matter of nationality, class, or social status" [3].

Miss R. M. Fleming of the University College of Wales who has been making some studies of half-caste children (Anglo-Negro and Anglo-Chinese) claims that these children are in no way inferior either physically or intellectually to those of 'pure races'. It is true that in about 14 per cent of the Anglo-Negro cases studied, she found mental deficiency, but in each of these cases it was traced back to the English mother's side. The number of cases investigated by Miss Fleming, however, is too small to arrive at any general conclusion.

For ourselves we may say that since the amount of scientific data available on the question of intermixture

1. *We Europeans, p. 281.* 2. *Ibid,* 3. *p. 282.*

between divergent racial stocks is meagre, the part of wisdom is to leave it an open question. For the same reason that marriages between Catholics and Protestants cannot be encouraged in general, marriages between widely divergent racial stocks, too, cannot be hastened. But where there is a unity of mind and spirit as well as a cultural affinity between the contracting parties, there need be no valid objection. One knows of several instances of happy marriages between Hindus, Mohammadans or Indian Christians on the one side and Europeans on the other, showing thereby that race is really no obstacle. Till such marriages take place on a large scale under conditions which will be mutually beneficial to the contracting parties as well as to the offspring, it must be borne in mind that when the coloured people are demanding social equality, it is not a subterfuge for indiscriminate intermixture with the white people.

If, in spite of all that has been said, there are those who insist that all that we are, and all that we are capable of becoming, have been determined once and for all by our racial heredity, we have two answers to give. In the first place what science teaches is that, while individual traits and pathological characteristics may be inherited, the possibility of variation in other respects will always remain. Our second answer is that if racial heredity is to be the sole determiner of our present and of our future, much of our effort in education, religion, and morality is bound to lose its meaning. For education, religion, and morality, all firmly believe in the changeability of human nature to a very large extent, and, on the basis of that, endeavour to effect improvements upon the human will. Putting it epigramatically, it may be said that it is natural for human beings to be artificial. Such of those educationists and psychologists as emphasise and over-emphasise the value of mental tests will do well to remember that these tests, while admirable in revealing gross mental defects, are not very useful in dealing with normal people. As Dr. Oldham remarks, man is not independent of his heredity or environment but he can make

his own original use of them. It may be that the racialist's point of view, as seen in the works of Gobineau, Houston Chamberlain, Madison Grant, and Lothrop Stoddard, is after all right, but we have to wait a long time for its scientific proof.

Instead of concentrating attention upon so-called racial differences it would seem wiser to direct attention to the social environment and culture-contacts of human beings. What is often attributed to genetic factors is really due to differences in habits, traditions, attitudes, dress, art, institutions, gestures, ideas and language—and these, as Huxley and Haddon tell us, "are not inborn, but have to be learnt or built up by experience."

The problem of race becomes particularly difficult of understanding, because in recent years it has been mixed up with the question of nation and nationality. Politicians use the questionable idea of the 'blood-tie' to strengthen national sentiment "because of the importance of such sentiment for unity and effectiveness in war." The Nazis have been using the same idea in order to oust the Jews from Germany, making out that the German Jews were genetically different from the rest of the population of the country. The fact of the matter is that both groups are very much mixed, and Jew-baiting has been practised in order to serve as a smoke-screen for the mistakes and errors of the Nazi Government and to turn popular indignation against an imaginary foe for all its troubles. As Huxley and Haddon observe: "The ethnic group discriminated against serves as a scapegoat for some economic fear, some class prejudice, some nationalist ambition, some cultural pride, even some 'inferiority complex'".

One cannot honestly maintain the thesis of common descent these days in the face of "mass migration and military conquest and the adoption of foreigners into the group by the legal change of citizenship and by marriage when the wife and children follow the father's nationality." Every great

nation is a melting pot of races, the two most outstanding examples being India in the past and the U.S.A. to-day.* We therefore refuse to countenance the idea that India is made up of two or more distinct ' races ' which cannot live together in peace and concord forming a strong nation. The fact that Americans come of different racial stocks and yet form a vigorous nation gives the lie to any such supposition.

We have said earlier that the first duty of the new social order with reference to race is to broadcast the most reliable scientific information on the subject. The question which now arises is, what shall we do with these facts? What are we to make of them? It is here that we turn to religion and moral idealism; for all that science can do is to furnish us facts. It has no business to assume the role of a prophet. But so far as the problem of " race " is concerned, religion, moral idealism, and science are all agreed that there is no case for social segregation, which is only caste under a thin veil. A policy of social segregation is neither possible nor desirable in the long run. The ' Jim Crow attitude ' prevalent in some of the Southern States of America and in S. Africa is irrational and altogether unjustifiable. It is inhuman.

The advocates of social segregation at times justify their position on the ground that the coloured races, especially when they occupy a low economic status and have poor standards of public health and sanitation, are a menace to the well-being of the Whites. We admit that there is a measure of truth in this argument. But the remedy is to raise the economic level of the people which has been purposely kept down by the Whites in order that they may benefit themselves. Once the economic level is raised, it will not be difficult to enforce strict rules of public health and sanitation in the interest of the well-being of everybody concerned. In the light of all this, it is disconcerting to find a great theologian and thinker of the reputation of Hastings Rashdall assert that it may be necessary to sacrifice " the lower well-being " of a countless

* " India is more of a racial melting pot than the United States".

number of Chinamen in order that " the higher well-being " of a few Englishmen may be made possible.

The real fear of the Whites to anything suggestive of social equality is the fear of miscegenation. Our answer to it is that inter-mixture is taking place today on a fairly wide scale even with the most stringent public opinion against it. American writers tell us that between 1850 and 1910 the half-castes known as Mulattoes (half white and half Negro) in the Southern States of America had increased by 426 percent. Under the new conditions which we suggest, what is done stealthily to-day and with all attendant disadvantages to the mother and children, will come to be placed on an honorable basis. Besides, when the present suggestion of superiority and inferiority ceases to operate, it is more than likely that the ethnic groups concerned will stand on their own dignity, neither being too anxious to contract marriage relations with the other. Only such marriages will take place as are rooted in a unity of mind and spirit, and the resultant offspring will not have to contend all its life against social ostracism and the slur of illegitimacy.

Some who see the injustice of social segregation, but yet feel that there is no way out of it, suggest that evils of segregation are to be mitigated by the negative principle of equality of opportunity. Quoting from Sir Frederick (now Lord) Lugard, the late President Harding of the U. S. A., in a speech to American Negroes, said: "Here, then, is the true conception of the inter-relation of colour: complete uniformity in ideals, absolute equality in the paths of knowledge and culture, equal opportunity for those who strive, equal admiration for those who achieve ; in matters social and racial, a separate path, each pursuing his own inherited traditions, preserving his own race purity and race pride, equality in things spiritual and agreed divergence in the physical and material." For ourselves, we believe that, while this solution may prove to be a convenient half-way house, it cannot be a permanent solution. So long as races entering into this compact are not on the same

level to start with, 'race pride' and 'agreed divergence' are bound to lead to racial arrogance on the one hand and racial humiliation on the other. Segregation, in spite of the nebulous principle of equal opportunity being tacked on to it, cannot remove the sore spots from our midst.

Some bold souls imagine that intermixture between races is the only solution of a peculiarly difficult problem. Mr. Frank Lenwood once said that if a person had no objection to calling another person brother in Christ, there was no reason why he should not also call him brother-in-law in Christ, when the suitable occasion arose. This, however, is not the view held by the majority. In the present state of affairs where blind feelings and narrow prejudices overrule reason and where the scientific information on the desirability or otherwise of intermixture between races is meagre, the solution suggested is not practicable.

Some of those to whom the idea of intermixture of races is repugnant believe that political domination and economic exploitation constitute the only possible solution. Such people need to be reminded that this policy like the others we have sketched is not possible nor desirable in the long run. The denial of franchise to coloured people, shutting them out from higher grades of work, depriving them of all desirable land and using them as cogs in the wheel of prosperity of the white man cannot last for all time. The coloured have the advantage of numbers on their side, being two and a half times as many as the white. The *Manchester Guardian* reports a speaker as saying : "No treatment of this problem (colour problem) in which force is an element can bring anything but disaster, and this ... was true not only of England, but of all white races in their dealings with coloured peoples. The enormous preponderance and the greater fertility of the coloured races ruled out any such policy. Two hundred years would see the end of white domination if that line were followed." Even the idea of trusteeship, while laudable in some ways, may be used as a cloak for national selfishness and

aggrandisement. Neither can the policy of racial indifference which some commend receive our support. 'Let every herring hang by its own neck' is not a maxim which is practicable in the present day world.

If the solutions of the race problem sketched above are either partly or wholly unsatisfactory, what are we to say from the standpoint of a new social order? The proper starting point of any lasting solution is the profound conviction that no race or ethnic group has a monopoly of all desirable qualities. Gifts and capacities vary. Where a people has not made as great a progress in material civilisation as some others, it is largely due to lack of opportunity. Favourable economic circumstances, social environment, and culture contacts are more important than any particular form of genetic mixture. It is too late in the day to argue that the so-called Nordic race alone is necessary for the progress of humanity. Few will be frightened by Madison Grant's sensational warning that civilisation can only be saved "if the Nordic race will gather itself together in time to shake off the shackles of an inveterate altruism, discard the vain phantom of internationalism and re-assert the pride of race and the right of merit to rule." An impartial study of history shows that the Mediterranean races and Eastern peoples "have made by far the greatest contribution to the aesthetic, cultural and spiritual resources of the world." "Sir Arthur Keith", says Mr. H. A. Popley, "has proved that, judged by every objective test, most Europeans of genius, Caesar, Napoleon, Shakespeare, for example, belong not to the northern but to the southern European variety of man. The Nordic race, in fact, considering its opportunities, has been conspicuously lacking in men of the very highest qualities, in poets, prophets, statesmen, inventors. It is a race of soldiers, of seamen, of mechanics,—in short of conquerors." Writing in a similar strain, Dr. Oldham observes: "It is an entirely unwarranted assumption that the best brains are found exclusively in any one race." Huxley and Haddon point out that such fundamental discoveries as the art of

writing, agriculture, the wheel, and building in stone have all come from the Near East, from people who cannot be described as Nordic even by the widest stretch of imagination. We do not know the innate capacities of the 'backward peoples' of the world.

Alongside of the fact that gifts and capacities vary among people, it is necessary to remember that changed circumstances and institutions can bring out hidden and unsuspected qualities in people. Even today one hears much irresponsible and unscientific talk about national character, as though it was something fixed for ever. Huxley and Haddon observe that at one time England was called 'merry'. But no one would use that expression today. In Carlyle's time the German 'national character' was supposed to be peaceable, philosophic, and individualist. But after the Franco-Prussian war, it became arrogant and militarist.*

A further point to remember in attempting a correct approach to the problem of race is that we must reverence human personality everywhere, irrespective of the question of race.

To put the idea in Christian, terminology, we must look for 'Christ in us' in every person. "Be a person and respect others as persons" is the injunction of a well-known philosopher. In the phraseology of Kant, every man must be treated as an end in himself and not as a means to another's end. It is in this way that some races can be cured of their 'superiority complex' and others of their 'inferiority complex'. There must be a recognition of merit, whenever and wherever it is found. Parodying the words of Burns, we may say

*Apropos of what we have said in this paragraph, *K. H. News-Letter* (May 26,1941) writes: "The Japanese (now allies of the Axis) and considered to be amongst our enemies, were much loved by the British public some thirty years ago when the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was in full flower. The 'gallant little Japs,' who in British minds were conceived as being British counterparts (in yellow skins) fulfilling the role of an island power in the Far-East, had just defeated the tyrannical Russians, whose Tsar consigned to the wastes of Siberia anyone in Russia who showed any signs of liberal thought."

" Race is but the guinea stamp
Man is the gold for all that".

The ' race ' problem is particularly vexing where white races rule over vast numbers of coloured races. In the case of people who have not had much culture of their own, it has meant the coloured man imbibing all the vices of the white man and few of his virtues. He has lost his old simplicity and adaptability to the old environment and is left as an orphan in a cruel and unfriendly world. Of late, imperialist powers have put forward the plea that the interests of the native people should have priority over every other interest. But this does not mean much in actual practice. It is only a way of keeping out other prospective exploiters in order that the imperialist power may have a monopoly of the exploitation, throwing the " crumbs" to the native races. The new concern of the Britisher for the welfare of the Africans, Burmans, Malays, and Sinhalese is to be interpreted in some such manner as this.

Neither the League of Nations nor the Mandatory system which it set up was able to do justice to the coloured people of the world. And yet the question cannot be left to the tender mercies of any one Power, however laudable its motives may be. We require an effective international organisation which by its intention and action will command the universal respect and confidence of the East and West, of the white and coloured races. It should provide to every people equality of opportunity for proper self-development, self-determination, and self-expression, equality before law, equal industrial opportunities, higher economic standard, and political freedom within the shortest time possible.

Another suggestion which may be made is a cross fertilisation of cultures. There is much that is noble and beautiful in the cultures of different peoples, alongside of a great deal that is ignoble and ugly ; and it is the duty of every one whose face is turned towards the future to understand and appreciate in different cultures " whatsoever things are true,

whatsoever things are honourable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, (and) whatsoever things are of good report." The Negroes of America have already contributed to the music, art and drama of that country. India has contributed the technique of satyagraha and non-violence, although it has not yet been tried in international conflicts. Conditions should be so altered that members of a given stock would be willing to try experiments and throw off tradition where necessary instead of clinging to it tenaciously.

One further suggestion for the solution of the race problem is the undertaking of an international conspiracy for the improvement of each ethnic group. If eugenics is going to be the science of the future with regard to the betterment of man from the biological point of view, it may be our duty so to develop the best elements in each stock that the world will become a healthier and happier place in which to live.

A question which calls for an immediate solution is the growing irrationality of masses of people on the question of race. Even otherwise sober-minded people refuse to think calmly and scientifically on this question. In Germany we are witnessing the evils of the 'Nordic' myth used to promote aggressive nationalism backed by effective propaganda. Even such a completely rational person as the late Mr. S. S. Iyengar, in his anxiety to bring about the national unity of India, used to advocate racialism as the only binding factor available to us in India. But the only response to it from the country has been the "two nation theory" of the Muslim League in which scientific knowledge regarding race is entirely out of the picture. The only right solution for all this is correct dissemination of scientific knowledge, however slow the effect may be.

Another question which is a source of anxiety to any believer in the new social order is that while the race problem seems capable of solution, the 'colour' problem seems

almost insoluble. In the U. S. A. as well as in South Africa, later white immigrants are mixing with the earlier whites to form a strong unit. But the coloured and white people who have lived together for longer centuries keep separate and all social intercourse is banned. Men like General Smuts argue that such separation is inevitable because of the difference in civilisation. The real cause, however, is the pride of power coupled with the fear of being ousted from it. Anyone who has eyes to see realises that the 'colour' problem is essentially a modern one, arising from the contacts of the whites and coloured after the European conquests began. Thus white has come to be associated with power and colours other than white with weakness.

It looks as though the clash of colour has yet to reach its height, as Africa and Asia become stronger. Europe being the minor partner in numbers is already aware of the threat to it for the future, and prophets have already risen there to give the necessary warning. Even in thoughtful circles there is concern that the European leadership of the world may go and that this must not happen. The Atlantic Charter and proposals of world federation (which in effect mean a European Federation) are prompted by the anxiety to consolidate Europe.

Our own way of looking at the question is that the world is big enough for both whites and non-whites to live together in peace and harmony if they will take the trouble to understand each other and apply the golden rule of Jesus Christ to all their relationships: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them". (Matt. 7: 12).

CHAPTER VIII

POLITICAL JUSTICE

1. DEMOCRACY

No discussion of a new social order can be complete which does not take into account the political conditions under which we live. There was a time when it was customary to speak of man's religious, economic, social, and political life as though it was possible to isolate each of them and study them separately. But what the complexity of modern life shows is that all these phases of life are closely inter-related and act and react upon each other. From the point of view of a new social order, we are convinced that the fundamental principles of religion and the religious spirit should underlie political life. In saying this we do not mean to suggest that we require any sectarian dogma or ritual to undergird politics. What we want from religion is a firm faith in the sacredness of human personality and a regard for such values as truth, justice, and freedom. Even without the formal name of religion, Soviet Russia has been able to cultivate a passion and devotion to the community. The deliberate use of any religion for the material advancement of those who belong to it, even at the expense of others, is a prostitution of religion and not a right use of it.

The outstanding political problems of our day are the conflict between democracy and autocracy, the claim to a place in the sun of people who have been hitherto kept down, the ethics of imperialism, and the devising of a world organisation which would secure enough bread for everybody, abolish exploitation, and prevent the periodical outburst of peoples' temper into war.

DEMOCRACY

Let us take up democracy first. There was a time, especially in the nineteenth century, when democracy was looked upon as providing an open sesame to peace, pros-

perity, and progress. Jeremy Bentham, the founder of English Utilitarianism, was full of the ardent hope that he could "better this wicked world by covering it over with republics." We who live in 1941 are not so hopeful of democracy. Our attitude to it is one of caution, if not of criticism. We have come to realise that mere majority vote does not settle anything. The voice of the people is not always the voice of God; it may well be the voice of the devil.

There is a general consensus of opinion that the principle of democracy is sound. Democracy stands for the consent of the governed. It asserts that in whatever is done by the government, no one should be neglected. People are the best judges of whether they are well or ill governed, for it is the wearer who knows where the shoe pinches. It, therefore, follows that, in the last resort, people should decide whether the existing system of government or the existing rulers should continue in power or should be replaced by others.

Democracy further stands for the sound principle that the personality of every individual is sacred and that nobody should be treated as a mere means to another's end. To quote the words of H. Rashdall: "other things being equal, my good is of the same intrinsic value as the good of anybody else." In the words of a seventeenth century English writer: "The poorest he that is in England hath a life to live as the richest he." Democracy, thus, in theory at least stands for liberty and equality. It can cashier the rulers when they go wrong and claims to hold the balance even between one man and another. It also stands for peaceful and orderly progress.

In actual practice, however, there is a vast gulf between theory and performance. The poor people in a democracy do not have much voice in the management of public affairs. Political life is controlled by vested interests and pressure may, and is often, exerted by bankers, manufacturers of armaments, commercial magnates, big landlords and the like, keeping up all the time the appearance of a broad-based

democratic rule. In England a large percentage of members of Parliament and of those who ascend to ministerial ranks belong to certain select families. The consequence of all this is that government is not really people's government by the people. It is government by certain classes, largely in their own interest—what Aristotle described as oligarchy. When common labourers and peasants band themselves together to vindicate their rights it is not seldom that the military is called upon to disperse them and break up their organisations. The class from which administrators and judges is drawn is on the whole prejudiced against the common man, and the result is that he does not always get justice meted out to him. What obtains in the United States is pluto-democracy, rather than democracy in the sense of a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." Money talks.

All this goes to show that in modern democracy there is only an appearance of liberty and equality. The real substance is not there. It is true that the common man is given a vote. But very often it is of no use to him. He has to use it to elect candidates, set up by party caucuses. One of the rival candidates may be a knave and the other a fool, and the elector is called upon to choose between them. What is worse is that while in the conduct of governmental affairs, the poor man may have at least a feeble voice, in the conduct of the industrial and economic matters, he has little or none. In other words, what democracy we have had so far has been in the realm of democracy as a form of government, but not in the sphere of either industrial or social democracy. There should be a much larger measure of social equality and fraternity and a greater degree of economic justice, if democracy is really to justify itself. Without a considerable degree of social equality and economic security, democracy is a sham and a delusion.

While this is the line of argument adopted by those who are kindly disposed towards democracy, its enemies bring up several other arguments against both the principle and practice

of democracy. Let us take up the principle first. Critics deny the fundamental assumption of democracy that people passionately care for liberty, either in individual or governmental relations. "Give me liberty or give me death", they consider to be a *bourgeois* conception which is not true to life as we know it. Their contention is that men care more for the satisfaction of hunger, for national greatness, and for domination of others than for personal or constitutional liberty. The approach of these thinkers to the problem of democracy is from the current anti-intellectual standpoint which claims that man is a bundle of blind feelings and prejudices and not a rational creature at all. Our answer to this charge is that it represents only a passing phase. We have not yet fully discovered or utilised the possibilities of human nature. Men to-day are so much enamoured of dicatorship and its striking successes that they are willing to throw overboard all inner values. But when the mood of reflection overtakes them again, which is bound to happen soon, they are certain to care more for a fuller measure of liberty and equality than they have done hitherto.

Against the principle of democracy, it is further argued that it exaggerates the importance of the individual to the exclusion of discipline and unity, the result of which is disorder and anarchy. Many people, it is claimed, want authority to be imposed upon them from without and do not want to decide things for themselves. In reply to this charge, it must be said that democracy does not exclude discipline. It is an attempt at the reconciliation of order and liberty. The kind of discipline in which democracy believes is a self-imposed discipline or self-discipline which is undoubtedly a higher form of discipline than that which is imposed upon the individual from without. In the well-known words of Rousseau: "Obedience to a law which we prescribe to ourselves is liberty." Or, to use the injunction of Immanuel Kant, we must obey "the self-imposed imperative of duty". The saying that "good government is no substitute for self-government," is true not only in the relation between a subject nation and the imperial

power over it, but also within a self-govering country itself in the relation between the government and its citizens. The greatest paradox of politics, as well as of the moral life is "self-government" or government of the self by the self.

In close connection with the above argument, it is argued by writers like Faguet that democracy is anti-evolutionary or unbiological. Instead of locating the brains in one part of the organism, it expects it to be located anywhere and everywhere. Democracy, it is argued, has no central nervous system. On the other hand, it means extreme decentralization and thorough incompetence. In practical terms, this means that democracy assumes that the power of thinking, planning, and deciding on national issues is present among all the citizens, which is an unsound assumption. The opponents of democracy argue that, as a matter of fact, a great majority of people prefer to be led, even by the nose if necessary. They further say that in a democracy there is no place for heroes, for men with extraordinary drive and initiative and ability to lead, and for men who can make and re-make human history.

Our reply to this charge is that it is a clear case of exaggeration. Democracy does not expect impossible things of the average citizen. It does not expect him to be able to decide on intricate questions of policy or on technical matters. But it does expect him to exercise his vote intelligently and conscientiously and to cultivate the ability to understand and evaluate matters of general policy and the doings of his government. As regards heroes in politics, we are not enamoured of them, for every hero ends at last by becoming a bore. Democracy believes in the necessity of leaders and wise administrators. A sound democracy, as has been well said, should make room for and include a sound aristocracy—an aristocracy of ability and talent. While including aristocracy within itself, democracy is better than aristocracy because it combines efficiency with responsibility. In the words of Mazzini, the great Italian patriot and founder of a pure type of nationalism, democracy means "the progress of all, through

all, under the leading of the best and wisest." Democracy assumes the equality of all in order to discover who are the best.

With special reference to India, the die-hard Englishman, the Princes, and their apologists say that India can never be independent or democratic because of her innumerable differences of religion, language, caste, and community. Mr. Jinnah, the president of the Muslim League, echoes a similar sentiment when he says "Democracy presupposes the existence of the solid rock of one race and one culture. India is unsuited for it." Apart from the fact that "race" is only a myth, one wonders whether Mr. Jinnah would say the same thing if the Muslims formed a majority of the population of India, instead of 22 per cent as at present. Besides, "the unity of race and culture" which Mr. Jinnah lays down as being the pre-requisite of a democracy is not found in any great democratic country. As a matter of fact, what democracy there is to-day is found among people of mixed ethnic origin, such as the Americans, the British, the Canadians, and the Swiss. As regards culture in the modern world, it is recognised on all hands that it is not a fixed and unchangeable commodity. It undergoes silent change under the impact of other cultures and other ways of living. It is only the unimaginative person who would say that his country or community should be shut up in a water-tight compartment so as to remain uninfluenced by outside forces. Democracy is possible in a country with heterogenous conditions, provided "the will to be a democracy" is present. Some of our so-called leaders are laying the axe at the will power of India so as to benefit themselves or their own narrow groups.

When we turn from the principle of democracy to the actual practice of it, we find that the arguments levelled against it are legion. One of the chief criticisms is that democracy means inefficiency. Faguet, a French writer, sneeringly refers to democracy as "the cult of incompetence." Democracy, it is said, is slow-moving and extraordinarily

wasteful. Some one has described it as an exaggerated committee, and a committee has been humorously defined as seven men doing in seven days what one man can do in one day. That there is considerable truth in this charge can be supported by experience in local boards and municipal councils in India. Extension of self-government in these spheres has not meant increased efficiency, with the result that in the Madras Presidency, at any rate, taluq boards have been abolished, many panchayats have been superseded by special officers appointed by the Provincial Government, and elected executive officers of municipal councils have been replaced by government—appointed commissioners. Although these measures may be regretted as being anti-democratic, they have been rendered necessary in the interest of efficiency and a fair degree of public honesty

At times of crisis democracy often speaks with a divided voice. There is no unity of leadership such as is possible under a dictatorship. So many rival parties and conflicting interests have to be consulted, and the decision arrived at is "the least common factor." Democracy, it is said, does not represent the people at their best or strongest but at their worst or weakest.

The truth of this criticism has been abundantly illustrated in the recent history of England. The mild and vacillating policy of the late Mr. Neville Chamberlain typified by the "philosophy of appeasement" meant the military unpreparedness of Great Briatin at the commencement of the present war. Although much has been done since to remedy the situation, immediately prior to the war and in the early months of it, England had to pocket several insults at the hands of Germany and even of Japan. For eight months England had to put up with Mr. Chamberlain and his associates, till the fighting speeches of Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Amery, and others turned them out of office. Although "in the name of God, they went", they continued to hold some key positions for some time longer. Before her collapse in June 1940, France in the

course of a few months, had three changes in her Premiership and two in her supreme military command. South Africa and Australia have had their party bickering, and, at the time of writing, a major political controversy in Australia has resulted in Mr. Menzies, the Prime Minister, being compelled to give place to Mr. Fadden, and Fadden to Curtin. In spite of the heroic speeches of Mr. F.D. Roosevelt, the American President, the people of his country are not solidly behind him in the efforts to help Great Britain and her allies. In contrast to what has happened in these countries, Germany has had a continuity of leadership—Hitler, Goering, and Goebbels are still in power.

The inefficiency of democracy, critics say, is particularly marked in the military field. For military preparation, for sudden attacks on the enemy, for unity of command, and for evoking the unquestioning loyalty of the people, dictatorship is considered to be infinitely superior. While admitting that there is a large measure of truth in this contention, we must say that, so long as we have aggressor nations in the world swayed by gangster mentality, democracies are bound to have a hard time because democracy is "the art of living together in peace and freedom." Democracy is admirably fitted for peace time and the securing of the fruits of peace. Dictatorship, on the other hand, is fitted for war, unprovoked attack, and domination.

But even in the military field, as the present war has demonstrated, dictatorships only have the initial advantage. Once people in a democratic country become fully alive to the dangers facing them, there is no sacrifice which they will not be prepared to make. War weariness is sure to overcome an unfree people much sooner than it can a free people. Under the strain of war, democracy may bend, but does not break, whereas dictatorship breaks without bending. The sequel to dictatorship is a bloody revolution. Apropos of what has been said, Dr. A. D. Lindsay, the Master of Balliol, remarks that men do greater things under the inspiration of freedom than

under compulsion and that the reservoir of courage, enterprise, and endurance is much fuller in a democracy than in a dictatorship.

The charge of inefficiency in a democracy can further be overcome by the developing of proper leadership. Both England and the U.S.A., under the stress of war, have strengthened themselves considerably by giving wide powers to their executive. Subject to the general supervision of the legislature and of alert public opinion, the authority exercised by Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt is very wide, almost equal to that of Hitler and Mussolini, with the difference that they do not have to go about in armoured cars and bullet proof trains. They do not, like Hitler, have recourse to "doubles" to impersonate them for obvious reasons.

Some of the other defects in the practical working of democracy pointed out by its critics and our reply to them may be briefly summed up. Democracy, it is said, means government by an irresponsible multitude, by the ignorant masses. It counts heads without taking their contents into account. But, as has been well said, it is better to count heads than to break them. Democracy, it is argued, leads to a tyranny of the majority, a tyranny of the prevailing opinion and feeling, and that it glorifies numbers. The remedy for it is not to abandon democracy but to educate the people in the art of democracy. The cultivation of a "general will" is much more important than the mere recording of the majority opinion. Miss Follett is right when she says: "the will to will the common will is the core of democracy."

Others say that democracy leads to an oligarchy of the worst kind. Power falls into the hands of an unscrupulous clique which cares more for authority than for justice and more for patronage than for honour. Such a clique has rightly been described as an "aristocracy of blackguards." In such a state the demagogue, the grafter, and the boss gain ascendancy. Good men are not elected but popular men,

the qualifications of success in election being that a person should be a good psychologist, a compromiser, and one who does not scruple to demean his own principles.

In close connection with this criticism, some writers expatiate on the evils of party politics and the spoils system in administration. Parties, it is contended, vulgarise issues and debase moral standards. They obscure, if not pervert, truth. A well-organised party often becomes dictatorial in character, seriously curbing the freedom of thought and action of those who subscribe to its tenets. In our own country to-day we find the unreasonable limit to which party dictatorship is carried to the detriment of the nation at large. Parties refuse to come to terms even in the face of a common enemy because of a false sense of prestige and self-importance.

The remedy, however, does not seem to be to do away with parties altogether, but to compel them by intelligent and well-informed public opinion to fight their battles on an honourable basis and to place the good of the country above their own party interests. Since 1933 Germany has disallowed all parties except the Nazi party which has brought the country to the present position. People are fed on a one-sided propaganda and the philosophy of Mr. Goebbels, the arch-propagandist, is the bigger the lie, the greater is the chance of its acceptance. No official or unofficial opposition is tolerated, and those who dare to criticise the administration are either shot outright or obliged to languish in concentration camps. In democratic countries with the parlimentary system of government, on the other hand, a place of great respect is assigned to the leader of the opposition. In England they speak of " His Majesty's Government " and " His Majesty's Loyal Opposition, " The leader of the opposition is also paid from public funds. Another criticism levelled against democracy is that it rests upon the common people who are fickle and emotional. At times people are given to flights of idealism and hero-worship. But at other times leaders are openly flouted. Hearnshaw compares leaders in a democracy to

school-masters who are elected by their pupils and liable to be punished and dismissed by them.

Criticisms like these can be multiplied indefinitely. But for our purpose it is enough to know that many of them are mere caricatures and embody such opposite contentions that they mutually cancel each other.

Even supposing for the sake of argument, we grant that democracy is unsound alike in theory and practice, what is the way out? Certainly not autocracy, because we know enough of the misrule which goes on in some Indian States. Even the most progressive among them have not gone beyond the stage of qualified autocracy.

Others believe that a popular dictatorship may be a suitable alternative. So far as we in India are concerned, we are not a regimented people. We value our individuality far too much to yield readily to Fascism or Nazism. This does not mean that there are no Fascist tendencies in the country or that there are not enough leaders aspiring to become dictators. As a matter of practical necessity, we may yield to despotism or autocracy. But to say that by temperament we prefer absolutism and personal rule is a convenient fiction set up by interested parties, who ignore the very important place occupied in the past by self-governing village communities in the political history of the country.

Whatever the political advantages of dictatorship may be, there is no denying the fact that it means a wholesale destruction of all moral and personal values. The voice of Jesus sounding through the ages says: "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his soul?" Dictatorship sacrifices individual liberty and personality on the altar of the State. Its motto is: "All within the State; none outside the State; none against the State." It follows a policy of repression at home and of aggression abroad. Opposition and criticism are stifled. What a person may say, read or hear is all severely censored. Thus we find that while

the speeches of Lord Haw Haw are treated as a great national amusement in England, in Germany to listen to enemy broadcasts means a sure place in the concentration camp; and "concentration camps," wrote a German newspaper in 1936, "are no disgrace; on the contrary, they are an ornament to *kultur*. Here neglected individuals are educated to real life with the firmest kindness."

Things that really make life worth living such as liberty, justice and fair play, mercy and humanity, and truth are thrown overboard by dictatorships. Democracy, on the other hand, means search for agreement by discussion. Compromise and tolerance are its essential principles. Even in war, England has greater freedom than is the case in other belligerent countries. One feels safe in one's own house. The Press is comparatively free, whereas in Germany it is completely gagged. Parliament meets often and exercises control over the executive. The Select Committee of Parliament on National Expenditure has been exercising close, continuous, and rigorous scrutiny over the whole range of government expenditure. Even conscientious objectors to war are given certain recognised rights. While they are not allowed to sabotage the nation's war efforts, they are given the right to profess pacifism.

In the matter of justice, as a recent writer notes, in Hitler's Germany, there is an open and contemptuous defiance of the rule of law. Germany is ruled by decrees and these decrees have no regard for the "usual standards of civilised justice"; "Hitler kills and tortures men who in any way dispute his supreme authority."

As regards mercy and kindliness, one finds a most startling contrast between democracies and dictatorship. A. L. Lowell and A. D. Lindsay have drawn attention to the wide humanitarian feeling which prevails in their respective countries. Social services such as the care of the poor, disinfirm, care for the working classes, and housing

schemes are well developed. Nazi Germany, too, can claim to have expanded her social services, but to counteract whatever good she may have done, she has raised cruelty to the *nth* decrée. Mr. Attlee, the Deputy Prime Minister of England, says : " I believe that the issue before the world of democracy or dictatorship is one between civilisation and barbarism. I put it as strongly as that."

Our study of modern dictatorships makes it clear that it can flourish only so long as the nerves of the people are kept at a high tension. In order to accomplish this end, dictators are obliged to find reasons for dragging the country into war and keeping it there. They have to invent such arguments as "encirclement," " economic blockade", " the selfishness of the English ruling class", etc., in order to keep themselves in power and avert civil war and revolution. Dictatorships follow an internal policy whose external consequence is war. Given peace and security, democracy can accomplish enduring results. Dictatorship may be a good form of government for extraordinary times, but not for normal times.

In evaluating the claims of dictatorship, it is necessary to remember that in all the countries where dictatorship prevails, democracy was either a weakling or had no existence at all. Therefore, dictatorship is not an improvement upon democracy, but upon a pre-existing autocratic form of government. It is possible that dictatorship may still pave the way for a fuller and freer democracy when people become disillusioned of the claims of dictatorship.

Furthermore, there is no guarantee for a country under a dictatorship that it will have a succession of capable and selfless " vegetarian " dictators like Hitler. They may become carnivorous in more senses than one. Modern dictators care infinitely more for power than for titles, honours or wealth. But this may not be so always. Besides, people in the dictatorial countries have a mystical faith in their leaders which is unjustifiable. There is no assurance that extraordinary times will bring forth extraordinary men as leaders.

In criticism of what we have said about dictatorship, it may be said that it is all negative in character. We do admit that dictatorship has given the people over whom it exercises sway a new faith and confidence in themselves and a sense of national unity. It has removed from them the post-war defeatist mentality and has made them strong and vigorous. But the mistake it has made is in extending its ruthless ways to people outside its own borders and wantonly bringing about war which is affecting every part of the world.

If democracy is adequately to meet the challenge thrown by dictatorship, it has to set its own house in order. For sometime past faith in democratic ideals has been a mere profession with most advocates of democracy and with the so-called democratic countries. Democracy, we are convinced, has no assured future before it unless it can see the difference between promise and performance. Freedom, brotherhood, justice, and the like are not mere sentiments or words and formulae but are eternal ideas which must be clothed with flesh and blood if democracy is to endure. A weak-kneed, sentimental liberalism paves the way for totalitarianism, as it did in the case of Italy. Dictators too use the language of liberals, the language of social justice, security, freedom from fear, etc., but have their own way of converting these ideas into institutions and realising them in daily life and conduct. Our emotions and sentiments should be yoked to reason and then translated into action.

People who talk glibly about liberty and democracy without understanding all their implications or, having understood them, do not possess the necessary spirit of sacrifice to realise them in practice, are the real enemies of democracy. They are like the 40,000 stout fellows in England that Daniel Defoe speaks of who were ready to fight Popery to death without knowing whether Popery was a man or a horse. Likewise there are many today who fight for freedom

without knowing whether "freedom means a phrase in a peroration or a pint of beer in a pub."

The most damaging criticism of modern democracy is that it is invariably associated with imperialist exploitation. It passes one's comprehension how people after freeing themselves from tyrannial rule and the rule of oligarchs can proceed to subjugate other people and keep them under bondage. So long as this inconsistency lasts, democracy is bound to be a laughing stock of the totalitarian states as well as of the subject nations. It is true that learned explanations are often given to account for this inconsistency, but they are really attempts at explaining away the difficulty. Thus it is argued by sober-minded people that the resources of backward areas cannot be left to the casual activity of illiterate and unprogressive people, but that imperialists should go there to drive them to work and pocket the huge profits themselves. Others argue that a coloured man is different from the white man and that, therefore, a ridiculously low wage, the deprivation of personal freedom, and subjection to a foreign country are not likely to be felt by him as hardships. In more recent times the idea of "trusteeship" has been bandied about, and the "trustees" themselves are most eloquent in singing the praises of it, while the right procedure would be to leave such assessment to an impartial international tribunal which would examine both sides of the case and come to a conclusion on the basis of evidence.

If democracy is to have a future, it should be enabled to pervade every phase of man's life. So far, it has been tried in the political field, but not much in the social, economic, national, and international fields, and until that is done, the battle for democracy will remain incomplete. Democracy will still be in its swaddling clothes. We need to remind ourselves constantly that democracy is not only a form of government, but also a type of State, an order of society, an economic or industrial condition, and a great moral and spiritual principle.

It is a pity that democracy in many lands is equated with imperialism as well as with monopoly capital and exploitation. So long as this situation lasts, democracy rests on a foundation of shifting sand. Modern democracies are only partially democratic. They suffer much from the fact that they do not represent the interests of the whole people. Concessions have been made to the common people under pressure, but the dice is still loaded in favour of the privileged classes. Under the guise of national interests and national prestige, the poor are exploited by the rich. The press, the pulpit, the cinema, and the radio, while not controlled by a dictator, are under the insidious influence of vested interests.

When we pass from the exploitation of the common people within democratic countries to the exploitation of the weaker nations under the heel of democratic imperialism, the story is infinitely worse. In these circumstances, it is no wonder that Fascism and Nazism wait round the corner, for Fascism and Nazism are simply an open and unashamed extension of the evil tendencies noticeable in a democracy. If England, the U. S.A. and other democratic countries do not genuinely become democratic, Fascism and Nazism are bound to overtake them, even after the defeat of Hitler and Mussolini.

Democracy, it must be remembered, is the most difficult form of government to operate. If it is to succeed, we need great moral changes as well as technical changes in the mechanism of democracy. It is a truism to say that a democracy cannot rise higher than the source from which it originates, viz., the character and temper of the people and their social institutions. So long as caste, class, and communal distinctions divide people into water-tight compartments, democracy will continue to be a very delicate plant. Social democracy is as important as political democracy. Therefore, there should be a frank recognition of the principle of equality in spite of the fact of natural inequality, resulting in equal opportunity to everybody who can benefit by it.

In providing economic security to everybody in the community, it may well be that socialism is the next step in democracy. We cannot preach liberty and equality even as abstract principles when we keep 9-10ths of the people in the ditch of want and poverty. There should be a "civic minimum" for everybody and possibly a civic maximum as well.

A democracy which exploits weaker nations is infinitely worse than a monarchy or a dictatorship which does the same, because of the higher principles which it professes. A country cannot consistently be democratic at home and autocratic abroad. Such duplicity will eventually bring destruction to itself.

Democracy cannot succeed where the critical capacity is not cultivated and where the masses are not literate. We are living in an age where through the platform, the press, and the radio we are inundated with half-baked ideas and prejudicial opinions, which sweep people off their feet unless they be on their guard and learn to think for themselves. An ignorant and misinformed electorate is the greatest enemy of democracy. The education given should cultivate a sense of discrimination and a critical power so as to enable persons to distinguish essentials from non-essentials. An educated, intelligent, and discriminating electorate is one of the first conditions necessary for the successful working of democracy.

Alongside of education and a critical capacity, we need to stress the importance of character, especially on the part of leaders. No democracy can endure long unless the people over whom it exercises authority possess sound character. Public opinion should demand a high degree of honour and of honesty as well as a spirit of nobility and magnanimity in politics. Clean hands and a pure heart in the case of leaders are a prime requisite of democracy. Among the people there should be a wide-spread enthusiasm and passion for justice and liberty, for mercy and truth, for these are the four corner-stones of a stable democracy.

On the mechanical side, it needs to be remembered that parliamentary democracy of the British type is not the only form of democracy. We need to revise text book opinions of majority rule, cabinet solidarity, and the like wherever necessary. The primary thing is to keep the people interested in the affairs of government so that they can bring to bear an intelligent and wholesome public opinion on the policy and acts of government. Other requisites are a strong executive, an independent judiciary, and an efficient and uncorrupt administration.

Democracy for India

If democracy means faith in the common man and reverence for human personality wherever it is found, then it follows that democracy is as essential for India as it is for any other country in the world. But critics come forward with various arguments to show that either democracy is not suited to India or India is not suited for democracy.

One chief argument that we often hear is that by tradition and upbringing the Indian can only think in terms of his own caste or community and never in terms of the country as a whole. India is to him only a geographical expression. In his opposition to a foreigner, he may occasionally think and feel like an Indian. But at other times the claims of his own caste, community, district or province take precedence over everything else.

There is no doubt some truth in this argument. But it is grossly exaggerated. As in the west, so in India distance is being rapidly annihilated. Swift means of transport and communication have knit India together. Hindustani music and Hindi cinema pictures are as much appreciated in South India as they are in those parts of the country where Hindustani is the common language of the people. Thanks to cheap third class railway fares, Indians constantly travel about the country in large numbers, especially as pilgrims and students. Educated people of one province frequently find jobs in other provinces as teachers, medical men, and superior

civil servants; and a greater interchange of such people will go a long way in breaking down caste and provincialism. A Brahmin going from Madras to Lucknow for work is not tied down to his local caste or communal inhibitions and restrictions. He can afford to be as liberal and cosmopolitan in his outlook as any one else.

Education and travel thus can go a long way in breaking down our insularity. But what about caste and communal loyalties? Under the stress of modern conditions, and particularly as a result of the western impact, caste is breaking down, especially as regards social intercourse in towns and cities. It is only a question of time when distinctions based on social position, occupation, and wealth will replace distinctions of caste, however much we may regret the change. Even today, except in the matter of marriage, people do not very much worry about a man's caste so long as he has a certain position and standing in society. He is welcome wherever money and status can carry him.

Communalism, however, cannot be so easily dismissed. While with the advance of education and enlightenment, caste is declining, communal bitterness is on the increase everywhere because of the ever-growing scramble for political power and patronage. There is no doubt whatever that unless some reasonable and commonsense solution is reached with regard to communalism, the ship of Indian democracy will flounder on this rock. Too much concentration on the present communal situation is enough to make any one pessimistic with regard to the future of India. But if we take into account the fact that for centuries together Hindus and Muslims have on the whole lived together in peace and harmony, making rough and ready adjustments wherever necessary, the situation is not as hopeless as it may appear at the outselt. At the bottom of much of our trouble today is the self-seeking politician thirsting for power and authority as well as the third party in the country. There can be little doubt that so long as the foreign power controls the

destinies of the country, the communities will not come together, for it is the easiest thing for a man with power to play off one community against the other and see that they remain disunited. Everything possible has been done to encourage separatist tendencies, and it will take a very long time before the evil consequences resulting from such tendencies can be undone. So long as the foreign power continues to be what it is, one must regretfully admit that there is no chance for democracy in India.

The staggering illiteracy of India is often adduced as a reason why India is not suited for democracy. This is an argument which goes round a vicious circle. India is illiterate and, therefore, cannot govern herself. Because she is not self-governing and is not allowed to determine her own destiny, she cannot remove such evils as illiteracy. At the present snail-like pace at which literacy has been spreading in the country, it is calculated that it will take at least a thousand years before India becomes completely literate. When the present history of India comes to be written, the impartial historian is bound to say that while the British connection with India had meant peace, order, and civilised administration of the country as a whole, it had at the same time tolerated the staggering poverty and the colossal illiteracy of the people. The right remedy is actively to promote self-governing democratic institutions and literacy simultaneously. We cannot afford to wait till perfection is reached in one sphere before we can make efforts in the other direction. If a nation-wide literacy campaign had been started at the beginning of the century, several of our present day difficulties would not have arisen at all.

The undertakings which the British Crown has either directly or indirectly given from time to time to the Indian Princes, it is argued, constitute a hindrance to the development of genuine democratic institutions for India as a whole. It is not necessary for our present purpose to examine minutely the nature of these undertakings. Suffice to say that neither

from the legal nor from the moral point of view does any prince have the 'right divine to govern wrong.' If the Princes have rights, their subjects have greater rights, and no future government of India can tolerate autocracy, however much diluted it may be, in one part of India, while democracy prevails in the other. Such a dual arrangement will spell destruction to both sides on account of their contiguity and intimate social and historic connections. As in the case of communalism, so as regards the Princes, the trump card is with Britain. If she gives the word there is little doubt that most, if not all, Princes will fall in line and forthwith grant full responsible government to their subjects. Sanads or no sanads, treaties or no treaties, in the name of Paramountcy, the Crown in Parliament can and should issue to Princes orders for the introduction of responsible government. Smaller states should be incorporated with the neighbouring provinces. There is no reason why any Indian prince should want any more power than what is enjoyed by the King of England. As his legal power goes down, his moral influence is bound to increase, especially if he identifies himself with the needs and sufferings of his people. It is an anachronism to perpetuate mediaeval institutions and feudalism when the rest of the world is forging ahead.

Turning to the character and temper of the people, it is sometimes argued (1) that Indians do not much care for personal freedom, (2) that they do not know to use power moderately, (3) that they do not understand the true spirit of party politics, and (4) that neither temperamentally nor racially are they suited for democracy. Let us examine these arguments one by one and see what truth they contain.

To say that Indians do not care for personal freedom but only for group rights and privileges, is a calumny on a whole people. On account of long years of foreign rule, a great many Indians are no doubt docile and do not assert themselves even when they are in the right. In spite of it, in recent years the country has witnessed the sight of thousands of

young men bearing their breasts to *lathi* charges and languishing in jails for what they considered to be a just cause. Even women who are proverbially timid have joined their ranks in large numbers. Students today are not so submissive as at one time, willing to take down everything which comes from their teachers as gospel truth. This new spirit of independence and self-assertiveness may take wrong turns but nobody would want to crush it. The people of India today, especially the younger ones, are burning with an eager desire to be masters in their own country. Even when we look into the past history of India, we find that absolutism has not always been the prevailing form of government. India has known fully self-governing village communities and had experimented in limited areas with republicanism and federalism. Speaking of modern times, the late Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar says : "Our love of freedom and democracy has become unquenchable. And our determination to succeed has become, though veiled in our eastern manner, as relentless as Fate."

The second charge is that Indians as a whole do not know how to use power moderately, that power acts as wine to their heads, that there is a streak of autocracy in every Indian, and that when placed in power he prefers personal rule to rule by impersonal and impartial law. When we look at things as they are, we are bound to admit the relevancy of this criticism within certain limits. But the extenuating circumstance to be borne in mind is the long years of foreign rule and bondage. " An autocrat ", it has been rightly said, " is a slave turned inside out". When we do away with slavery and bondage, we also do away with the desire or necessity to be autocratic, which seems to be nature's compensation for subordination and serfdom.

When we look at the policy pursued by our party leaders we cannot help feeling that they revel in personal dictatorship. The explanation for that is to be found in the fact that India today is not in a normal state of affairs. It is on pins and

needles so to speak. The Congress feels that in its fight for freedom it cannot allow any of its members to take his own line but that all should wage a concerted battle. The Muslim League likewise feels, rightly or wrongly, that the safety of the whole Muslim community is at stake and that, therefore, the Muslims should stand as a unit in their opposition to the Hindus ; and the Hindu Mahasabha pays back the compliment. When self-government is granted and the legitimate rights of every community are properly safeguarded, the incipient dictatorship which is noticeable on all sides will die a natural death. What the country has to guard itself against in the meantime is, in the words of Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar, " the formation of a political caste or sect and the growth of professionalism in politics. "

In what we have said in the above paragraph, we have partly answered the charge that Indians do not understand the spirit of party politics. Parties to a large extent have become factions and there is little of the spirit of give and take. There is a profound sense of suspicion and jealousy between leaders. The remedy for it is not to do away with parties altogether, but to secularise politics and to replace communal parties by political parties. Communal parties are incapable of expansion and, therefore, a communal party which is in a minority can never hope to form a Government. Political parties, on the other hand, do not have fixed majorities and minorities. Their success depends upon the confidence they are able to win from the electorate by their programme and performance. So long as we have separatism in politics in the form of communal electorates, there is no chance of parties developing along right lines and becoming the " brokers of ideas. "

The last criticism need not engage our attention long. To bring in " race " into a discussion on democracy is to confuse the issue. We know so little of " race " that the wise thing to do is not to ignore it, but to emphasise more other factors such as education and sound public opinion, where we are on surer ground. Democracy has made considerable headway in

China in spite of it being an Oriental country and in spite of the unsettled conditions brought about by the unprovoked and ruthless war that Japan has been waging against her. What China has done, we too can do if we will only take thought and mend our ways.

As said earlier, historical and geographical conditions demand that India should remain as a single unit. To these considerations we must add considerations of an economic and military nature. For purposes of communication, trade, commerce, defence, and the like, it is desirable that nothing should be done to break up the unity of India or erect barriers of various kinds within the country itself. If government is a difficult art, democracy is more difficult than almost any other form of government. But just because it is difficult, it does not follow that we must give it up in favour of untried and novel methods which may land us in greater difficulties. Professor T. V. Smith is right when he says that if democracy does not provide us heaven, it is foolish to despair so long as it at least helps us to avoid hell. Taking into account the peculiar conditions of India, we have no hesitation in saying that a dictatorship is likely to be of little avail. We have to follow the long and tedious road of democracy where the results may not always seem to justify the effort.

A crying need of the hour is to make Indians both democratic and patriotic. There is already a substratum of unity in the national tradition of the country which should be developed and utilised to the fullest extent possible. Even to-day in North Indian temples, prayers are said daily for rivers in far away Punjab. Hindu and Moslem sacred places are scattered all over the country and pilgrims for centuries have regarded India as a single unit. Attention should be fastened on facts like these to make the people of India patriotic and democratically-minded; and, in bringing about this end, the school, the newspaper, the handbill, the poster, the pulpit, the cinema, and the radio should all be fully utilised. If genuine democracy is to flourish in India, we need to secularise

politics in the sense of divorcing it from sectarianism and narrow-minded communalism, without at the same time giving up the fundamental religious principles of truth, justice, love and mercy, brotherhood, and freedom.

Another suggestion which may be made in making democracy succeed in India is the necessity of paying greater attention to the development of self-governing institutions in the villages. The kind of democracy which we have had so far has been largely in the interest of the 10 per cent of city dwellers. The process should now be reversed so that the villages can become self-governing and, to a large extent, self-sufficing. In this connection it must be said, as pointed out in an earlier chapter, that Mahatma Gandhi's idea of decentralised production and distribution, when coupled with the most up-to-date methods of co-operation, can be productive of great good. Alongside of this economic self-sufficiency there should be self-sufficiency in the political field too. To this end the village panchayat under the careful supervision of the provincial government should be given the power to raise adequate local taxes to be spent on village education, sanitation, hospitals, roads, etc. Such a body should further have control over village and forest land attached to the villages and be responsible for co-operative credit, co-operative marketing, consolidation of holdings, and communal cultivation wherever possible. The village officers should be men of education and enlightenment receiving an adequate salary and filled with an eager desire to serve the needs of the people.

While the election to the village panchayats must be direct, to the district boards and possibly even to the provincial legislature, it may be indirect, the lower body acting as the electorate. The chief trouble with the indirect form of election is that the number of electors being smaller, though perhaps more responsible, the possibility of bribery and corruption becomes greater. But that is no reason why it should not be given a fair trial considering the fact that

democracy and democratic institutions are still a tender plant in India.

In this day and generation there is no justification for the special representation of landlords, of commerce and industry, and of Europeans as such. Democracy and vested interests can have nothing in common. Along with the disappearance of special seats for these interests should also disappear separate electorates which, during the thirty years that they have been in existence, have complicated our political situation and driven the communities farther and farther apart. More than any one single factor they are responsible for the political backwardness of India. It is a well-known fact that compromise in favour of any evil eventually means the complete victory of that evil. Even today it is not too late to substitute for separate electorates joint electorates with reservation of seats with reasonable guarantees to the minorities so that those elected to represent them will not be mere nominees of the majority party. If John Morley had taken this progressive step in 1908, Indian politics would have taken a different turn altogether during the subsequent years.

Territorial representation may be supplemented by functional representation where necessary. The Upper House may be transformed into a House of Functions with advisory powers, or functional representatives may be constituted into a separate advisory council to advise the government on all economic questions. Where such representation is allowed, it should be along the lines of well-established guilds where the working classes will be fully represented, and where there will be no suggestion of communal representation. Matters strictly relating to the religion and culture of any community may just as well be left to the consideration of the members of that community in the legislature, and the legislature, by convention, should accept the wishes of the minority concerned as final. Questions which concern any one province directly should be dealt with by the provincial

government. It is not necessary that in all matters there should be a uniform policy for the whole country. For a fixed number of years some provinces may want to experiment with the parliamentary type of executive, others with the presidential type, and still others with the Swiss executive type carrying out the will of the legislature.

An irremovable composite executive with a fixed term of office may be tried at the centre alongside of a parliamentary executive in provinces which are more or less homogeneous in their make up. While everything possible should be done to make the executive strong, the legislature should remain supreme and be responsible for laws and general policy. In England, even in war time, Parliament has not surrendered its right of criticism and control.

In a country like India where communities are suspicious of each other, a strong and independent federal judiciary can render much valuable service. It may be empowered to deal summarily with questions which are likely to exasperate communal feelings. It must be possible to draw these judges from almost any part of the world. By its impartial judgments a federal judiciary can build up for itself a place of trust and confidence in the hearts of the people. There should also be a thoroughly efficient and incorruptible public service, close to the people, and rising above all communal and party considerations. If democracy is to function satisfactorily in India the civil servant should have no politics. Parties and party committees should not unnecessarily interfere with his work. They should confine themselves to the legitimate tasks of building up the party strength and party funds, nominating candidates, and enunciating policy and programme. Under no circumstance they should have direct control or even influence over day to day administration. Whatever administrative irregularities may come to their notice should be dealt with in the usual parliamentary manner of members of the legislature asking questions, moving

motions of adjournment, voting 'No Confidence' in the ministry, and the like.

In framing the future constitution of India, no attempt should be made to depart from the federal ideal. For a country like India, with its vast size and complex conditions, with its archaic Princes and rival communities, with its provincial jealousies and local suspicions, federalism offers the only possible solution. A unitary constitution with a considerable degree of decentralisation may be tried. But it will not be as satisfactory as a federation which can combine full local and provincial development with a strong centre in matters of foreign policy, defence, finance, and communications. The present concurrent list of powers as laid down in the Government of India Act of 1935 should be suitably altered so that each provincial unit will have practically complete control over such matters as education, cultural development, personal law, and health.

Federalism alone can preserve the dignity and autonomy of the units. A confederation may satisfy some of the units such as Indian States, but it is bound to be weak. In times of crisis, a confederation cannot stand the strain. The experience of all confederations has been that they cannot stand still. They have either to move forward and become full-fledged federations or step backward and become unitary states with little of provincial or local autonomy. Federation alone can substitute relations of co-ordination for those of subordination and a genuine union for a mechanical unity.

If a confederation of the whole of India will not serve our purpose, much less will a Hindu federation and a Muslim federation loosely linked together by an All-India confederation. The only way of strengthening India, both internally and externally, and keeping the fissiparous tendencies at bay is the federal.

In continuation of what we have said, and in line with some of the points mentioned already, we may record with approval the following suggestions made by Mr. D. V. Gundappa :

"(1) The constitution to be secured should make India the equal of Britain and other members of the British Commonwealth in independence, authority, status and rights of every kind . . . .

"(2) It should provide for a strong central government, endowed with plenary powers in all matters of common concern to the whole of India including the States, and bidden to hold together all parts of the country in all circumstsnces, at the same time guaranteeing to the States their prescriptive internal autonomy and to the Provinces full freedom for the promotion of their economic, cultural and social interests according to their own special circumstances.

"(3) It should establish a democratic form of government throughout, subject to arrangements necessary (i) to preserve the constitutional sovereign prerogatives of the Ruling Princes in the States, and (ii) to satisfy recognised minorities and special interests with reference to the composition of the executive. However constituted, the executive should be subject to the direction and control of the legislature; and the legislature should in the main be representative of the community in general as ascertained by means of votes.

"(4) It should also contain guarantees and safeguards with reference to the religious, religio-social, educational and cultural interests of minority communities and safeguards as to their due representation in the legislature, such special provisions being subject to review and revision at the end of every ten years through an independent commission to be appointed with the approval of the legislature.

"(5) It should provide for the appointment of boards of arbitration to inquire into and decide all questions of difference on communal matters not otherwise provided for in the constitution or laws made thereunder. The board of arbitration may find its chairman in the person of the Chief Justice of India or a non-Indian jurist of international standing invited for the purpose. The award of the board should be enforcible as though it were a statute of the legislature.

"(6) It should enable India to make her own arrangements for the military defence of her territories as well as for her internal security and peace.

"(7) Under the new constitution, the several governments, Provincial and State as well as Central, should be free, each in its sphere, to pursue a policy of vigorous economic development, the government, under the supervision of the legislature, taking a direct share in the building up of industries or giving special facilities or help towards that object. India's fiscal and commercial policies shall be entirely of her own making.

"(8) Finally, it should make it clear in the preamble or in some other suitable form, that the several governments are to be taken as having definitely undertaken (i) to see that the terms of service between the employers of labour and the employees are fair and equitable, (ii) to find, or help in finding work for the workless, and (iii) to secure a minimum standard of wage and welfare to everybody under its rule."*

* The *Hindu* November 11, 1941.

CHAPTER IX

POLITICAL JUSTICE

NATIONALITY

Next to the problem of democracy, we discuss the problem of nationality which is one of the vexing problems of our day. All through the nineteenth century 'nationality' and 'nationalism' were considered to be forces working for good, at least so far as the western world is concerned. But we who live in the second quarter of the twentieth century have come to realise that nationalism can be a force for untold evil as well as for immeasurable good. The chief enemy of mankind to-day is a grossly exaggerated form of nationalism which has led to the present war. We are not so sure of the intrinsic justice or rightness of 'the self-determination of nations', which gained much currency during and after the last war. The history of the world during the past few months and years is enough to convince us that more important than national sovereignty and national self-determination are world peace and prosperity.

Nationality is primarily a cultural and ethnical term. It can exist, although with some difficulty, even under foreign domination. The term 'nation' on the other hand has come to assume a definitely political meaning. It stands for national independence and sovereignty. A nation or nation-state equals nationality *plus* political unity and sovereign independence.

Till very recent times it was widely held by western scholars and statesmen that every group of people who formed a distinct nationality had an intrinsic right to become an independent state. This idea was expressed in the formula 'one nationality, one state'. We today are engaged in a revision of this idea, for to allow each small nationality to become a self-governing state with all the paraphernalia and

equipment of a modern state means not only economic waste but is also a fruitful cause of war.

Postponing further discussion of this question to a later place, we may ask ourselves what is meant by nationality and whether it is something to be encouraged or discouraged. Nationality is essentially a psychological disposition. It is a condition of mind or a sentiment. It is vague and elusive. Zimmern writes: "Nationality, like religion, is subjective; psychological; a condition of mind; a spiritual possession; a way of feeling, thinking and living." The core of nationality is group consciousness or a feeling of corporate unity. It cannot be manufactured by artificial means. It is the resolve of a people to go through thick and thin together. If a people *feels* itself to be a nationality, it is a nationality. It is a strong feeling of kinship. Nationality is only accidentally a political question. It is primarily and essentially a spiritual question.

Putting the same idea in other words, some writers say that nationality is an instinct. J. H. Rose defines it as "a union of hearts once made, never unmade." Another writer claims that nationality means "a body of people which by reason of a community of origin, custom, language and laws is drawn into a union of mind and conscience."

Nationality as defined here is undoubtedly a power for good. But trouble arises when this feeling of kinship is adduced as a sufficient and, perhaps, the only reason for claiming the status of statehood. If the affairs of the world are to be directed along right lines, it is necessary to distinguish nationality from statehood and not confuse one with the other. We now turn to the question of what it is that really makes a people a nationality. Is it possible to speak of the people of India, for instance, as a nationality? Is 'Indian nation' a mere figure of speech? British writers and politicians who are naturally prejudiced in the matter have held for generations that India is only a geographical expression and that there is no unity of any kind to weld the people into a nationality.

On the other hand, a good many Indian thinkers assume that India is already a single nationality and that if it were not for the machinations of the British, India could be a completely self-governing and independent nation to-morrow. The fact of the matter is that India is a composite nationality and both internal and external difficulties stand in the way of her reaching her full stature.

Writers on political science have discussed at great length the factors which constitute nationality. But they are all agreed that none of the factors which they discuss is absolutely essential. Nevertheless they take care to say that without *some* of these factors at least, no nationality can truly exist. There is no universal law which can be laid down regarding the relative importance of various factors. In the western world as a whole religion has long since ceased to be a factor of nationality. But in the East, and particularly in India, it is still a force to be reckoned with. Where certain factors of nationality are weak in a given country, it is necessary to strengthen other factors if nationality is to survive at all.

The first important factor stressed by writers in general is a naturally defined territory or geographical unity. Where a homeland exists, there is a powerful aid to nationality. For ages the Jews have had no national home of their own. Yet the hope that some day Palestine will be restored to them has kept alive and given strength to the Jewish nationality. The boundary between France and Germany is almost accidental, and yet in both these countries there are very strong nationalities, in spite of the Nazi shadow over France today. But this is an exception which proves the rule.

The gypsies have never had a settled abode, accustomed as they are to wandering from place to place. Consequently they do not form a nationality. The Roman people of old in exchanging their homeland for world empire lost their nationality. Natural boundaries thus play an important part

in the evolution and continuance of nationality; and when attempt is made to deprive a country of them the usual result is war.

Naturally marked geographical boundaries are an immense aid to nationality owing to various reasons. In the first place, geography and climate have a definite bearing upon the character and physique of the people. They tend to create common physical, mental, and psychological traits, thereby aiding co-operation and mutual understanding between people. As has been said earlier, Professor Boas of Columbia University has discovered that even the head shape of immigrants in the United States undergoes change after some years of residence there.

In the second place, human sympathies are limited; and at the present stage of man's development a national home seems to be the most suitable geographical unit for the drawing out of the altruistic feelings and emotions of man. There was a time when such feelings and emotions were confined to one's village or tribe. But in all progressive countries these narrow loyalties have given place to a national loyalty. Such an expansion of our loyalties means that a time may come when our sympathies will go still farther and include the whole of mankind. But for most of us this larger loyalty can begin to function only after the legitimate claims of nationality have been met satisfactorily. The man who speaks of being 'a citizen of the world' is not infrequently one who loves humanity in the abstract and hates individuals in the concrete. His sympathies are terribly watered down.

A third reason for stressing a naturally defined territory as an important factor of nationality is that human beings share with animals a love of their habitat. There is an instinctive attachment on the part of every human being to the land of his birth. This attachment is particularly noticeable when a man returns to his homeland after a sojourn of

many years in foreign countries. * The Psalmist gives expression to the feeling of the Israelites when they were kept captives abroad in the following striking words: "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, may my right hand forget its cunning. If I do not remember thee let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy." Mazzini, the father of the purest form of nationalism which is free from all chauvinistic tendencies, says: "Our county is our home, the house that God has given us, placing therein a numerous family that loves us and whom we love."

While the considerations that we have adduced go to prove the importance of a national home, it must be said at the same time that attempts to divide the world on the basis of naturally defined areas will lead to chronic strife and warfare. According to Hayes, a naturally defined territory is not very important in modern times. He criticises the view that geography makes nationality and asserts that the idea of natural boundaries between nationalities is a myth. Yet where such boundaries exist already, violence should not be done to them except where people manifest an eager desire to transcend barriers and form a single unit.

So far as India is concerned, except for some openings in the Himalayas, we are fortunate in having a naturally defined territory. India is a distinct geographical unit, marked off from the rest of the world, and it is a pity that our statesmen and patriots have not given enough attention to this natural advantage which we possess over many another struggling nationality. In view of this geographical unity, it seems foolish to speak of dividing India into Hindu India, Muslim

---

*1. Sir Walter Scott has immortalised this sentiment in his well-known words:—

"Breathes there the man with soul so dead
Who never to himself hath said:
This is my own, my native land?
As home his footsteps he hath turned,
Whose heart hath ne'er within himself burned,
From wandering on a foreign strand?
If such there breathe, go mark him well."

India, Sikh India, Christian India, and Dravidian India. India is our national home with clearly marked boundaries. It is our புண்ய பூமி (Sacred Land).

"Country" is the most suitable geographical unit for the calling out of the highest patriotic feelings. If India is to survive in the modern world, it is necessary that we should soon replace village politics, caste politics, and tribal politics by national politics. Hindu politics at its worst is caste politics: and Muslim politics at its worst is tribal politics, and the country needs neither. It is sorely in need of national politics.

In a thought-provoking article entitled *The Projection of India*, Mr. M. Ruthnaswamy, of the Madras Public Services Commission, contends that in the present controversy in India undue importance is being given to the people of India and not enough attention to the land. Electorates are mapped out not for particular localities but for particular communities. Even in the realm of culture, particularism is clearly marked as suggested by the names "Andhra University", "Hindu University", and "Muslim University".

The writer rightly argues that if the people of India have their rights, so has the land of India. It "has its own rights and liberties, its own interest and importance." The unity of India is determined by its definite frontiers, the Himalayas in the north, the Hindu Kush in the north west, and the seas in the east and west. In these circumstances it is the duty of every son of India to 'project' his country so that the people will become zealous of the country, of her freedom, and progress. The figure of India, its form, its beauty, its hills and its rivers, its flora and its fauna must be made known to every man, woman, and child in India. In realising this end, documentary films about the geography, history, and the life of India are bound to be of immense value, as also radio programmes. Tourist and travel agencies must organise tours of the common folk to all parts of the country. The

youth of the country must be trained to love India long before they become conscious of their separate communities.

Another suggestion made by Mr. Ruthnaswamy is that the press, the cinema, and the radio should join together in creating a Corporate Society of National Projection, backed up by government. A National Exhibition should be organised every year or periodically to publish not only the intellectual but the artistic, literary, and cultural achievements of India and facilitate tours to this exhibition from all over the country. In the striking words of the writer of the article: "Politics divide us, religion divides us, culture divides us. But the land and the love of the land of India may unite us."

In the light of this geographical unity of India, the preservation of which is obvious to every lover of the country, it is amusing to find Dr. Ambedkar plead vigorously for independent Muslim States being carved out of the present territory of India. It is beyond one's understanding to see how Dr. Ambedkar can argue that Pakistan, comprising as it does at the least a North Eastern Zone, a North Western Zone, and an augmented Hyderabad, chopping up India into bits, is 'politically detachable' from the rest of the conntry. Any such 'detachment' can be achieved only by throttling the life of India as a whole. In the re-alignment of the existing provinces to form new states in order to accommodate the Muslims, it is true that Dr. Ambedkar proposes that the districts in the Punjab west of the Sutlej which are predominantly Muslim should become part of Pakistan and the districts east of the Sutlej which are predominantly Hindu should belong to Hindustan. But, as he himself realises, a river, however mighty it may be, is not a safe or suitable boundary between two rival states. Further, it does not seem fair to ask the people of India, and particularly the Hindus, who have occupied the country for a much longer time than the Muslims to give up their natural boundaries. It is possible to argue, as does Dr. Ambedkar, that in the interest of

communal peace and harmony even natural boundaries should be abandoned. But the trouble is that judging from what has happened hitherto, and is happening today, one is not prepared to believe that peace and harmony will prevail once the vivisection of India is carried out. It will be a repetition of what happened to Czecho-Slovakia at the hands of Germany between 1938 and 1939. Appeasement is not the same as settlement. It whets the appetite of the country which is appeased; and the last stage is likely to be infinitely worse than the first.

A second important factor of nationality stressed by many writers is racial unity. Identity of racial integrity is put forward by some as a helpful factor in the formation and strengthening of nationality. Zimmern gives it a high place and Bryce regards it as one of the factors in creating the sentiment of nationality. Mazzini, on the other hand, holds that race is not essential to nationality. Renan is of opinion that "race is something which makes and unmakes itself and has no application to politics." J. H. Rose claims that only in a very crude form does nationality depend on race. " Purity ", says Hayes, " if it exists at all exists nowadays only among uncivilised tribesmen." Pillsbury writes: " In the determination of national lines in general race is no more important. There is no pure race in any nation. Man is everywhere a mongrel."

As every student of political science knows, there is no single racial stock either in Switzerland or in Canada, and yet no one will have the boldness to deny the name " nationality" to the people of these countries. For several generations now the U. S. A. has been " the melting pot of nations ". What history shows is that racial unity, such as what it is, was a more important factor in the earlier history of nations than it is today.

Realising that there are some broad physical and outward, but not necessarily scientific, racial differences we may say that

minor variations do not matter much, but major variations at times do matter. Thus to take a hypothetical case, at the present stage of our development, where reason has not yet supplanted blind emotion and unthinking passion, it may not be possible to weld large numbers of Englishmen, Chinese, and Negroes into a single nationality. On the other hand, we must bear in mind the fact that every nationality in the modern world is made up of several ethnic groups ; and race and nationality are nowhere identical. Joseph says : "Nationality actually cuts through and across race." Some writers go to the extent of saying that it is nationality which creates race and not race which creates nationality.

So far as India goes, it is too late in the day to argue that the different communities of India belong to totally different racial stocks. Even if there be differences, the line of demarcation is not between Hindus on the one side and Muslims on the other. The Punjabi Muslim and the Punjabi Hindu, for instance, have much greater racial affinity, than say the Punjabi Muslim and the Bengali or the Madrasi Muslim. A regional classification in this regard is likely to be more helpful than a religious or communal classification. But the fact of the matter is that India, even more than the U.S.A., was in the past " a melting pot of races. "

Even Mussolini, before coming under the influence of Hitler, wrote : " Race is a feeling, not a reality ; 95 per cent at least is a feeling. Nothing will ever make me believe that biologically pure races can be shown to exist today. " So what really matters from the point of view of the unity of India is the cultivation of the passionate belief that we are one people, for what history clearly shows is that even assumed ethnic relationship can act as a real bond of unity.

A third important factor of nationality stressed by many writers is a unity of ideas and ideals or cultural unity. Unity of culture includes common customs and manners, common traditions and common literature, folk-lore, epics, and art. It

also stands for a "certain dominant view of life with its common standards, duties and prohibitions". Unity of ideas and ideals draws people close together and creates in them an *esprit de corps*. In spite of the serious military reverses and dismemberment which Poland has suffered from time to time, her unity of culture has held the people together and helped them to emerge as a united nationality after every successive defeat.

National education can play an important part in creating a similarity of outlook on life and in setting up the same or similar standards. The teaching of citizenship in the form of 'Americanisation' has gone a long way in moulding the diverse racial and cultural groups of the U. S. A. into a single powerful nationality. When mishandled, as in Nazi Germany, national education can easily lead to national prejudice and bigotry. It may even pervert men's minds and goad them on to warfare against their unoffending neighbours. Still there is no necessary connection between nationalism and chauvinism. National education of the best kind can create common ways of thinking, feeling, and acting. And the advantage of all this is that when people think together they are prepared to act together, and when they act together they are prepared to go through thick and thin together.

National history and tradition also can become a vital factor in the creation of national culture. Ramsay Muir says: "Heroic achievements, agonies heroically endured, these are the sublime food by which the spirit of nationhood is nourished." A legitimate pride in the past, a wholesome confidence in the present, and a buoyant hope for the future can all strengthen and sustain the national tradition. Even such traditions as playing the game, pride in the navy, and drinking tea which appear to be of minor importance have played a part in the strengthening of British nationality.

If Indian nationality is to become a plant of vigorous growth, stress should be laid on the unity of ideas and ideals

which underlies Indian culture. Looking with a magnifying glass at the present strained relations between the Hindus and Muslims, men like Dr. Ambedkar claim that there is no unity of culture in the country at all. It is true that there are some differences between the Hindus and Muslims as regards food, dress, social customs, speech, and modes of worship. But these are secondary. Both Hindu aud Muslim cultures have influenced each other so much so that Indian Islam to-day is not the Islam of Arabia or of other Muslim countries nearby. We do not agree with Dr. Ambedkar when he claims that "Muslim destruction of Hindu temples and forced conversions, spoliation of property, slaughter, enslavement and abasement of men, women and children" are a source of pride to the Muslims. Even if it be so, it does not represent the settled convictions and abiding feelings of Muslims. It is only a passing phase.

All through the ages Hinduism has been characterised by its tolerance and respect for the beliefs of others. "Ahimsa" has meant not only the tolerance of life, but also of ideas and beliefs. In such an enviroment it should be possible to promote sympathy and understanding if the different religious communities will do their share in meeting each other half-way, instead of rigidly adhering to all their religious and communal beliefs and practices which are outmoded. Within the short space of a generation we have seen how, under the fire of constructive criticism, Indian Christianity has undergone a revolutionary change. Outside the circle of Christian workers in the employ of foreign missions, one does not find much enthusiasm for some of the outlandish Christian beliefs and practices from the West. A good many Indian Christians have the honesty and courage to think out their Christianity for themselves and relate it to the every-day problems which they see around them. What Indian Christians are doing, Hindus and Muslims can do on a large scale and much more effectively. Dr. Ambedkar assures us that music before mosques does not lead to riots in other Muslim countries. Yet in India because of the antagonism between the two rival

communities which is kept alive and fostered by interested persons, Muslims in particular do not want to abandon beliefs and practices which are no longer in keeping with the modern tempo, thereby condemning themselves to mediaevalism in thought, word, and deed. A similar statement can be made with regard to the Hindus, too, in relation to such matters as noisy religious processions and the ringing of temple bells at all hours.

Two chief remedies which may be suggested in this connection are national education and the scientific training of priests. Matters which unite the communities are more in number than those which divide them, and everything possible should be done by means of national education to strengthen the unifying factors. Our history books should omit all exaggerated reference to bloody wars and persecutions between the two communities and concentrate attention upon matters of spirit and culture. In passing it may be said that the Catholics and Protestants in some of the European nation states have fought more bloody battles than the Hindus and Muslims have done in India.

Uneducated, illiterate, and superstition-ridden priests are one of the curses of India. By what is known as 'Modernism' a great deal of improvement has been effected among the Christian clergy, but the same cannot be said of the Hindu priests and Muslim moulvis. When political power was passing from the aristocratic classes to the common people in England during the last century, a cry which was heard every where was : " We must educate our masters ", viz. the common people. A similar cry should be set up in India today in connection with communalism, viz. " we must educate our priests ". Ignorant and superstitious priests not only keep their flocks in ignorance and superstition, but occasionally inflame them to mob violence. Knowledge of ancient lore alone is not enough. Modern science and scientific methods should be brought to bear upon ancient lore so that what gold it contains may be preserved and the dross discarded. The trouble with men like Dr. Ambedkar is that they assume, all

too naively, that progress is impossible because of our present difficulties. Communal prejudices and exclusiveness, large-scale ignorance and superstition can, and should, be removed by reasonable and well-thought out schemes of national education. For the effecting of such progress what we require is not the shutting up of communities into water-tight compartments but closer contacts and a much greater degree of inter-penetration than what obtains today.

Some writers emphasise unity of language as an important factor of nationality. Ramsay Muir believes that "language counts for more than race in the moulding of a nation." Common language means also a common literature, a common interpretation of great ideas, and common heritage of songs and folk tales. Rose considers common language as the most powerful political influence. According to Joseph, language is the most obvious element of nationality. The advantage of a common language is, as Joseph points out, that it enables a people to express the same ideas and same sentiments, creates common standards as regards morals, manners and justice, preserves common historical traditions, and creates a common national psychology. What common language can accomplish has in recent years been abundantly illustrated in the case of Poland where it has held the people together socially and culturally through all their political adversities. In spite of the manifold advantages of a common language, it is obvious that several nationalities do not possess national languages.

So far as India is concerned, diversity of language is no doubt a hindrance to national unity, but the difficulty is not insuperable. Already the English language has become the *lingua franca* of the educated people, but in the very nature of the case it cannot become the language of the masses. People's attachment to the local language is very great, and everything possible should be done to preserve and develop the main local languages so that they become the vehicle for the expression of the national soul. Besides, these languages

should be so modernised and liberalised by their contact with the living languages of the world that they may be made to express the most recent scientific discoveries and social and economic facts. In addition to teaching every child his own mother tongue thoroughly, he should be given a working knowledge of a national language like Hindustani. In the case of those who go up for higher education, they should be given a working knowledge of the English language, stressing not so much the literature of the language as the technical and scientific ideas which can best be conveyed by it. When European and Japanese students can acquire a working knowledge of English in a few years, it seems a colossal waste of time and energy to require Indian students to devote a major part of twelve to fifteen years of their school and college life to a study of English.

Common religion is adduced by some thinkers as a further factor of nationality. It was more important in primitive than it is in advanced communities today. In all progressive countries religion is becoming more and more an individual affair. In the U. S. A. religion has hardly entered into the national life of the people at all. There is no discrimination against any religion or sect. People are free to profess whatever faith they choose.

In India, on the contrary, religion is the warp and woof of the life of the people; and interested persons exaggerate religious differences so as to benefit themselves. It is impossible for Hinduism to swallow up Islam or for Islam to swallow up Hinduism. Therefore, what is required in the interest of national unity is genuine religious tolerance born of sympathy and understanding, and not a flabby kind of indifference which consists in being all things to all men. The educated people at least should cultivate a profound respect for each other's religious beliefs and susceptibilities. Religious fanaticism and bigotry can never make Indians a great people. 'Religion in danger' is a meaningless cry, and nobody needs to take up the cudgel on behalf of the truth or

honour of his religion. Crusades in this day and generation are barbarous. If any religion has real truth or vitality in it, it ought to be able to defend itself. It is the bounden duty of religious-minded people of India to emphasise the universal, rather than the accidental, aspects of religion—God as the embodiment of love, compassion, purity, and righteousness rather than God as a tribal deity or God as demanding unreasonable and unbrotherly conduct of his followers. If a religion falls below the highest moral code and best social behaviour that we can think of, it is not worth preserving.

The various religions of India should learn to distinguish essentials from non-essentials and scrupulously avoid proselytising. If the steady process of depletion from Hinduism to Christianity and Islam is to cease, the Hindus should realise the importance of setting their own house in order as regards caste, temple entry, and social customs, which do not fit into modern conditions. Politics should be secularised. By this we do not mean to suggest that the highest principles of religion and morality are not to guide and control politics; for politics calls for an idealism which religion and morals alone can give. But we do not want to look at politics through the spectacles of sectarianism. In making appointments to public posts, for instance, ability and character should have precedence over caste and communal considerations.

We need not linger over other factors of nationality such as common economic interests, common subjection to a firm and systematic government, political sovereignty, gregarious instinct, and the like, none of which by itself can produce nationality. We cannot, however, easily pass over the importance of the will to co-operate and 'the will to be a nation' on which Dr. Ambedkar places much emphasis. With characteristic vigour which often results in over-statements, he argues that nationality is not made of common race, language or territory, inasmuch as it is a psychological subjective feeling. To quote his own words: "It is a feeling of corporate sentiment, of oneness which makes those who

are charged with it feel that they are kith and kin." The essence of nationality " is a longing to belong to one's group and a longing not to belong to any other group." Dr. Ambedkar argues that the Hindus and Muslims of India constitute two different nationalities and should, therefore, become two different nation states. Suffice to say that the entire thesis of Dr. Ambedkar is based upon a one-sided view of things and upon too much concentration on the present difficulties which are for the most part artificial in character. The 'consciousness of kind' which the Muslims are said to possess among themselves resulting in aloofness, is not something which they have always had. Further, it is easy to claim, as Dr. Ambedkar does, that nationality is an entirely subjective feeling. But the best thought on the subject is that even a subjective factor requires certain objective elements in support of it, and our contention is that some of these objective factors are already present in India. Huxley and Haddon express a point of view which is more comprehensive than that of Dr. Ambedkar when they say : " A nation is a group of people with a common tract of country bound together in a common state by common history, common sentiment and traditions, common social organisation and usually by common language." The sense of solidarity and of oneness with one another which is of the essence of nationality is nothing permanent or inherent in human nature. It is capable of realignment.

To conclude the discussion on nationality, our considered opinion is that nationality can be a legitimate part of a new social order provided it does not lead to the exploitation of other nationalities or the annexation of their territory. We are further of the opinion that it is not a great calamity if every nationality is not given the opportunity to become a self-governing sovereign state since nationality is itself plastic and the future safety of the world requires the formation of larger and larger units.

If nationality is justifiable, what about nationalism by which we mean the historic process by which a nationality transforms itself into a political unit? Nationalism is both a power for evil and a power for good. Unfortunately for mankind, it is the former type of nationalism that has often been in the ascendancy. It is an aggressive kind of nationalism which is ruthless in its methods and has no respect for the feelings of weaker peoples. It is a raging, tearing kind of nationalism which Mr. J. C. Kumarappa aptly describes as 'wolf-pack nationalism'. It easily shades off into Imperialism of the worst kind. It is the breeder of war and the perpetrator of economic exploitation.

Over against this type of nationalism is a kind of nationalism which is peaceful in character. All that it demands is the opportunity to develop itself without in any way interfering with the opportunity of other nations to develop themselves. It is a redemptive kind of nationalism whose motto is 'Live and help others to live'. It has no territorial designs on its neighbours or on backward territories in distant Africa, Asia or the islands of the sea. It is a synonym for national self-respect. Its claim is to a rightful place in the sun. This is sometimes described as 'sheep-flock nationalism'.

Striking illustrations of 'wolf-pack nationalism' today are found in Militarist Japan, Fascist Italy, and Nazi Germany. The Scandinavian countries, on the other hand, are good examples of the peaceful type of nationalism. But even such countries whose only desire is to be free to develop themselves within their own borders are being tied today to the chariot wheels of war-mongering nations such as Germany and dragged about mercilessly.

We cannot grasp the full meaning of nationalism unless we interpret it in the cultural, economic, and political fields. Up till now nationalism in the cultural field has been on the whole a unifying factor, while in the economic and political fields it has been a divisive factor. The problem for the new

social order is to cultivate nationalism along all these lines without in any way interfering with the claims of the international community.

The cultural type of nationalism contents itself with developing such things as national language, national literature, national songs, and national drama. This type of nationalism binds the people together, especially in countries where there are no heterogeneous minorities, and uses up national energies along non-competitive and non-aggressive lines. In countries where there are considerable racial, linguistic, religious or cultural minorities, cultural unification becomes a very delicate task.

This last-mentioned fact has to be specially borne in mind in a country like India where there is both cultural unity and cultural diversity. The part of wisdom is not to aim at a uniform culture for the whole of India, but a composite culture by means of which the culture of each people will be enriched and ennobled by close contact with the culture of the rest. In the realm of art, painting, music, handicrafts, and the like there is no necessary antagonism between the two major communities, because art is universal. While the Hindu religious dance may not appeal to the Muslims (the Muslims, too, have their own religious dance), there is no reason why they should not cultivate a secular dance which will be in keeping with the Indian background. Indian medicine, whether *ayurvedic* or *unani*, Indian *asanas*, breathing exercises, and yoga practices can be patronised by all Indians without doing violence to their religious precepts. To the Hindu ideals of simplicity, non-attachment, and non-violence which are all passive in nature, Muslims and Christians may add such active virtues as downright honesty, bravery, courage, and frankness in thought, speech, and action. A *via media* can be worked out between the world-renouncing view of Hinduism and the world-affirming view of Islam and Christianity, inasmuch as all religions stress the fleeting nature of the earthly life and earthly goods and exhort their believers to submit themselves to a Divine will.

Above all, Indians should possess the burning conviction that they have a mission of civilisation to perform to the rest of the world. Such a mission can never be performed so long as the soul of India is not free, and people deliberately place personal and communal advantages above national good and honour. India's mission certainly does not consist in military conquests nor in the economic exploitation and political domination of less fortunate peoples. It lies in demonstrating to the world at large in no uncertain terms the supremacy of the spirit over matter.

Nationalism plays an important part not only in the cultural field, but also in the economic realm. In its extreme form it is known as autarchy, which aims at complete economic self-sufficiency. It is the watch-word of many a western nation today. Some time ago Mussolini declared that his countrymen had not forgotten sanctions, meaning thereby that it was his intention to make Italy economically self-supporting, especially at times of war. In anticipation of the present war, which she undoubtedly precipitated, Germany had been following the same policy, one of her hopes being to extract oil from coal. She is already producing wool synthetically in place of the wool she used to import from South Africa. Her aim has been to make herself entirely self-supporting as regards bread, meat, potatoes, sugar, vegetables, and dairy produce. The U.S.A. have consistently followed a policy of erecting high tariff walls against foreign goods. In recent years the British Empire has been following the vicious policy of tariffs in the form of Imperial Preferential Tariff and the Ottawa Agreement, rousing the suspicions of other nations and doing little good to herself.

Economic nationalism is justifiable up to a certain point. But beyond that, it is a fruitful cause of war. It is like a boomerang reacting upon itself and bringing infinite harm upon its own head. It is no solution to the problem of unused capital and unused labour. Recent years have

witnessed the spectacle of wheat being burned in Canada, apples and milk being dumped into rivers in the U.S.A., and coffee being thrown into the sea in Brazil while millions were starving.

Autarchy is a folly. Condemnation of it does not mean that we are in favour of a policy of 'let alone' in the economic relations between nations. What we require is planned economy *within* each nation, and *between* the nations. World economic planning is a task to which the new social order should give itself whole-heartedly. There is no reason why people should starve or be under-nourished when we produce more than enough for the world's needs. Statistics show that at least one third of the world's population is on the verge of starvation. If the people of the world are not to commit suicide, careful international planning is an absolute necessity. This means a serious modification of the time-worn doctrine of absolute sovereignty. The problem is to avoid scarcity on the one hand and excess stocks on the other. The ideal of a planned economy, as sketched by Principal A. E. Garvie, "would be that each country produced all for its own needs which it was best fitted to produce, imported all that it could not itself produce as advantageously as could other lands, and confined its exports visible and invisible (goods and services) to the lands which needed them in proportion to its imports as payment for them."

So far as India is concerned, while one whole-heartedly believes in the international division of labour and specialisation, one does not find it in one's heart to refuse support to a genuine *Swadeshi* movement which would make India more economically self-sufficient than is the case at present. There can be no doubt that one of the causes for the staggering poverty of India is the inadequate exploitation of the material resources of the country—especially in the industrial field*.

* Sir Mr. Visveswarayya has recently observed that while the average income from industries in the United States and the United Kingdom was Rs. 830 and Rs. 463 respectively, in the case of India it worked out at such a low figure as Rs. 12. This, he said, was the result of over-ruralisation.
—The *Hindu* Sept. 9, 1941.

The utter dependency of India upon foreign lands comes out clearly at a time of war. In a country which is rich in bamboo and coarse grass of various kinds, we have to depend upon foreign-made paper. Dye has to be imported from abroad. Rice has to come from Burma. For packing tea grown in the country we depend upon plywood imported from the Scandinavian countries, while similar wood is obtainable in our own forests. While shark liver oil which is even more potent than cod liver oil can be obtained from sharks which are plentiful in our seas, nothing has been done to extract this oil on a large scale on a commercial basis. Millions of rupees worth of patent medicines, drugs, and tonics are imported every year, while valuable plants, roots, and salts lie unused at our doorstep. There is no reason why we should not produce all the cloth, shoes, matches, and salt which the country requires, without the aid of foreign capital and foreign management. Potatoes used to be imported in large qnantities from Italy before the war ; dairy produce, jams, and jellies come from New Zealand and Australia to a country which has the necessary facilities for dairy farming and fruit growing on an extensive scale.

One of the reasons given for the present state of affairs is the lack of enterprise on the part of the people. But this is not the entire explanation. Even when Indian capital and business brains are available, impediments of one kind or other are placed in the way of our industrialisation, as can be seen with reference to the motor car, ship-building and aeroplane industries. We have not got trawlers to go out into the mid ocean and catch fish. Even transport facilities are not what they should be. While experts claim that locomotives can be made in the country, nothing has been done in the matter. On the contrary, owing to the export of locomotives, rails, and rolling stock belonging to the Indian railways to meet the exigencies of war, we are faced with the prospect of a drastic reduction in railway travel facilities. We still lack certain kinds of machinery such as machines for making nails, cutting thin planks of wood, etc. If the present helpless situation is to be remedied, we need a different type of educa-

tion for the great bulk of the people, a high degree of patriotism on the part of the educated, utilisation of Indian capital and Indian enterprise on a large scale, and active co-operation on the part of the Government.

Nationalism has not only its cultural and economic aspects. It has a political aspect as well. It is often used to describe the movement by which a subject people throws off foreign yoke and makes itself its own master. One of the war aims of the Great War of 1914-18 was the self-determinations of nations. It was ardently held by men like Wilson that a group of people who formed a strong and vigorous nationality should be allowed to determine their own political future. In the light of this creed, the map of Europe was re-drawn and several new nation-states were formed. But the last two years since the commencement of the present war have established beyond doubt that the independence of small states is no longer an assured fact. Like the city states of Greece which perished when larger states like Macedon and Rome came into being, it looks as though the smaller states of today will have to give place to one or more federal states covering the whole world.

So far as India is concerned, nationalism is not a luxury, but a necessity. It is the very basis of our existence. It is a matter of life and death to us. It is another name for national self-respect, the assertion of a people to a right to be themselves. However necessary and valuable foreign tutelage may be, it cannot last indefinitely without seriously crippling a people materially, morally, and spiritually. While it is an utter folly to place all our misfortunes at the door of the foreigner, there can be no doubt that foreign domination over a long period of time produces certain slave vices for which self-determination is the only genuine remedy. If civilised Europe can produce its Quislings and Lavals within a few months, what are we to say of countries which have been under foreign yoke for generations together? Political nationalism alone can cure such slave vices as fear, cowardice, and dissimulation.

Indian nationlism in the political field means the right of India to be its own master. Freedom is our birthright and nobody can deny it to us, once we become strong and united. There is no reason why we should be tied to the apron strings of Britain for all time to come. We can and ought to stand on our own feet. If we are to continue to be linked up with Britain, it should be on a new basis altogether—a basis of free and equal partnership. As things are today, we are for the most part only a sleeping partner. Even under the Government of India Act of 1935, 75 to 80 per cent of our central revenues will be non-votable by the legislature responsible to the people of the country. The number and extent of the special powers and safeguards in the hands of the Governor-General and the provincial Governors are simply staggering. Since the war began we have been told that 'Dominion Status of the Westminster variety' is our goal, but it is hedged in by so many 'ifs' and 'buts' that most Indians refuse to accept the promise on its face value—a promise which was made so long ago as 1929 by Lord Irwin (now Lord Halifax). The prevailing opinion among Indians of all sorts is that Great Britain is not prepared to part with power and responsibility and is resourceful enough to find scores of reasons for her unwillingness. In declaring that the Atlantic Charter of Freedom does not apply to India, Mr. Churchill, one of its co-authors, has said : "We have pledged by the declaration of August 1940 to help India to obtain free and equal partnership in the British Commonwealth of Nations subject of course to the fulfilment of obligations arising from our long connection with India and our responsibilities to its many creeds, races and interests."*

In 1937 there began an era of honourable co-operation between Great Britain and India, but that has come to an end, at least for the time being. The dilatory tactics of Mr. Amery and the British Cabinet have not helped matters much. Whether India should have complete independence or

* (The *Hindu*, September 10, 1941). Suffice to say that the first part of the sentence contains the facade and the second part, the real intention.

Dominion Status is largely an academic question. It is not a question which we in all fairness can expect Britain to answer at a time when she is engaged in a life and death struggle. Dominion Status so long at it confers 'the substance of independence' is all that we can manage. In a world of international brigands, it is a distinct advantage to be a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations. But such membership should not be at the expense of our individual and national self-respect. The Empire should speedily transform itself into a Britannic Alliance (an expression used by A. B. Keith) or a genuine commonwealth of nations where the whites, blacks, and browns will all enjoy complete social, economic, and political equality.

The relation between Great Britain and India, to start with, was in the nature of a typical Hindu marriage where the bride was not consulted. We are no longer like a newly married couple who fight over trivialities. We have been married long enough to understand one another and overlook each other's foibles. We have fought our battles in the past and have become chastened by the struggle. Therefore, there is a greater likelihood of our getting on together amicably than we would if we changed partners at this stage. A genuine British Commonwealth of Nations in a context of world federation can very well fit into the new social order of our dream.

To sum up the discussion on nationality and nationalism, it may be said, geographical unity, cultural unity, and even ethnic unity in a limited sense cannot help us unless a conscious effort is made to build a nation. One cannot escape the artificiality around the idea of nationalism if it is tested by purely rational standards. It is the ideal of common good that is served thereby that justifies nationalism. If this is realised and accepted by the *intelligentsia* generally, then the creation and multiplication or projection of symbols of unity to appeal to the young and the masses becomes comparatively easy.

Secondly, there can be no international standards and ideas for a country which has not achieved national control

of all aspects of its life—economic, political and social. It is obvious that we must have *all* our possessions in our hands before we could think of giving up some of them for the good of humanity. The Russian control of her international trade during 1920-29 is a case in point. Systematic annual planning of exports and imports, equalising the value where values of imports tend to rise and create an adverse balance by conscious under-selling even below production cost of exportable produce, are instances where communism for all its internationalism was obliged to resort because of economic reasons. Its economic principle of state ownership and management required a national unit for its operation.

CHAPTER X

POLITICAL JUSTICE

IMPERIALISM

However much we may disguise the fact, there can be little doubt that imperialism is primarily a manifestation of the predatory instinct of man. Even when other factors such as the love of adventure and the conducting of trade on mutually beneficial terms are present in the origin and development of imperialism, the predatory element is never wholly absent.

To say that imperialism expresses the predatory nature of man is not necessarily to condemn it inasmuch as it is in accordance with what we find in every day life. Among lower animals the strong displace the weak. Even within the same genus it is nothing unusual to find a species which is strong and aggressive or a species which has developed a high degree of internal discipline and co-operation driving out from its place a species which does not possess these qualities in the same measure. The big fish swallow the small, and one species of the monkey compels another species to go in search of a new abode.

When we turn from the lower animals to man we find such tendencies prevalent especially in the earlier stages of his development. In the movement of races from one part of the world to another in search of food, pasture, and the like and the conquest of one tribe by another, we find ample evidence of the predatory character of man's nature in one form or another. Sometimes it takes the form of ruthless aggression and bloody warfare, sometimes of gradual displacement by superior skill and intelligence, and still at other times of a parasitic existence when the new people or tribe establishes the relation of master and slave with the old.

Conquest and exploitation as between organised political societies go back to very early times. As long ago as 3,200 B. C. the Egyptians had an empire. So did the Assyrians. Between 1947 and 1905 B. C. Hammurabi established a Babylonian Empire. Empires rose and fell in other parts of the Orient too.

The Causes of Imperialism

When we turn from these early empires to empires during the Christian era, we find that several factors have contributed to their making such as the scramble for food, land hunger, the search for areas producing raw materials, and thirst for conquest for its own sake. The British connection with India began with trade and commerce and eventually led to political control. The flag, in other words, followed trade. There was no conscious attempt to annex territory or to rule over foreign people. But once the British had a taste of the advantages accruing from political control, the flag has played as important a part in the development of their empire as trade. There have been, on the other hand, cases where an empire has been deliberately planned and brought into existence, as was the German empire in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. In these cases trade has followed the flag.

In the modern world, colonial possessions are coveted for various reasons. Many of the western countries, as well as Japan, being largely industrial, feel the urgent necessity of acquiring territories from where they can import raw materials at low prices, and to which they can send finished goods at a big profit to themselves. This explains the consistent opposition of Great Britain to the expansion of Indian industry even in war time. Even if downright annexation is not possible, recourse is had to several devices such as the carving out of spheres of influence and the obtaining of valuable concessions and leases which serve the same purpose. Dr. Schacht, the German financial wizard, states: "The fight for raw materials plays the most important part in world politics, an even greater role than before the war."*

* The reference here is to the War of 1914—18.

Colonial possessions are also desired as an outlet for surplus population. England is a thickly populated country, and many of her sons and daughters have found new homes for themselves in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and elsewhere. In recent years Japan has put forward the plea that, in order to relieve congestion in her small island kingdom she should send out some of her teeming millions to China and to the Islands of the Pacific. Migration to Australia is denied to her because of the 'White Australia Policy', which has been consistently followed for nearly half a century. Italy, too, has been brandishing her sword and annexing territories such as Libya and Abyssinia with a view to finding an outlet for her surplus population. But the curious fact is that even after making imperial conquests, neither Japan nor Italy has proved herself to be a good coloniser. The people of these two countries do not seem to take very kindly to settling in foreign lands in large numbers. The number of Italian settlers in Libya and Italian Somaliland and the number of Japanese settlers in Korea, Formosa, and Manchukuo is infinitely small. In spite of it, both Italy and Japan, in their eagerness to acquire an empire, are spilling blood and using up a vast amount of money and materials. One chief reason for it is the love of prestige. In the modern world, ability to acquire and hold foreign territory is considered to be a hall mark of strength and vigour, if not of respectability. Planting one's flag over as wide a territory as possible and painting it with some particular colour are still regarded as indispensable proofs of a nation's greatness. They are taken to mean an expression of the 'will to power.'* It is no wonder, then, that Mussolini has been haranguing his countrymen saying that Italians were 'squeezed into their narrow but adorable peninsula', and that 'Italy must expand

* This 'will to power' was forcibly expressed by Mussolini in a speech delivered by him on August 4, 1932, though he clothed it behind the usual humanitarian and civilising professions. "The Fascist State", he said, "is a will to power and an empire. The Roman tradition is the idea of force. In the Fascist doctrine, the imperial idea is not only a territorial, military, and mercantile expression, but also one of spiritual and moral expansion. For fascism, the tendency to the imperial idea means expansion of the nation and is a manifestation of vitality."

or perish.' It was the boast of Cecil Rhodes that he thought in terms of continents.

Prior to the present war Hitler carried on a vigorous propaganda for the return of German colonies lost after the last war. He insisted on the return of the 'stolen property', claiming that there was not enough "Lebensraum" in Germany for the teeming "Herrenvolk". Yet statistics show that while Netherlands has a density of 2,233 per square mile of arable land and Belgium a density of 1,793, Germany has a density of only 578. From these figures it would appear that the claims of Netherlands and Belgium are at least three or four times as good as those of Germany.

In spite of the plea of overpopulation, Japan, Italy, and Germany have been offering inducements of various kinds to enable their countrymen to 'multiply and replenish the earth', while the simpler and more obvious remedy would seem to be to restrict population. It does not seem to have occurred to the statesmen of these countries that in the modern world expansion can only be at the expense of the original inhabitants occupying territories which aggressors seek to annex. It is not expansion into empty space or thin air.

Even if Empire today may not solve the problem of overpopulation in the imperialist country, it offers advantages of various kinds to a select few. It provides ample opportunity for the investment of foreign capital and for the utilisation of the services of foreign pro-consuls and diplomats, foreign civil servants, and foreign army at a prohibitive cost to the people of the dependent country. It is very well for Mr. Amery to claim with righteous indignation that India pays no taxes to Great Britain, but he conveniently forgets the statement of the semi-official Institute of International Affairs that one Englishman out of every four lives by India directly or indirectly. Mr. Amery is guilty of practising what Professor Hocking describes in another context as the ethics of *evasion* as against the ethics of *severity*. In a country under foreign domination, the civil and defence services are invariably

pampered; and foreign merchants, traders, planters, and joint stock companies constitute a solid wall of opposition to every attempt in the direction of self-government, which would deprive them of some of their vested interests. Others who benefit by imperialism and constitute themselves into vested interests are shipowners and manufacturers of armaments of military and naval uniforms, and of railway, cable and telegraph materials.

Although the U. S. A. is not one of the principal imperialist countries of the world, she is able to exert a powerful influence over the economic and even political conditions of Central and South America by means of her vast investments. This kind of diplomacy known as the 'Dollar diplomacy' is almost as effective as a foreign army of occupation and foreign battleships and aeroplanes.* All this goes to show that in the modern world "investment" or "exploitation" colonies are valued much more than "settlement" colonies. Capital may be lent by an imperial country to the governments of her colonial possessions or to private individuals and companies therein. At times foreign investors put their money into business of their own in these colonial possessions and dependencies where labour is cheap and abundant and sell their goods as genuine *swadeshi* product. Long years ago, Joseph Chamberlain, the father of the last British Premier, truly observed: "The Empire is commerce."

A further important cause of imperialism in modern times is diplomatic. Just as poverty breeds poverty, so imperialism breeds imperialism. The vital interest of Britain in the Suez Canal, her indirect control over Egypt, her efforts to establish some form of authority and friendly relations in the Arab territories of the Near East, and her partial occupation of

* It was the fear of foreign 'investment' that made the American Senate forbid the 40,000 acres surrounding the Magdalena Bay in Lower California being transferred to a purely private Japanese Syndicate on August 12, 1912. President Woodrow Wilson gave a wider interpretation to this doctrine in his famous Mobile Speech at Alabama on October 27, 1913 before the Southern Commercial Congress when he declared it to be the duty of the U.S.A. to assist the nations of Central and South America in their emancipation from the material interests of European nations which, thereby, dominated even their internal affairs.

Iran are all to be explained in relation to her control of India, as control over these territories means control over the gateways of India. The British naval base at Singapore is a forcible reminder to Japan that she cannot with impunity set foot in Australia or other parts of the British Empire in the Orient. For the same kind of military and naval reasons, France till recently controlled Djibuti. She also valued her African colonial possessions as troop reservoirs.

Religious and humanitarian considerations are sometimes advanced in favour of imperialism. But it goes without saying that these are of minor importance when compared with the economic, political, military, and diplomatic causes. " In the seventeenth century the missionary motive was an important factor of imperialism. The annexation of Siam by France during this period was largely the work of Jesuit missionaries. Even in later times it has played a considerable part. The name of David Livingstone in Africa is the most outstanding name in the history of missionary empire builders. The London Missionary Society was closely linked up with the spread of British Imperialism in Africa. There are several instances to show that the Christian missionary has at times been the forerunner of the western trader and imperialist. Even today it is not an exaggeration to say that the missionary enterprise is to some extent an arm of imperialism. Frequently, in the past, territory was annexed and economic and political concessions obtained under the pretext of protecting missionaries.

" Imperialism today is generally indifferent to the question of converting the people of backward countries to Christianity. At times it even opposes missionary work for fear that it may give people a new freedom and a new sense of their dignity and importance. Where Christian missions have been the open or secret allies of imperialists, they have been accorded a warm welcome.

" While conversion to Christianity pure and simple is no longer regarded as a sufficient cause of imperialism, Christianity

in the form of humanitarianism is sometimes used as a justification for imperialist adventures. Thus, in justifying the annexation of the Philippines, William McKinley, the then President of the United States, declared: 'There was left nothing for us to do but to take them all, and to educate the Filipinos and uplift and civilise and Christianise them, and by God's grace do the best we could by them as our fellow-men, for whom Christ also died.' Likewise Calvin Coolidge, a more recent President, said: 'The legions which (America) sends forth are armed not with the sword but with the Cross. The higher state to which she seeks the allegiance of all mankind is not of human but of divine origin. She cherishes no purpose save to merit the favours of Almighty God.....We extended our domain over distant islands in order to safeguard our own interests and accepted the consequent obligation and liberty upon less favoured people' "*

Whatever the theory may be, in actual practice, humanitarian considerations have not played an important part in the history of imperialism, as seen in the notoriously small amounts of public revenue spent on the education, sanitation, and general improvement of the people. F.L. Schuman observes: "It is no more the 'purpose' of imperialism to confer benefits upon its victims than to confer benefits upon the home country."

Sublimation of Imperialism

Having fully considered the causes of imperialism, we may now ask the question whether imperialism can fit into the new social order of our dream. In answering this question it is necessary to remember that the imperialism of the 'satiated' powers of the world is quite different from the imperialism of the 'disgruntled' powers. The imperialism of Great Britain today is very much chastened and mellowed. Some one has described it as the policy of the 'retired imperialist.' This does not mean that British imperialism has lost its vigour but that conscious efforts are being made to sublimate it and

* E. Asirvatham: *Forces in Modern Politics*, pp. 58-60.

present it in a new light in keeping with the tempo of our day. We do not believe that any Englishman today would revel in the thought of burning defenceless people to death as did Bruno Mussolini during the Abyssinian campaign. His words as quoted by B. Russell*, in describing his exploits from the air, are : " We had to set fire to the wooded hills, to the fields and little villages.....It was all most diverting..... The bombs hardly touched the earth before they burst out into white smoke and an enormous flame and the dry grass began to burn. I thought of the animals : God, how they ran.....After the bombracks were emptied I began throwing bombs by hand.....It was most amusing : a big Zariba surrounded by tall trees was not easy to hit. I had to aim carefully at the straw roof and only succeeded at the third shot. The wretches who were inside seeing the roof burning jumped out and ran off like mad.

" Surrounded by a circle of fire about five thousand Abyssinians came to a sticky end. It was like hell."

Sadism and wanton cruelty which characterise a good many Germans, Italians, and Japanese today are not generally found among Englishmen. Even during the height of the Civil Disobedience movement in 1930—32, charges of cruelty were levelled by Indians more against Indian subordinates than against English officers.

One of the usual arguments advanced in modern times in justification of imperialism is that the resources of the world belong to the whole of mankind and that, if certain backward people do not know how to exploit their resources, it is the sacred duty and glorious privilege of the advanced nations of the world to undertake that task. The modern imperialist points to the tea, coffee, and rubber estates, to the oil wells, mines, and the like and claims with characteristic pride that these would never have seen the light of day if it were not for the capital and business ability of his countrymen. While all this may or may not be true, the modern imperialist does not

* B. Russell: *Power*, p. 29.

stop to consider the enormous benefits reaped by his own countrymen compared with the pittance which goes into the hands of the people of the country in the form of wages. Besides, he is not willing to allow the coloured nations of the world to use against him the argument which he himself uses that the resources of the world belong to those who can best exploit them. If this were allowed, large tracts of land which now lie uncultivated in Canada, Australia, and parts of Africa would by right belong to the teeming, industrious, and frugal millions of India, China, and Japan. But we must remember that it is too much to expect imperialists to apply to themselves the arguments which they apply to others in the process of exploitation. Their motto is, 'Heads we win, tails you lose.'

Another argument used in the process of sublimating imperialism is that, in the interdependent world in which we live, it is dangerous to have neighbours who are unable to maintain law and order in their own territory, provide security to foreign investors, enact a reasonable brand of justice, and control epidemics. Some such argument as this has been used by the Government of India in pushing out its frontiers in the north-west. It has also been used by Japan in a masterly way in her relation to China in recent years.

A more recent argument used in defence of imperialism is that it is necessary for the advancement of the culture, education, and political training of backward peoples. The imperialist never stops to lay down objective standards of what constitutes 'backwardness', and what constitutes 'advancement.' In general, military strength, ability to wage a successful warfare, and the power of intimidation are considered marks of an advanced nation. Countries which seek peace and want to order their life in their own way within the territory assigned to them by nature are considered backward. They should acquire a nuisance value before their legitimate rights are conceded.

So far as India is concerned, she does not stand in need of a culture to be imported from outside. In the realm of the

spirit, her culture is much more advanced than the culture of almost any other country in the world. This does not mean that she cannot learn much that is of value from the cultures of other people. But the relation of master and subject which imperialism institutes does not provide the best possible environment where the highest in a foreign culture and civilisation can be imbibed. We have no doubt whatever that the day that India becomes the mistress of her own destiny she will willingly adopt the many valuable elements which one finds in British culture and social living.

A further truth which the imperialist often forgets is that if India is to imbibe the culture of Britain, Britain too should imbibe the culture of India. Long years ago, Tagore pointed out that the number of British scholars who had made a deep and sympathetic study of Sanskrit literature was very small when compared with continental scholars. To this observation we may add the further one that in spite of almost two centuries of close contact between Great Britain and India, very few Englismen have made a scientific study of Indian art, music, dance, medicine, food, and the like. The philosophy of non-violence, as expounded by Mahatma Gandhi, the Wardha scheme of education, and the true meaning and significance of *charka* are a closed book to most Britishers. While educated Indians have nearly all taken to western dress, we find very few Englishmen who would condescend to wear Indian *achkan*, loose-fitting pyjamas, dhoty, turban or sandals. The graceful sari is for the most part taboo among English women, while their American cousins do not have any such marked prejudice against it. Among Indian Christians, there are thousands of Johns, Georges, Williams, and Edwards but one knows of no Devadosses, Sargunams or Satyas among English Christians. It is derogatory to the self-respect of Indians to be pickers of crumbs which fall from the table of the westerner.

As regards the plea that imperialism is necessary for the political education of the people under its control, facts do

not accord with theory. There is no doubt whatever that under British rule Indians have been trained to appreciate the value of personal liberty and the rule of law and the importance of self-government. But this love of liberty is allowed to operate only so long as it does not touch the pocket of the Englishman and his continued control of India. The Indian National Congress, though started under official auspices, has met with the wrath of Government for a considerable number of years. Whatever its faults may be, it is undoubtedly the only national organisation in the country, seeking to unite Indians of all descriptions under a common banner and give them a place of respect and equality among the nations of the world. Yet its plans and purposes have been consistently misrepresented, and all kinds of anti-national and mushroom parties and self-constituted interests have been encouraged to thrive, with the result that the Congress today is pitted against a multitude of vested interests and self-seeking groups.

A further point regarding the alleged political education of India is that, after bringing India to the verge of self-government, Britain has suddenly developed qualms of conscience regarding the suitability of parliamentary democracy, territorial representation, and self-government for India. The two years of Congress rule in the Provinces which some choose to describe as 'Congress tyranny' is said to be the cause of this serious doubt. Yet when the Congress was in power, officials and non-officials vied with each other in singing its praise. Even if it be admitted that the Congress made some mistakes during the two brief years of its administration, which nobody denies, that is not a sufficient reason to pull up self-government by the root and pass judgment on its unsuitability for India. Constitutions, conventions, and sound political practices take time to establish themselves. Further, the self-governing Dominions within the British Commonwealth of Nations had their periods of internal trouble and disturbance. Yet that was not made a ground for doubting the validity of full responsible government which is equivalent to indepen-

dence to-day. History gives no instance of the gradual political education of a dependent country occupied by 'coloured' people culminating in complete self-government, except where considerations of expediency dictate it.

One more plea which has been advanced in recent years in the effort to sublimate imperialism is in reference to such backward areas of the world as are found in Africa. It is claimed that, in all these territories, the interests of the natives come first and foremost. In recent years the British Colonial Office has definitely declared that its first concern must be the welfare of the people governed. Not long ago Mr. Malcolm Macdonald, as Secretary of State for the Colonies, said that "at any given time, the peoples of the Colonial empire shall enjoy the maximum practicable amount of freedom." Lord Hailey has defined British goal in Africa as "trusteeship for native interests" and "self-government based on representative institutions."

In examining this plea, it must be admitted that a gulf separates practice from theory. As Governor-General of India, Lord Irwin (now Lord Halifax) emphatically declared that whatever safeguards were to be included in the constitution which was then in the process of revision, were to be primarily in the interests of India. Yet even a cursory acquaintance with the Government of India Act of 1935 is enough to show that the safeguards adumbrated therein are more in the interest of British finance, commerce, and the Security Services than in the interest of the common people of India. More recently Mr. Amery gave the high-sounding motto "India First" to the warring sections of India. Yet his various official and unofficial utterances and his schemes for the political progress of India are altogether at variance with the ideal propounded by him.

When colonial statesmen claim that the interests of the native people should come first, they set themselves up as self-appointed judges of what these interests are. Thus in the Union of South Africa, the interests of the natives in

Parliament are represented by a White nominated member. The idea underlying it is that the natives are like children who cannot be trusted to decide what is good for them and that, therefore, they require the help of their big brother, the white man. Hitler and his tribe do not seek to camouflage their intentions. They honestly believe that the non-Aryans are half-apes and say that they would treat them as such when they come into power. The Englishman, on the other hand, may feel in his heart of hearts that the coloured person is only a half-ape. But to say that openly hurts his soul and he is, therefore, obliged to discover a form of words which would soothe his conscience.

A further point to keep in mind with regard to the plea under consideration is that it may really be a subtle way on the part of the imperialists of clearing the field of other exploiters such as Indians in East and South Africa, in Ceylon, Burma, and Malaya. In Ceylon and Burma particularly, the Indian has lately been represented as a shameless exploiter, and public indignation has been turned against him, despite the fact that millions of humble Indians in the 'cooly lines' and out of the way places have helped to open up these countries and lay the foundation of their prosperity. In Ceylon it is estimated that two million Indians have laid down their lives on the estates, railways, and elsewhere in making the country prosperous. In saying this, however, it must be understood that we do not hold a brief for Indian money lenders and petty merchants who have followed the British imperialists as their camp-followers and have helped to exploit the indigenous people. If imperialism is wrong in relation to the Britisher, it is ten times worse when practised by the Indian, since he has all along been fulminating against imperialist exploitation and aggression. We cannot consistently be champions of freedom and justice in our own country and become exploiters when we go abroad. The last thing that one would want India to be is an imperialist country. Should she become imperialistic, she might play her role most efficiently, as efficiently as a

confirmed teetotaller who had all of a sudden become a drunkard or an orthodox vegetarian who had become a meat eater, racing with time to make up for the omissions of the past.

It is to be regretted that a good many modern writers on imperialism, instead of facing issues fairly and squarely, try to evade them. They give us an idealised picture of imperialism which exists nowhere except in their own imagination. Thus when C. D. Burns describes imperialism as a half-way house to internationalism and an antidote to provincial nationalism, we have to scratch our heads to see where such an imperialism exists in practice. If anything, imperialism warps a person's vision and gives him a distorted view of things. H. G. Wells is nearer the truth when he says that imperialism implies " arrogant swagger, the opposite of cosmopolitanism. " The late Mr. C. F. Andrews, who knew imperialism at work in more than one country, came to the conclusion that it was difficult, if not impossible, to be an imperialist and a Christian at the same time.

In a book written as late as 1940 Mr. Basil Mathews, a well-known Christian author and a master of words, claims : "This British Commonwealth of Nations does not stand for standardisation or denationalisation, but for the fuller, richer and more various life of all the nations comprised in it."[1] He repeats the hackneyed argument that India does not pay any taxes to Britain and that she can set up her own tariff with regard to certain commodities. He conveniently fails, however, to tell the reader what feeble control the Indian legislature has over tariff or over the thousand and one indirect ways by which money is drained out of the country. Another of his brilliant generalisations is : " The Indian has the same freedom of speech as an Englishman."[2] Of the many economic gains that have accrued to India from the present war, the author picks out the fact that millions of sand bags have been sent out of India " to cushion the empire against air attacks."

1. B. Mathews : *We Fight for Peace*, p. 15.
2. Ibid., p. 69.

Another author who is even better known through his K. H. News-Letter, Stephen King-Hall, is equally guilty of constructing for himself a glorified form of imperialism which does not exist in practice. Thus he blandly tells us in his *Empire Yesterday and Today* that the object of empire is "to promote the common 'weal' or 'good' of all the nations within its compass" and that the degree of self-government within the empire "varies from place to place according to the stage of political education reached by each people." He omits to tell us that the judge in all these matters is not the people under the imperial yoke or an impartial outsider, but 'the big noise' (to quote an African expression) of the imperialist. He describes the Government of India Act of 1935 as "one of the greatest experiments in democratic government the world has ever seen." Apparently his understanding of the Act belongs to the same class to which belongs Mr. Amery's recent reply to his admiring American enquirers when he said that the relation of Britain to India was more or less the relation of the American Federal Government to Ohio !

The Gains and Losses of Imperialism

We are now in a position to sum up the gains and losses of imperialism and see whether we can fit it into a new world order at all. Mere condemnation of it will not abolish it. Therefore, the wise thing to do is to make it, so long as it lasts, as serviceable to mankind as possible. On the side of assets, it must be admitted that imperialism, particularly of the British variety, has meant material advancement, although the beneficiaries of it are more the well-to-do classes and foreign investors than the common people. Under the British rule in India there is greater economic opportunity and less of stark poverty. Extensive measures have been adopted for the relief of famine conditions. There is a wide-spread net work of railways and canals in the country, as well as a reliable and efficient postal and telegraph system. Speaking of the canal system in particular, some one has said that 'if all the canals in India were put end to end they would go twice round the

earth.' Over against this fact, however, one has to bear in mind certain facts which have recently been brought to light by Mr. Schiff in his *The Present Condition of India*. Mr. Schiff claims that more than 35% of the rainfall is allowed to go into the sea and is not utilised in cultivating the parched fields. 84% of the cultivated land is not artificially irrigated. Ancient tanks have been allowed to fall into disrepair.

Further facts relating to the economic life and the general improvement of the people under imperial control may be briefly stated. It is in the nature of imperialism to look to its own interests first and then to the interests of the people of the country. Imperialism, it needs to be remembered, does not come under the description of a missionary or charitable organisation. Under modern conditions it is a vast business enterprise. No one could have been more brutally frank than Sir William Joynson-Hicks, a former Home Secretary of England, when he said: "We did not conquer India for the benefit of the Indians. I know that it is said at missionary meetings that we have conquered India to raise the level of Indians. That is cant. We conquered India by the sword, and by the sword we shall hold it. We hold it as the finest outlet for British goods."

An "Esteemed Correspondent" writing to *The Hindu** says: "Here (India) the fundamental problems are poverty, disease and illiteracy. During a century and a half of British rule, the country has been developed in diverse ways, by railway, irrigation, post, telegraph, roads, etc. But the people have been reduced to abject poverty smitten by disease and kept in ignorance. The resources of the country are rich but they are available to small privileged classes only. The people are intelligent, but no attempt has been made to educate them. The educational policy has been conditioned by the needs of administration. The result has been university education to the neglect of primary education. Poverty and ignorance have disabled the people from fighting disease. Millions die

* June 27, 1941.

of the preventable disease of malaria. The toll of epidemics like cholera, small pox and plague is heavy. The duties of the state as conceived in advanced European countries and in India are not the same. There are no doubt some common features, e.g., defence from aggression, internal security and administration of justice. The British in India have never considered social service or the development of the individual as part of governmental duty. In Europe social service in practically all aspects of human life has increasingly been the business of government. Fighting disease, providing education, relief against unemployment, accidents and old age are the normal functions of government. There the government helps the people to rise to the height of human development and realise themselves. In India the government is not concerned with the individual or the human side. Government's business is efficient administration of the country. The country has been developed but the people have been stunted."

Statistics show that these generalisations are broadly true. Prof. K. V. Rengaswamy Iyengar writes: "To-day the expenditure on education is only 6 p.c. of the aggregate central and provincial expenditure of the Government. While Great Britain spends 15 shillings per head on education, the corresponding figure for India is only 6 pence".[1] Dr. P. J. Thomas calculates the principal items of expenditure on India in 1937 as follows (in crores of rupees): Defence 47.4, Police 11.2, Law and Justice 7.1, General Administration 12.0, Education 11.9, Public Health 5.6, Civil Works 7.8, Agriculture 2.0, and Debt Charges 16.3.[2] According to the compilation of the League of Nations, if the total expenditure of India for 1936-37 is taken as 1,227 units, Defence Charges consume 503.8, Home Department, Law and Justice, Police, etc. 24.5, Education 10.8, Public Health 6.2, and Social Welfare (Poor Relief, etc.) nil.[3]

1. Trends in Modern Public Finance, p. 108.
2. Federal Finance in India, p. 502.
3. Federal Finance in India, p. 494.

Unemployment relief, poor relief, old age pensions, and sickness insurance are practically unknown. While the President of America, the richest country in the world, receives a salary of Rs. 17,062 a month and the Prime Minister of England Rs. 11,111, the salary of the Governor-General of India is Rs. 21,333, not to speak of the allowances of various kinds which he enjoys. Similar striking contrasts can be established between the salaries of cabinet members in foreign lands and of executive councillors in India, as well as between the salaries of provincial governors in India and elsewhere. District officers in India receive between 1,200 and 3,000 rupees per month, and in Upper India, Divisional Commissioners, without whose services Madras Presidency is able to carry on, receive Rs. 4,000 a month. Even the most ardent admirer of British imperialism is bound to concede that a poor country like India is saddled with one of the costliest civil administrations in the world.

The interest paid to investors in England is roughly £35 million a year. About two million Indian workers are employed in plantations, mines, and factories, but the wages received by them are like a drop in the bucket when compared with the huge profits which go out of the country. Besides, large quantities of goods are purchased from England for use by the Government of India. When we turn to shipping, we are told that the share of the Indian companies is only 13 per cent of the coastal traffic and 2 per cent of the ocean borne trade in India. The public debt of India, increased largely through foreign wars planned and conducted by England, is 900 millions, while productive debt is very small.

What all this shows is that the chief beneficiaries of the economic development of a dependent country like India are not the people themselves. It is possible to argue that economically India is better off than she would have been if the Moghuls or Maharattas or some other group of Indians had been in power or if India had been under the control of Germany, France, Belgium or Holland.

We have no hesitation in admitting that among modern imperialist countries Great Britain, on the whole, has followed a more enlightened policy than others. But such admission is not enough when we deal with a country which has set a very high standard for itself, expressed by such sentiments as 'trusteeship,' 'imperialism of responsibility,' and the 'white man's burden'. Further in the new social order which we envisage, no imperialism is justifiable which does not give the first and foremost place to the welfare of those under its control and is not able to justify every act of commission and omission at the bar of an impartial international tribunal.

In addition to promoting the material advancement of countries under its control, imperialism is credited with providing peace and internal order. It must be admitted with thankfulness that under the British rule in India the country has not witnessed any serious warfare such as is being witnessed today all over Europe. *Pax Britannica* has really been a great boon. Under it the population has increased by leaps and bounds (388 millions in 1941), and there have been no such violent economic upheavals as follow in the wake of major wars. But all this has been at the expense of the manliness of India and the ability of the country to defend itself against *goondas* in times of communal trouble. Even such a thoroughly peace-loving person as Mahatma Gandhi asks : "Why has this long spell of British rule left the people so emasculated as to disable them from standing up against a few hundred goondas ?.....The first act of any government worth the name would be to teach its people the art of self-defence, but the foreign British Government had no concern about this fundamental welfare of India's citizens and so it deprived the people of the use of arms."

It is further said in defence of British imperialism that it has meant the spread of the 'rule of law', wherever it has gone. It is true that under British rule no one can be punished "except for a breach of some known or ascertainable

law, tried before a properly constitued court". But that does not prevent a vindictive sentence for political offences such as four years' rigorous imprisonment as was recently passed upon Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. The 'rule of law' in practice has not meant absolute impartiality as between the European and Indian or between the different classes of Indian society.

One more justification of British imperialism advanced by Mr. King-Hall is that it stands for the ideals of liberty and justice. To quote his own words: "Perhaps the most important of all reasons for the maintenance of the British Empire is that in a world in which dictatorships are arming to the teeth, the Empire remains one of the few powerful and solid bulwarks of liberty." While this may be true in theory, the practice is indicated in a letter to the press of an American missionary in Lucknow, India (September 12, 1941), who, not being able to fulfill his pledge of neutrality to the British Government and yet remain loyal to Christ, has resolved to resign his post and return to his native land where he can express his ideas "without a violation of my pledged word." In the course of the letter he says: "I cannot be silent in the face of the injustice and hypocrisy of a conqueror who claims to be fighting for 'the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live' (from the Atlantic Charter) and at the same time holds in jail .... five thousand Indian leaders for the crime of attempting to exercise that right. I cannot be silent in the light of claims to be fighting against dictatorship and for democracy when I know that India is in bondage herself."

Weighing the gains and losses accruing from imperialism, one is bound to say that the balance tilts on the side of losses. These losses are first in relation to the territories under imperial control; second in relation to the imperial country itself; and third in relation to the outside world. Let us take up these losses and deal with them one by one.

It is not easy for an imperialist to get beneath the skin of a person under his control and see things as he sees them.

It has been well said: "The toad beneath the harrow knows where each sharp tooth goes; but the butterfly on the wayside preaches contentment to the toad." To a country under imperial rule, imperialism means ruthless economic exploitation. As Sir George Schuster, a former Finance Member of the Government of India, has hinted, under imperialism political relationships are used for economic advantages. The way in which currency, tariff, and railway freight rates are manipulated and the way in which British commercial interests are encouraged to thrive on the fat of the land are too well known to need comment.* Taxation falls much more heavily on the poor than on the rich.

Alongside of economic exploitation, there is also political domination. How loath British statesmen are to part with their political control of India has recently been clearly seen in the declaration of the British Prime Minister that the Atlantic Charter is not meant to be applied to India. The magic phrase which he and Mr. Amery never get tired of repeating is that India is to obtain "free and equal partnership in the commonwealth of races" when the reasonable and unreasonable claims of the minorities, Princes, and com-

*That conditions are changing, though slowly, is indicated by certain forms of industrial research recently undertaken by the Government of India. Commenting upon this welcome change, the *Guardian*, Madras, writes:

"One of the bright spots in the proceedings of the present session of the Central Legislative Assembly was the resolution moved by the Commerce Member, Sir A. Ramaswamy Mudaliar that a Fund called the Industrial Research Fund for the purpose of fostering industrial development in this country be constituted with an annual grant of Rs. 10 lakhs for five years. With the distinguished scientist Sir S. S. Bhatnagar, as Director, successful research had already been conducted for 18 months. Some results are immediately capable of application to war industry and others will be of use in the long run for the country's industrialization. They were made available to private industrialists and they were not slow to take advantage of the schemes. The proposal is to extend the present system with a net work of scientists all over India. A third of the royalties received by the Government would be paid as honorarium to scientists. As illustrations of success, Sir Ramaswamy mentioned these. The Vegetable Oil Committee had helped to solve the problem of absorbing in Indian industry 600 to 700 thousand tons of groundnut which could not be exported. He envisaged the possibility of the Plastics Committee enabling them to drink not only coffee but coffee in cups made of coffee seeds. The armoured plate made in India has been pronounced by experts to be better than what is produced in many industrially advanced countries. Internal combustion engines using oil are being produced and those using petrol may soon be a possibility. Other Committees at work are Fertilisers Committee, the Drugs Committee and Sulphur Committee." (November 21, 1941).

mercial interests have been met. A phrase which has of late come into the picture is that Britain should fulfil her "historic obligations" before she can relax her hold on India. This is the present-day equivalent of ' the white man's burden ' or 'trusteeship' which has been ridiculed out of existence.

To cope with the war situation, the Governor-General's Executive Council has been expanded by the addition of seven Indians, but the work assigned to them is the work which was formerly done by two executive councillors. The principal portfolios of Finance, Defence, and Communications, in spite of the repeated protests of even the Moderates in politics, are retained in the hands of the European councillors. While not even Mahatma Gandhi has done anything to interfere with Britain's war efforts, the duly elected representatives of the people have no control over the 20-25 lakhs of rupees which is said to be spent daily by India in the prosecution of the war. Several war time appointments are taken out of the hands of the Federal Public Service Commission, and Europeans and relatives of European officers are freely appointed to them. There is general agreement in the country that Hitlerism should be thoroughly defeated, if not by violent, at least by non-violent, means. Yet very little is being done to utilise this sentiment to the fullest. Instead, we are being told repeatedly that if Hitler should win we shall have a much worse time than at present. What the country is eagerly waiting for is a magnanimous gesture in favour of complete self-government for India and an appeal to the long-standing historic connection between Britain and India which can be made to yield valuable results to both sides if properly handled.

Much worse than the economic exploitation and political domination of the subject people is the loss of their manliness. Imperialism levies a very heavy toll on honesty and integrity of character. Loyalty is valued much more than independence of thought and action. Imperialism provides a fertile field for the growth of such slave virtues as flattery, hypocrisy,

and dissimulation. People are ready to sacrifice the honour of their country, not to speak of their own honour, for material considerations, and invent all kinds of queer and circuitous arguments to justify their conduct. Feudalism, mediaeval monarchy, and unhealthy forms of landlordism are allowed to go on unchecked. In supporting them, an imperial country which may stand for freedom and progress within its own shores, comes to support arbitrary authority and retrogression abroad.

No opportunity is given for the expression of the national soul of a people. A person cannot hold his head high and walk erect, as he can do in a free country. While a good part of the world is open to the European to which he can go and start business, colonise, or serve in the army and civil service, the Indian has to encounter restrictions of various kinds even when he goes from one province to another or into a territory administered by an Indian Prince. In his own country he is a *pariah*.

The harm done by imperialism to the country practising it is equally great. It has been well said that slavery hurts the slave owner even more than it hurts the slave. While the suffering of the slave is largely physical, that of the slave owner is moral and spiritual. Much the same is true of imperialism, too. It hurts the soul of the nation practising it. It tends to deteriorate character. Witness, for example, the number of half-truths embodied in a pamphlet entitled *Talking Points on India* issued by the British Ministry of Information, which under the fire of criticism has been withdrawn from circulation.

Imperialism whets the love of greed and avarice. It tends to regard people as mere chattels. Convenient fictions of 'superior' and 'inferior' races are built up, and theories are invented to the effect that a subject race does not feel the deprivation of freedom, unjust economic and social conditions, and loss of territory in the same way as a superior nation might. Thus Dr. Ley, a Reich Minister of State, has said:

" A lower race needs less room, less clothing, less food and less culture than a higher race. The German cannot live under the same conditions as the Pole or the Jew. The war must give Germany the foundations on which to build the life that its race and blood demand. More bread, more clothes, more living room, more culture and more beauty : These our race must have or it dies."

Repression of liberty which is practised in the subject country sooner or later comes to roost in one's own home. Freedom deteriorates and the way is paved for authoritarianism. The vested interests created come to dominate politics. The radio, the press, and the church are muzzled. Manufacturers of armaments and investors of capital abroad determine foreign policy. Honest labour is replaced by exploitation. Wages are depressed both abroad and in the ' imperialist ' country itself.

In its relation to the outside world, imperialism raises many difficult problems. It is a potent cause of war in that it rouses the jealousy and suspicion of others. Trade agreements and preferential tariffs among empire countries naturally rouse the anger of countries which are shut out of their legitimate share of markets and raw materials. Aptly it has been said that the road to Addis Ababa (1936) began at Ottawa (1932), whose motto was "We first, the other units of the Empire second, the foreigner nowhere ". Commenting upon the Ottawa Agreement and its sequel, which did more harm than good to the Empire countries, and was later denounced by some of these very countries, Mr. D. Abel writes : " Mr. N. Chamberlain, who had said that Free Trade was as dead as mutton and who asserted that Britain would remain Protectionist even if all the world went Free Trade, never realised until after war broke out in 1939 that Free Trade and Peace were one and the same cause. It was then too late."

Imperialism is productive of war, further, because it rouses the prestige complex of the vigorous nations of the

world. In order to establish their international status and manliness, they fall upon some defenceless country like Abyssinia and annex it by means of liquid fire and poison gas and then pretend that they are carrying forward a 'mission of civilization'. The attitude of the satiated powers in this colonial game is "what we have we hold" on the plea that possession is nine points of law. When they are driven to part with some of their territories, they do it with very little concern for the welfare of the subject people who become mere pawns in the game. Their wishes and desires are not consulted, and even if consulted are not respected, as happened, in the case of Syria after the last war, which, expressed a desire to be placed under the U.S.A. as a mandate, but was assigned to France.

Writing of the present war in *the New Statesman and Nation*, Leonard Woolf, a well-known writer on imperial questions, claims that "imperialism and empire are among the causes of this war and that their future will be determined by how the winner of the war makes the peace."

Can Imperialism Be Humanised?

The last question to which we now turn our attention is, whether it is possible to tame imperialism and make it serviceable to mankind. We believe that this is possible if imperial statesmen will resolutely place the good of the backward regions of the world above their own national interests and regard the imperialist enterprise as a species of genuine missionary enterprise. But the indications are that we shall have to wait till Domesday before we get such statesmen. Even if we get them before then, there are enough vested interests of various kinds to torpedo their good intentions and laudable schemes.

The only practicable way out seems to be an extension of the mandatory principle which came into existence after the last war and has worked with limited success during the last twenty years. The original intention of Woodrow

Wilson, the father of the scheme, was that there was to be "an absolutely impartial examination of all colonial claims," but this was never done. The mandatory principle was extended only to the colonial possessions of Germany and her allies, while Great Britain, France, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Japan kept intact what was theirs already. Further it was never the thought of Wilson that the mandates were to be classified into A, B, and C classes and that some of them were to be treated as practically equal to annexation. Whatever the noble sentiments of Wilson may have been, they were watered down by the allied statesmen at Versailles.

The principle underlying the Mandatory system, as embodied in Article XXII of the League of Nations Covenant, was that there were some colonies and backward territories which under the strenuous conditions of the modern world could not stand by themselves for the time being and that their tutelage should be entrusted to certain advanced nations of the world who were to act as mandatories on behalf of the League. It was solemnly declared that the well-being and development of the peoples of these territories was to be a "sacred trust of civilisation" and that in the case of the more advanced among them, such as the people of Iraq, Palestine, and Syria, they were to be trained for self-government as speedily as possible. In order to see that no mandatory power abused its trust, it was required to submit an annual report of its doings to the League Council, and a Mandatory Commission was set up "to receive and examine the annual reports of the Mandatories, and to advise the Council on all matters relating to the observance of the mandate."

While the principles underlying the Mandate were unexceptionable and the machinery provided was fairly adequate, the system did not work as satisfactorily as it might have done because of the greed of the mandatory powers. The 'C' class mandates were practically annexed to the territories of the mandatory powers, and the administration of the 'B' class

was not very much better. Even the 'A' class mandates came under the effective control of the mandatories. Except in the case of Iraq, which was fitted by Britain for self-government and "independence" of a sort, in which British interests were fully protected, and admitted to the League of Nations, elsewhere the legitimate aspirations of the people were ruthlessly crushed. France practised military excesses in Syria which left rankling bitterness in the hearts of the Syrians. Since the present war began and France collapsed, Great Britain has declared the independence of Syria as a matter of military necessity. What will be the exact position of Syria, Abyssinia, Iraq, and Iran after the War remains to be seen.

The Permanent Mandates Commission has done some good work. But its recommendations are only of an advisory character. The inhabitants of the mandated territories have no direct access to it. Any petition of theirs can be sent up only through the Mandatory Power. Since 1927 the Council of the League has disallowed the right of oral evidence to the petitioners. The Commission does not visit the mandated territories to satisfy itself of the extent to which the civilising and humanising work of the mandatory powers is carried on. It does not appoint any committees of its own to enquire into glaring abuses on the spot. Once in a way it takes a bold line, as it did in the case of South West Africa, but generally it fumbles and hesitates on account of the entrenched position and influence of the Mandatory powers in the League Council.

In spite of these defects, the mandatory system is better than downright conquest and annexation. It makes it possible to turn the searchlight of world's criticism upon some of the sore spots of imperialism. What the imperialist powers could formerly do with impunity and in secret cannot be done so easily to-day. It, therefore, seems to us that in the years immediately ahead of us a further extension of the mandatory system under strict international supervision is likely to be in

the best interests of the world at large. All colonial possessions which are still in a really backward condition should be brought under it, and its powers of supervision and control should be much greater than what they are to-day. Mandates should become both in theory and in fact "sacred trusts of civilisation" which nations undertake out of a sense of public duty and not out of a desire for profit or glory.

In seeing that the purpose of this new kind of mandatory system is not defeated at the very start certain precautions should be taken. Countries like India, Iraq, Palestine, and Iran which are well able to stand on their own feet should forthwith be granted "the substance of independence"; and the independence of India should in no sense be less than that enjoyed by Canada, Australia or South Africa. If such independence cannot be conceded at once, a definite time limit should be placed within which it can be implemented. In the case of areas which are really backward, and which may be placed under an international mandatory system, care should be taken that the supervision exercised over them is by an international authority and is real and effective. The responsibility should in no circumstance be transferred to an imperial country or to a group of dominant Empire partners. The nationals should have a dominant voice in shaping their constitution and in determining their advance in the direction of complete independence. A definite time limit should be set to the period of tutelage. In order to avoid exploitation, the economic development of the areas under question should be placed in the hands of economic experts chosen by the international supervising body. These experts should undertake their task altogether in the interest of the territories concerned and not in the interest of their own countries or in that of the present empire-owning nations.

Experienced colonial statesmen like Lord Lugard frown upon suggestions of internationalising the colonial possessions. Lord Lugard argues that such a system "would paralyse all initiative by the dead hand of a super-bureaucracy devoid of

national sentiment and stifling to all patriotism, and would be very disadvantageous to the countries concerned." Others hold that so long as government is organised nationally, "internationalised" mandates are not possible. Suffice to say that one who believes in a new social order need not take these arguments too seriously. We have come to realise the futility of national patriotism when it goes beyond a certain point and do not see any objection to government by an international bureaucracy.

Dr. Ivor Jennings who has produced a federal scheme for western Europe argues that under this scheme Great Britain and other imperialist countries can continue to possess their colonies subject to a general supervision and control by the new federal government. We do not believe that this is enough of a guarantee for the humanising of imperialism. If mandates are to continue at all they should be strictly under an international authority and everything possible should be done to advance the true interests of the mandates.

Dr. Leonard Woolf who believes that 'imperialism and empire are among the causes of this war' has no illusions about the value of a partial federation of the world. He is of the firm opinion that the 'ring-fence empire' of recent times as typified in the Ottawa Agreement has had its day and that the new world order calls for free trade all round with a system of semi-barter in which, to quote the words of Joseph Chamberlain, "empires in future, unlike all empires in the past, could dissolve without disintegrating into a wider world order." The plea which Dr. Woolf puts forward is for the extension of the Ottawa system from the empire to the world.

Dr. Leonard Barnes who believes in the extension of the mandatory system reminds us that colonies and mandates are not the possessions of any nation to give away as it pleases. They belong to the people of the land and as such their interests should come first. The transfer of territory should not take the form of paying blackmail to the disgruntled powers, as was contemplated before the commencement of the

present war. "Countries which are already ripe for self-government such as India, Burma and Ceylon should be assisted speedily to reach their goal. If they still require the assistance of the advanced countries of the west, it is better that it should take the form of supply of experts, advisers and administrators by an international body like the League of Nations, rather than indefinite tutelage to a single country. In the other possessions which come under this new mandate system, the open door should be maintained; the interests of the people of the land should be given the first consideration; "there should be no militarisation either of population or of territory; the Mandates Commission should exercise strict supervision over all territories transferred to its jurisdiction."[1]

Further suggestions for the improvement of imperialism are :—

. The fate of the indigenous population should not be left to the white settlers, such as those of South Africa and Kenya who have practised exploitation and discrimination of the worst kind against the coloured people.

2. Restriction should be placed upon the free flow of private capital into backward areas, because, as said earlier, investment colonies are just as bad as colonies for political and strategic reasons.

3. The backward regions of the world should be fitted for self-government as speedily as possible on the basis of indigenous institutions.

4. "As long as outside control is necessary, it is better on the whole to have partial control than complete control; indirect control based on indigenous institutions and culture than direct control; international control than national control."[2]

5. Leonard Barnes makes the suggestion that since capitalism and imperialism are closely linked together, some

1. E. Asirvatham: *Forces in Modern Politics*, p. 117.
2. *Op. cit*, p. 119.

form of socialist revolution in the imperialist country is a prerequisite to any tolerable kind of imperialism. In the words of Barnes himself, the "liberation and development of the colonies is interdependent with the socialisation of Britain. Neither can take place without the other. They are two aspects of a single interlocked process."*

To sum up, if imperialism is to justify itself during the transitional period when attempts are made to remove economic backwardness, political inexperience, and mass illiteracy, it should immediately transform itself from an "imperialism of exploitation" to an "imperialism of responsibility."

* *The Duty of Empire*, p. 275.

CHAPTER XI

POLITICAL JUSTICE

WORLD FEDERATION

Thoughtful people everywhere are coming to realise the urgent need of replacing international anarchy by international order. The world cannot afford once every generation the luxury of a titanic war such as the one in which we are now engaged, following in the close wake of the Great War of 1914—'18. Wars such as these, thorough in their destruction and worldwide in scope, repeated often, are bound to destroy what little of civilisation there is today and take us back to the "Dark Ages", out of which only superhuman help can extricate us.

International order on the very face of it seems such an obvious necessity that one wonders why the people of the world do not lay aside everything else and work for it till it becomes a living reality. International order should no longer remain a dream of the religious man, the philosopher or the Utopian, but should become a part of the armoury of even the ordinary politician and statesman. Only when that happens and the dream of an international order is reduced to a practical form can life on this planet continue in a rational manner.

The world is no longer as huge a place as we once imagined it to be. Distance has been annihilated by rapid means of transport and communication. Quite recently the papers reported of an American airman who crossed the Atlantic and back in 19½ hours. Economically the world is a unit. The reactions of a war in Europe push up the price of even such commoditees as vegetables and firewood in Madras. England goes off the gold standard and every corner of the world is affected by it. The radio has annihilated the sense of space and the mysterious fear which accompanied it.

We can hear the voice of Roosevelt 10,000 miles away as though he was speaking to us face to face. With the aid of a radio set the bombing of London could be heard in the impenetrable jungles of Africa and the remote corners of India. "From the point of view of news and views," as Madariaga says, "the world has attained the unity of the market place."

If the whole world is thus a neighbourhood, why should not the people of the world behave as good neighbours towards each other? Whether we are aware of it or not, there is a world community already and "we have smuggled that truth into our store of thinking without preliminary discussion". What is needed today is to give a definite form and shape to the fact of this world-community and provide it with institutional forms through which it can express itself effectively. In the words of Madariaga: "We are all world citizens in fact and by instinct, even though in theory and by intellectual tendency we may be provincial, insular or nationalistic".*

Time was when people thought and lived solely in terms of their own family, village or tribe. But with the rise of the nation state such narrow loyalties became out of date. Likewise, the events of the present show that those who live and act in terms of their own country are at least partially blind in that they are oblivious of what is happening in the wider world. The historical events and scientific discoveries of the twentieth century call for a world approach.

Time also was when it was the sole prerogative of the Patriarch to punish any offending member of the clan or tribe over which he exercised authority. Later, with the rise of feudalism, the feudal lord took the place of the Patriarch in providing security to his subtenants and vassals and in exercising discipline over them. Justice was conceived in terms of redress to the individual against whom an offence had

* *The World's Design*, p. 8.

been committed. It was only in course of time that the idea of "king's peace" or "king's justice" took the place of private justice, and legal punishment came to be substituted for personal vengeance. What has happened in the life of the country or state should now happen in relation to the world community. Redress of wrongs by means of war should no longer be entrusted to the state against which the offence has been committed; it should become the responsibility of the entire international community.

If all this be true, why are the nations of the world waging war against each other? Why do they spend millions of pounds every day in causing wanton destruction to life and property, mortgaging the well being of generations yet to be?* Why do they raise tariff walls, enact measures providing for quota in production, practise cut throat competition, and carry on a general economic warfare? The only answer that one can think of is the sheer stupidity of mankind. Taking Germany as an illustration of our contention, we find that she says in effect that she is fighting for the sake of colonies, that colonies are for the sake of raw materials, and that raw materials are for the purpose of making war. Nothing can illustrate the stupidity of mankind more strikingly than this method of arguing in a circle. Mankind is caught to-day in a web of its own creation, and the only way of releasing it is to give it an all-absorbing sense of the world community. But the trouble with most people today is that they are not lovers of the world community "in the same burning sense in which they are ratepayers" (Bernard Shaw).

In our modern world, as long ago as 1795 Immanuel Kant, a foremost philosopher of Germany and of all time for that matter, saw the urgent necessity of a *Perpetual Peace* and wrote a memorable book on it. His dream was sought to be realised by others, even though not very successfully,

* According to Madariaga, in 1936 the world spent more than 10,000,000,000 dollars on armaments, while the average League budget has been eight million dollars per year or 1-2500th.

through such political devices as the Holy Alliance and the Concert of Europe (1815).

Coming to our own time, at the end of the last war in 1918, there were thousands of people who were so heartily sick of war and the international chaos to which it had given rise that they gave their enthusiastic support to Woodrow Wilson, the man who would not wait, who insisted on the Covenant of the League of Nations being brought into existence in the midst of much imperfection. So far as the machinery for international peace or order is concerned, it would look as though it had been admirably provided by the Covenant. Article X of the Covenant promises security to every member of the League against aggression or threat of aggression. It reads : " The members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled."

Articles XVI and XVII lay down penalties or sanctions, by means of which the offending State can be brought to its knees. These sanctions are of various kinds : social, economic, financial, diplomatic and military. The economic and financial sanctions are particularly noteworthy, viz., the covenant-breaking State is to be subjected to the severance of all trade or financial relations. Article XVI expressly lays down that when a State or a group of States goes to war in defiance of the Covenant, " it shall be the duty of the Council . . . . . to recommend to the several Governments concerned what effective military, naval, or air force the members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the Covenants of the League." This means that the League contemplates the possibility of what may be called a League War. Article XI gives to each member of the League " the friendly right . . . . to bring to the attention of the Assembly or of the Council

any circumstance whatever affecting international relations which threatens to disturb international peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends."

When a person examined the articles just as they stood, it looked as though the dove of peace had come to take its permanent abode on earth. One could well have rejoiced with the eloquent M. Briand of France when, with the wave of the hands, he declared in one of the sittings of the League Assembly "away with guns! away with cannon!", although such rejoicing might have been tempered by the knowledge of the fact that at the very time M. Briand burst into this ecstasy, his own country was the most heavily armed power in Europe.

All the high hopes entertained of the League of its ability to secure peace and prosperity have been dashed to the ground, particularly during the last ten years. Many reasons contributed to this failure. One of these was the linking together of the peace treaty of Versailles, which was a dictated peace and vindictive in some of its provisions, with the League Covenant. It definitely blamed the Germans as the sole villains of the piece by the so-called "war-guilt" clause, imposed huge reparations upon Germany which she could not, and never did, pay in full, disarmed her almost completely, especially in the air, and made impossible the peaceful change of the *status quo*. The sole aim of France during the years of the uneasy peace which lasted between the close of the last war and the ascendancy of Hitler in 1933 was to keep Germany down both economically and militarily, using the League of Nations as an instrument for the carrying out of such a purpose. But in this she increasingly failed as years went on until 1940 when Hitler completely turned the tables on her. Ever since he came into power, Hitler began the secret rearming of his country and the League was either unable or unwilling to stop him.

The League certainly did valuable work in the non-political fields, but in the political and diplomatic fields,

especially where large Powers were concerned, it has been a failure. In the early days of its existence it helped Austria to recover her economic stability, promoted economic co-operation in general, and attended to the problem of refugees and the interchange of population in accordance with the peace treaty and other treaties following it. In the social and humanitarian fields as well as in the field of health, in such matters as the control of noxious drugs and certain kinds of epidemics, the investigation of the causes of malaria and the checking of international traffic in women and children, the League has been a success. Through its various technical committees it has rendered yeoman service. Its committee on intellectual co-operation has helped the *intelligentsia* of the world to get together and promote international understanding. Its greatest service, however, has been through the International Labour Office which had laid down several valuable conventions for the improvement of labour conditions all over the world which have subsequently been ratified and enforced by many of the member states.

Notwithstanding these successes, the League has failed to keep the peace of the world. When the testing time came, collective security and sanctions upon which the League had depended for the enforcement of peace proved to be broken reeds. In 1931, Japan, a member of the League, invaded Manchuria and, after waging an aggressive and altogether unprovoked war upon China, another member of the League, virtually annexed Manchuria. When even the man in the street knew who the aggressor was and China was desperately crying for help, the League hesitated to name the aggressor and to set in motion the machinery which it had at its disposal for the checking of such international brigandage. After considerable delay it appointed the Lytton Commission to go to the spot and investigate conditions there, but before the report was published, which was mildly critical of Japan, the worst in Manchuria had been done. And when at long last, acting on the report, the League proceeded to reprimand Japan, Japan walked out of the League because of the affront

to her innocence which she always proclaims in the loudest terms possible, whenever she is engaged in doing something despicable.

Another disgraceful episode in the history of the League has been in connection with the Italo-Abyssinian War (1935-'36). For months before the commencement of the war, Mussolini openly prepared for it, and the League simply winked at his activity. Under the pretext of the Wal Wal incident, he invaded the Abyssinian territory in 1935, and after raining poison gas and liquid fire upon the poorly equipped Ethiopians, the great Italian annexed their country in the following year. Strange as it may seem, all through the war both Italy and Abyssinia continued to be members of the League. Although the League showed a little more determination in this episode than in the Manchurian affairs in naming the aggressor, it hesitated to take any effective steps in checking him. After considerable delay it resolved to apply sanctions, but France was most unwilling to carry out her share of responsibility because of her eagerness to keep Italy as a potential ally in any future combat with Germany. England which had a guilty conscience on account of a secret treaty of 'appeasement' with Italy during the World War to allow her to expand in Africa, applied sanctions more or less in a half-hearted manner and said plainly that she was not prepared to risk any war with Italy.*

No sanctions were applied with regard to oil which was the principal commodity required by Mussolini. Although not a member of the League, America was prepared to apply sanctions, and did apply them, but President Roosevelt declared that American Government would not stand in the way of individual American businessmen exporting oil to Italy at their own risk. This half-hearted and non-provocative way of applying sanctions, instead of helping the Abyssinians even

* According to Mr. D. N. Pritt (the author of *Federal Illusion*), the British Government in 1935 entertained the view that from the standpoint of British interests it did not matter if Italian Fascism seized Abyssinia.

partially, infuriated the Italians into making the war even more barbarous than it was before, so as to win a speedy victory. To add insult to injury, the Hoare-Laval proposals were being negotiated behind the scenes for the partition of Abyssinia, and these knocked the bottom out of the sanctions.

What this sorry Italo-Abyssinian episode has shown the world clearly is that collective security really leads to collective insecurity. Great Powers are not willing to risk anything for the protection of weaker nations, unless their own safety is directly threatened. Besides, they do not seem to see the inconsistency of helping the aggressor with materials of war even when they have solemnly promised to safeguard the territorial integrity and political independence of each other as members of the League. They seem to prefer their own trade and commerce to the plighted word. This has happened most strikingly in the Sino-Japanese "incident," which commenced in July 1937 and has not come to a close yet. Till recently oil, scrap iron, and even armaments were sold freely to Japan, although one did not need another Lytton Commission to say who the aggressor was. The "non-intervention" policy adopted in the case of Spain really helped Franco and his party against the lawful government of the day.

Sanctions, as shown already, are ineffective and cannot be relied upon for the future.* They call for an indefinite commitment against an uncertain enemy or enemies at some future date which nobody can anticipate. If a country is prepared to apply economic sanctions, she should be prepared to apply military sanctions as well, but very few Powers, especially the small ones, are in a position to do that in a world where power is unequally distributed. A small Power applying sanctions means a sure invitation to a man like Hitler to invade the country and swallow it up. In the present war, as every one knows, solemn assertions of neutrality have not

* Sanctions, says Madariaga, fail because, being co-operative, they are in advance of the current polical morality of nations and yet lag behind the organic character already developed in fact by the world community.

saved any of the small Powers like Belgium, Denmark and Norway. If strategy requires it, whether a Power is strictly neutral or not, the aggressor has no hesitation in annexing it or at least occupying it for the duration of the war.

The big Powers have shown no scruples in defying the League. They have taken the law into their own hands. Both in the case of Japon *versus* China and Italy *versus* Abyssinia, the aggressor nation insisted on direct negotiations, and the League was helpless in the face of such defiance. It could not act promptly or efficiently. The clause requiring unanimous consent of the members of the Council before any action could be taken has hampered the League. Japan was able to defy the League because of its conviction that Article XVI would not be invoked.

The League machinery, thus, has failed to prevent aggression. It has also failed on the whole in its attempts at conciliation, arbitration, and adjudication through the instrumentality of the International Court of Justice, except when very small powers were pitted against each other and were not backed up by big nations. It has failed further to prevent the piling up of armaments. In the early years of the post-war world, the Washington Conference which was held outside the jurisdiction of the League succeeded in a large measure in limiting naval armaments, but the subsequent conferences have been practically failures with the result that each of them was followed by a new impetus to the armament industry. In 1927 Russia boldly proclaimed that she was in favour of immediate general and total disarmament, but England frowned upon her, subject as she was to the dictates of armament manufacturers.*

Other efforts at the securing of peace, under the general auspices of the League, have not been a great success. The Locarno treaties of 1925 gave mutual guarantee to certain Powers of Europe against unprovoked aggression against one

* Refer to D. N. Pritt: *Federal Illusion.*

another, but they did not prevent the war of 1939. The Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928 outlawing war as an instrument of national policy, signed by most of the nations of the world including Japan, did not help China in 1931 or since. The Nine-Power-Treaty has been an equal failure. In 1925 all the European Powers signed a protocol not to use poison gas in warfare, and yet every one of them expected the other Powers to use it with the result that all of them have volumes of gas in store and have supplied their citizens with gas masks.

In the financial and economic fields, the situation has not been any better. There was dire distress in Germany for many years after the war on account of the depreciation of the mark and the policy pursued by France in extracting her pound of flesh. In 1933 on the eve of Hitler's ascendancy to power every third man in Germany who could be gainfully employed was out of work, and Hitler provided them work in his secret armament and aeroplane factories. Even the victorious powers were not rolling in prosperity. For several years after the war, unemployment mounted up high both in England and the U.S.A. At one time more than two million people in England and ten million people in the U.S.A. were without work. Just when the economic situation was improving, the Great Depression of 1929 swept over the world like a blizzard blasting all hopes of economic recovery. Great Britain, the Dominions, and India entered into an economic pact at Ottawa in 1932, hoping to save their own skins by limited free trade among themselves and trade barriers against outsiders. But subsequent years have belied their hope. According to such a keen observer as Dr. Jennings, the Agreement worked towards the disruption of the Empire and not towards its strengthening.

While the "satiated" powers of the world have been following the policy of holding tight to what they have and not wanting any more colonial possessions or fresh markets, the "disgruntled" powers of the world have been systematically planning the conquest of the world. For some years

before the present war, Germany was not only arming herself furiously, but planting ' fifth columnists ' all over the world to do propaganda for her and break the *morale* of the people of the country. Conditions reached such a pitch in 1938 that Hitler had to be bought off with a good bit of Czecho-Slovakia in order to prevent him from continuing the gentle art of blackmail which he was then practising. Although at the time, Hitler said that he had no further territorial ambitions to satisfy in Europe and Mr. Chamberlain declared that he was able to conclude " peace with honour " by means of the Munich Agreement, within a year after that the world was once again plunged into a gigantic war. Hitler today says that he will not be satisfied till he has created a " new order in Europe", by which he means that Germany is to become the sole industrial power and the armament centre of the Continent and the rest of Europe is to become predominantly agricultural, supplying Germany with all the necessary materials which she requires. According to his " new order " there is room only for one state and others are to become vassal states.

What Next ?

If, as we have shown, the League of Nations has been unable to give the world peace and conditions necessary for economic prosperity, what are we to do next ? Bilateral and multilateral agreements are worse than useless. The Powers entering them do so with no intention of keeping them. Germany's pact with Russia on the eve of the present war guaranteeing her territorial integrity has not prevented Germany from breaking her word and waging a ruthless war against Russia when an opportune time came. The number of pacts of which Poland was a signatory did not save her at the time of her severe trial in 1939. Powers entering these agreements in recent years have not shown even as much of honour as is found among thieves.

The world is in a fix and progressive people are coming to realise the utter futility of allowing each nation to be its

own master in international affairs. They seem to think that the chief enemy of freedom and progress today is not Hitler or Mussolini, but an excess of nationalism. They argue that if the time-worn doctrine of national sovereignty, according to which each sovereign-state claims complete independence for herself in foreign affairs, could be abandoned all will be well with the world. They rightly claim that the League of Nations failed because it was a League of Governments and not a League of the people of the world. Those who took part in the deliberations of the League did so as the delegates of their Governments and could not commit their countries to any policy or course of action of their own accord. The League, in other words, was a body without a soul. It had no 'general will' of its own. It could not give effect to any of the measures proposed by it without ratification by the Governments of the component states. Lovers of peace argue that unless such a situation is changed, the future is indeed dismal.

Mr. D. N. Pritt, an acute thinker of our day, does not agree with this diagnosis of the situation. He claims that all talk about the abandonment of national sovereignty is useless until far-raching changes take place in the mental outlook of the people of the world, and all economic exploitation ceases. Until that time comes, Pritt argues that state sovereignty is only a scapegoat for our mistakes and wanton sins. World anarchy is caused, he says, not by state sovereignty, which is only an effect, but by economic forces which are the real cause.

Postponing a detailed consideration of Pritt's argument to a later place in the chapter, let us examine some of the schemes which have been propounded during the last five years for the unification of the world, or at least a part of it by means of a federation. The idea of federating the world has appeared from time to time, but largely as an academic dream or a poetic fancy. Long years before Tennyson sang of a " Parliament of Man, a Federation of the World," Dante, the famous mediaeval Italian poet, wrote of a universal empire which was

to secure peace for the whole world. Empire as conceived by him really meant world unification and internationalism. It stood for peace and not war. Pierre Dubois, his contemporary, who wanted the West to become wealthy at the expense of the East, adumbrated a scheme in which are to be found the germs of a European Federation. Towards the closing years of his life, M. Briand dreamt of a federation of Europe, in which customs barriers would be removed and trade would follow freely. Long years before his time Joseph Chamberlain and some others dreamt of a federation of the British Empire which came to nought.

It is only very recently that the scheme of federal union has received serious consideration. As yet no country has adopted it as a government programme, but writers are busy drafting constitutions for such a union in order to prepare public opinion in favour of it when the time comes for peace settlement.

One of the first writers to take up the question of federal union is Clarence Streit, a brilliant American journalist, in his book *Union Now*. Arguing on the basis of the American Federal history, Streit believes that a federation alone can save the world from the economic and political destruction which seems to await it. The League of Nations, representing as it did some fifty or more sovereign states, was only a " glory in the heavens ". It was unable to deliver the goods because it could not speak with authority and had no teeth with which it could bite. It had no army, navy, or air force with which it could enforce its decisions.

In the federal scheme proposed by Mr. Streit, the original members are to be some fifteen countries which have been at peace with each other for over a century, which are governed by democratic institutions, and which possess a more or less common outlook in the affairs of the world around. These countries are Great Britain and her five Self-Governing Dominions, the U.S.A., France, Sweden, Norway, Finland,

Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and Switzerland. The door is not closed against outside nations. They can become members of the Union as soon as they establish democratic institutions within their own borders and pledge solemnly to promote the ends of peace.

The organisation of the Federal Union is to consist of a Federal Legislature, a Federal Executive Board of Five jointly fulfilling the functions of a Constitutional President, and a Federal Prime Minister and Cabinet. This federal Government will have complete charge of such questions as war and peace, defence and foreign relations, trade, international communications, postage, and currency. Within the Federal Union there will be "one citizenship, one defence force, one free trade area, one money and one stamp". The colonial possessions of the member-states will be taken away from them and administered conjointly by the Union with a view to fitting them to become members of the Federal Union as speedily as possible.

The first criticism that suggests itself to one as one looks at the scheme is that it is a union of Western peoples only. India is dismissed in a rather light hearted manner, as also China, both of which countries have great contributions to make to the civilisation of the world in the years immediately ahead of us. To exclude all non-white races from the union is to start it with a very serious handicap. It is certain to be interpreted as a Machiavellian device for the perpetuation of white dominance in the world, and more particularly of the Anglo-Saxon variety. It is true that, in India at the present moment, we have our communal bickerings and our petty jealousies. But if a country like South Africa with its racial exclusiveness and discriminatory legislation and inhuman treatment of the coloured people can be admitted as an original member of the union, the claim of India even as she is to day is at least ten times as great.

Streit may have very good reasons for choosing fifteen "virtuous" powers to serve as the nucleus of the proposed

union. But one wonders whether it is right to require that every prospective member of the Union should adopt the democratic system of government before admission is granted to it. So long as the totalitarian States are willing to confine their philosophy to their own internal politics, it may be possible to admit them even now, provided they give a solemn undertaking to seek peace and the fruits of peace. The reason for making this statement is the argument put forward by several people in recent times that one of the causes for the rise of Hitler and Nazism to power is the forcing down the throats of Germans the democratic Weimar constitution for which the people had not been trained and which, therefore, did not strike a sympathetic chord in their hearts. It is possible as things stand at present, for a 'limited' totalitarianism to find a place in 'Union Now' and gradually wipe itself out as it sees for itself the merits of the democratic way of life.

Senor De Madariaga who is a keen advocate of world community and a world commonwealth does not limit his commonwealth even at the start to certain countries of the world. In addition to the existing international institutions such as the I.L.O. and the World Court, he sees the need for a real world bank which will be a Central Bank of Central Banks and a World Trade Commission with no national bias. He rightly claims that a defensive alliance of democratic nations against fascism will not work and that what people everywhere need to cultivate is a living sense of world unity. In the new order which he contemplates, there is to be a commonwealth of men as well as of nations. Colonies are to be handed over to the world commonwealth to be administered as a World Trust, and that Madariaga considers to be the best way of disarming Germany. In his own words: "The whole colonial system must go since it is incompatible with the idea of a world community." The new international army will become an international police, functioning like the Saar Commission which was "the only real example of international administration" and which "lived an honourable life and

died a saintly death." There are to be further a Civil Service School for World Administration and a World Association for the Advancement of World Citizenship organised on private lines, whose main purpose would be to make world citizens.

Between these schemes and others which have followed them there is a good deal of family resemblance. According to W. B. Curry, the author of *The Case For Federal Union*, who has done much to popularise the scheme of federal union in England, the union is neither a super-state nor a mere league. It is a world government in a genuine sense which does not trench upon the internal administration of the member states. The powers which are to be surrendered to this world government are in respect of foreign policy, armed forces, economic relations between states (i.e., tariffs), international finance (i.e., markets, raw materials, capital export), colonies, communications (posts, telegraphs, shipping), currency, and migration.

According to Oscar Newfang, the author of *World Federation* (1939), the present League machinery is capable of easy transformation into a world federation. The League Assembly is to become a World Legislature and the League Council a Cabinet. The World Court is to be given compulsory jurisdiction. All the armed forces of the members are to be gradually transferred to the central authority. Trade barriers are to be removed and a world banking and monetary system is to be introduced.

Sir William Beveridge in World Order Paper No. 3 (Published by the Royal Institute of Affairs) holds that a world federation is an impossibility at the present state of affairs. He, therefore, limits his scheme for the time being to Britain, France, Germany (democratised), Belgium, Holland, Finland, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, and the five British Dominions. The minimum subjects to be transferred to federal control are defence and foreign policy. Other subjects such as the management of dependencies, currency, trade, and

migration are to be transferrrd gradually. Sir John Fischer Williams in World Order Paper No. 1 holds a similar view with regard to the allocation of functions between the federal centre and the states.

Dr. W. R. Inge (formerly Dean of St. Paul's) proposes a federation of the English-speaking countries of the world which means Great Britain together with her self-governing Dominions and the U.S.A. Sir A. Watson, a former editor of the *Statesman* (Calcutta), is in favour of a British Empire Federation. Writing to *Great Britain and the East* he says : " The vision for the future is some kind of empire federation out of which none of the countries that now complain of an inferior status can afford to stand, since their safety and very existence will depend on association with a group of nations that together will be unchallengable, but standing alone will have no prospect of continued existence in freedom."

A restricted scheme of federation for the countries of western Europe with a detailed blue print has come from the pen of Dr. Ivor Jennings. The countries with which he wants to make a start are France, Germany (democratised), Switzerland, Luxemburg, Belgium, Holland, the United Kingdom, the self-governing British Dominions, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Norway, and Iceland. Provision is made for the admission of such countries as India and Burma in the distant future. If and when they are admitted, despite their huge population and importance from the point of view of raw materials and even finished goods, for purposes of federal representation, India is to be equated with Canada and Burma with New Zealand.

Dr. Jennings' argument is that " Europe is the cauldron in which most wars are brewed " and that, therefore, a federal union, particularly of western Europe, will be an effective check on these warring propensities. His object seems to be not so much to secure the peace and prosperity of the world at large but to prevent European rivalry in order that the exploitation of Africa and parts of Asia can be carried on

without let or hindrance. In his own words, the chief object of the federation is to "render war among the nations of western Europe absolutely and literally impossible." It is true that he says that the federation that he contemplates is not to be construed as "a threat against any extra-European power", but as he himself admits, those who will be called upon to frame a federal constitution and work it when the time comes will not be academicians like himself but timid (and it may be added 'scheming') politicians who are not much swayed by lofty idealism.

Dr. Jennings does not mean to discard either the British Empire or the present League of Nations, if and when his scheme comes into existence. Even under the new federation, the British Empire will continue as a unit. The benefits and losses accruing from her colonies and dependencies will be shared by all the members of the federal fraternity these backward territories being open to the capital and enterprise of all federal citizens*. There will be a federal commission exercising jurisdiction over all the colonial possessions, and members of the fraternity will be eligible for colonial services. The League of Nations will continue in its present form, especially for the benefit of those who are not members of the Western European Federation, and this federation itself will be represented on the League councils as a single unit, relieving the League of much of its responsibility for the federation and giving it opportunity to serve the rest of the world more fully.

The federal subjects will be chiefly defence and foreign affairs and, to some extent, economic relations and colonies. Residuary powers will remain with the States. The federal constitution and the federal laws will override state constitutions and state laws where there is repugnancy between the two. A Bill of Rights will be incorporated in the preamble assuring members of certain fundamental rights. National conscription will disappear and defence forces will be in the hands of the federation. The

* *The Federation of Western Europe, p. 53.*

main burden of foreign policy will be transferred to the federal government, as also some economic power. No federal state will be allowed to discriminate against other members. There will be free trade with limitations, and no concealed protection will be tolerated. The federation will have power to regulate the health, morals, safety, and general welfare of the citizens of the state. Neither capitalism nor socialism will be banned. The constitution will be flexible enough to accommodate itself to meet changing conditions. The federal authority will have power to control currency and inter-state payments and the transfer of securities. It will also have power over weights and measures. There will be freedom of movement within the federation, and migration of population from outside will be under the exclusive control of the federation. The federation will have 'commerce power' regulating trade and commerce between the states and with the outside world, and carry out a planned economy. A federal court will interpret the constitution and the laws thereunder and settle disputes between member states.

While we can generally endorse all these details of the scheme and others which we have not mentioned relating to bi-cameralism, graded representation to the member states in the federal legislature, the parliamentary system of government with an elected president like the French President and the like, we must frankly confess that we are not much enamoured of the general principles underlying the scheme. It is likely to turn out to be an engine of oppression of non-European people in the colonial countries, in spite of the scheme recognising the principle of trusteeship. The Colonial Commission, membership of which is to be a full-time occupation, with no party or political considerations playing any part in its composition may, in practice, prove to be no better than the present Mandates Commission. Further, in the new order contemplated, federal loyalty may sit too lightly on the people, if, as Dr. Jennings says, British subjects are to remain British subjects with federal citizenship superimposed upon them, and British colonies continue as British colonies. What is there

to prevent small powers like Switzerland, Luxemburg, and Denmark from feeling that this form of colonial administration is a subtle way of making them pull the chestnuts out of the fire for England and other empire-owning members of the federation ?

The most trenchant criticism of all schemes of a partial federation of the world has come from the pen of Mr. D. N. Pritt. Arguing on an avowedly socialistic basis, Mr. Pritt claims that so long as capitalism and imperialism are retained, a federation of the world is only an illusion. Real power today, he says, rests on the narrow group of finance and industry; and those who control industries are much the same as those who control governments. Therefore, a federation in these circumstances means the banding together of vested interests in various countries for a thorough-going exploitation of their own people as well as of the colonial countries. It will be a 'Holy Alliance' of a few great Powers and their satellite states. To quote Mr. Pritt's own words: "The nature of the modern industrial state, with its handful of very rich men as the real repository of power must itself be radically altered before any world federation becomes practicable."*

That these charges are not mere prejudices, Mr. Pritt is able to establish by a pointed reference to the yawning chasm which is noticeable between the theory and practice of the League of Nations. The League was to a large extent based upon Wilson's 14 points, but in the actual practice of the League none of them was well observed. The first point demanded open diplomacy—open covenants for peace openly arrived at—and stood against private international understandings. Yet there was very little of this open diplomacy between 1919 and 1939. The second point insisted on "the freedom of the seas" and the third wanted the removal of all trade barriers and tariffs. But neither of these conditions became a practical reality. Instead of the removal of trade barriers, we got the Ottawa Agreement and other similar

* The Federal Illusion, pp. 90—91.

measures. The fourth point called for a reduction of armaments all round, but in effect Germany alone was really disarmed. The fifth point insisted on an equitable adjustment of all colonial claims (including the colonies of both the victors and the vanquished), but in actual practice the colonies of the victorious powers were left intact, and these very powers scrambled with each other for mandates in order to control raw materials. The sixth point called for co-operation with Russia; and yet the powers actively supported all counter-revolutionary movements for a long time till they saw the futility of it and refused to allow the U.S.S.R. to enter the League till 1934.

Mr. Pritt finds further support for his thesis in some of the loose statements made by Mr. Curry such as his observation regarding India under the new state of affairs when he says that "as regards India all that is necessary is British good faith", as though we have not had enough of that faith all these years. With regard to national currency all that Mr. Curry says is that it is "a nuisance" and personal inconvenience forgetting, as Mr. Pritt points out, that currency is closely linked up with capitalism. On the basis of all these arguments the conclusion to which Mr. Pritt is led is that "a genuine world federation is possible on a socialist basis and not otherwise." "Socialism and only socialism will end war and ensure peace".

He further criticises the various schemes of federation on the ground that they do not include the whole world, at least for the present. Such a partial federation, he holds, is worse than no federation at all, and is even worse than an empire, for it may be used as a spearhead against other States. The excluded powers may form combinations of their own, and between them and the new federation there may be constant friction and jealousy.

While we may not accept Mr. Pritt's criticism in all its fulness, especially in the realm of dogma, we must admit that it contains a large measure of truth. It is quite possible for a

state to be socialist at home and imperialist abroad. Mr. Pritt argues that "war is impossible between socialist states". Does this mean that the world federation is to be postponed till the whole world becomes socialist? If that be so we may have to wait till the Greek kalends. The trouble with most federal schemes current today is that they show more enthusiasm than insight. When a great war is on, people's minds naturally turn to peace, but once it is over, the enthusiasm wanes. Thus we find that while a great many sincerely believe in a federation of the world today, they allow their emotions to get the better of their reason. They have not given full consideration to the necessity of curbing irresponsible economic power alongside of checking irresponsible political power, if a world federation is to become a power for good. As regards the vast colonial empire, the most that they are prepared to say is that it will be placed under federal control and that all the member states of the new federation will have full access to raw materials. They hardly stop to consider the claims to prosperity and self-determination of those who are required to produce raw materials in order to feed the factories of the industrial West. The fourth clause of the much advertised Atlantic Charter, which does not strike one as a charter of liberation for the down-trodden countries of the world, says that the U.S.A. and the United Kingdom "will endeavour with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access on equal terms to trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity."

Any scheme of world federation which in effect means a federation of the European people is likely to work greater hardships to the non-European people than is the case at present. It may mean a more ruthless and thorough-going exploitation of those who have no political power. So long as the different parts of the world are at different levels of economic and political development, it is difficult to see how a federation can work successfully. The acid test of the

genuineness of such a federation is when nations are prepared to admit the backward areas of the world to equal share in political power and economic advantage. Will they, for instance, be prepared to have on the Federal Colonial Commission at least 50 per cent. of those who in a real sense represent the people of the colonial countries and dependencies? Will they allow greater freedom in the movement of population in search of employment? Will skilled work be open to people of all nationalities and races, solely on the basis of merit? Will the white workers in a factory be prepared to have a coloured foreman or superintendent over them? Practical questions of this nature will have to be squarely faced and answered before we can sincerely plan for a federation.

No one denies that the world federation adumbrates a grand scheme. It places a lofty ideal before mankind. But the necessary spade work for its successful operation has not been undertaken. With perverted notions and erroneous beliefs insidiously inculcated in the minds of people by wrong types of school education, defective home training, wrong social suggestions, one-sided propaganda, and cheap Press, one fails to see how we can bring about revolutionary changes in men's thinking overnight. Modern schemes of federation seek to reap where they have not sown. As matters stand at present, with the low level of public morality, especially in the relations between different so-called "progressive" and "backward" races of the world and a poor sense of social responsibility for the well-being of all the people of the world, it is dangerous to vest great powers in a world organisation. If a scheme of the magnitude of a world federation is to work successfully, we need a wholesale moral revolution and a great psychological change, aided by schemes for a more even and better distribution of wealth and by the abandonment of all distinctions between the rulers of the world and their subjects. If the people of the world can be persuaded to accept the brotherhood of man, both in theory and in fact, and to abandon both direct and indirect forms of

exploitation, a world federation can work well; otherwise it will turn out to be an engine of oppression. It will be much like our modern civilisation which is insincere to the core and carries with it a thin paint of respectability.

From what we have said it is obvious that we are not against the idea of a world federation. We believe it to be the only ultimate way for securing the peace and prosperity of the world. But we want to bring about a radical change in the mental climate and moral tone of the people in order that it may have a smooth career. It may be possible to work simultaneously for a world federation and the changes indicated. But it is rather difficult. Once the world federation becomes crystallised it will be difficult to change it. Therefore the first thing to do is to bring into existence the conditions necessary for its successful operation.

If a world federation is a necessity and the magnitude of it prevents its immediate realisation, it may be wise to consider the possibility of several federations working in close harmony with each other. Should disharmony break out between them and recourse is had to war, we shall witness a state of affairs much worse than the situation brought about by the present war. Partial and exclusive federations are useless, if not mischievous. They will unnecessarily provoke the suspicions and jealousies of those who are left out. Regional federations, so far as feasible, have a right to be considered. Thus it may be possible to have a federation of North and South America, a federation of Europe (minus Russia) and Africa, and a federation of Russia, Asia, and Australasia. Such an alignment may be somewhat more logical than other arrangements proposed. Canada will have to decide to throw in her fate completely with the rest of America. Africa may be linked on to Europe, for at least some years, till the people of Africa are able to manage their own affairs. If the 'Dark Continent' is allowed to form a federal union of her own at the present juncture, it is possible that the Union of South Africa may come to dominate it, which is altogether undesirable. In matters of

colonial administration, the production of raw materials, and foreign trade, the genuine representatives of the African people should have as much of a say as the present imperialist powers which are throttling her life. No part of Africa should be regarded as the colonial possession of any single European power or of all of them put together. Russia may be linked up with Asia because of the close similarity in social and economic conditions. The two together may be able to work out a social and political economy best suited to their conditions. It is a distinct advantage to have Australia and New Zealand in this federation, for it will be a striking demonstration to the world at large that we do not contemplate a division of the world along colour or racial lines.

The three federations should have an international court above them for the compulsory adjudication of differences, an international labour office, and other such international organisations with which we are already familiar. After some years of smooth working there may be an international army for purposes of police protection between the three federations. For the present each of the federations should have its own army, no purely national army being allowed anywhere.

A scheme of this kind takes for granted that hitherto warring nations will become peaceable and peace-loving all of a sudden. Since such a miraculous change is not possible, we must set to work immediately to bring about the moral and psychological changes which we have suggested already. Germany in the West and Japan in the East are likely to be doubtful factors. Russia is still an enigma. If the advocates of a Western federation can trust Germany to become democratised and behave towards her neighbours as she should, we in the East may trust Japan to the same extent. In the early years of these federations there is bound to be a certain amount of friction and even suspicion. But so far as the Eastern Federation is concerned, it is possible that the "Old Adam" in Japan will be kept down by the moral power of India and China and the physical strength of Russia and Australia.

In none of the federations proposed we can have absolute free trade or free movement of population all at once. For some years to come there should be restrictions in favour of countries whose economic development has been retarded hitherto in order that they may make up for lost time. Just as in the proposed Indian Federation (Government of India Act, 1935), the member states do not all accept the same list of federal subjects, but are allowed to make reservations in respect of some, so in the wider federation we may have such reservations for a limited period, arrived at by mutual consultation and agreement. Such reservations will be essential so far as India is concerned, whichever federation she may join eventually. She should not be compelled to produce raw materials for all time to come, but allowed to develop her industries (both large scale and small) *pari passu* with her agricultural resources.

As regards the movement of population it is not right, for instance, to allow large numbers of Japanese, Chinese, and Indians to migrate to Australia immediately. A restricted scheme of migration may be justifiable, if it is confined to the middle classes who, by virtue of their education and social training, can be easily assimilated to the Australian way of life.

Whether we have one federation for the entire world or three federations, there should be rational economic planning of a detailed kind for every country and every part of the country in the world. Economic and scientific experts should be set to work to plan the exploitation of the natural resources and industrialisation in such a manner that every member of the federation will be a gainer and nobody a loser. It will take time for people to think altogether rationally and exclude considerations of community, nationality, and race. But as believers in a new social order, we are confident that it can be done.

Men like Mr. Pritt who tend to overemphasise one aspect of the problem forget that even the present League of

Nations, in spite of all its shortcomings, has made possible the idea of a world federation and the concept of a restricted sovereignty—concepts which were not accepted even as concepts a generation ago. The world during the last twenty years might not have been much worse without the League, but certainly it would not have been any better. So even the idea of a partial federation of the world, working its way to a complete federation, may be another milestone in the direction of " a new heaven " and " a new earth "

The progress which the world has made during the last quarter of a century in developing an international outlook is indicated by the following facts. Except for a few academicians and jurists, a great many thoughtful people today are not afraid of abandoning the doctrine of absolute national sovereignty. They realise that whatever value it may have had at one time, it is not so important today. Even the Almighty British Parliament, they find, cannot, in practice, do anything and everything which it likes, whatever the law regarding it may be. Those who are crying hoarse over the retention of state sovereignty are really wanting to lock the stable after the horse is stolen.

The old argument that if national sovereignty is abandoned, national patriotism will suffer, is not taken too seriously. We are no longer enamoured of the kind of patriotism which says, " My country, right or wrong ". The patriotism which we believe in today is one which reaches its culmination in a love and devotion to the world community analogous to the love and devotion which we have for our own family or country. We are no longer frightened by the argument that a world federation means the establishment of a superstate or the argument that it may lead to a colourless cosmopolitanism. The difficulty of securing an international army, navy, or air force is not as great as it once appeared to be. If the international force is to play the part of a mere international police, it is not necessary to goad it on to victory by appeal to low forms of national patriotism or by jingoistic

methods. The success of the League Secretariat under Sir Eric Drummond and his successors, until the time when Mussolini introduced politics into it, has convinced us that it is not difficult to build up an international civil service which will be as efficient as it is impartial. The criticism that the world federation attempts so great and stupendous a task that it may break down under its own weight, however, is one which has to be considered seriously. Only practical experience can help us in overcoming this difficulty. The real trouble is likely to arise in the unwillingness of the white man to sit and plan with the black, brown, and yellow man around a common conference table on terms of absolute equality. In social, religious, and intellectual gatherings such consultation and co-operation have been found possible. Why not in economics and politics too ?

As a first step in the direction of a sound and lasting world federation, the nations of the world should get together as soon as the present war is over, if not earlier, to plan scientifically the economic and financial development of the world, as well as its health and general welfare. This task should be entrusted not to professional politicians but to scientific experts who would not allow national prejudices to warp their minds. Their sole object should be the promotion of the welfare of mankind as a whole. To this end they should frame schemes which would remove all forms of exploitation and cut-throat competition. Each nation would be engaged in producing those commodities—whether they be raw materials or finished articles—for which there is a ready demand elsewhere. If the nations of the world would only realise that the weal of one is the weal of all, and the woe of one the woe of all, there would be little hesitation on their part to get together for an effective economic programme. A committee of scientific experts could easily calculate the amount of wheat, rice, wool, cotton, sugar, and other commodities which the people of the world require and assign their production among the various countries in such a manner that nobody would be a loser, but everybody a gainer.

CHAPTER XII

WAR AND PEACE

One of the first conditions of a new social order is freedom from war and the wanton destruction which accompanies it. There is a general consensus of opinion that war is ethically wrong and economically futile. Knowledge of the horrors of modern warfare is common property. Everyone realises that modern warfare makes no distinction between combatants and non-combatants. The science of aerial bombing has advanced so far that, in the twinkling of an eye, it can cause certain death to masses of population and destroy millions worth of property. During the Great War of 1914-18 it is estimated that ten million combatants were killed, twenty million were wounded, three million were taken as prisoners, and fourteen million were turned adrift as widows and orphans, not to speak of thirteen million civilians who met with death in one form or other.

The economic futility of modern warfare is a theme which is well-known to every educated man. Vast sums of money are spent in preparation for war and vaster sums are spent when the war is in progress. R. B. Gregg, the author of *The Power of Non-Violence*, quoting from the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, shows that 82 per cent of the taxes of that government (federal) were then going to pay the bills of past wars and of preparation for future wars. In 1936, Russia, Germany, the U. S. A., Italy, Great Britain, France, and Japan, in the descending order of money expended, spent a total sum of ten billion and seven hundred and thirty million dollars on arms. The military appropriations of Japan for the year 1930-31 were 470,000,000 yen; and this sum was increased to 1,400,000,000 yen in 1937-38 when the "Chinese Affair" began, exceeding the national tax revenue for the year by one hundred million yen. The amount spent

today when Japan is actively fighting the A B C D Powers must be several times greater. During the present war Great Britain has been spending on an average 12 million pounds a day and a poor country like India is spending daily 25 lakhs of rupees. All this means that we mortgage the social and economic well-being of generations yet to be. Even before the present war began, Neville Chamberlain declared that one of the results of the arms programme of Great Britain was the necessary postponement of social reform for a generation. According to the Statesman's Year Book for 1926, during the year 1924-25, 67% of the total national expenditure of Great Britain went to pay for armaments and past wars.[1] Sir Josiah (later Lord) Stamp calculated that the cancellation of the expenditure on armaments would mean the raising of the standard of living in the industrial countries by at least 10% ; and this difference, says Sir J. Stamp, means for masses of people " the difference between grinding penury and a reasonable standard of comfort."[2]

In order to show more vividly the enormous waste of money and materials entailed by war, we may be permitted to quote from Aldous Huxley's *An Encyclopaedia of Pacifism*, p. 32, where he says : " The cost of the Great War has been reckoned at about four hundred thousand million dollars, or eighty thousand million pounds. According to figures quoted by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, this sum would have sufficed to provide every family in America, Canada, Australia, Great Britain and Ireland, France, Belgium, Germany and Russia, with a five hundred pound house, two hundred pounds worth of furniture, and a hundred pounds worth of land. Every town of twenty thousand inhabitants and over in all the above-mentioned countries could have been presented with a library to the value of a million pounds and a university to the value of two millions. After which it would have been possible to buy the whole of France and Belgium, that is, all the land,

1. See R. B. Gregg : *The Power of Non-Violence*, p. 217.
2. Quoted by R. B. Gregg : Ibid.

houses, factories, railways, churches, roads, harbours, etc., in these countries."

Colossal sums of money are wasted not only before the war begins and during its progress; but, even after it is over, there is no way of the victorious country recouping itself at the expense of the vanquished. The theme of Sir Norman Angell's *The Great Illusion*, which has been proved to the hilt, is that war does not pay either the winners or losers. If a heavy indemnity is imposed on the vanquished, as was done by the reparations scheme after the last war, the collection of it is almost an insuperable task. France and Great Britain could not collect even a fraction of the reparations, in spite of their superior military strength and the military occupation of the Ruhr by France. If attempt is made to extract reparations from the defeated country, in the form of either finished goods or raw materials such as coal, it leads to gigantic unemployment in the land of the victor. Even compensation in the form of appropriation of the colonies belonging to the vanquished nations does not offer much relief to the victors. Under modern conditions it is not possible to carry out a wholesale expropriation of the existing owners of property in a colonial country merely because it has changed hands as a result of successful warfare. A certain amount of monopoly may be created with regard to the export of raw materials from that country and imports to it. High tariff walls may be erected in shutting out goods coming from the former enemy countries or from other economic competitors. But all this is as nothing when compared with the millions spent in the acquisition of these benefits.

War, then, is a colossal waste and a literal hell. It kills and maims millions of people and brings untold hardship and indescribable misery to millions more, including innocent women and children. It breaks up thousands upon thousands of families, and a great host of children are obliged to grow up without the protecting care and loving discipline of parents. It brutalises human nature and takes people back to

barbarism. Senor De Madariaga is right when he says: "A man who has had the living experience of digging his bayonet into another man's body, however noble the cause in his eyes, will never be spiritually the same."

Is War Natural And Necessary?

If all this be true, why should people be foolish enough to wage war against each other? An answer given by some is that the fighting instinct is as natural as the instinct of hunger or sex, and, therefore, cannot be eradicated. War is said to be in accordance with the law of nature which is a law of conflict and rivalry. The poet describes nature as 'red in tooth and claw.' If men do not fight with guns and bombs, they fight with fists, stones, and *lathis*. The instinct to fight, it is said, is so strong that even if there be no sufficient cause for its expression, people invent any kind of excuse for indulging in it. Thus the people living to the north of a river in a city fight with those to the south of it and keep up the tradition of strife for generations. War, it is claimed, satisfies the adventurous and romantic spirit of man in a way that nothing else can. It is thrilling.

Arguments such as these are repeated so often that many have come to believe that war is as natural as the mountains and rivers around them. But is war really in accordance with the laws of nature? Among the lower order of creation there is no war. It is true that some animals are carnivorous, but "their activities are no more warlike than are the activities of fishermen or butchers."*

As Mr. Huxley reminds us, the lower animals of a given species often fight among themselves, under the stress of hunger or sexual impulse, but the fight is seldom carried to the point of extinction or permanent hurt. Insects fight organised warfare, but not within the species itself. Thus a swarm of ants may fight a swarm of termites, but not another swarm of

* Aldous Huxley: *An Encyclopaedia of Pacifism*, p. 7.

ants. " Man is the only creature to organise mass murder of his own species."

Supporters of war have at times said that man is bound to fight, because he is a descendant of pugnacious ancestors akin to the gorillas. But the probability is that he has descended from a " gentle, sensitive creature something like a tarsier. In any case the gifts which brought man his extraordinary biological success were not ruthlessness and brute strength . . . . , but co-operation, intelligence, wondering curiosity and sensitiveness."[2]

If there have been cannibals in some parts of the world, elsewhere we have had people who have refrained for ages from eating any form of animal food. The Chinese have lived at peace with each other for generations, and they are as much a part of humanity as the head hunters of Borneo and the cannibals of Africa. War-mongers may be surprised to know that the institution of war is not as old as man himself. Assuming that man as man has inhabited this planet for millions of years, the fact that warfare has been practised for only six or seven thousand years is a factor of some significance. This may no doubt be explained by the fact that the points of conflict, on which war has since been fought, did not arise then on account of the smaller population and the resulting absence of conflicts of interest on a large scale; nevertheless that man was able to get on for thousands of years without having recourse to warfare is not without interest. Much of his time was taken up with the subduing of nature and, as for implements with which to fight, he had only his fists and teeth. He, no doubt, fought with his fellows for the possession of a mate or for other such desirable goods, but that, as said earlier, did not lead to a wholesale extermination of his fellowmen.

Besides, arguing on biological grounds, it must be remembered that when we pass from the lower animals to man in the

1. Ibid., p. 7.
2. Ibid., p. 8.

scale of evolution we enter upon a startlingly new stage of development. We have to reckon with such new factors as human intelligence, human conscience, and human sympathy extended even to far away and unconnected people. As Henry Drummond puts it, in man there is not only a struggle for one's own existence, but also a struggle for the existence of others. Man, it has been rightly said, is "a strange mixture of fire and clay." The 'clay' in him may support continuous warfare and strife but the 'fire' in him urges him to rise above it. The mistake made by militarists and war-mongers is in concentrating attention upon one part of man's nature, and that, too, the lower, and ignoring the claims of the higher elements. If we believe in the true meaning of the law of evolution as it applies to man, our aim should be not to allow the law of the struggle for existence and survival of the fittest to operate blindly, but to adapt as many people as possible to survive.

Human nature is not something fixed and unalterable for all time. Professor W. E. Hocking and others rightly contend that we can remake human nature. The true meaning of religion, morality, education, and democracy is that we can change human nature to a large extent in accordance with a given pattern or standard. We, therefore, do not need to take seriously the argument that the pugnacious instinct, expressing itself in the form of war, is natural and unalterable for all time to come. It can be stemmed and made to run along higher channels—say, the fighting of diseases, the conquest of poverty, and the active realisation of the principle of equality.

Nothing can be a greater enemy to progress than the disposition to allow time-old habits and ancient institutions to continue even after they have ceased to be of any value. There was a time when the vindication of one's honour by fighting a duel was considered to be an immutable part of human nature. But today the duel has become an anachronism. Likewise, the personal avenging of the assault or

murder of a near relative or a close friend has been replaced successfully by the due process of law.

What has happened in man's personal relations may well happen in the relations between nations, too. We, therefore, cannot accept Santayana's statement: "To fight is a radical instinct." William James is guilty of exaggeration when he states: "The plain truth is, people want war. They want it anyhow. It is the final bouquet of life's fire-works." He is nearer the truth when he claims that what the world needs is a "moral equivalent for war."

Reverting to the biological argument under consideration, we find a good many say that, however colossal the waste of war may be, war is neccessary in the interest of progress. These supporters of war naively assume that war results in the survival of the fittest. However valid such a contention may be with regard to ancient warfare, it is certainly not true as regards modern mechanised warfare which is not a test of superior physical strength, courage or manliness. It is not even a test of superior intellectual or spiritual qualities. A well-known writer of our day assures us that the West has dominated the East not by superior brain power but simply by superior development in the art of war and superior science in manufacturing the weapons of war. As A. Huxley reminds us: "there is no reason to suppose that warlike peoples are superior to unwarlike peoples. Even if the violent were to survive (and war is just as likely to kill them off as to ensure the persistence of their stock), this would not necessarily mean the survival of the most satisfactory type of human being. The most violent are not the best human beings; nor conversely are the most valuable necessarily the strongest."*

It is, therefore, a travesty of truth to say, as Sir Arthur Keith does, that war is "a pruning-hook of nature." Within the nation itself war does not result in the survival of the fittest stocks. What it does is to skim the country of the cream of its population. The young, the strong, and the

* A. Huxley: *An Encyclopædia of Pacifism*, p. 8.

healthy are the first to fall on the battlefield. It has rightly been said that Napoleon's crime against humanity was that he "peopled Hades with the elite of Europe." The physical stature of the Frenchman, it has been averred, has greatly declined as a result of the many wars in which the Frenchmen have had to fight. "War-children" tend to be inferior to children born in peaceful times. We agree with Dr. Inge when he says: "The notion that war is good for the virility of a nation is absolutely untrue, at least under modern conditions." An epigram which he quotes with approval from the Greek anthology says bluntly that the war-god spares not the good but the bad. War is dysgenic. Writing in 1905, Santayana said: "It is war that wastes a nation's wealth, kills its flower, narrows its sympathies, condemns it to be governed by adventurers and leaves the puny, deformed and unmanly to breed the next generation. . . To call war the soil of courage and virtue is like calling debauchery the soil of love."

In spite of these forcible words, several thinkers even today justify war on the supposed ground that it serves to bring out the highest moral qualities of man, qualities such as bravery, heroism, devotion, self-sacrifice, and idealism. This argument does not make any appeal to us. In the first place, it is a reversion to the casuistic argument that the end justifies the means, however ignoble the means may be. Secondly, the assumption that some of the finest moral qualities can exhibit themselves only under the stress of war is like that of Charles Lamb's legendary Chinaman that one's hut had to be absolutely burnt in order that one might have a taste of roast pig. Thirdly, even if war brings into bold relief qualities of bravery and heroism, it also brings in its train a great many moral aberrations which outbalance the good it does. War brutalises human nature and works against the innate sympathy of man. "War knows no law, and is a stranger to humanitarian feelings." "Rome made a wilderness and called it peace." No one will dare to dispute the testimony of the American General Sherman when he says: "I confess without shame that I am tired and sick of war (the American Civil

War). Its glory is all moonshine. It is only those who have neither heard a shot nor heard the shrieks and groans of the wounded, who cry aloud for more blood, more vengeance, more desolation. War is hell."

War is not only brutal, but is also inimical to the cause of truth and veracity. Modern warfare is waged not only against people's bodies but also against their minds. It is a 'total' warfare. Continuous propaganda is necessary if war is to be won—propaganda which aims at demoralizing the opponent and sustaining the morale of one's own people. Rightly has it been said that the first casualty in war is truth. "Of all arts," writes a contemporary, "that of war propaganda is the most diabolical." The truth of this statement has been strikingly illustrated in our own time by Dr. Goebbels who, for the first time in history, "has made unrighteousness readable."

All this leads us to say that even if war may elicit such noble qualities as heroism and rare self-sacrifice, it gives rein to several undesirable qualities as well. War, then, we may conclude, is not a necessary condition to spur one to noble activity. Nor is the opposite true that peace breeds softness and fear of death. The Scandinavian peoples have not fought national or international wars for many years; yet their moral fibre is as good as that of any other people in the world, if not better. To argue that without war people will give themselves to the pursuit of comfort, luxury, and pleasure—both physical and mental—is a libel upon man. Von Moltke blasphemed when he said: "Eternal peace is a dream and not even a beautiful dream; and war is a part of God's world order". The dictum that the strongest, the most virile, and the most intelligent races have always been warlike is not supported by sufficient historical evidence. In China when personal altercation takes place, the man who hits the first blow is considered the inferior type of man on the ground that a person has recourse to it only when he has no further arguments to support his claim.

Writing at the beginning of the last war, Henri Bergson claimed that war gave indignation rein in the presence of crime. This seems sound on the surface, but is really not so. On the basis of a similar argument, people have contended against the abolition of capital punishment, for nothing can give as much satisfaction to the relatives of a murdered person as the hanging of the murderer! Surely, with increasing moral development, it must be possible to rise above such personal feelings. Both war and capital punishment can and should be abolished, even if it be conceded that the taking of human life, under the worst of provocations, may be necessary at the present imperfect state of man's moral development.

To conclude this part of our argument, war is not natural biologically nor is it necessary from the ethical standpoint. Neither could we countenance the argument that war is necessary to keep down the population of the world or for the transfer of world authority and leadership from nations which have become soft and indolent to those who are virile and energetic. The world is large enough for the whole of mankind to live in peace and comfort if the intelligence and energy which are now directed to the cause of war can be devoted to the cause of peace. It is a blasphemy to say that war is a great antiseptic of national life.

Why Do Nations Fight To-day?

Even if everybody grants that war is neither natural nor necessary, we have to reckon with the fact that nations fight with each other from time to time as well as with the further fact that a good many people who are sincere lovers of peace and workers for it till the eve of the war become active supporters of it as soon as war is declared. How do we account for this?

Leaving aside the high-minded individuals who may fight because of the honest conviction that, in certain circumstances, not to fight is worse than to fight, the bulk of ordinary individuals who comprise a nation and their leaders, who do not

have any higher moral standards than they, fight for the same reasons for which individual men and women contend against each other. The root causes are moral wickedness and intellectual error. Individuals as well as classes and states fight because of greed, fear, anger and hatred, and jealousy. Thomas Hobbes argues that the three main causes of war are the desire for gain, the fear of injury, and the love of glory, the first of them making men invade for gain, the second for safety, and the third for reputation. Let us consider these causes *seriatim.*

It is a well-known fact that the different nations of the world are at different levels of economic development and do not all have an equal access to the wealth of the world. The economically and socially backward nations of the world have come within the orbit of powerful empire states. Youthful and vigorous states coming into their own, finding that the world is closed against them, make active preparation for the unsettlement of the present order and provoke war when the right time comes, hoping thereby to profit themselves. This partly explains the determination with which Germany, Italy, and Japan have been actively preparing for war for a decade and are now conducting it with the utmost ruthlessness possible. Before the war commenced they clamoured for a " place in the sun," and threatened to fight if their demands were not conceded.

This claim of the " disgruntled " powers cannot be accepted at its face value. There are many other nations in the world which do not enjoy even half the advantages enjoyed by the so-called " disgruntled " powers. Yet because they do not keep shouting and clamouring for what they want, no attention is paid to them. In the international world, as we know it today, capacity to make a nuisance of oneself seems to be the way of getting one's rights and even unreasonable demands recognised. For years now Japan has had a prosperous trade with a great many countries of the world, especially in the East, but, her greed knowing no bounds, she has now ventured upon the conquest of the whole

of the Far East, and, if possible, of the Middle East as well. Some of the demands of Germany, at least in Europe, were met and some of Hitler's forcible annexations were acquiesced in. But these did not satisfy Hitler's ambitions. The more he was given the more he wanted, and everytime something different.

The war-mongers of our day are clever enough to clothe their greed and plunder in terms which may appear plausible. Germany certainly has not been slow to take full advantage of the public opinion of the world that some of the terms of the Versailles Treaty were iniquitous and that the treaty had not provided means for the peaceful alteration of the terms, which leads us to say that one of the fruitful causes of war is, and indeed has always been, a rankling sense of injustice, whether real or assumed, in the hearts of men. If Germany's cause had been wholly unjust, attempts could have been made at a very early stage to curb her aggressions. But she was clever enough to divide the opinion of the world by playing upon the pity that many people had for her on account of the war guilt clause in the Versailles Treaty, the forcible occupation of the Ruhr valley by Senegalese troops, which was very distasteful to Germany, the thumb screw pressure of reparations, the depreciation of the mark, the colossal unemployment, and the deprivation of German colonies. Within the country itself a general sense of frustration provided a fertile field for the spread of Nazism. Such a sense of frustration in India today on the part of some of the minorities threatens to result in a chronic civil war.

Greed, then, is one of the chief causes of war, but it is often clothed in idealistic terms such as a protest against social injustice and hunger. For years now the world has been acquainted with the cry of some nations that their territories were not adequate to meet the needs of the teeming millions and that, therefore, they should overflow into neighbouring lands. In our personal relations we would regard an argument of this kind as the height of impertinence. But in the relations between nations and states such an argument is

allowed to pass muster. Whatever its validity may be, the only right of a country with a vast population is for friendly discussion and mutual adjustment with its neighbours on terms which will be advantageous to both sides. There is no right for invasion or annexation. To insist on such a 'right' is a mark of barbarism.

The usual reply given by the 'satiated powers' to the claims of 'disgruntled powers' for colonies is that in most cases they, too, can buy and sell in the colonial market on more or less equal terms with the empire-owning states. But this does not satisfy the disgruntled powers, for at any time tariff walls may be raised against them and, at a time of war, they are completely at the mercy of empire owners. Besides, it hurts their pride to be placed in this dependent position for all time to come.

The second main cause of war, as pointed out by Hobbes, is fear and insecurity. For years after the conclusion of the last war, France could only think and dream in terms of security against Germany. She wanted the League of Nations and Great Britain to guarantee her a perpetual security of this kind. But when she failed to get such an assurance, she entered into bilateral agreements with Poland, Russia, etc., but this caution and foresight of hers did not help her at the most critical time in her history.

Fear has played a most dominant part in recent years in international affairs. No country absolutely trusts another in a world where alliances and the circumstances leading to them change with kaleidoscopic rapidity. At the very time that Russia and Germany entered into an agreement of Non-aggression against each other (1939), both of them were secretly contemplating the possibility of a war with each other, and that fear has come true in 1941.

President Roosevelt has called the attention of the world to the necessity of freeing people from fear which is obsessing them. Mr. Attlee, the Deputy Prime Minister of England, has

spoken of the fear of bombing and sudden destruction gnawing into the hearts of people. Even children today know the awful consequences of aerial bombing. The fear will become still worse when poison gas and disease-carrying bacilli are used, as they are sure to be, when one side or the other becomes desperate and is driven to push matters to a crisis.

It is this factor of fear and insecurity which has been responsible for the piling up of armaments. As pointed out earlier, barring the Washington Conference, the Disarmament Conferences have been dismal failures, each of them being followed by a race for armaments. If, in our individual lives, fear prevents us from being at our best, the situation is even worse in the relations between nations. So long as fear is the governing factor, the nations of the world find themselves seated uncomfortably on magazine dumps which threaten to go off at any moment. Just as a man who is frightened imagines that every passer-by is a potential enemy and at times attacks even an innocent person, so a nation which is frightened imagines to itself that it is being 'encircled' on all sides and provokes a war without any adequate justification. Wickam Steed is right when he says: "Undeniably fear stands foremost among the conceivable causes of future war." Living in a world of fear, the slogan of each nation is "If you want peace, be prepared for war." British statesmen, including high-minded men like Lord Baldwin in recent years, have subscribed to this creed. Hitler too has been protesting that a strong Germany in the military sense was a guarantee of peace in Europe.* What the events of the last two years have shown beyond doubt is that when nations prepare themselves for war in order to maintain peace, war breaks out sooner or later. Preparation for war is a sure invitation to the opening of actual hostilities.

* The editor of a German newspaper wrote to the *Spectator* on November 11, 1936: "Germany is making her preparations not in order to *attack* any one but to insure that no one shall be able to attack or bully our country again." (Quoted by A. Huxley).

The third main cause of war, says Hobbes, is the love of glory. A great many of the war-lords of the world have been egotists to whom individuals and nations are merely pawns in the game. It gives them supreme satisfaction to know that they are the masters of the world. Such a motive has played an important part in recent years in the lives of men like Mussolini and Hitler. At times war-mongers seek to hide their personal ambitions and vanity behind the glorification of their country. This motive operates powerfully in modern times when by continuous propaganda we have been trained to deify the nation. A man who does not own even six feet of the earth's surface where he could be buried when he dies, swells with pride at the thought that he is a member of a vast empire-owning country. He has the satisfaction of belonging to a stronger group or nation. The Italian conquest of Abyssinia and the annexation of portions of China by Japan are to be explained largely in terms of a national thirst for prestige and glory. Gangster nations today assume that the only way in which they can establish a name for vigour and manliness is by attacking peaceful neighbours and annexing their territories.

Along with the love of glory goes the love of power. Our modern values are so debased that power is often equated with strength and virility, and peace with weakness and impotence. Power is usually sought not for its own sake, but for the opportunities which it presents for the economic exploitation and political domination of others.* The trouble with the exercise of the motives of both power and prestige is that it arouses the silent indignation of its victims who bide their time till they are able to overthrow their oppressors. Empires are impermanent. War leads to war. Violence begets violence. Power and prestige, like money and material goods, do not remain in the same hands indefinitely. War

* One special form of the exercise of power in our time is the persecution mania which has exhibited itself in all its vulgarity in the Nazi treatment of the Jews. War seems to satisfy the vulgar desire "to taste even at second hand the joys of criminality." (A Huxley).

never settles anything, despite the assertion of Justice Frankfurter that a statement of this kind betrays "a paralysing evasion of thought". In support of his assertion, Frankfurter says that "the civil war settled slavery". But the fact is that slavery has not been settled. It is continued in more insidious forms. The Negro is theoretically a free man, but virtually a serf.

Besides these three main causes—greed, fear, prestige and power—which often work in different combinations with one another, there are other causes which may be briefly mentioned, some of which are subdivisions of the three main causes. While vested interests by themselves may not be strong enough to bring about a war, the indirect part which they play in precipitating a war and prolonging it is not well known to everybody. Every war produces its crop of profiteers whose sole aim is personal profit even if it may mean the defeat of their own country. When the war is on, one hears such soul-stirring slogans as "a world fit for heroes to live in", but when it is over some of these heroes are allowed to shift for themselves as pavement artists. The common people who do not stand to gain economically from war are swept "off their feet by bellicose propaganda"* and controlled press. The Opium Wars of Britain with China are a striking illustration of the part played by vested interests in the prosecution of a war. Some years ago when China gave a contract to a Belgian company to build a railway line, the pressure put on China by the British Government at the point of the sword was so great that China was obliged to give six such contracts to British firms.

In more recent times, private manufacturers of armaments have done everything possible to sabotage the peace efforts of their nations and have even engaged professional agitators and experts to undermine the work of Disarmament Conferences. Mr. Aldous Huxley cites the case of Mr. Shearer who was

* A. Huxley: Encyclopædia of Pacifism, p. 4.

employed by some of the largest American ship-building companies on a fabulous salary to fool the American people into believing that the interests of these companies were identical with their interests. The same writer tells us that between 1915 and 1918 the American Munition Firm of Dupont de Nemour paid dividends amounting to 458 per cent. of the part value of the original stock. The theme of Norman Angell is that war does not benefit the ordinary people, the chief beneficiaries being the investors of capital, business men, and ruling groups. According to Aldous Huxley : "During the World War, the Briey basin was not bombarded because the French and the German armament makers had a gentleman's agreement."

Radical difference in ideology is adduced in our day as a fruitful cause of war. But this is mostly a camouflage. The claim of Mussolini and Hitler to position and authority in their respective countries has been that they saved their countries from Russian Communism. The part which they played in the recent Spanish Civil War (1936—39) was given a similar interpretation. Yet as soon as the present war commenced in September, 1939, Hitler had no scruples whatever to conclude an agreement with Russia for the partition of Poland. And two years later when he found that the opportune moment had come for fighting Russia, he once again proclaimed himself as the saviour of the world from the clutches of Russian communism, but no one outside his own country took him seriously this time. The only threat we have had of an ideological war in recent times was the threat of Russia in the early post-war years to bring about a world-wide revolution in order to realise a world-wide communism, without which, it was said, no communism over a part of the world could succeed. But that ideology was consigned to the limbo of oblivion with the coming into power of Stalin. And so what Hitler has been doing in proclaiming himself as the saviour of the world against a world-wide communism is to flog a dead horse. All this does not rule out the possibility

of ideological wars in the future. It is more than possible that as the working classes become more and more conscious of their power and the age-long injustice done to them, class wars will take the place of national wars. But, in such cases, economic motives will be inextricably interwoven with ideological differences.

Attempts to impose a foreign culture may lead to war, but it is often an *occasion* of war rather than a *cause* of it. In our own country the cultural differences between the Hindus and Muslims are exaggerated beyond all recognition in order to justify the proposed partition of India, if not civil war itself. Sir Alfred Zimmern holds that in the modern world there is no justification for cultural wars even when it takes the form of one country wanting to abolish by force slavery in another. Barbarous practices such as slavery should be abolished by the Government of the country concerned at the instance of the international community. One of the purposes for which the Germans fought the last war was to impose their superior 'kultur' upon the rest of the world, but fortunately they did not succeed. In his *Mein Kampf*, Hitler has explained at length what is meant by this 'Kultur' when he says: "Any one who sincerely wishes that the pacifist idea should prevail in this world ought to do all that he is capable of doing to help the Germans to conquer the world. The pacifist-humanitarian idea may indeed become an excellent one when the most superior type of manhood will have succeeded in subjugating the world to such an extent that this type is then the sole master of the earth . . . . So, first of all the fight and then the pacifism."*

We agree with Zimmern when he says that if cultural wars are to be prevented in the future, the nations of the world should develop the profound conviction that "just as all men are equal in the sight of God, so all cultures are equal

* *Mein Kampf*, p. 423 (quoted by B. Mathews: op. cit.)

in the international community; all are entitled to equal consideration; the members of all are entitled to equal respect."*

Closely connected with differences in culture are differences of race which in the future may lead to gigantic wars. One wonders whether Abyssinia would have been abandoned the way she was if she had been a European country. Likewise, Western intervention on behalf of China might have taken place earlier if the people of the country had belonged to the white fraternity. In the present war white, black, brown, and yellow are ranged on both sides of the controversy. But, as pointed out in an earlier chapter, there is a growing feeling that the European people must unite in order that they may not be wiped out by non-Europeans. Of late Japan has been loudly proclaiming that she wants to bring the whole of the East into a "co-prosperity sphere," but nobody who knows her real motives is likely to be taken in by such proclamations. As yet, what passes for the race problem is primarily a political and economic problem rather than a purely biological one.

Religious differences have at times made for war, but they play a very small role in the modern civilised world. The history of the Church in the Middle Ages was marred by the Crusades, and the Protestant Reformation brought in its train religious wars in Europe. But today the western world as a whole has come to regard religion as a personal affair and does not go to war for the purpose of exterminating the followers of another religion or for converting them to its own faith. The Jews are still persecuted in several European countries, but the cause is not primarily religious. Capitalistic states in the recent past tried their utmost to work up a righteous indignation against "atheistic" Russia, but could not succeed to any large extent. At present they are satisfied that religion is not in such a bad way after all in Russia.

* Causes of War (a composite work), p. 38.

Humanitarian considerations on the whole have not played an important part in bringing about wars. Even when such considerations were present, they were intermingled with economic and political considerations. Thus we find that the American Civil War of 1861-65 was fought not so much for the emancipation of slaves in the southern states as to prevent these states from seceding from the federal union, which would have been a major political calamity. As war becomes more and more ruthless in its nature and thorough-going in its sweep, as is the case at present, it is extremely unlikely that stronger nations would go to the aid of weaker ones out of humanitarian considerations. They cannot afford to risk a war which may result in their own defeat and destruction.

Is War Justifiable?

War can never be an absolute right. At best it is a relative right. In certain circumstances it may be the lesser of two or more evils. Those who hold that view argue that mere preservation of life is not a worthwhile ideal. More important than the quantity of life is the quality. Therefore, physical injury, or even loss of life is nothing when compared with mental and moral outrages.

This position is by no means universally accepted. Pacifists, Quakers, and conscientious objectors refuse to believe that there can ever be such a thing as a "just war." War means to them the wanton shedding of blood—very often of innocent blood. They argue that it is illogical to regard the use of armed forces on the battlefield as an extension of the use of police force for the preservation of internal order; for while it is comparatively easy to fix the blame in the case of offenders in our domestic relations, it is not so easy to fix the blame in national and international relations. The fixing of war guilt is a game at which two can play. Motives are so much more mixed in the relations between nations than in personal matters.

Christian Pacifists, in particular, hold that they are forbidden to fight even under the worst possible provocation. In support of their position they quote the words of their Master: "Resist not evil"; "Whosoever smiteth thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also"; "They that take the sword shall perish by the sword." Jesus Christ was himself the Prince of Peace.

It is urged on the other side that Christ never taught absolute pacifism. The injunctions which he gave to his disciples not to use force were not meant to be applied to all—more especially not to national relationships. They were special injunctions to Christian missionaries who were to win their way to the hearts of men by the "rhetoric of invincible meekness." Besides, Jesus Christ, like the men of his day, used hyperboles to drive home great moral truths; therefore, to interpret his sayings literally is to do violence to the general spirit and tenour of his teaching. Furthermore, the purpose of Christ's mission was to enunciate *principles* and to give people a certain *spirit* and *attitude* in facing the manifold problems of life. It was never to give detailed instructions with regard to every vexed question in life. Jesus, for instance, never taught that slavery or drink was wrong. It is for his followers to appropriate for themselves the spirit which was in him and make it operative to the changing conditions around them.

Non-Pacifists further argue that, if Christ condemned war without hesitation, he would not have been on friendly terms with some military people as he was. Soldiers and centurions came to him and were possibly among his followers. The Kingdom which he proclaimed was a kingdom not of "peace at any price," but of "righteousness at any cost." Further, the New Testament as a whole does not condemn war wholesale. Both the Old and New Testaments are full of the imagery of war.

Non-Pacifists go on to say that the sum and substance of Christ's teaching is love and that love does not exclude

punishment, especially when it takes the form of discipline. God who is the Father of Love is at the same time the maintainer of justice. Ultra-Pacifism, it is argued, may be a censure on God Himself and a compromise with evil. From all this the inference is drawn that war is sometimes "just" and is to be entered upon with "soberness and a sense of responsibility." In certain circumstances, it may be the best or the only means of attaining the end of peace.

Non-Pacifists respect the inner convictions of Pacifists with regard to wars in general, but they cannot see eye to eye with them when they condemn even purely defensive wars. Pacifists, like other citizens, it is argued, enjoy the right to life and property, for the maintenance of which both police force and national arms are necessary. Therefore, in a time of national crisis, the Pacifists have no right to sabotage the nation either by refusing to take part in war or by carrying on vigorous propaganda against it. We need not take too seriously the flippant argument that as soon as a war is declared the only logical thing for a Pacifist to do is either to migrate to a desert island or to commit suicide. The Pacifists, it is said, are "idealists in a hurry" and "there is no hurry in the universe." They are accused of applying to twentieth century conditions a code of morality which may be practicable in the twenty-first century.

Despite all these criticisms, it must be said that the Pacifist position is consistent, clear-cut, and absolutely sincere, and is the direction along which sensitive souls are moving more and more. The late Dick Sheppard was opposed even to an international defence force, humorously remarking that a bomb hurled with the label "with love from the League of Nations" will be no less devastating than a bomb hurled from less respectable quarters.

The Pacifist takes the stand that what is morally wrong can never be politically right. He wants to apply to the relations between states the same high ethical principles which

we apply to individual relations. He does not take into account considerations of expediency or the commonly held view that the first duty of the state is to protect itself. Further, if pacifists are prepared to throw away their own lives in a non-violent resistance against the aggressor, it is not quite clear whether they have a right to endanger the lives of countless others who are not pacifists and whose immediate reaction to attack is to defend themselves by every possible means.

Leaving aside the absolute pacifists for the time being, we find that, among those who hold high moral principles, there are some who argue that, in the present circumstances, where the moral development of individuals and nations is at varying levels, we may justify (1) defensive warfare, i.e., warfare which takes the form of self-protection against a bully; (2) wars undertaken to abolish such inhuman practices as cannibalism, slavery, and head-hunting; (3) wars which result in the realisation of a greater degree of social justice and brotherhood; (4) wars which are waged without any hatred or bitterness against the enemy; and (5) wars which do not aim at material gain for oneself, if one should come out victorious.

Of these five forms of justification, only the first needs to engage our serious attention. Wars undertaken on purely moral and humanitarian grounds are few and far between in the modern world. No war results in the realisation of a greater degree of social justice and brotherhood, for we cannot drive out Satan by Satan. War leaves behind greater bitterness and a determination for revenge. A war may begin on a highly elevated moral plane without any bitterness towards the people against whom it is waged, but as it proceeds it becomes more and more bitter and "ungentlemanly" when the sole aim becomes victory at any cost. The argument that we can "humanise" war and use it in a civilised manner seems utterly foolish in a world where the combatants are ready to kill and maim people by the aerial bombing of civilians, by the use of poison gas, and by the spread of deadly bacilli.

The prevailing opinion among thoughtful people is that defensive war alone may be justifiable, however difficult it may be to define it. Even to this view objection has been taken by some, including Non-Pacifists. Sorley, for instance, argues that not every defensive war is justifiable; but only such defensive wars as make for a higher civilisation. The Victorians had no doubt whatever of what "civilisation" meant, viz., the indefinite multiplication of the Victorian type! We who live in 1941 are not so clear in our minds of what it is to be civilised. Mere mechanical invention and scientific development do not mean progress, especially when they are devoted to the purposes of war and to other anti-social purposes.

Others who object to the distinction between offensive and defensive wars claim that, in certain circumstances, offence may be the best form of defence. Why should we wait till a ferocious animal pounces upon us and tries to tear us to pieces before we attempt to slay it? A gangster nation may so bully an inoffensive country that the latter may fire the first shot, out of sheer desperation, thus giving the gangster nation the chance of pretending to the outside world that it is fighting a war of defence, pure and simple. According to some moralists, therefore, "what is technically a measure of offence may be in reality an act of anticipated defence."

The exponents of the above argument claim conversely that if a nation is militarily weak and has no chance of success at all, it has no right to fight even a defensive war for the sake of prestige, endangering the lives and property of its people. This means that Abyssinia and Czecho-Slovakia should have yielded themselves philosophically to the aggressor. But what about China which has been able to stand its ground against heavy odds? It is even possible to argue that a good cause seldom succeeds at the very first attempt. Repeated attempts and repeated failures may be necessary before it can succeed.

The trouble with the distinction between offensive and defensive wars is that, in most cases, it is difficult to draw the line. War involves a complexity of factors and a multitude of motives which it is not easy to disentangle. From this fact the Pacifists draw the conclusion that all wars should be avoided. Others take the view that a dispassionate study of the causes and course of a war can give one the assurance that one side is more in the right than the other. But the question is whether it is possible to reach such a dispassionate judgment when the war is actually on. In the present war there seems no doubt that the conflict was thrust upon Great Britain and her allies by Germany. Therefore, it would appear that there was no alternative left except to take up the challenge as " a cruel necessity " or a stern duty.

Many of our modern wars cannot be strictly called wars of defence or of self-protection. A good many of them are motivated by economic considerations such as the establishment of 'the open door' in trade or depriving the 'satiated' powers of the just or unjust economic privileges which they have been enjoying long. Some wars are dictated by considerations of prestige in a world where aggression and the possession of colonies are apt to be regarded as hall-marks of respectability or signs of virility. There are still some wars which take the form of a revision of unjust treaties and the disturbance of the *status quo.*

Other wars which have been justified are wars which seek to overthrow oppressive foreign rule, wars of redemption of persecuted people, and civil wars fought with a view to unifying and consolidating a country which for the time being is torn to pieces by rival factions. Thus the American War of Independence, the Great War which had for one of its objects the deliverance of Belgium from Germany, and the American Civil War, are all " justified." The flaw in this argument is that if these wars had all failed to accomplish the results which they set out to accomplish, posterity might have found it difficult to justify them. In other words, the rightness or

wrongness of a war cannot be determined till the final results are known; and that is possible only many years after the war is over. No moral guidance is given to the participants in the war at the time.

The Claims of Non-Violent Resistance

As believers in a new social order, can we tolerate any kind of war, when it is difficult to define what is "defensive" and what is "offensive", and when war means the indiscriminate destruction of life and property? A good many today believe that we should persuade all the nations of the world to give up their national arms and agree to having an international force to be used at the behest of an international tribunal. Even Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru seems to believe in the feasibility of such a proposal. Mr. Aldous Huxley, on the other hand, describes an International Police Force as an International Massacre Force. He does not believe that the proper recruitment and officering of such a force which will be free from all narrow national loyalities is possible. He and others like him, therefore, hold that if lasting peace is to be secured, whether it be between classes, communities or between the nations of the world, the only right and practicable course is non-violent resistance. It is argued that a police force which each country maintains and with which a national defence force is compared at times, as well as prisons, may evolve a non-violent technique. If this is done successfully, the need for force both within the state and outside will disappear altogether.

The apostle of non-violent resistance in our day is Mahatma Gandhi. More than any living person he has tried it honestly for nearly forty years in every walk of life and claims that it has succeeded wonderfully. As every one knows by now, non-violent resistance is not mere passivity in the face of injustice and aggression. It means continuous and sustained moral resistance, unaccompanied by violence in thought, word or deed. It calls for self-discipline and self-sacrifice of the

highest order. It believes in *satyagraha* or soul force. The person practising it interposes himself between the aggressor and the object of aggression and is prepared to have his own body offered in sacrifice before the aggressor is allowed to realise his aim. By means of such resistance the *satyagrahi* hopes and ardently believes that, when his cause is cent per cent just, he will be able to melt even the stoniest of hearts. He rightly holds that there is an element of nobility or divinity in every man, which is sure to respond to such an action. If it is to succeed, the person practising it should be absolutely unselfish and free from all impure and dishonest motives. His only aim should be the vindication of right and the winning over of the aggressor by the practice of love. He should hate the wrong sought to be perpetrated, but not the wrong-doer.

Non-violent resistance when practised in this manner is highly moral : and from the practical point of view it is much more economical than warfare. It does not call for armaments of any kind, the only armaments being a pure heart and a resolute will. It does not leave any bitterness anywhere. There is no question of 'fight to a finish' ; of the victor exulting in his bravery or good luck ; and of the vanquished secretly swearing vengeance to himself when the opportune time comes. It is possible for both contestants to become the best of friends and march together in the search after truth and the abolition of all injustice and unrighteousness. Even if some lives are lost at the hands of a heartless assailant, the loss is nothing when compared with the millions killed, maimed or poisoned in modern warfare.

Both Mr. Aldous Huxley and Mr. R. B. Gregg give several instances in the relations between groups and nations where non-violent resistance has succeeded. But the world is still to be convinced of its practicability when applied on a national scale against a thoroughly unscrupulous assailant. Of late in India a great many have said that they believe in non-violence only as a matter of policy or expediency. Such people do the greatest possible disservice to the cause of

non-violence. A person who says that he has recourse to non-violence just because he is not in a position to use violence is guilty of moral deception. A person should be non-violent because he considers it to be the only right thing to do.

Non-violence in India has succeeded to a large extent, whether it took the form of non-co-operation, civil disobedience or the active practice of *satyagraha*.* Such success is due to a happy combination of factors which may not always be present. The most important of these factors is, of course, the personality of Mahatma Gandhi. Whether we agree with his politics or not, we must give him full credit for his moral fervour and sincerity of purpose. It is not possible to secure such a leader every time a nation is in need of a person like him. The conduct of even such a man has not been altogether free from criticism. At times he has said that in certain extreme circumstances violence may be regarded as equal to non-violence. In the present war he has insisted on complete freedom of speech in relation to the war without meaning to cause embarrassment of any kind to the powers that be. This seems somewhat of a contradiction. A hundred per cent non-violence should mean a hundred per cent non-embarrassment; and when it becomes that, there is very little to distinguish it from mere passivity.

It has not yet been demonstrated in India that the gospel of non-violence can succeed without the towering personality of a person like Mahatma Gandhi to hold the reins and give detailed direction at every turn. At Chauri Chaura (1922) it led to mob violence. As late as 1940 the practice of 'symbolic' satyagraha meant a good deal of dissimulation. Even those who did not believe whole-heartedly in non-violence offered *satyagraha* because of the moral pressure of Mahatma Gandhi. They swallowed it as a bitter pill. Morality of the highest

* According to Mr. C. Rajagopalachari: "This practice has given us something more than objective success. We have gained a feeling of inexhaustible strength which is more precious than any actual achievement because it sterilises all defects and failures and protects us effectively during every reverse." From the Lucknow University Convocation Address delivered on December 13, 1941.

sort, on the other hand, calls for a disinterested and cheerful performance of it. It is derogatory to the self-respect and moral growth of a person to require some one like Mahatma Gandhi to be by his side all the time to guide him at every step. In making this criticism we realise that we are only mentioning a practical difficulty and are not disproving the validity of non-violence itself.

We are still to be convinced that non-violent resistance in relation to the opponent does not involve coercion of any kind, not even moral coercion. When an aggressor unexpectedly comes up against non-violent resistance, his first reaction is perhaps one of anger. As he realises the potency of this form of resistance, he may feel that he is being coerced morally and so yield, but entertain a sense of frustration. This happened in the case of Dr. Ambedkar over Mahatma Gandhi's "fast unto death" in coercing him to accept the Poona pact. Mahatma Gandhi himself has confessed that his fast at Rajkot in 1939 was "tainted with *himsa.*" The other alternative is that fear may take the place of anger, and this fear may result in the forcible removal or destruction of the person causing him the fear. It is too much to believe that the practice of non-violence will always result in the melting of hearts. It may just as well result in the brutalising of human nature. The person who says to himself that he is not going to be moved by any kind of sentimentality will make the attack even more brutal and violent than he had originally contemplated.

Non-violent resistance can only succeed when one's cause is absolutely just and true. But in this imperfect world where we only know "better" and "worse", we cannot have such an assurance. If the two parties to a non-violent controversy believe that each is right, it is difficult to forecast how one will wear the other out. It may be a case of an irresistible force coming into conflict with an irremovable object, resulting in the moral degradation of both. That such a possibility is not merely theoretical can be seen from recent cases

in India, where *satyagraha* has been resorted to by people who were not morally trained for it and who were using it only as an expediency. Not long ago the Zamindars of the United Provinces threatened to practise *satyagraha* if a certain tenancy bill abolishing some of their vested interests were to be placed on the statute book.

In dealing with a people like the British who have certain "streaks of humanity and liberalism", non-violent resistance has worked. But it may not work in the case of those whose natures have been hardened to all the fine susceptibilities of man. Further, non-violent resistance may be perfectly justified on a small scale in the relations between persons, but the same technique may not apply to relations between nations.

Notwithstanding all this criticism, we cannot disown the moral grandeur of the philosophy of non-violent resistance. It seems inherently right, although in the world of practical affairs it may mean repeated failures before it can finally succeed. The question which the practical statesman asks himself in the face of an unprovoked attack is, will non-violent resistance or active participation in a defensive war cause less havoc to the people over whom he exercises authority? The moralist will say that if a thing is just and right, it should be done even if the heavens should fall, while the practical statesman will balance the probable consequences against each other. One does not see how these different considerations can be made to harmonise with each other.

The common sense view seems to be that in a world where moral values are dimly perceived, where some nations seem to have crushed all their moral susceptibilities, and where the nation as a whole, even in a country like India, is not fully educated to realise the meaning and potency of non-violence, we have no right to throw away the lives of countless people in vindicating a lofty moral principle. That will be futile martyrdom. While adhering to *ahimsa* and non-violent resistance as the ultimate ideals to be realised within a

measurable distance of time, we may have to make some concession in the case of wars of self-protection. Even while we do it, we should continuously carry on a vigorous agitation in favour of non-violent resistance, even as the Swiss Government which has a monopoly of the liquor industry sets aside ten per cent of the income derived from this source for combating liquor, with a view to ultimate prohibition. In making such a compromise "we keep our face turned steadily in the direction of *Ahimsa* but only do not commit the mistake of killing the principle itself by opposing it to commonsense and reality."* Writing on *Ahimsa*, Sir P. S. Sivasamy Iyer says: "The maxim of *Ahimsa* cannot be recognised or applied as an invariable rule of conduct. There are circumstances in which the employment of force is justifiable or becomes a matter of duty. In such cases it would be improper to characterise the use of force as violence."

Conditions of Peace

World Courts, Leagues of Nations, peace pacts, and peace conferences alone cannot bring about peace. Not even disarmament which is simply a misnomer for the limitation of armaments. Even when such a limitation takes place, Powers insist either on parity or on the maintenance of the existing ratio in relation to each other, the sole aim of each being "greater security." If they do not get their demands met at the conference, they proceed to secret armaments. Even if there be a reduction of armaments, as soon as war is threatened, Powers proceed to rearm themselves as furiously as possible. As Brailsford points out, disarmament may mean a gain for economy but there is no political change.

Peace is positive and creative. It calls for a steady continuous, and devoted adherence to it. The pity is that

* Mr. C. Rajagopalachari: Op. cit.

everybody desires peace (the Fascists being an exception)[1]. But very few are prepared to pay the price for it. The world would have seen peace long ago if nations had spent on the cause of peace even one-tenth of the money, energy, ingenuity and talent which they have been spending on the art of destruction. G. D. H. Cole writes, "To get rid of war, the first requisite is a compelling will for peace."[2] B. Russell says: "Passive resistance, if it were adopted deliberately by the will of the whole nation, with the same measure of courage and discipline which is now displayed, might achieve a far more perfect protection for what is good in national life than armies and navies can ever achieve without demanding the carnage and waste and welter of brutality involved in modern war."

If peace is to become a reality, we need a thorough-going change in the mental and moral outlook of people. The starting point of such re-education is the inculcation of the belief that human life is sacred. However much people and nations may differ in their natural endowment, human life everywhere should be regarded as inviolable. We should not allow ourselves to be side-tracked by those who put forward the specious argument that the quality of life is more important than quantity. People everywhere should be brought to realise the unity of all life, love being the governing principle in all human relations. This means a whole-hearted and steady devotion to the ideal of *Ahimsa*. If suffering is to be inflicted at all, it should be vicarious.

We need further to cultivate the belief that the world is big enough for the whole of mankind to live in peace and in a fair degree of comfort. God has not been niggardly in

1. "Fascism," wrote Mussolini in 1932 "repudiates the doctrine of Pacifism—born of a renunciation of the struggle and an act of cowardice in the face of sacrifice. War alone brings up to its highest tension all human energy and puts the stamp of nobility upon the peoples who have the courage to meet it." According to Hitler, "an alliance whose aim does not include the intention of war is worthless."

2. *The Intelligent Man's Way to Prevent War*, p. 256.

providing the necessary resources for the maintenance of human life. What comes in the way is the greed and avarice of man, coupled with waste and thoughtlessness. Concerted efforts should be made to secure a reasonable standard of living for all human beings whether they be Europeans, Americans, Indians, Chinese or Africans. This will mean the levelling up of incomes in many cases and the levelling down in some. Artificial distinctions of class should be abolished. Private property and private capital should be so limited as to make the national or world community, as the case may be, the supreme owners. If, as H. N. Brailsford has argued, capitalism means war and capitalism brings in its trail imperialism, which is another fruitful cause of war, it is time that we curbed both of these. According to Brailsford, an equal society alone can make for peace. "Peace must be built on equality."* John Haddon holds that even in the present war a certain amount of economic rivalry is involved; there is a conflict of economic imperialisms. We agree with Haddon when he says that imperialism should be turned into "partnership", if wars are to cease. There should be a scientific planning of the economic resources of the earth in such a manner that everybody will be gainer and nobody a loser. There will be no class of exploiters and a class of the exploited; no "satiated" and no "disgruntled" powers. If war is to be eliminated, we must remove the causes provocative of war, the chief among which are the economic exploitation and political domination of weaker people. As a contemporary puts it: "The roots of peace are justice and mercy, liberty and magnanimity, truth and equal dealing."

In order to achieve this end, people should be re-educated in the ideal of a world community which is sadly lacking today. The mere *patriotic* spirit should be replaced by a *public* spirit which is infinitely more difficult to practise. Zimmern is right when he says: "It is psychologically and biologically easy to be patriotic, if the unit is small enough.

* *Why Capitalism Means War*, p. 95.

Patriotism is congenial. It is difficult to be public-spirited. World-mindedness is an uncongenial attitude."

Nations should be trained to submit their disputes to an international tribunal. Their desire for peace should be so whole-hearted that they would be "willing to accept all the consequences of doing without the war system."[1] As Cole points out, renunciation of war alone is not enough ; "nations must also renounce the right to be judge in their own cause. They must accept pacific settlement in the last resort by a third party's judgment."[2]

Writing in a similar vein, H. N. Brailsford lays down three conditions of peace. In the first place, the Powers must renounce not only the use but the ownership of force and hand over to an international authority the duty of keeping the peace and the means with which to keep it. Secondly, they must submit every grievance to impartial settlement without prescription of time and reference to dictated treaties. Thirdly, they must throw into a common pool, for the common good, every economic advantage they derive from sovereignty and possession of force.

1. Cole, op. cit. p, 257.
2. Ibid, p. 314.

CHAPTER XIII

THE HOME AND FAMILY

A well-ordered home is the bulwark of a sound and enduring society, and yet in our modern society insidious attempts are being made in different quarters to belittle the home, if not to break it up altogether. For ourselves, we are convinced that any new social order which assigns an increasingly insignificant place to the home is bound to be short-lived. We may be prepared to abandon even such an ancient and important institution as private property, but we cannot afford to let the home and family go, if society is to develop along right lines. Many an ancient civilisation perished because it failed to give the eminence due to the home. Among ancient Greeks, it is said that the husband met his wife only at table, and, that too, when no company was present, and in bed. Such a casual and mundane relation between husband and wife was not calculated to the building up of a strong family life, and it is no wonder that it eventually contributed to the disruption of Greek society. A similar fate overtook the Roman Civilisation when the upper class men among the Romans took to mistresses and to a life of debauchery.

In the early days of human development, indiscriminate sex relations must have prevailed when the morality of the farmyard fowl was probably the rule of the day. But as time advanced and man began to be dimly conscious of social and moral values, the family must have gradually come into being. Some of the earliest forms of married life were polygamy, polyandry, group marriages, and transient marriage relationships, vestiges of which have come down to modern times. Whether polygamy preceded polyandry or *vice versa* or whether there was a universal system of wife capture are questions which are not of much concern to us from the point of view of the future of the family. In the early hunting stage,

and even later when warfare between classes and tribes was the prevailing order of the day, it is more than likely that relationship was traced through the mother, rather than the father. In these days of strife and warfare, maternity was a certainty while paternity was only a matter of conjecture. Even to-day polyandry is not totally absent. Among certain castes in India a married woman is considered to be common to all the brothers of the husband. Till recently at any rate, among the Nambudris only the eldest son in a family was allowed by custom to marry within his own caste and beget children for the family, while the other sons were allowed to marry Nair women, following the customs of the latter regarding marriage and divorce. *

It is more than likely that polygamy and polyandry had a survival value in the past. But to-day they are an anachronism, which needs to be set aside immediately. Both polygamy and polyandry imply a supreme disregard of human personality. Any rule other than 'one man, one wife,' or 'one woman, one husband' is contrary to the law of personality. Marriage primarily is not a matter of sex; nor is its sole purpose the procreation of children. It is the coming together of a man and woman for friendship and companionship as well as for the founding of a miniature Kingdom of God. If such be the meaning of marriage, polygamy and polyandry stand self-condemned. They imply an affront to the husband or wife who is compelled to play the role of one among several husbands or one among several wives. A husband has no right to demand absolute chastity of his wife, if he is not prepared to concede a similar right to her. Rights, it need hardly be said, are reciprocal. "Privileges alone on one aside" and "duties on the other" mean the breaking up of any form of society. Polygamy necessarily means the lowering of the status of a wife from a friend and companion to the position of a chattel for the satisfaction of the husband's sex impulses.

* Recently Nambudri Marriage Regulations have been passed in the Madras Presidency, as well as in Cochin and Travancore, allowing the younger brothers also to marry within their own caste.

Such being the case, one of the first conditions which we require of a new social order is the establishment of permanent monogamous family relations. When we turn to India we have evidence to show that the family in the Vedic period was founded on a thoroughly satisfactory basis. But, with the coming of the lawgivers, several aberrations set in, one of which was polygyny. What we have among the Hindus even to-day is polygyny rather than polygamy according to which, in certain circumstances, a man is allowed to marry more than one wife, the general practice being the second, third, and subsequent marriages being of an inferior character when compared to the first. According to Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Iyer: "It is only when the first wife is barren, or has no male issue, or is adulterous or diseased, that a second wife is married."

Although polygyny is still allowed, monogamy has steadily gained ground in the Hindu society so much so that among educated middle class Hindus, a polygynous or polygamous marriage is an exception rather than the rule, the principal factors working in favour of the change being the spread of education, economic pressure, and recognition of the just claims of women. A Muslim is allowed to marry four wives and a Buddhist may have more than one wife if the first wife is "barren or quarrelsome or ineffective for one reason or other."* Polygyny among Muslims is permitted under certain conditions.

An urgent reform which is needed to-day is the establishment of monogamy on a stable footing. Religious and customary law should give place to a law based on sound commonsense. To argue that for the sake of procreating a son, a man should be allowed to marry as many times as he chooses when his first wife is still alive is to put ourselves down as a primitive people. Reverence for personality is of much greater importance than the necessity of having a son

* P. Appasamy: *Legal Aspects of Social Reform, p. 54.*

to perform certain ceremonies for the supposed good of the soul of a deceased parent.

The arguments against polygamy and, in turn, against polygyny, as summed up by T.H. Green, are as valid to day as they were when Green wrote his monumental work, *Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation.* Polygamy excludes some men from marriage and thereby from the moral education resulting from it. They are obliged to remain single all their lives, or marry too late in life with all the attendant evil consequences preceding such enforced bachelorhood. Polygamy, as said earlier, is a deliberate violation of the rights of the wife. Instead of being treated as an end in herself, she is treated as a mere means to the satisfaction of the husband's pleasure. Polygamy undoubtedly means a serious affront to the wife's capacity for self-devotion and moral growth. She does not enjoy the complete confidence and the undivided affection of her husband which are necessary for her full growth and development. From the legal point of view, polygamy places her at the mercy of an overbearing husband, who can always threaten to take a second wife and bestow upon her more favour than upon the superseded wife. Besides, "when the law allows a plurality of wives, it is not possible to endow the wife with a definite portion of her husband's property in the event of his death, as the Indian Succession Act does", according to which, "the widow gets one third of her husband's property if she has children, and half if she has neither children nor lineal descendants."* Polygamy is an open violation of the law of mutual fidelity. In the words of the late Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar: "Mutual fidelity is the highest law for men and women, and polygamy is nothing short of a breach of the obligations of that fidelity."

One further argument against polygamy is that it is a violation of the rights of children. In a polygamous family,

* P. Appasamy: Op. Cit. p. 55.

in the eyes of the children, the father enjoys a much higher status than the mother. He is regarded as the supporter and sustainer of the family and the lawgiver. The mother is only a bearer of children and does not command as much respect as does her husband. Consequently the children are deprived of a free moral training which can only result from the father and mother acting as a conjoint authority.

If polygamy is to be allowed at all for sometime more, the Hindus will do well to place on the statute book a provision similar to that which obtains among the Muslims, according to which every wife is entitled to the same allowances and comforts given to the first wife. Such a provision is sure to discourage hasty second and third marriages. But the best thing is to root out the evil altogether and prohibit polygamy completely. Public opinion, especially among the educated women of the country, is tending in that direction. If, as the Hindus believe, marriage is an irrevocable sacrament, the irrevocability should apply not only to women but also to men. Mr. Appasamy is right when he says that he sees no reason "why a Hindu wife, who is discarded without adequate reason, or superseded in favour of a younger wife, should not at once be endowed by law with a separate allowance for her maintenance and residence." [1]

For the prevention of polygamy and other such practices which reduce marriage to a sham and mockery, a reform suggested by many Indian thinkers to-day is the compulsory registration of all marriages.[2] Whether a marriage is performed by a priest or a Civil Marriage Registrar, it should be registered by the State so that the wife may enjoy the status which rightly belongs to her. In this day of enlightenment, there is no justification for inferior types of marriage, such as the pan-leaf

1. P. Appasamy: Op. Cit., p. 56.
2. A recent writer suggests that there should be a law to the effect that no wife can claim rights of maintenance and *consortium* from her husband, and no husband can claim conjugal rights against his wife, and no issue of the marriage should be deemed to be legitimate unless the marriage is properly entered in a public register which can serve as evidence in a Court of Law.

marriage in Assam, the Anand among Sikhs, and the like. Among the Muslims, according to Mr. Muhammad Ali, the mutual consent of the two parties to live as husband and wife does not constitute a marriage unless that consent is expressed publicly and in the presence of witnesses.

If polygamy, polygyny, and polyandry are unjustifiable, so is concubinage, which has been practised for a long number of years in countries like India and China. In India particularly where partners at times are unevenly yoked together by outside pressure and where inter-caste marriages is frowned upon by the bulk of society, recourse is often had to concubinage. Sometimes a widow, not being able to stand the treatment meted out to her at her father-in-law's home or a wife fleeing from a cruel husband, chooses to become a concubine of some one who is willing to take her under his protection. At times even maidens are reduced to become the concubines of married men. Concubinage is sometimes sought to be justified on the alleged ground that the sexual needs of men are much greater than those of women. It is even argued that institutions such as concubinage and prostitution are necessary to keep the family together without having recourse to frequent divorces and such new-fangled practices as companionate marriage.

Whatever the explanation of concubinage may be, it is morally wrong because, in addition to the grave injustice which it does to the woman, it is liable to break up the family itself in that it is based upon a double standard of family morality. The legal position of the concubine and her offspring is anything but satisfactory. "At present no concubine, however long she may have been kept, has any claim or right to maintenance against her paramour during his life time, and she is always liable to be discarded by him at any moment. A concubine who is sent away just before death also loses her right to maintenance. Her maintenance again is contingent upon her continued chastity after her paramour's

death "[1] which the relatives of the deceased man do everything possible to disprove in order to deprive her of all rights of inheritance. While the sons of a concubine have a right to a small share of the father's property, daughters born of such an alliance are deprived of all rights of inheritance and even of maintenance after the father's death. The only remedy for this state of affairs seems to be to amend the existing law in such a manner that a man will be held strictly responsible for the maintenance and education of all the children whom he has brought into existence, whether through legal marriage or otherwise. "Also, as under Muhammadan law and under ancient Hindu law as promulgated by the Rishis, concubines of whatever class, if kept permanently or for a long period, should be declared entitled to maintenance both during the lifetime of the husband and after his death."[2] Another important reform which can go a long way in checking concubinage is the full recognition by law and, if possible, by enlightened public opinion of inter-caste marriages, the prohibition of which to-day acts as a severe strain upon those who are attracted to each other physically and intellectually and are eager to enter into matrimonial relations with each other.

If concubinage is bad and needs to be discouraged, prostitution is much worse and can have no place whatever in an ideal social order. It means "the bartering of sex gain on an unemotional and promiscuous basis."[3] The fact that prostitution has existed from time immemorial does not mean that it should continue for all time to come. As practised at present, it is largely an urban problem, arising in the main out of conditions produced by large scale industry. In cities such as Bombay and Cawnpore, masses of male labourers congregate with an insufficient number of women accompanying them. Very often they are crowded together into tiny and ill-ventilated rooms, where there is little or no privacy and where

1. P. Appasamy: op. cit., p. 60.
2. Ibid.
3. M. A. Elliott and F. R. Merrill: *Social Disorganisation*, p. 180.

family life is almost impossible. The hours of labour are unduly long and the work itself is terribly monotonous. Very little opportunity is provided for healthy games and wholesome recreation with the result that a great many take to drink or seek the company of prostitutes.

People at the other end of the scale, who have more money than what is good for them, also at times patronise prostitutes. Certain kinds of dance-halls, theatres, night clubs, soft drink parlours, hotels, and wayside inns carry on a roaring business with the help of prostitutes. In every large city, and particularly in sea port towns, there are procurers going about looking for victims and evading the watchful eye of the police. In some Western cities, where prostitution is prohibited by law, public women roam the streets at night trying to entice the unwary.

If all this is to be altered, we need far-reaching moral, social, and economic changes. It is a regrettable fact that marriage today is not considered by a great many as a holy sacrament binding the man and woman irrevocably. Even those who make solemn promises at the altar do so with a good many mental reservations. The remedy for this state of affairs is to bring to the fore again the sacramental character of marriage. This does not necessarily mean that one should believe that marriages are made in heaven or that married existence continues even into the life after death. What it means is that marriage should be contracted after mature deliberation and be regarded as a sacred pledge of loyalty taken in the presence of God. A great many are inclined to excuse themselves for their temporary failures in this regard because of the undue influence of current literature, the theatre, and the cinema which overemphasise the sex element in marriage at the expense of the ideals of friendship and companionship and of the building together of an ideal social order in miniature.

If prostitution is to be combated in India as well as elsewhere, we need to improve the economic conditions of the

masses, so that no one will be obliged to become a prostitute for the sake of a living, segregate from the rest of society feeble-minded girls and women who are easily suggestible and fall an easy prey to the advances of men, and carry on a relentless warfare against traffic in human flesh. The lifting of the ban on widow re-marriage also can contribute towards the eradication of prostitution, so far as India is concerned. When large masses of people migrate from one country to another or from the village to the city, care should be taken to see that they migrate as families and that the housing conditions provided for them are such that each family is able to have the necessary privacy for the cultivation of domestic virtues. Music halls, dance halls, cinema houses, theatres, and carnivals should be properly supervised and controlled in order that they may not encourage immorality under the guise of entertainment or the promotion of art and culture. In this connection we may be permitted to say that India will do well not to imitate the voluptuous forms of Western dance of the dance-hall variety which unduly excite sex-passions, but confine herself to the revival of Indian classical dance and group and folk dances.

Young men and women should be taught the dire consequences of sexual immorality, both to themselves and to their immediate families. They should be made to realise the moral responsibility of not abusing birth-control measures for the illicit gratification of their sexual impulses. The fact that nature itself punishes promiscuity by venereal disease should be brought home to them. Before contracting marriage, law should require every young man and woman to produce a certificate of health so that the unsuspecting partner may not become a victim of venereal diseases. Wholesome outdoor exercise should be provided for all in order that no one will be obsessed with thoughts on sex during his spare moments. Everything possible should be done to break down prudery and undue curiosity regarding sex. Children in their teens should be taught the natural and normal functioning of sex so that when they grow up they would not be tempted to indulge

in sex pleasures or go to the other extreme and regard even marriage as licensed sin. When properly handled, sex can be made a most beautiful thing, linking together men and women in lasting love and deeds of sacrifice and charity. But, when mishandled, sex can become a vile and an anti-social factor sapping the health, strength, and happiness of countless individuals.

A peculiar form of prostitution in India, legally recognised in the Presidencies of Bombay and Madras, is the dedication of girls to temples. The *Devadasi* system is deeply rooted in many parts of India and attempts to eradicate it by means of legislation and public opinion have not been a success. No one can object to the services of devoted and consecrated women to the temple when they take the form of music and dance before their gods and goddesses or teaching in temple schools, even as nuns in the Roman Catholic institutions burn themselves out in the service of their fellow human beings. But no one in his right mind can countenance prostitution under the protecting wings of a house of prayer and worship. It is high time that the Hindu mind underwent a radical change in this matter so that every place of worship would be entirely free from anything suggestive of immorality. The priests, too, should become holy men in the literal sense of the word and abolish prostitution root and branch from the precincts of the temple. Ignorant and custom-ridden priests are one of the chief curses of India to-day. Temple trustees should be truly religious and enlightened men who will have the courage of their convictions in breaking down hoary institutions which do not fit into a new state of things. " The number of persons (women) that could be attached to each temple and maintained out of its endowments may well be limited by some body or committee brought into existence by statute."* The practice of allowing *Devadasis* to adopt girls which is a euphemism for training in prostitution should be put down by the stern hand of law. So should the ancient practice

* P. Appasamy: op. cit., p. 63,

of marrying girls to the local gods. Mysore abolished the institution of *Devadasis* altogether, without it giving rise to protest of any kind. Nautch parties which even to-day are a part of marriage functions and of ceremonial processions should be abolished.

Some radical thinkers of our day argue that the surest way of abolishing such evils as concubinage and prostitution is to give complete sex expression to members of both sexes. Judge Lindsey has advocated companionate marriages and Mr. and Mrs. Bertrand Russell have advocated equally radical measures. They do not regard the ideal of absolute chastity and mutual fidelity as fitting into modern conditions. According to Mrs. Russell, married people might observe continence during the period when they bring children into existence, but there is no necessity for imposing upon themselves such a self-denying ordinance either before or after that period. She is even in favour of sterile "Free Love" for the unmarried. The chief feature of companionate marriage, as propounded by Judge Lindsey, is its experimental character, divorce by mutual consent being allowed if the marriage is considered to be unsuccessful. According to others, a married couple may remain the best of friends for the sake of their children as well as for their own sakes and yet have temporary relations with those whom each of them fancies. In support of these forms of sex laxity, many adduce the relative success of the experiments made in Russia, where it has been claimed that the removal of old inhibitions has resulted in the family coming into its own. A system of easy marriages and easier divorces, it is contended, has meant the practical annihilation of prostitution and increased domestic bliss. In the absence of extensive personal knowledge of conditions in Russia, it is difficult to say how far these contentions are true. But it is instructive to find that the " new morality " in Russia prior to the present war was leading to a situation similar to licensed prostitution so much so that the government of the land was obliged to take disciplinary

measures against those who frequently changed their mates, construing it as a gross form of exploitation.

The chief criticism of such proposals as 'companionate marriage' and 'trial marriage' is that they tend to place an undue emphasis on the sex element in married relationships and too little emphasis on this elemental instinct transforming itself into rare forms of conjugal and parental affection. Besides, these proposals lay down exacting demands in the sphere of sex satisfaction and thereby tend to increase, rather than diminish, the rate of divorces. Mutual physical attraction ought undoubtedly to be one of the bases of married life, especially in the earlier years, but that is not the only basis. Human nature is such that what somebody else possesses always seems more attractive than what is owned by oneself. Unrealised and perhaps unrealisable pleasures seem always much sweeter than realised pleasures. If this be true, to make marriage at the very start experimental in character is to undermine its very foundation as to make it anything but enduring. The course of wisdom, therefore, seems to be to emphasise

* F. Halle, who gives a sympathetic account of the position of women in Soviet Russia, claims that sex and family life are functioning in a normal and natural manner, free from old inhibitions. The prerequisite of marriage not being property and both sexes being able to find work, people marry very early in Soviet Russia. Although legislation does not expressly require monogamy, it adheres to it. Transient unions are not regarded as marriages. "With all the facilities that the new Russian marriage law has brought, change of partners is nowise more frequent in Soviet Russia than in other countries. The same is true of promiscuity." (Op. Cit., p. 199). Conjugal disputes which threaten to lead to dissolution are discussed publicly by the members of the commune and suitable action is taken against those who manifest a desire for a frequent change of mates.

Comradeship is found possible between the two spouses not merely because they both enjoy equal rights but also because of their economic independence. If a man deserts his wife and evades paying an alimony, the woman goes to work and supports the children. "Unmarried motherhood" is becoming more and more an established institution. "The number of women who are not willing or not in a position to pass their lives with a man, but are none the less unwilling to renounce the joys of motherhood, is constantly increasing" (p. 210). The author cites the extreme instance of a well-known woman official in Russia who had three children and wanted to have nine more, but each from a different man, because she refused any permanent tie and loved children of the most varied types. There is no distinction made in Russia between "legitimate" and "illegitimate" children. Children call their parents by the first name, and women do not necessarily take up the husband's name on marriage. In the new type of marriage and family emerging in Russia, the basis is "the full economic, political and social equality of the sexes" (Op. Cit., p. 217).

the sacredness and permanence of marriage, taking care of course to see that those who enter into the married relationship do so willingly and joyfully. Only such a course can link the husband and wife together into a permanent union of friendship and companionship and make their home a source of joy and blessing to themselves and to others. To regard marriage at the very start as experimental in character is to deprive it of the possibility of striking its roots deep and maturing into a fruit-bearing tree. It causes a mental conflict which few can withstand.*

A second criticism of the proposals under consideration is that they tend to regard marriage as a matter which exclusively concerns two and only two individuals. The Hindu idea, however, is very much superior. It regards marriage as the coming together of two families, resulting in a larger and more cohesive social circle. What " wooing " there may be, is between the parents of the parties concerned. It is a beautiful symbol that in the Hindu marriage ceremony the principal participants are not only the bride and bride-groom but also the respective parents. While in the West the wooing of the woman by the man is carried too far and several shipwrecks are caused in the process, in India there is too little of it. The principle in operation here is one of engrafting one family upon another. It ought to be possible at the present stage of education and enlightenment in India to arrive at a middle course in this regard so that every marriage will represent the linking together of individuals as well as of families that care for one another and are prepared to work together for the promotion of a greater social good. Experience shows that arranged marriages are not all a failure nor that courtship marriages all end in bliss. It is as much possible to marry and love as it is to love and then marry. No

* Expounding the teaching of Islam, Mr. Muhammad Ali says : " Free Love" makes each of the mates selfish in the extreme because while the male and female become each other's partners in happiness, each is free to leave the other, uncared for in his or her sorrow.

one can lay down a rule of thumb in these matters. Common-sense should be the unfailing guide.

A problem which is assuming more and more serious proportions in modern society is the problem of divorce. For many years now it has been a serious problem in the highly industrialised countries of the West and in Japan, which has been their apt pupil. But to-day it is threatening to invade even such countries as India where, among the Hindus at least, marriage from time immemorial has been regarded as a sacrament witnessed by gods rather than as a mere contract. Family life in the West has been much weakened by both parents taking up work in a factory, shop or office, and children being taken care of in creches and schools when the parents are away at work. In the well-to-do family, too, similar disruption has taken place owing to totally different reasons. The home is no longer a centre of family life. Father, mother, and grown-up children have their own friends and associates, their own clubs and recreation centres, and their own forms of enjoyment. The home, says C. D. Burns, has become "a little more than a dormitory." It is a place where people only sleep. Home life is less absorbing than it used to be. With the increased use of electricity and gas and mechanical devices of various kinds, the wife is no longer a household drudge. She has more time at her disposal for dances, whist drives, night club activities, and the like. The number of children, too, is much smaller than it was a generation ago.

These factors tend somewhat to weaken the fidelity of the parents to each other and of the affection of both to their children. "Now always the child looks forward to school time and feels an interest in what he learns." A further factor which weakens family relationships is the exacting standard which married people lay down for each other in the sphere of sexual satisfaction. The husband expects the wife to be as beautiful and as physically attractive as she was during the days of courtship. The wife in turn wants the husband to be as romantic and foolish as he was before marriage and in the

early days of married life. One of the results of this new demand on the sexual plane is the increase in the number of middle-aged and old women decking themselves like young girls, playing at times the role of "gold-diggers" and society women, caring more for the preservation of their looks and form by artificial means than for sober motherhood.* Men too care more for the glamour and vivacity of women than for such solid qualities as intellectual companionship and strength of character.

The natural consequence of this state of affairs is the increasing tension at home between husband and wife. The two do not seem to be interesting enough to each other any longer, and there is a vague hope that life will be infinitely happier if they can change partners. Sheer boredom thus seems to be one of the potent causes of divorce. Along with it, one finds in operation such usual causes of divorce as drunkenness, cruelty, infidelity, and desertion sometimes following prolonged unemployment. There is on record the extreme case of a woman who divorced her husband for failing to put back the cap of the tooth paste tube!

Students of the problem of divorce tell us that the most critical years of married life are the first ten years, and more particularly the first five, and that if a marriage weathers this period, there is every likelihood of its endurance. The begetting of children is the best safeguard against divorce. The authors of *Social Disorganization* state that in 1922, 62% of

*According to Richard Titmuss (quoted in the *Hindu*, November 13, 1941), Europe's present plight is directly due to the psychological atmosphere of a highly industrialised capitalistic society "which places acquisitiveness before children." Ludovici condemns Feminism and holds it responsible for the desire of many western women to make themselves pale imitations of men weaning them away from their normal functions. Women, he says, are taught that pregnancy amounts to disease, that normal marriage functions for a woman need not involve child-bearing and child-nursing and that children are a form of luxury or a form of sex-vanity. There is, says Ludovici, a modern worship and cultivation of the 'boyish figure' in young girls. Women in the higher class of the civil service "prefer their jobs to marriage." In Soviet Russia, however, conditions are different. Child-bearing and child-nursing are not dreaded. According to F. Halle "nowhere in the world do you see so many pregnant women as in Moscow, in Soviet Russia, in the whole Soviet Union, nowhere are there so many children." *(Women in Soviet Russia*, p. 137).

the divorces in the U. S. A. were sought by childless couples. The natural affection which parents have for their children and the planning together of their future have kept together even parents with a violent incompatibility of temperament between them. We do not approve of the new-fangled idea that husbands and wives should take sabbatical leave of each other in order that they may appreciate one another more fully. What we fear is that such sabbatical leave will become more and more frequent and longer in duration each time, resulting in a final break-up. If there are not to be so many divorces as there are in America, we need to change our ideas of marriage and give a secondary, and not a primary, place to the element of sex. This does not mean that one should go through life carrying the martyr's cross with him. Sex is not sin. It "is not a malady to be cured but an art to be cultivated." Hinduism, as pointed out by Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Iyer, never attaches any notion of impurity to sex, as does Puritanism. Marriage is not a concession to human weakness, as St. Paul makes it out to be. Among the Hindus a great many Rishis were married men, and life-long celibacy was not enjoined as an ideal. In many cases asceticism was practised as a temporary method of discipline and self-restraint. Marriage in Islam is a sacred contract which every Muslim must enter into, unless there be special reasons to the contrary. According to Mr. Muhammad Ali, the prophet expressly forbade celibacy. Marriage, is according to the Holy Quran, the union of two souls which are one in their essence.

If marriage is not licensed sin, nor is it an occasion for over-indulgence. A wife is not a prostitute. On the other hand, a 'virtuous' wife who refuses to give her husband his share of enjoyment in married life is herself a cause of his infidelity, at times leading to divorce. If married life is not to lead to constant friction and irksomeness, if not to divorce, the husband and wife should prayerfully consider their responsibilities to each other and grow together in mutual affection, fidelity, and consideration for each other's needs and

even failings. The responsibility which they have for the highest well-being of children should help them to overlook one another's foibles and cultivate a determination to hold together. Divorce and divorce proceedings involve a mental and emotional strain not only to the parties concerned, but also to the children, if any. When such children grow up, without the affectionate care and loving discipline of their parents, they become a serious problem to all concerned. The Dean of an American University has come to the conclusion that children of divorced parents are a much greater 'character' problem to the University authorities than other students. When such young men and women reach maturity, they tend to take a low view of marriage and regard divorce as more or less a matter of course. Thus divorce begets divorce. Sometimes divorced persons go headlong in the path of debauchery. W. Lippmann is right when he says in his *Preface to Morals*: "given an initial attraction, a common social background, common responsibilities and the conviction that the relationship is permanent, compatibility in marriages can normally be achieved." Writing in a similar vein, Elliott and Merrill say that marriage calls for mutual give and take, mutual respect, a certain amount of chivalry on the part of man, and sacrifice of some degree of egotism.

In condemning divorces in general, we do not advocate the extreme view "once married, always married." There are situations where to insist upon the continuance of married life may be the worst form of tyranny. Infidelity on the part of the husband or wife is, for instance, an obvious ground for divorce. Even here, if the aggrieved party is willing to condone the offence, no impediment should be placed in the way by the State or Society.

T. H. Green is right in holding that the State should not punish adultery as such. The aggrieved person should set the law in motion, for the man in whom disloyal passion is neutralised by the fear of punishment is not likely to be a good

father or a faithful husband. Divorce for adultery should be made cheap and easy. It may also be allowed in cases of permanent lunacy, such incurable and loathsome diseases as leprosy in its later stages, and extreme cruelty. Incompatibility of temperament does not seem a strong enough ground. The important thing to remember, however, is that the grounds on which divorce may be legally granted should be the same for men and women.

Although the Hindu marriage is generally supposed to be indissoluble, certain exceptions are recognised. A wife is allowed to take another husband if her first husband has disappeared altogether or renounced the world, is impotent or has been expelled from his caste. Although this theoretical freedom is still there, it is not much used in practice. The husband is allowed to supersede his wife if she is a drunkard or is of bad character, or is diseased, rebellious, mischievous or wasteful. It will be noticed that the grounds of divorce in the case of women are much wider than in the case of men. The begetting of children, especially of sons, plays such an important part in Hindu thinking that supersession, if not divorce, is allowed in cases of barrenness. Thus Manu says: "A barren wife may be superseded in the eighth year, she whose children all die in the tenth, she who bears daughters in the eleventh, but she who is quarrelsome without delay." According to Yajnavalkya: "One who abandons an obedient, dexterous and sweet-speaking wife who has borne sons should be compelled to give her a third of his property, and if poor, he should be ordered to maintain her." What is needed in India to-day is the equalisation of the conditions for divorce for both men and women and the supersession of mere customs by civil law based on commonsense. The supersession of a wife merely because she has not borne a son is not in keeping with the law of personality upon which we have placed repeated emphasis. Islam restricts the husband's right to divorce while recognising the wife's right to it. The Holy Prophet is reported to have said: "Never did Allah allow

anything more hateful to him than divorce. (M. Ali p. 670) Divorce is allowed if there be a good cause for it.

" Even divorce is to be followed by a period of waiting called the ' idda ' (about three months) which affords a chance of reconciliation." (679) During this period the divorced wife stays in the same home with the husband, unless she should be guilty of misconduct." At the end of the period, the two parties are allowed, and even encouraged, to re-marry themselves. "Divorce may be given orally or in writing but it must take place in the presence of witnesses." (681)

Problems Peculiar to India

One of the blots on Indian social life to-day is child marriage. We have enough evidence to show that infant marriage was unknown in the Vedic period. But by the time of the Sutras (6th and 5th centuries B.C.) and Smritis (ranging from 3rd cent. B. C. to 5th cent. A. D.) the age of marriage came to be lowered, though gradually. Manu lays down eight as the minimum age at which a girl may be given in marriage. One of his oft-quoted sayings is "Reprehensible is the father who gives not his daughter in marriage at the proper time."

In the early days, one of the parties at least—the man—was normally required to be mature in years; indeed this maturity was necessitated by the long period prescribed for studies. Though at sixteen a young man could marry (among Brahmins), in many cases the age must have been twenty-five; and there are instances of marriages being performed at even forty-three. But with the passage of time both boys and girls came to be married at a very early age, and this imposed a great hardship particularly on the girl, since she could not renounce her marriege when she reached maturity* and was condemned to the life of a widow even if she lost her husband as an infant.

* A Muslim girl who has been given in marriage by her father or guardian may repudiate the marriage if she dislikes the man. A similar right of repudiation is granted to a minor girl on coming of age, if she finds the match unsuitable.

Several causes in relatively modern times have contributed to the marriage of immature girls, the chief among them being the fear of kidnapping. The requirement that one should marry within one's own caste, if not one's sub-caste also made parents anxious to give their daughters away in marriage before puberty. Besides, the fact that in the Hindu home the girl is not valued as highly as the boy also encouraged the marriage of girls when they were but infants. The joint family system, too, was an aid to infant marriage, since according to it, it is desirable that young people should be married as early as possible in order that they may make the necessary social and psychological adjustments to their new family surroundings and the process of engrafting may go on gradually. The system further has the advantage of shifting the burden of maintaining the girl-bride to the shoulders of the manager of the joint family of which she becomes a member.

The following figures taken from the 1931 census show that child marriage was until recently at least a serious problem.

Age	No. Married Males	No. Married Females
0—1	36,882	44,082
1—2	41,228	63,954
2—3	63,375	114,099
3—4	118,844	232,813
4—5	168,897	346,904
5—10	1,883,773	4,200,534
10—15	3,217,626	7,269,208

The most urgent social reform needed in India to-day is the abolition of infant marriage. Strenuous attempts have been made in the past to moderate the rigours of infant marriage, but nothing effective has been done owing to the stronghold which religious custom has on the people. Prior to the passage of the Child Marriage Restraint Act, popularly known

as the Sarda Marriage Act, in 1929, legislation was passed aiming at raising the age of consent at which a married couple could live together as husband and wife. This reform was of little or no avail, since it strove to regulate something which is essentially personal and private in character. The law as it stood on the eve of the Sarda Act was that a man was not to live with his wife before the latter was 14, but he was not punished if he had connection with her after 13. The Sarda Marriage Act made it illegal for any priest or relative to conduct a marriage in which the bride was less than 14 and the bridegroom less than 18. Six months were allowed between the passing of the Act and the time when it was enforced. This intervening period was utilised by thousands of orthodox parents and relatives in reaping a crop of infant marriages. Since the passing of the Act, there has not been enough popular support behind it, with the result that it is practically a dead letter to-day, although public opinion among city-bred, educated people has been roused in support of the reform. The need of the day is the stringent application of the law in such a way that while 14 and 18 may still remain the minimum at which a girl and a boy may respectively marry, public opinion should push up the age still higher. For a country like India we would recommend 18 for girls and 21 for boys as the minimum age for marriage. As matters stand at present, the Indian girl has little or no childhood. During the first few years of her life, the parents make much of her, deck her with ornaments and fine clothes, and give her some education. In far too many cases, even when she is a child she is given away in marriage and has no opportunity given for the building up of her body and the training of her mind and will. Before she knows it, the cares of a family are thrust upon her. The consequence is that a large percentage of Indian marriages turn out to be dysgenic in character, lowering the strength, vitality, and longevity of each succeeding generation. In England while the legal age of marriage was only 14 for boys and 12 for girls until 1929, when it was raised to 16 for both sexes, very few marriages

take place at that early age. In India, on the other hand, we dig our own national grave by refusing to discountenance the marriage of the immature. Marriage soon after puberty is unknown in Christian lands. Ludovici considers 18 to 23½ the right age for the marriage of girls in the West.

In saying all this, we do not mean to suggest that we should go to the extreme to which some of the western countries have gone in postponing marriage to a very late age and in producing an army of old bachelors and spinsters. Marriage is the normal state of affairs for most men and women, and the begetting of strong and healthy children (on an average of four per family) is a moral responsibility of the married. A system of universal marriages which we have in India may have its economic evils. But it adds to the sum total of human happiness and keeps down sex immorality at a low level. Society should be so organised that the unmarried in both sexes are the unmarriageable. In the U. S. A. about 45% of college women, it is stated, do not marry, which has its serious moral and eugenic implications.

Almost as great an evil as child-marriage is the prohibition of widow re-marriage. Here again we find that present-day practice is entirely at variance with the Vedic practice. Even Manu who says: "A second husband of a good woman is nowhere prescribed," makes frequent references to the re-marriage of widows. Both in Manu and other law-givers we have many indications to show that widows could re-marry or have offspring without re-marriage. According to certain other law-givers, re-marriage is expressly ordained for widows. Among the Muslims, the widow and the divorced woman are allowed complete freedom in the choice of their husbands.*

When the prohibition of widow re-marriage came to be enacted, it was largely with a view to preserve a high order of sex morality and to perpetuate the sacred memory of the deceased husband, but at this time there was no infant-marriage.

*Muhammad Ali: *Religion of Islam*, p. 633.

Consequently the serious problem of child-widows with which we are confronted to-day was not present from the beginning. The problem is made particularly vexing by the wide disparity there frequently is between the age of the husband and that of the wife. The percentage of widows among the Hindus who marry early and allow the marriage of mature men to mere infants and young girls is much larger than among Muhammadans, Christians, and Buddhists who marry late. The unmerited privation and suffering inflicted on Hindu widows, especially if they should be child-widows or widows with no children, is a story too well-known to need recapitulation.* In a well-ordered family, however, the widow can by her life of utter self-denial, become the "care-taker of the home and the common matriarch of society."

As late as 1931 there were 155 widows for every 1000 females. The number of child widows was as follows :—

Age.	Number.
0—1	1,515
1—2	1,785
2—3	3,485
3—4	9,076
4—5	15,019
5—10	105,482
10—15	185,339

This state of affairs calls for immediate attention. As long ago as 1856, as a result of sustained agitation, the Hindu Widow Re-marriage Act was placed on the statute book, but to this day it remains a dead letter on account of the social opprobrium attached to widow re-marriage.

*A recent writer says: "A child widow knows neither that she was married nor that she is a widow. All the asceticism of widowhood without its piety becomes gradually imposed upon the poor thing as her consciousness develops, as her youth unfolds itself, as her size, shape and form, her mental equipment and emotional outlook mark her out not merely as a bud that is blossoming but a flower that is destined to fade even before it has budded." P. Sitaramayya: *The Hindu Home Re-Discovered*, p. 60.

The common people blindly believe that the Sastras prohibit widow remarriage and "pillory with contempt the people who remarry."[1] As yet the Act under question is only an enabling Act, giving legal recognition to such marriages and to the offspring of such marriages. The chief defect of the Act is that it lays down that "from the moment of her second marriage she (the widow) ceases to have any interest in the family or property of her husband. The same applies to the children of her second marriage."[2] It is obvious that these restrictions should be removed by law if widow re-marriage is to become really popular. There is no reason why a widow who marries again should not inherit a portion of her deceased husband's property as well as be entitled to a portion of her father's property. While children born of the second husband have no legitimate claim to the property coming from the first husband, the widow herself should be placed on a different footing. Property obtained by her as *Stridhanam* or otherwise should in no circumstance be taken away from her. Further, as Mr. Appasamy suggests, children born of widow remarriage might be given free concessions at school and other such privileges in order to give a fillip to widow remarriage. Public opinion among the Hindus should be so educated that middle-aged and elderly widowers will not be allowed to marry young girls. They should, on the other hand, be encouraged to marry widows, as far as possible.

Some of the other evils connected with marriage in India are heavy marriage expenses, the dowry, and the payment of bride and bride-groom prices. These evils, in their very nature, are incapable of removal by the fiat of the state. We require an enlightened public opinion to tackle them. People themselves should place severe restrictions on ruinous wedding expenses such as the feeding of all and sundry for days on end, elaborate musical entertainments, and the throwing away of hard-earned money on expensive fire works and on thousands of bright-coloured electric lights. A certain amount

1. P. Appasamy: Op. cit., p. 37.
2. Ibid.

of expenditure on entertaining one's friends and relatives in giving marriage the necessary dignity and solemnity is justifiable. But there is no justification for either extravagance or the incurring of debt in order to play the part of a magnificient host. We should learn to simplify our wedding ceremonies. Commonsense tells us that much of the money which is wasted to-day on extravagant expenditure can be put to a much better advantage if given to the young couple as a marriage settlement. The State may even impose a sliding tax on wedding expenses if they exceed a certain minimum consonant with the economic position and status of the parties concerned. It is regrettable that " in addition to the actual sums spent on the marriage ceremony itself, the money that changes hands as bride or bridegroom price, the commission paid to the broker who is a common institution in North and West India, the jewels and other paraphernalia that have to be given to the bride and bridegroom, and the numerous presents bestowed upon relations on such happy occasions, amount to a ruinous total."

If extravagant expenses on the wedding ceremony are to be condemned, the dowry system which is becoming a growing menace among the educated and middle classes all over India deserves a greater stricture. With the advance of education, prospective bridegrooms or relatives and friends on their behalf demand iniquitously large amounts as dowry from the bride's people. This means that most men with moderate incomes are practically ruined in getting their daughters married. The dowry system will not be as bad as it sounds, if the money extracted from the bride's people is used to build up the home of the newly-wedded couple inasmuch as the daughters have little or no share in the father's property. But in most cases the dowry goes into the coffers of the bridegroom's people, and the bride and bridegroom have no share in it. As a result of this pernicious system, well-accomplished and eugenically desirable girls who do not belong to well-to-do families are obliged to marry people who are not their equals either

intellectually or from other points of view. Sometimes they have even had recourse to suicide in order to save their parents the economic ruin awaiting them in finding a suitable dowry. A bride-groom's price varies proportionately to his educational qualifications and the prospects of advancement which his job holds. Not satisfied with the dowry which he gets, the bride-groom, according to well-established customs, demands a second sum at the time of the nuptials and presents of various kinds on the Deepavali day, the New Year's Day, and other such occasions, robbing marriage of all its sanctity and making it a purely mercenary affair.

Public opinion has not yet been able to assert itself in the matter, the worst culprits being the educated people in each community. It is high time, perhaps, for the law to come to the rescue and demand that if a dowry is given at all, a substantial portion of it, along with whatever jewels may be given to the bride by her own parents, or the husband, or other relatives at the time of the wedding should go to her as her *stridhanam* or her own peculiar property. A better course, however, will be for the various caste groups, through their Panchayats, to regulate all such matters as dowry, infant marriage, and widow re-marriage in accordance with the progressive thought of the day. Some advance has been made in this direction by certain caste panchayats. But much more remains to be done.

A problem of increasing complexity to-day is the problem of inter-communal or inter-religious marriages. As yet marriages between Hindus and Muslims are few and far between. But a good many marriages do take place between Christian girls and Hindu or Muslim young men, the chief reason being that Christian girls are generally better educated and are, on account of that and their different home and family traditions, better suited to be companions of well-educated husbands than poorly educated or purdah-governed Hindu and Muslim young women. Modern romantic ideas of marriage inculcated by

the novel, the theatre, and the moving picture as well as co-educational institutions contribute their share in bringing about such mixed marriages.

What objection there is to these marriages has come largely from Christian quarters. It is rightly contended that it is derogatory to the self-respect of a Christian girl to become one among several wives of a Hindu or Muslim. But not all mixed marriages are of this kind. Many of them are monogamous pure and simple. Even to these, objection is raised on religious grounds. It is contended that the Christian girl is sure to lose her religious moorings and that the religious training of her children is bound to suffer, if she marries anyone other than a Christian. We are not so sure of this contention. As a general rule, we may say that mixed marriages should not be actively encouraged, especially when the two parties are strongly attached to their respective faiths and to the social patterns of the communities to which they belong. But where there is a unity of mind and spirit between the intending parties and where they have worked out in detail a satisfactory arrangement for the religious and moral training of their children, there need be no real objection. One knows to-day of a few instances of happy marriages between Roman Catholics and Protestants; and what is possible between these two groups is possible also between members of different religious faiths. In China it is nothing unusual to find members of the same family belonging to different faiths, and yet all of them holding together as a single unit. Why should not such a state of affairs be possible in India, too? The essential condition which may have to be enforced by law is that where a Christian girl marries a non-Christian man, the more liberal laws on divorce, inheritance, the custody of children, etc. governing Christian women should apply to her. These mixed marriages, when contracted under proper auspices and are free from the undue attention of trouble-makers and gossip-mongers, may turn out to be one of the effective ways of solving the communal tangle. If religion is a matter of the sharing of

one's deepest experiences, there can be no better sharers of it than a husband and wife, even when they belong to different faiths. We do not endorse the view of a recent writer: "A mixed marriage between a Christian and a non-Christian is not a sacrament, and should never be entered on if possible." As the education of women advances and women take their rightful place in the legislatures and public bodies, they are sure to demand equal rights with men. And one of these rights would certainly be the selection of their own life companions. It is futile for man to lay down the law in all these matters. Because of possible undesirable developments, we have no right to object to the higher education of women, to co-educational institutions, to the wide use of birth-control devices, and the like. The right thing is to emphasise the positive ideal of the woman as the home-maker, wife and mother, and inspire her to live up to it.

In order that Indian women may come into their own and take their share in the national awakening of the country, it is necessary to make education widespread among them and destroy the inhuman and outlandish system of the purdah. Reformers everywhere are coming to realise that if India is to be built anew, women should be free, educated, and enlightened. A superstitious and custom-ridden woman is the greatest hindrance to the progress of any community, especially in the social field. Therefore, it is true to say that, while we educate a man we educate only a single individual, in educating a woman we educate an entire family.

In saying all this, we do not mean to suggest that the same kind of education should be given to both boys and girls, except in the early stages. As they advance in years, there is a need for some kind of bifurcation which will be in keeping with the different functions which men and women have to fulfil in life. While a few of the fair sex may become professional and business women, scholars, writers, artists, painters, and the like and, as such, will require the best form of education

and training available in these spheres of human activity, these fields of activity are not open to, or intended for, most of them. Therefore, the kind of education given to them should be essentially practical, related to everyday life and conditions around them. One rejoices to find that in recent years attention has been paid to home science courses in our schools and colleges for women. Every educated woman should be given training in the proper care of children, hygiene, and sanitation, first aid, dietetics, domestic economy, budget-making, interior decoration, elementary science, sewing, music, etc. She should further know something of the construction of houses and the laying out of gardens, be able to direct minor electric and drainage repairs in the house, know how to invest small sums of money, possess some knowledge of the laws of the country relating to marriage, divorce, inheritance, etc., and know what her civic rights and responsibilities are. She should be so trained that she will be able to stand on her own feet at any time and not be stranded on the death of her husband or fall a prey to the machinations of unfaithful friends or wily relations.

For the realisation of this end, concerted efforts should be made to place the rights of women on a stable and secure footing. One of the first reforms needed is the abolition of purdah which has ruined the health and strength of countless women and children, in addition to imposing upon them a deplorable " intellectual and moral purdah.". It also makes the men super-sexed and unchivalrous towards women. The women, too, become unduly conscious of sex. If women are to come into their own, it is necessary to restore to them the freedom which was theirs in the Vedic times. We have evidence to show that some of the hymns of the Rig Veda were composed by women. In the Upanishads we find references to learned women taking part in philosophical discussions in public assemblies. They were even allowed to wear the sacred thread as a mark of initiation for a study of the Vedas. The parties to a marriage were of mature years ; and young women had a voice in the selection of their partners. Women in

ancient Hindu India were honoured members of society. Even Manu says : " The mouth of a woman is constantly pure, to be held in the same esteem as running water, or a beam of sunlight."

Where women enjoy equal freedom with men, there may be cases of moral aberration, but they are not any more, possibly much less, than in a society where the two sexes are kept away from each other by impenetrable walls of separation. Cloistered morality is no morality at all. All honour is due to those who, in the midst of temptation, keep themselves pure and uncorrupted. In his work, *The Moral Teaching of Jesus*, Dr. A. D. Lindsay refers to a contemporary historian who has observed that one of the greatest achievements of Christianity is the existence of the maiden lady in the ordinary world.[1]

A further reform is as regards property. The property rights of daughters, wives, and widows should be so altered as to fit into modern conditions. Reference has been made already to the ancient Hindu practice of *Stridhanam*, according to which a woman is allowed to keep her own earnings and devolve them upon her own heirs, as distinct from her husband's heirs. While this system still continues to some extent, it is necessary to give it a proper legal basis. Whatever a woman earns as a maiden, wife or widow—by her own labour or by the exercise of arts and crafts—should belong to her. So also should all gifts and bequests made to her before and after marriage, as well as during widowhood. When a wife dies, the husband may be one of the legal heirs of her *Stridhanam*, but during her life time she should have complete control over it.[2]

Women should have rights of absolute inheritance to the property of their fathers and husbands, which is not the case

1. A.D. Lindsay : *The Moral Teaching of Jesus*, pp. 134—5.

2. Among the Muslims, according to Mr. Muhammad Ali, a married woman can earn money and own property just as much as a man and, therefore, she may, if she feels the need, follow any profession. She has full control over her property and can dispose of it as she likes. A dowry given to her is her own property and does not belong to the guardians.

to-day. In the opinion of Mr. P. Appasamy "a married woman should be entitled, if she has no sons or daughters, to inherit absolutely half her husband's property, and if she has sons to obtain half the share which a son would get. A similar right should also be available to daughters, each daughter being entitled to obtain on her father's death half the share which a son obtains. But as a just offset to the concessions thus made in their favour, when the inheritance again falls open by their decease, the absolute estate enjoyed by them may in its turn be made descendable not to daughters alone as at present in the case of *stridhanam* property, but to daughters and sons, each daughter taking one share and each son taking a half share."[1] The position of the Hindu widows should be made as good at least as that of Muslim and Christian widows. It is not fair to leave the maintenance of the Hindu widow, as is the case at present, to the tender mercies of her sons or husband's relations. Among Christians the widow is entitled to one-third of her deceased husband's estate if there are children or lineal descendants and to one half if there are no children or lineal descendants. Under Muhammadan law, too, the widow is always entitled to a share of her husband's estate. Bare justice demands that a widow, whether Hindu, Muslim or Christian " must always be declared entitled to maintenance when her husband has not left any estate."[2]

Under the Hindu law the only absolute rights of a daughter are the rights of maintenance and marriage. The right to inherit to her father which is conceded in certain circumstances is so hedged in as to be practically valueless. Under the Indian Succession Act, however, which applies to Christians and others the widow, as pointed out above, is entitled to one-third of the estate of her deceased husband, the remaining two-thirds being equally divided among the children, both sons and daughters. A similar law should be enacted for other com-

1. Op. cit., p.109
2. P. Appasamy; Op. cit., p. 92.

munities, too, if daughters are to enjoy the legal status necessary for their growth and development.

The Future of the Family

Is the permanent monogamous family which is the ideal of our day bound to disappear shortly? Theodore Deiser, quoted by Elliott and Merrill in the work cited above, believes that modern marriage is a farce and, therefore, recommends complete freedom in marriage and divorce. Another writer says that with the wider use of contraceptives and greater control of venereal diseases, the monogamous family is bound to decline. Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Iyer notes with regret that the old codes of marriage and sexual ethics are disappearing to-day and that there is an increasing perversion of public taste. Even in England, which on the whole has adhered to a higher ideal than the rest of Europe and America, he observes, there is a sympathetic condonation of adultery and of extra-marital and temporary alliances.

What are we to say in the light of all this? While there is an increasing disposition to be somewhat lenient towards extra-marital relations and not to regard them as constituting a sin in the religious sense of the term, most people are convinced of the necessity of maintaining the monogamous family as the basis of a stable society. Even those who refuse to bring in religious considerations in dealing with matters of sex cannot fail to observe the moral wrong involved in treating any person as a mere chattel for the gratification of one's desires. "In friendships between the sexes it is well to remember that they are a trust to be cherished and preserved and never to be abused."

If we are to prevent the rot which is creeping into the family, we must make "love" as against "lust" the foundation of marriage. "Used and forgotten" is a conception unworthy of any human being in his relation to his fellow human beings, especially in such an intimate matter as marri-

age. The trouble with the modern romantic theories of marriage and sex is that they stress "lust" as against "love" and do not give time and opportunity for the gradual transformation of "lust" into "love" The law of life, on the other hand, is love. As Dr. A. D. Lindsay remarks: "We find ourselves only when we devote ourselves to something beyond us."* The man who thinks only in terms of himself and his own pleasures can never be truly happy.

The romantic ideal of marriage which bases itself upon lust is bound to break up the family. It will result in new unions being formed every now and then according to the passing whims and fancies of the partners, and there can be no responsibility for the bringing up of children. In support of the romantic ideal, its advocates may say that in the modern world we should radically alter time-old conceptions of marriage and sex and transfer the care of children to the State and even be satisfied with the production of children in the laboratory. All this may sound interesting, but is not calculated to the true well-being of either parents or children. The bringing into existence of children and training them according to one's ideas are such a fundamental part of a person's moral development that to deprive him of them will be to reduce him to the brute-level. No mother is likely to be satisfied with children produced in a state laboratory and brought up in state creches. Plato advocated such a system for his rulers and warriors, but it died a stillborn death. As said earlier, in the circumstances prevailing to-day, we may be willing to set a maximum limit on the amount of private property. But to abolish private family life is to maim and stunt the individual in the most vital part of his nature.

If the romantic ideal of marriage and family is to be deprecated, so should the extreme utilitarian ideal which regards marriage as a matter of convenience and utility. Both these ideals, as pointed out by Dr. A. D. Lindsay, are defective and

The Moral Teaching of Jesus, p. 179.

inferior ideals. The utilitarian marriage exists for something outside itself, and persons become mere means and instruments. The romantic marriage, on the contrary, exists for nothing beyond itself.

The right ideal is to regard marriage as a relation of mutual service, of mutual assistance and delight. For the attainment of this end lifelong partnership is essential. There is no doubt a possibility of such a marriage resulting in common selfishness. The way to remedy it, however, is not to make marriage romantic or utilitarian, but to infuse into it the ideals of comradeship, love, and service. In the ideal social order of our dream, the home, instead of being a prison house of selfishness, would become a nursery of social virtues. In the striking language of Dr. J. H. Oldham: "In the home persons are valued for what they are in themselves rather than for what they do. Work and business engage only a part of the personality, but in the love of the family the whole man can find his satisfaction. The family is a school of character, providing an education in sympathy and understanding, in self-control and co-operation. It is a training ground in responsibility and mutual obligation, and builds the dispositions which fit its members to participate in the wider life of the community."

Positing, then, love and unselfishness as the unquestioned ideals of a good home, we may consider the various relations which ought to exist in such a home. Between the husband and wife there should be mutual fidelity and absolute loyalty; and, except in the cases mentioned above, there should be no question of divorce. The husband should give up his domineering tendencies and the wife should not remain content with playing the second fiddle. Just because the husband is the earning member of the family, it does not follow that he should have the sole right of spending it. The co-partnership between the husband and wife should be extended to every sphere of life. They should plan together the family budget, the entertainment of friends, charity and tithing.

In their relation to children, the father and mother should act as a single authority. The children should not be encouraged to think of one parent as in any way different from the other. Neither the father nor the mother should be a court of appeal to children from the decisions of the other. Because, in the very nature of the case, the mother spends more time with the children she should recognise her special responsibility for their moral and social training. Both parents should instil in children qualities of honesty, courage, self-control, regularity, industry, justice, love, and service of the weak. They should also train them to appreciate beauty and the abiding values of religion. "The virtues of co-operation, give and take, love and forgiveness, social justice in the relations between the family and the servants, hospitality, and neighbourliness are some of the lessons that are learnt in a well-organised home." While authority should be tempered by love, parents should not go to the other extreme of indulgence, which is bound to do incalculable harm to children. Since children are a trust given to parents, whose highest possible development is their sacred duty, they should prayerfully consider together the number of children whom they could conveniently bring into existence. In considering this matter the health and strength of the parents, and particularly of the mother, should be given its due importance. In general, more than one child is desirable for every family, since a single child is invariably spoilt by receiving more attention than what is good for it.

One of the defects of the traditional Hindu family is that there is nothing like the English fire-side life, where father, mother, sons and daughters eat together at a common table and spend considerable time together in social fun, light reading, and study. The members of the Hindu family do not, as a rule, eat together ; nor do they have chaffing and merriment together. The father is always looked upon as an august personage who cannot come down from his pedestal and be a playmate and companion to his children. From the Western

home we can with advantage borrow the idea of a happy family, cheerful and free from traditional restraints.

In the relations between brothers and sisters, mutual helpfulness and consideration for each other should be the governing principle. Children should be so trained that they and the parents together would endeavour to make the home a miniature kingdom of God. While the joint family system in all its details cannot be made to fit into modern conditions, the ideal of a co-operative society for which it stands should ever be kept alive. "The Hindu household is," says Dr. P. Sitaramayya, "a co-operative society of credit, production, and consumption." It is based on a division of functions and implies faith in one another. There is something beautiful about the ideal of a family as consisting not merely of father, mother and children, but also of brothers and sisters and their families. In such a family there is a joint sharing of family goods. It is the best possible insurance against poverty and need and builds up the spirit of family socialism. While a man's primary responsibility is to his own wife and children, he also has a responsibility to the members of the wider family, especially if he should happen to have more of the earthly goods than they. The educated people of India should learn to strike a middle course between the hard-heartedness engendered by western individualism and the parasitism and lack of individual responsibility which may be fostered by the joint family.*

* In our enthusiasm for the new order of things, we should not overlook the valuable features of the joint family system. Its merits, in the past at least, were:—(1) it was a co-operative expansion of the family; (2) it provided some measure of equality of distribution, notwithstanding inequality of income; (3) the incompetent, the backward, and the sick were taken care of; (4) it enabled the handling down of sound family traditions and the fostering of a legitimate family pride.

Its demerits were: (1) to some extent at least it encouraged laziness, although there was an automatic checking of it by the public opinion of the members of the household: (2) because it was unwieldy, it was not favourable to freedom of domestic life; it could not provide the necessary opportunity for the growth of genuine friendship and companionship between the husband and wife; (3) it involved too much of self-restraint which meant a hindrance to the development of personality.

Christians will do well to infuse a little of the joint family spirit into their

The ideal home, further, should take into account its responsibility to the servants who minister to its needs. It should be frankly recognised that servants have personalities to develop just as much as anybody else. There is no justification for exploitation of any kind in this sphere. Servants should be paid a living wage and be given adequate leisure and opportunity for the development of their mental, moral, aesthetic, and religious natures. If they are illiterate, a moral responsibility is laid on those who employ them to remove this blight. The responsibility becomes even greater in the case of the children of servants. Simple and inexpensive forms of recreation should be provided to servants in order to relieve them of drudgery. The honest householder should constantly ask himself whether the standard of living which he maintains for himself is so far above that of his servants and others dependent upon him that they are obliged to live in two different worlds altogether.*

The ideal home has its responsibility to the wider neighbourhood as well. Till we have a more equitable economic system than the present, the good citizen should satisfy himself that every penny which he earns is earned honestly and that every penny spent on himself and his family cannot produce greater good elsewhere. He should set his face resolutely against the temptation to make money by grinding down the poor, by oppressive landlordship, and the like. He should constantly ask himself whether his personal and family expenditure is on a scale consonant with the poverty of the country, with the inability of millions of people to provide the

---

families, inasmuch as at present they live too exclusively for themselves and their children. They should make care for near relations one of their principal duties.

Servants should be regarded as members of the household, entitled to love and care. There is no justification for addressing them as "boys" as most Europeans and Anglicised Indians do. The common complaint that servants are not as loyal and as attached to the family as at an earlier time is partly a reflection upon ourselves—the growing commercialism in the relation between the master and servant.

ordinary amenities of life such as food, clothing, shelter, education, and medical help.[1]

A good householder should see that every member of the family has a share in the service of his neighbours, say in the poorer quarters of the town, in hospitals, prisons, etc. No one has a right to a self-contained and self-satisfied existence. Every member of a well-ordered family should do what he can to relieve the oppression of the weak by the powerful—whether it be in the political, economic, social or religious fields. He should not be found among those who, in the midst of evil, preserve a tactful silence, or what is worse, make common cause with the powerful against the weak and helpless.

Adapting the eulogistic words of Dr. P. Sitaramayya regarding the Hindu home at its best, we may say that an ideal home should be "a fine economic unity, an embryonic co-operative society, a model hygienic abode, a cultural and emotional centre, a miniature philanthropic organisation, and a perfect temple of praise and prayer."[2]

To see for oneself the extent to which one's home approximates to the ideal set forth, one may ask oneself the following questions:

(a) Is my home a cage or prison house from which I long to escape?

(*b*) What is the predominant note of my home, selfishness or unselfishness, constant bickering and irritation or love and affection, mutual understanding and accommodation?

(*c*) Is there in my home sharing and comradeship in thought, word, and deed? Does the spirit of co-operation prevail there?

1. It is necessary for the enlightened people of the world to realise the importance of a new *Grhastha* dharma according to which the able and fortunate people in any profession, business or trade would impose voluntary restrictions upon their earnings. The fact that a person is specially talented or is particularly fortunate does not entitle him to levy a toll upon the less talented and the less fortunate. If he earns much more than others in his profession, he should consider whether it is not his duty to return the balance to society in some form or other.

2. Dr. P. Sitaramayya: "*Hindu Home Rediscovered.*"

(*d*) Do the children have one kind of relation to the mother and another to the father?

(*e*) Is there absolute frankness between myself and my partner? Or do we harbour grievances and ill-will towards each other?

(*f*) Does my love for my partner wane as the physical side of married life begins to decline?

(*g*) Who are the kind of people who move in and out of my home freely (i) social and professional equals; (ii) those from whom I can get things; or (iii) those who need my help, sympathy, and friendship? Is my home a castle from which all but a select few are shut out or a guest house to all those who need it?

(*h*) Do I observe caste in some form or other in the matter of dining, marriage, friendship, etc.?

(*i*) Is my home a nursery of social virtues, a foundation upon which the future character of children is built, a training ground in good living, a preparation for citizenship, and a discipline in right living?

(*j*) What do I do (i) for the discipline and moral training of my children (ii) for the inculcation of sound religious truths?

(*k*) Is my home marked by simplicity and quiet dignity? Have I trained myself and my children in such a manner that one can be perfectly at home with all and sundry and in all circumstances and appreciate the best in everybody?

(*l*) Is my home marked by cleanliness and tidiness? Have I learnt the art of making my home bright, attractive, and comfortable within the limited means at my disposal? Is my drawing room, like many a western drawing room, "a museum of curios"?

(*m*) How much do I spend on marriages, feasts, and funerals? Can I justify all this? What have I done to abolish

the dowry system and its attendant evils in my own family circle? How much do I give to the various good causes crying for help?

(*n*) From observing what happens in my house, what impressions are likely to be formed by my relatives, friends, neighbours, chance acquaintances, shopkeepers, street venders, and the beggars who knock at my door?

(*o*) What service does my home render to (i) the people in the neighbourhood, the high and low, the rich and poor (ii) to the national cause, and (iii) to the world community?

CHAPTER XIV

LEISURE AND RECREATION

No discussion of a new social order can leave out of account the problem of leisure. Leisure has been defined as "the time at the disposal of the complete man." It is "opportunity for disinterested activity." Without it a man cannot develop all the aspects of his nature and become the best that he is capable of becoming.

Leisure is necessary not only for the realisation of individual personality, but also for the culture and civilisation of every society. C. D. Burns aptly describes leisure as the "seed-plot of civilisation." An ancient proverb says : "Wisdom cometh by opportunity of leisure." It is " the germinating time for art and philosophy" and affords opportunity for the appreciation of the finer things of life. Ancient China realised the importance of giving its scholars ample leisure which they utilised in working out an abiding philosophy of life. In the highly industrialised countries of the West to-day, where money-making and comfortable living are a craze, there is a high degree of civilisation, as the term is interpreted by themselves, but a low level of culture, partly because they have not yet learnt the right use of leisure.

In the modern industrial society, it is usual to distinguish between work and leisure. The term 'work' is used to cover any activity in which a man is engaged in order to make a living, whereas the term 'leisure' is used to describe what he does with himself at other times. In earlier societies, however, such a distinction was not observed. Even to-day in a non-industrial and non-mechanised society, work and leisure often go together. Where, as it sometimes happens in India, the whole family is engaged in all the processes of a piece of work such as the carding of cotton, spinning it, and weaving it into cloth, it is difficult to say where work ends and leisure

begins. The same merging of leisure into work is true in the case of every true artist. 'Art for art's sake' is the ideal for which he lives and works. What material reward or appreciation he may receive from an admiring world is incidental.

In the case of a large mass of industrial workers and even agriculturists who use machinery on a large scale, on the other hand, the distinction between 'work' and 'leisure' is a vital one and cannot be slurred over. Even in this sphere, it is possible to find individuals who are fortunate in having struck upon types of work which give them the fullest possible opportunity for the expression of their personalities. But the vast bulk of industrial workers are obliged to do a fraction of some dull and monotonous piece of work, such as the making of the head of a pin, times without number. One of the serious criticisms of the industrial system under which we live to-day is the deadening, devitalising, and dehumanising effect which it has upon the millions who are called upon to do a small fraction of a mechanical piece of work, which is unrelated to their life and its purposes and which they are obliged to do merely for the sake of a living. They have no chance of seeing the work completed by their own hands or of making it for their own use or profit. It is manufactured on a mammoth scale with the aid of large-scale machinery, primarily for the cash returns of a body of unseen and unknown shareholders of a company. It is true that a great many of these people have become so mechanised that the idea of expressing themselves through the various processes of work has deserted them altogether. But it is possible to reverse this order by a different type of industrial organisation and give workers real joy and meaning in work.

Till such time is reached, we must plan for the leisure of large masses of people. In undertaking this task it is necessary to remember that leisure does not mean idleness. It is not a synonym for valueless spare time. It is the use of one's free time in such a manner as to contribute to his true well-being and happiness. By the extensive use of machinery and

the harnessing of mechanical power to labour, the industrial West has made ample spare time possible for its toiling masses. But as yet people have not learnt its proper use.

Leisure and recreation do not mean one and the same thing. For our purpose we may regard 'leisure' as the genus of which 'recreation' is a species. There are many other ways of utilising leisure besides engaging oneself in recreation, although in popular conversation the two terms tend to be used interchangeably. The primary purpose of recreation is to "re-create" oneself in body, mind, and spirit; and it is with this object in view that we should judge the use to which a person puts his leisure. If recreation is used by one in getting dead drunk or in dancing till very late at night or in playing cards till the small hours of the morning, it cannot be said that the person concerned has "re-created" himself. If anything, he has made himself less fit for the work of the day following the enjoyment. It is said, with a certain amount of justification, that in some offices the day following every important public holiday is also to be declared a holiday in order to enable their employers to get over the after effects of their undue enjoyment on the holiday.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the same kind of recreation cannot do good to everybody. It depends on various conditions, such as the person's temperament and upbringing, the nature of his work, and the environment in which he lives, moves, and has his being. Thus, in the case of a manual labourer, bodily rest may in many cases be the best form of recreation, while to a person who works with his mind all the time, bodily labour may mean rest. "Change of occupation, and not merely cessation of occupation, has a remarkable effect in restoring poise and tone." Our society should make it possible, say, for a philosopher to work in the garden every now and then, while his own gardener sits under the tree and philosophises. It is a welcome sign of the times

that with a view to relieving industrial workers of the monotonous nature of their work, attempts are being made to vary their work by shifting them periodically from one branch to another. Even a theoretical comprehension of all the processes of the work connected with the small share which they themselves are asked to contribute, gives them an intelligent interest in their work and makes them more efficient.

If leisure is to be of maximum value to the maximum number of people, it is necessary to classify people as well as their interests in life. In olden times leisure was the privilege of the few. The aristocrat, freed from the necessity of earning his living, very often spent his time in idleness or in trivialities. Thomas Carlyle, who was a great apostle of work and glorified it, claimed that a well-to-do member of the British aristocracy, with an income of £200,000 a year, consumed the whole fruit of 6666 men's labour and did nothing for it, but to "kill partridges." While this statement may be true generally, in spite of the characteristic exaggeration of Carlyle's language, it must be admitted that the English nobility in general has tried to put into practice the principle of *Noblesse Oblige*. For generations now it has rendered conspicuous service to the national and political life of the country and to its education and culture, without indulging in conspicuous waste and luxury. It has built up a tradition of service and has acted as the carrier of what is good in the past.

When we turn from the English aristocracy to the Princely Order of India, it must be confessed that a good many of that Order make a thoroughly improper use of their leisure and of public money. The riotous living of some of them in foreign lands and the maladministration which prevails in several of their States make one wonder whether the time has not come for cutting down their freedom and emoluments to the narrowest limits possible. It is true that there are a few among them to whom the general well-being and economic prosperity of their subjects is a matter of utmost concern, but such Princes are few and far between. The leisure time of

many of them is spent in expensive and unnecessary Continental tours and in travelling back and forth to the various summer and winter capitals of India, basking in the sunshine of Governors and Viceroys. They spend lavishly on entertaining high government officials and others of their own rank, while their own people wallow in poverty. The sports in which some of them indulge are wasteful sports such as the killing of tigers and leopards which have been carefully preserved in their jungles by a State department and are driven to the mouth of their guns to be shot on specified occasions and at the appointed time. In order that their Royal Highnesses may indulge in game hunting, polo, golf, and the like, a great deal of valuable land has to remain uncultivated.

What the Princes do on a large scale, the Zamindars and taluqdars do within limits. Several of them are absentee landlords, fleecing their tenants to the utmost degree possible and contributing very little to their prosperity. Instead of giving their time and attention to the scientific methods of cultivation, the improvement of cattle and social uplift, they waste their substance in litigation and extravagant living. They have not yet learnt the truth of the principle of *Noblesse Oblige.*

When we pass from the Princes and the landed aristocracy to other classes, we find that they too have an inadequate understanding of the meaning of leisure. A great many of our successful merchants and traders live for money and die for it. The fact that many of them march to an early grave on account of over-work, unrelieved by the proper use of leisure, does not seem to deter them from their suicidal course. Recently the Ceylon government had to pass a Shop Ordinance limiting the hours of work, particularly with a view to checking the unfair competition offered by Indian merchants and shopkeepers, who, at the risk of their health, were keeping their places of business open from early in the morning till late at night. The trouble with many of our well-to-do business men is that they have not yet learnt the art of

enjoying life in the best manner possible. Even such a gentle and harmless form of recreation as daily walk is not to their liking. They prefer to go about in their comfortable cars all the time, forgetting the primitive art of walking. Some of them go to summer resorts and attend horse races, blindly imitating those higher up in the social scale. They have no time for any hobby or for such vigorous games as hockey, cricket, and tennis or for health-giving exercises such as rowing and riding. Many of them are not even patrons of music, painting, sculpture, poetry, or literature. Their one and only one God of worship is Mammon.

Among the educated classes of India, especially of the younger generation, there is a greater appreciation of the importance of leisure. But in the case of a good many, it is only a theoretical appreciation. The large band of lawyers and politicians in whom the country abounds turn to politics as the elixir of life. In a subject country like India that is perhaps inevitable. Till national freedom is won, everything else seems to be of minor importance. But this does not mean that we should take life so seriously as to exclude from it all forms of leisure and recreation. One chief trouble with a good many of our educated people is that they talk shop everywhere. They cannot be at ease with themselves when they are off their work, unless they carry with them the worries of their office or desk wherever they go. In recent years a large number of recreation clubs have been organised in towns and cities where educated men, and sometimes women, can spend their afternoons and evenings, playing tennis, billiards, cards, etc., and reading newspapers, magazines, and light literature.

These recreation clubs are for the most part patronised by government officers, often of the "gazetted" rank, rising professional men such as doctors and lawyers, and a few business men. Members of the Civil Service who through the years have built up a myth of efficiency and paternal care

for the suffering poor also have a variety of opportunity for leisure and recreation. Their office hours are short and they enjoy a large number of holidays and leave of one kind or another on full pay, half pay, etc.

When we turn from people of this kind to the thousands of clerks and others like them working in Government and semi-government offices, and private firms and companies the situation is indeed pitiable. They are over-worked and underpaid, a good many of them contracting such diseases as tuberculosis and dying a premature death. Although many of them are University graduates and have a taste for art, literature, music, outdoor games, and the like, the exacting nature of their work and the pittance they are paid for it make anything like the enjoyment of leisure an idle dream. No new social order for India can rest satisfied with the low position to which the huge army of educated clerks and others like them are reduced. So long as the present order of things continues, there cannot be a widespread enjoyment of leisure.

Turning our attention now to the working classes in cities and the common people in our villages, we find that the struggle for existence is so keen that there is little or no time for recreation of any kind. When mill workers have to walk some five to six miles a day even before sunrise, after having cooked their food for the day and attended to the children, and return to their humble abodes late in the evening after sunset and cook another meal and attend to the needs of their children, we do not expect them to bother themselves about leisure or recreation. The same situation is true as regards village women who walk ten to fifteen miles a day in order to sell two to three annas worth of buttermilk, firewood, or grass in the nearest town. The grinding poverty of the masses is so intense that the question of leisure becomes altogether irrelevant, if not a cruel joke.

Both industrial workers in cities at times of unemployment and agricultural workers during the off season have

periods of enforced leisure, but they have not been trained to utilise it to the best advantage possible. Much of the time is spent on idle gossip, meaningless wandering here and there, and ruinous litigation. It is not yet realised either by the public or those in authority that if the spare time of these people could be properly organised and utilised, it would immensely add to their enjoyment as well as to the productivity and general well-being of the country. Just because a great many of them find time hanging on their hands at a time of economic depression or periodic unemployment, it does not mean that they are incapable of enjoying leisure. Anyone who is acquainted with our villages knows of the important part played by *bhajanas*, theatrical performances, indigenous outdoor games, and the like in the life of the villagers from time immemorial. With the decline of rural life and the drawing away of the talents to the city and town, there has been also a marked decline in the capacity to utilise leisure. One of the urgent needs of the hour is, therefore, to resuscitate the village life and create a renewed interest in leisure-time activities. Leisure should be used to illumine and illustrate one's work.

Planning of Leisure

Two important facts which emerge from what we have said above are that leisure ought not to remain the monopoly of a special class or classes and that it should be carefully planned and organised on a national scale. Early civilisations such as the Egyptian, the Chinese, the Indian, and the Greek reached a high stage of development by providing leisure to a few select classes and compelling the masses to work for them. Such a state of affairs is not in consonance with the democratic ideal of our day. We do not believe in a society which reaches a high level of culture and civilisation by allowing a few people to climb on the shoulders of the masses. Such a society is a "slave-society", and its foundations are weak. What we want to-day is an equitable distribution of leisure so

as to avoid the extremes of social parasitism on the one hand and undue concern with one's own daily task for the sake of eking out a livelihood on the other. Where the Greeks used slave labour in providing leisure for a select few, we may use machinery on a large scale in providing leisure for all.

In the democratic society of our dream, everybody should have work and everybody should enjoy leisure. There is no justification for the so-called leisured class, which does not have to depend on its own efforts for its living—such classes as large landed proprietors, rentiers, holders of sinecures, and hangers-on at courts and public offices. Work is worship. If there are Princes and others who are not obliged to earn their daily bread by the sweat of their brow, justice demands that they should spend themselves unstintingly in the service of their people and patronise arts and sciences. According to Theodore Roosevelt, "Those who work neither with their brains nor with their hands are a menace to the public safety." Thomas Carlyle remarks "Work is the grand cure of all the maladies and miseries that ever beset mankind." Again, he says "Blessed is the man who has found his work, let him ask no other blessedness." Ruskin who writes in a similar vein remarks "Life without industry is sin, and industry without art, brutality." Dr. Eliot, a former President of Harvard University, has said that the greatest joy in life had come to him from work. All true work is service.

If in an ideal social order there is no place for social parasites, neither is there room for grinding poverty. So long as we have vast extremes of income and inherited wealth, there is no scope for the enjoyment of leisure by large sections of the population. A recent American writer observes that a man who has to work fourteen hours a day or eight hours under a speed-up system has really no leisure. What little free time and recreation he has are just enough to enable him to return again to toil. His life is one round of monotonous work, slaving for the benefit of unknown and unseen persons.

To relieve this situation, it is suggested by the advocates of Gandhian economy that we should revive cottage industry on a vast scale so that everybody will be engaged in doing the various processes of a unified piece of work himself for his own personal profit, without exploiting anybody in the bargain. These advocates claim that so far as India is concerned heavy industries such as railways, mines, the manufacture of motor cars, and machinery should be undertaken by the State on a *service* basis, while cottage industries should be worked on a small scale, with a limited use of machinery, on a *profit* basis. The advantages claimed for this arrangement are that it will give every individual zest in his work, abolish the artificial distinction between work and leisure, and render unnecessary the exploitation of helpless people and weaker nations.

There is undoubtedly much force in all these contentions. But they do not completely solve the problem of leisure. Those engaged in government-owned heavy industries would certainly require a large measure of leisure. Even those working for their own profit under conditions of cottage industry would require leisure. They may derive a great deal of joy from their work and be able to find satisfaction for the creative impulse in them, such as artisans. Notwithstanding all that, they would require opportunity to get away from themselves and their daily worries and work. Not all work is capable of being transformed into perfect art. Therefore, the planning of leisure in our modern society is of utmost importance.

The proper starting point in training people for the enjoyment of leisure is the home. The Catholics express a profound truth when they say "Give us the child until he is seven and you may have him for the rest of his life." It is during this period that habits, attitudes, and dispositions are formed which are likely to last all through life. Therefore, it is necessary that during this early stage parents should train children to understand and appreciate the uses of leisure. The

kindergarten, the play method in pedagogy, and learning things by doing them—all have their value. Parents themselves must have the spirit of play in them and realise the profound truth that play is not a waste of time. During this period parents can instil in children a love for hobbies—such as gardening, poultry-raising, bee-keeping, drawing, painting, stamp-collecting, etc. Children may be encouraged to take long walks enjoying the marvellous beauties of nature.

If the foundations are laid by the home, the school and the nation can build on them. Schools should be encouraged by means of special grants and other such means to instil in their children a keenness for " hiking " or rambling and travel by cycle, train, and motor bus to places of historical interest and natural beauty. Every school should have a neatly laid out garden worked by the pupils themselves. There should be facilities for learning carpentry, blacksmithy, pottery, farming, paper making, tailoring, typewriting, printing, etc., depending upon the local circumstances. A child should be encouraged to use his hands and fingers much more than is the case at present. While at school every child should cultivate some simple and inexpensive hobby, which he can keep up all through life and which can give him immeasurable delight when he grows up and is weighted with the burdens of the household and his work. Every school should have ample facilities for athletics, and no child should be given his school-leaving certificate unless he has put in a minimum number of hours of attendance at games and sports of various kinds. Movements such as the Boy Scouts and Girl Guides should be actively encouraged so long as they are free from sectarianism or suggestions of imperialism, and do everything possible to teach boys and girls the art of social living. The Scout Movement has three advantages: (1) It brings the children into close contact with nature. (2) It provides companionship in adventure. (3) It promotes social equality.* The cinema should be widely used by schools or groups of schools, inasmuch as it is a quick

* C. D. Burns: *Leisure.*

and vivid way of teaching a great deal about the world. Travel films, films of wild life, films depicting great stories in prose and poetry, and films exhibiting the historical monuments and beauty spots of India can all be used to great advantage. The radio also can come to the aid of the school in educating as well as entertaining the pupil. Care should be taken to exclude propaganda of every description. Nazi Germany has prostituted the radio in making its school children military-minded.

Uniforms, regulations, and marchings in groups have their value, but they are apt to be overdone. They may destroy spontaneity in the play of children. In organising the leisure of children, utmost care should be taken not to crush individuality and originality. While the West has made great advances in the art of comfortable living, it has produced too many standardised men and women, who conform to a type in matters of food, dress, taste, general outlook, politics, and even love-making. Undue conformity and conventionality are some of the worst features of life in the West. We want our people to be themselves.

The art of conversation is something which the modern world is losing fast. In ancient times much wisdom was imbibed through conversation. Socrates carried this method to perfection through questions and answers. Our education to-day places too much emphasis on book-learning and too little on everyday-life and practical experience. When an educated Indian talks, he often orates, and, if he is a clever man, he dominates the whole conversation. The art of conversation lies in a process of give and take which will add to the enlightenment as well as the enjoyment of all those who take part in it. A good deal of modern conversation is conventional talk about weather, health, and the latest news in the morning paper, if it does not descend to the level of gossip and scandal-mongering. The home and the school can do much in training children in the art of conversation.

When we turn from children to youth, we need to remember that youth do not want to be treated like children. Young people to-day are much more independent and assertive than the youth of the last generation. The forms of recreation in which they are most interested are the cinema, commercialised sports and athletics, and mass meetings of a political character. Also, with the gradual removal of barriers between sexes, young men and women seek the companionship of each other and like to spend their leisure hours together. The older generation may shake its head in disapproval at this kind of innovation, but it cannot stem the tide. The right thing is to place high ideals before youth, especially when they are in their teens when hero-worship and lofty idealism make a powerful appeal, and trust them to do the right thing. Indigenous movements such as the Bratachari movement* aiming at the building of strong and healthy bodies in the service of the country should be encouraged. So also should such organisations as the University Training Corps, if we are convinced of the rightness of war as a "cruel necessity" in defending one's country against an aggressor. We cannot approve of compulsory military training for the youth of the country, for, as time goes on, the world is bound to be convinced that war does not pay

* "The Bratachari Movement may be described as a system embodying an ideal and practice of citizenship based on a simultaneous physical, mental and spiritual discipline through the medium of rhythmic vows and songs expressive of a high ideal of conduct and accompanied by the practice of national and community dances.

Brata signifies a solemn ideal or purpose which is pursued as a rhythmic ritual and Chari denotes one who pursues such an ideal or purpose. The Brata of life is 'Knowledge, Labour, Truth, Unity and Joy.' The ultimate purpose of a Bratachari is to achieve the ideal of the complete man or the complete citizen of the world by attaining complete self-expression as world man in all spheres of life, physical, mental and spiritual and establishing complete inner harmony and unity with all humanity.

Its origin lies in the researches made by Mr. Guru Saday Dutt, between the years 1929–32 into the folk dances and folk songs of Bengal and in an attempt to conserve them and to popularise their practice on the part of the public.

The Bratachari Movement offers a genuine means of self-expression of the community by the formation of society dedicated to social service and constructive work and earnestly striving towards the development of individual character and organised collective life.

In its present form it originated in 1932."

The Bratachari Movement—Its aim and Meaning.

anybody and is thoroughly unbecoming of human beings and that non-violence, though not immediately, is the only right course of action. War is bestial.

Youth may be guided in selecting the right type of moving pictures and those forms of recreation which will really "recreate" them. The guiding principle should be entertainment as well as enlightenment. Both prudery and the complete letting down of the bars should be deprecated. They should be induced to travel about and see the country, undertake "hikes", and do strenuous hill-climbing. It is time that there was a strong youth movement in the country having as one of its mottos "Strength through joy". There should be a network of national playing fields and parks throughout the country subsidised by the State. Instead of contenting themselves with witnessing somebody else play cricket, football, hockey, or tennis, every young man, particularly in our schools and colleges, should be encouraged to play these games himself, supplementing them by inexpensive indigenous games. It is unfortunate that, in spite of Mahatma Gandhi's pleading, communal cricket is patronised in India today. Sports should know no distinctions of caste, community or race. Communal sports should receive no countenance whatever. There should be musical and dramatic societies in every school and college and in every village and *mohulla** in the city. Those who have a taste for photography should be encouraged to become amateur photographers and become members of photographic societies. Young people should be made to realise their responsibility towards the poor and unfortunate. Teachers and elders should inspire them to take an active interest in some form or other of social service by their own personal example.

There should be a network of libraries, reading rooms, and research centres all over the country open to everybody who can utilise them. The admission fee to them should be

* *Mohulla*—part of a town.

next to nothing so that even the literate labourer and enterprising peasant can find his way to them. In this respect Soviet Russia has made great headway. For years now British Universities have conducted evening extension courses mainly for the benefit of workmen in scientific and technical subjects, literature, art, and civics. Such endeavour might usefully be undertaken by Indian Universities too. But even before that, adult education should be undertaken on such a large scale as to wipe out illiteracy in the course of a generation. Agricultural Colleges, research centres, and radio stations are disseminating very useful knowledge to the farmers and agriculturists, but such information should be more closely related to actual village conditions than is the case at present. We should build on the common experience of the people of the village. There should be a rural reconstruction officer in every village organising the spare time activities of the villagers.

As said earlier, the common people in our villages, towns, and cities cannot be persuaded to make time for leisure and recreation till their bare human needs are met. Some of the indirect methods of meeting these needs and providing for free public education and public health and an extensive use of State-aided insurance against unemployment, old age, accidents, premature widowhood, etc. The social services provided out of public funds should be so large and varied that one will be relieved of the necessity of devoting every minute of his time and every ounce of his energy to provide himself and those dependent on him the bare necessities of physical existence. Common property in the form of public parks, libraries, recreation centres, music halls and the like should be so large and social services such as free education, free medicine, and subsidised housing should be so abundant that there will be no need for more than a limited amount of private property. In other words our immediate goal should be "Common property large, private property small."

In order that the common people may utilise their leisure hours properly, we need both positive and negative measures. Government should compel every factory and mill-owner to provide ample recreation facilities for his employees. The employees themselves through their recognised organisations such as the Trade Unions should supplement the efforts made by the employers. Non-sectarian and non-political organisations which aim at the improvement of the conditions of the people such as the Servants of India Society might be given every possible inducement to arrange a well-thought out programme of sports, outdoor and indoor games, moving pictures, and simple talks on civic rights and duties and on public health and sanitation, as well as musical, dramatic, and radio programmes.

As for negative measures, both the State and public opinion should co-operate in abolishing such evils as drunkenness, gambling, and prostitution. We discountenance the idea that strong drink is necessary for the working man in order to get over his bodily weariness. There is a very strong sentiment in favour of prohibition all through India, and the efforts of the Congress government in enacting prohibition received the general approval of the people. It is true that such efforts were not to the liking of drunkards or the vested interests which profit by the liquor trade. But that is no reason why prohibition should not be given a fair trial. The argument that it will make serious inroads into the revenues of the country is irrelevant. If the revenue falls, we should find alternative sources of revenue or cut the coat according to the cloth and not perpetuate a dire social evil which does incalculable harm to the poor people of the country. The fact that prohibition has not succeeded in the United States is no argument why it should not be tried in India. Both the Hindu and Muslim teaching is against the consumption of liquor. The large bulk of the middle classes and a high percentage of villagers have not yet become addicted to drink. Besides, in a warm country like India there is no need for

liquor. If the Congress had stayed in office, it is more than likely that prohibition would have been extended to a wider area and administered more effectively. Even during the short period when it was in office and enacted prohibition, the results justified the boldness of the effort. There was a definite decline in the number of criminal cases, and the purchasing power of the labourer went up. Women in particular benefited by it. More money was available for nourishing food and clothing. The financial position of the labourers improved and mortgages were redeemed. Children were better clad and dwelling houses showed a decided improvement. After the enthusiasm of the first few months had spent itself, there has been considerable deterioration. But even as late as the closing months of 1941 the Member of the Board of Revenue of the Madras Government, in charge of excise, observed that prohibition had been a success in spite of the general public not having given the measure as much support as it deserved. With an alert public opinion and active co-operation of private bodies, a national government with a religious fervour for prohibition can make the experiment a success.

If liquor acts as a detriment to the well-being of a great many who use it, the effects of narcotics are even worse. Here again we need the whole-hearted co-operation of the people and government in putting down the evil. The Government of India should take courage in both its hands and restrict the production of opium to what is necessary for "strictly scientific and medicinal purposes."

We cannot support the argument used by Government at times, that opium and the various preparations from it are a household remedy in India against malaria, stomach troubles, etc., and that it is a cruelty to deprive the poor man of it. In recent years the Government of India has done much in limiting the area under the cultivation of opium and in controlling the sale of the commodity for internal consumption. However, a great deal more needs to be done. In the en-

forcement of prohibition of liquor and of narcotic drugs we need a scrupulously honest police and excise staff as well as an alert public which would help in detecting the offender and bringing him to book.

Gambling is assuming serious proportions in India. The instinct of getting something for nothing is deep-rooted in man, and gambling caters to that instinct. Even villagers gamble on cock fights and bull fights, partly because they have no other excitement. In industrial centres, gambling is becoming a serious menace and poor people lose vast sums of honestly-earned money on it. A good many take to gambling in connection with horse racing, which is an evil introduced into the country by the foreigner; and one of the first duties of a national government would be to abolish horse-racing or at least make it penal for people to bet on horses.

Prostitution is another social evil which needs to be tackled resolutely. Neitzsche spoke truly when he said: "The mother of debauchery is not joy, but joylessness." The experience of the Western countries is that with the provision of a positive recreation programme there has been a visible decline in the amount of drunkenness and prostitution. The same is likely to be true of India, too, if the recreation programme we have outlined above is put into effect. At the same time, direct measures should be adopted in the eradication of prostitution and the traffic in women and children.

In planning for the leisure activities of people, we need to provide for the two opposing moods of men—the desire for excitement and the desire for quiet. Some people, especially certain classes of workers, require more excitement than others. But every one should have opportunity for the exercise of both excitement and quiet. Mere excitement is not good for man. It is likely to make him a nervous wreck. All that it does is to provide an escape mechanism for the time being. It should be supplemented by quiet, which is indispensable to thought and reflection. Picture

going, witnessing an exciting football match, etc., may advantageously be supplemented by long hours of quiet walk into the country or the outskirts of a city, away from the din and noise of people. We must not lose sight of the fact that man is a creature who "thinks before and after." A man who does not make time to think and reflect is no better than a brute. Even in married relations there should be opportunity for each partner to be by himself or herself so that one can think and reflect. The husband and wife should have many common as well as some individual interests. C. D. Burns is right when he says: "A wife who is only a wife is a bore, just as a husband who is only a husband is generally a beast."

In promoting companionship and providing opportunities for the enjoyment of one's spare time, we should plan on having a chain of cafes and restaurants which will provide simple and wholesome food and drink in attractive surroundings and at a reasonable price. The present practice of only men going to restaurants, leaving their families behind, should be discouraged. On holidays and other such occasions the whole family may want to have their meals together in one of these cafes or restaurants. Such eating places should undertake a diet revolution, utilising the services of nutrition experts. Coffee and tea which do not do much good, but perhaps do considerable harm when one over-indulges in them, should more and more be replaced by buttermilk, fruit juices, especially of fresh lime which is cheap and health-giving, ragi malt, etc. More use should be made of whole wheat than of rice whose nutritive value is very little. Where rice is used, parboiled rice should be preferred to raw rice and hand-pounded rice to milled rice. In no circumstance should the water in which the rice is boiled be thrown away. There should be a proper balancing of diet, making an abundant use of greens and leafy vegetables which are plentiful in India and which are rich in their vitamin value. The present practice of eating large quantities of rice to the accompaniment of tiny quantities of vegetables should

be reversed. Steamed food should be preferred to fried and highly spiced food. The monotony which one finds in most Brahmin hotels should give place to a variety both in the selection of the articles of food and in the number of dishes which can be cooked out of the same article. The use of highly refined sugar should more and more be replaced by *gur* or jaggery produced under hygienic conditions and by honey, where possible. A wider use should be made of nuts and fruits. During the height of the fruit season, mangoes, pineapples, grapes, oranges, etc. should be preserved either as whole fruit by the process of canning or as fruit juices in bottles. In the matter of food reform, the educated people should set the pace, instead of clinging to time-old ways and foods which have no nutritive value or by patronising expensive tinned food from abroad. In a country like India we should be able to produce vegetable soups, marmite, etc., instead of having to depend upon foreign lands for them.

The whole family can enjoy leisure together not only by having a few of their meals in good cafes and restaurants, but also by going out together on short trips and for picnics. Week-ends could be spent together in quiet, out of the way places in tents or *dak* bungalows. While at home, families which can afford to have a radio can sit around it and enjoy a variety of menu which is available these days. The Indian home can learn a great deal of value from the Western home if the whole family can sit round the dining table or in the drawing room and enjoy themselves through a game of cards, light conversation, story telling or music provided by the members of the family itself. All this makes for companionship and mutual enjoyment. Many more things should be done together by the family as a unit than is the case at present, since the collective enjoyment derived from such undertakings is bound to be much greater than individual enjoyment when each member of the family plans his own leisure and recreation without consulting the needs and conveniences of the rest of the family.

With the steady increase in the longevity of middle class Indians, as a result of a greater regard being paid to health and sanitation, the period of compulsory retirement in most services at 55 needs to be revised. A good many in the Western countries do constructive work up to 65 and 70 years of age. Even after making due allowance for the inhospitable climate of India, it is a question whether in a good many cases the age of retirement may not profitably be extended from 55 to 60. The reason for making this suggestion is that several retired people, having spent all their working years in strenuous labour, find themselves at a loose end when they retire; and, not finding anything worthwhile to do, find their way to an early grave. In order to discourage people who should retire at 55 but who want to hang on for the sake of a salary, the salary after 55 may be halved, making it possible for those who really have a passion for their work to continue in service.

A question of much importance in considering the problem of leisure is the extent to which recreation may be commercialised. The chief criticism of commercialised recreation is that its first, and sometimes only, consideration is private profit. But this need not always be so. It is possible to combine profit motive with service motive. Travel agencies such as Thomas Cook and Sons and American Express Co., no doubt make much money, but they also render great service to the travelling public. The cinema in particular has come in for a great deal of criticism. It has been contended by some that it is largely responsible for debased moral standards, particularly as regards sex. The fact of the matter, however, is that if there is undue interest in sex to-day, it is due to repression or complex of one kind or another in contemporary society, quite apart from the cinema. The public in general gets the entertainment which it demands. Therefore, instead of throwing the entire blame on the cinema, strenuous efforts should be made to improve the public taste. At the same time, the cinema industry should realise its moral

responsibility to provide clean and wholesome pictures. Both the cinema and the general public should act and react upon each other.

Professionalism kills any genuine enjoyment of leisure. Boxing and wrestling matches are attended by thousands of people, but all kinds of deceitful practices are adopted in order to swell the gate money. The management sometimes colludes with the boxers or wrestlers to put up a mock show. Dance halls, eating places, and hotels are at times places where opportunity is provided for the illicit satisfaction of one's sexual impulses. Places of natural beauty are advertised in glorious terms and people are induced to visit them in order that some vested interest or other may reap a huge harvest. In spite of their aberrations, it is not desirable to put down commercialised recreation altogether. What is needed is the proper supervision and control of it by the State. In India one rejoices to find that much of our entertaiment and recreation is connected with religious festivals, frequently in a beautiful natural setting on the banks of sacred rivers, on the sea beach or on hill tops. While there is scope for abuses here as well, it is much less than in places where people assemble merely for enjoyment, provided by commercial agencies. People travel great distances often by foot, through fields and valleys, hills and mountains in order to take part in a religious festival. In undertaking such a trip they not only satisfy their religious longings, but also their aesthetic sense. It is regrettable that we have not yet utilised these religious festivals to the fullest extent possible in the interest of recreation and popular education. Religious disquisitions, musical entertainments, carnivals and cattle fairs are the usual accompaniments of these festivals. To these may be added national games, artistic dances, and entertainment and instruction through the film and radio.

While we cannot eradicate commercilised recreation, the State and voluntary agencies should be constantly planning for the leisure activities of the people. The State should

undertake a proper city planning with small parks and playgrounds in congested areas which will serve as the lungs of the city and provide garden plots outside the city for the workers. It should also provide national parks on a large scale, public libraries, and reading rooms, museums and art galleries. Some of the European cities have their own opera houses and theatres.

The aim of public policy should be such that everybody has some leisure and nobody's work is so exacting as to leave no energy for the enjoyment of leisure. We should educate people for the proper utilisation of leisure as well as improve public taste. What the State can do in this latter sphere is very limited. But those who have an artistic gift can do a great deal. Thanks to the life-long efforts of the late Dr. Rabindranath Tagore, public taste in India has been raised to a high level. We are no longer satisfied with a blind imitation of western art, music, and dance. We have come to realise that in drawing, painting, sculpture, music, dance and drama we can hold our own with any other country in the world. What Tagore has done for the re-orientation of education in an artistic setting, Uday Shanker and his followers are doing for dance. The late Mr. G. S. Dutt has popularised physical culture through the Bratachari movement. The cinema industry to-day in India is becoming more dignified as a result of well-educated and respectable young men and women adopting a film career. All this shows that the amateur and semi-professional can do a great deal in developing public taste along right lines.

In the planning of leisure, literary, cultural and athletic societies as well as village and caste organisations can play a vital part. Owing to our lop-sided education, several of our organisations and associations devote more time to literary activities than to cultural activities or to the building up of the body. We should so change our emphasis that every part of man's complex nature will have facilities provided for its

complete development. We should remember that the tone of any society depends largely on the quality of its leisure.

The extra-curricular activities of our educational institutions should be devoted to the cultivation of leisure. The best efforts of men and women should be devoted to working out suggestions for the creative use of leisure. Our educated women in particular should be induced to devote a good part of their time to such objects as (a) home decoration, (b) kitchen craft, (c) study of food values, (d) nursing, and (e) participation in the work of philanthropic institutions. Our educated men should be trained to devote their leisure hours to exercise, social work, village reconstruction, municipal cleanliness, the development of a civic consciousness, adult education, mass contacts, and systematic reading and writing.

CHAPTER XV

EDUCATION FOR CITIZENSHIP

If a new and desirable social order is to be created, its foundations should be laid at the home and the school. Education for a long time has been unduly governed by utilitarian considerations. The time has now come for a re-orientation of education in order that, among other things, we may train boys and girls for a life of citizenship. Writing on the aims of education, Sir Ernest Simon distinguishes three of them, each of which must play an important part in the new social order. The first of these, not necessarily in the order of importance, is the enabling of children to make their way in the world and earn a living. One of the chronic problems of our day is unemployment which, in India, hits the middle class educated people particularly hard. This means that a chief aim of education should be to give children knowledge and skill so that they may be able to overcome the demon of unemployment. For a good many children, education should have a distinct vocational bias. L. P. Jacks claims that skill is one of the main sources of strength in modern civilisation and recommends to the Labour Party of his country the adoption of the motto: "The greatest skill of the greatest number."

The second aim mentioned by Sir E. Simon is cultural. Education which stops short of "the bread and butter" aim is inadequate and altogether short-sighted. Merely to give children the tools by which they can earn a living is not to educate them. Education should enable them to understand and appreciate the finer values of life. Appreciation of art and beauty, reflection upon the conditions of life around them, and contemplation of the eternal verities of life should form a part of the training given to youth. A truly educated person is one who can be at home in the midst of all surroundings, not in the sense of blindly resigning himself to the in-

evitable, but in the sense of utilising situations to the best advantage possible. He should develop such a sense of detachment that, instead of being a slave of circumstances, he would be their master. He would further have a trained eye for the detecting of truth, beauty, and goodness even in the most unexpected quarters.*

The third aim of education is training for citenzenship. Man is a social being and naturally seeks the company of his fellowmen. This means that he has rights and duties in respect of society. Education should enable a person to take his legitimate place in society and contribute to its strength and unity. It is not seldom that we come across persons who may be excellent scholars, keen business or professional men, loving fathers, and ideal husbands, but who are at the same time bad citizens. The development of a civic consciousness, therefore, becomes an important aim of sound education. Ruskin rightly remarks: "Education is not to teach people to know what they do not know but to behave as they do not behave."

We repudiate the view of education as stated by the Encyclopædia Britannica that it is "an attempt by the adult members of human society to shape the development of the coming generation in accordance with *its own ideals of life*" (italics ours). We are not so enamoured of our own ideals as to want to perpetuate them for ever. Our aim should be not to educate children for democracy as we know it to-day, but for "the democracy to come."

If "Education for citizenship" is thus one of the principal aims of education, the next question is how are we to realise it in practice? The traditional view has been that citizenship is not a subject which should be taught directly, but is something which can be taught indirectly through a general training

1. In the Nazi and Fascist states the triune virtues inculcated in children are "Believe, Obey, and Fight." Mechanical discipline and blind obedience to authority are emphasised at the expense of individual liberty. Study of humanities and even the aesthetic aspect of education are deliberately ignored.

of the mind, particularly with the help of the classics. We do not believe that such a view can stand the test of experience. We believe that it is as necessary to impart to pupils lessons in citizenship as it is to inculcate in them fundamental moral qualities. While there is bound to be some " transfer " from one subject to another, we cannot agree that we can make a man a good citizen by merely giving him a general training of the mind. " Nobody," remarks Sir E. Simon " thinks of training doctors through Hebrew or engineers through theology."* Such being the case, if we want good citizens we must train children in citizenship and subjects of study related to it. A knowledge of the broad facts of politics and economics should be made available to every young man and woman. As many as possible should be taught the elements of civics, of political institutions, and political theory. We do not want our universities to become "groups of professional schools " as in Germany and France, but want them to lay the foundation of a truly liberal education in addition to what professional and technical education they may impart. We want them among other things to train the younger generation "to discuss dispassionately and realistically the problems of Civil Liberty, the doctrine of the Rule of Law, the idea of progress, the value of culture and the basis of economic Justice."

Turning our attention more specifically to conditions in India, it may safely be said that at the present stage of our national devolopment there are few subjects which are more worthy of our immediate attention than citizenship. Democracy, even partial democracy, is undoubtedly a great boon, but, without a spirit of good citizenship, it cannot succeed. Even the best form of government is sure to fail if the people for whom it is provided do not possess sound character. Intelligent villians can do much greater harm to a country than mere fools. Centuries ago, Aristotle discovered the valuable truth that the success or failure of a constitution depends on the character and temper of the people. Almost any constitution

* Education for Citizenship in Secondary Schools, p. 20.

can be made to yield good results if the character of the people is sound. Citizenship calls for a passion and devotion to the State and community analogous to the passion and devotion which the individual has to his own family.

The word "citizenship" and the related term "civics" are derived from the Latin word "civitas," indicating thereby that civic life had its origin in the city-states of the ancient world. Both Plato and Aristotle assigned a very important place to the training of the individual in all civic virtues. To the Greek thinkers in general, to be a good citizen was practically equal to being a good man. Aristotle defined citizenship as the capacity to rule and to be ruled.

The civic ideal reached a very high degree of development in the Greek City State. The relation between the individual and the State was so intimate as to justify the saying, "She is ours and we are hers." Pericles said: "Our city as a whole is an education." While the Greeks thus regarded the life of the individual as inextricably interwoven with the life of the State, we tend to look upon the State as something outside ourselves. And it is in order that we may correct this tendency that we are obliged to stress the civic education of youth which calls for a conscious effort of the mind and will.

In India not much emphasis has been placed on citizenship till very recent years; and the contrast is most striking when we take into account the minute care given to civic training in some of the modern states. After the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71 France devised a system of national education which made the teaching of patriotism compulsory, the good effect of which was seen during the Great War of 1914-18. Since then, however, a moral decadence set into the body politic resulting in the defeat of France at the hands of Germany in 1940. For many years now, the U.S.A. has been carrying on a programme of Americanization endeavouring to mould her vast and heterogeneous population after a single pattern. Training in citizenship is an essential part of education of every American.

In our own day Italy, Germany, and Japan have been using the teaching of citizenship to make the youth of their country aggressive and military-minded, deliberately turning them back to the days of barbarism. In the words of the Emperor of Japan, the aim of education should be " that in all emergencies the individual ought to offer himself courageously for the state."

In ancient India citizenship was based on the ideal of *Dharma*, according to which every Hindu was to develop his personality through the four stages of life as a student, householder, forest dweller, and ascetic. It was also his duty to maintain the social order by faithfully performing the duties of the class to which he belonged, a close parallel to which is found in Plato's threefold classification of society which laid down that the rulers should rule, the warriors defend, and the husbandmen produce the necessities of life. The Muslim faith in its glorious days taught *Din* and *Millat*—the purification of self and the realisation of social unity. The Christian teaching on citizenship which is not confined to this life alone is summed up in the conception of the kingdom of God, which stands for a rule of justice and righteousness, and which knows no distinction of race, caste or creed. It is a universal kingdom, one in which every individual is enabled to be his best possible self and where the family ethics prevails. In this kingdom each is enjoined to contribute according to his ability and each is to be rewarded according to his needs. Purity of heart is to precede and accompany the transformation of man's social environment into the image of God.

In modern times in India no serious and systematic effort has been made to teach citizenship to our boys and girls. Education has been lop-sided, emphasising the literary aspect at the expense of the civic and cultural. It has produced expert quill-drivers and contentious lawyers, providing little or no scope for the expression of the national soul contenting itself for the most part with the furnishing of information, helping one to pass such an examination and enabling one to earn a living at the lower rungs of the professional ladder.

What is required of education to-day is that it should become an active promoter of social and national unity, creating a nucleus of enlightenment and progress. It should become "a leaven which leaveneth the whole mass." Though education in India has not directly imparted lessons in citizenship, it has indirectly wrought a certain degree of national unity and solidarity. The study of western institutions and the works of such inspiring writers as Burke, Mill, and Spencer has filled the educated Indian with a desire to be free and united and to give this country a place of dignity and equality in a family of self-respecting and self-governing nations. Even the partial democracy which the country enjoys to-day and which has been won by the efforts of the self-sacrificing among our number has been a large-scale experiment in public education. Much more, however, remains to be accomplished in the direction of both political freedom and civic training.

Citizenship, Both a Science and an Art

Prof. Ernest Barker rightly observes: "civics properly understood, runs into or comes out of ethics." Years ago Kant observed that a true theory of politics must begin by doing homage to ethics. If this point of view be accepted, we are right in saying that citizenship is, like morals, both a science and an art. It is not only a subject which should be learnt like other branches of study, but also an art which should be assiduously practised. It may be defined as character in action. It is simply another name for right social living. No man has a right to be called a good citizen if he does not do all that lies in his power to practise citizenship in every walk of life. The mere possession of a knowledge of political institutions and of the facts of civic life does not make one a good citizen. It calls for an effort of both the mind and will.

In educating children for citizenship, we must make it absolutely clear that citizenship is not mere patriotism. It is much wider and deeper than patriotism. Rightly or wrongly, patriotism is often associated in the popular mind with some

form or another of noble, exalted, and exceptional service rendered to one's country at an hour of great need. It often means prepardeness to lay down one's life for the good of the country and has at times even been construed to mean lying and prevaricating on behalf of one's country when its safety or honour was at stake. It is no wonder, then, that an ambassador has humorously been defined as "one who lies abroad for the good of his country." The first casualty in war, it is said, is truth. Machiavelli, who is the most outstanding exponent of the type of patriotism here mentioned says: "I prefer my country to the salvation of my soul."

In the history of the world there have been not a few good patriots who rendered some striking and conspicuous service to their country at exceptional times, but who were poor citizens in their every day life and contacts. Even to-day one may find a good patriot, but not a good citizen, who tries to dodge the ticket collector, the income tax officer, or the customs official. The world is slowly learning the bitter truth that patriotism, in the oft-quoted words of Nurse Cavell, "is not enough." At times, it is "the last refuge of a scoundrel." 'Citizenship' on the other hand, calls for a steady, continuous, devoted, intelligent, and often unnoticed and unrecognised service in both small things and big, to one's immediate neighbourhood, one's country, and eventually to humanity itself. Not infrequently patriotism in its actual working has been a divisive force; but citizenship is a unifying factor. It knits together man and man, community and community, nation and nation in an all-embracing unity. In the training of children, citizenship, rather than patriotism, should be the goal of our endeavour.

Another valuable truth to instil in the minds of youth is that citizenship is in the nature of a series of ever-widening concentric circles. It begins with the home or family, but soon spreads itself into the neighbourhood, the village, the town or city, one's industry or occupation, the country, and the world

at large. The good citizen should recognise his loyalty to every one of these groups. Citizenship which stops short of one or few of these groups is partial and incomplete. True citizenship means a right ordering of loyalties. To put the matter concretely, a good citizen ought to be a good father, husband or brother, a congenial and useful neighbour, a loyal and intelligent patriot, a faithful worker, a lover of the poor and down-trodden, and an ardent champion of international peace and goodwill. Citizenship is not a mere sentiment or the repetition of platitudes. It is a steady and devoted service in every aspect of man's life.

In the light of what has been said, it follows that in the understanding and practice of citizenship, one should begin as far as possible with one's own immediate neighbourhood. Before world unity and world responsibility are taught, one should teach local unity and local responsibility. Love of humanity in the abstract is sheer nonsense. In teaching children lessons in citizenship, we should begin with the panchayat, municipality, and district board and gradually work our way up to the province, nation, and the world at large. In the case of children in their adolescence, simple but valuable lessons can be taught in world politics and world community. Besides teaching them loyalty to their own school, province, and country, we can instil in them a genuine faith in the brotherhood of man. A good citizen should be a good nationalist and a better internationalist. He should know how to keep together his different loyalties—loyalty to his family, to his profession, to his language, to his religion, to his country, and to the wider humanity of which he is a part. He should not let his loyalties take the form of *anti*-anything, except it be anti-injustice and anti-inhumanity. His loyalty to the Tamil language and literature, for instance, need not take the form of a crusade against the teaching of a national language for India such as Hindustani. Neither should his loyalty to Christianity mean in any way anti-Hinduism or anti-Islam.

The Science or Philosophy of Citizenship

As indicated already, citizenship is a science which the teacher and taught should learn together and an art which they should live together. The science of citizenship should include, among other things :

(1) An appreciation of the worth and dignity of every human being.

(2) An understanding of the right relation of the individual to society and of the necessity of social solidarity.

(3) An apprehension of the place of the State in the life of the individual and of society.

(4) A recognition of the correlation of rights and obligations.

(5) An appreciation of the importance of the proper training of habits, dispositions, and attitudes in children and youth.

(1) *The Worth of the Individual.*—Reverence for human personality, which is only dimly perceived to-day, is the first lesson to learn in citizenship. To quote the well-known words of Immanuel Kant, every man is an end in himself and nobody is a mere means to another's end ; and to quote the late Lord Haldane : " Personality is the great central fact of the Universe." There can be on doubt that one of the chief causes of the stagnation of Indian society is the comparative lack of reverence for personality. Artificial distinctions of caste, class, creed, and community are inimical to the development of a spirit of true citizenship. The leadership principle accompanied by blind submission to authority which is so dear to the hearts of modern dictators does the utmost possible violence to the value of individual human personality. Individual freedom which is indispensable to the development of personality is

spurned by the Nazis who say "We spit on freedom"; "we think with our blood."

If we are to reverence human personality, we must have a genuine faith in the brotherhood of all men. Good citizenship calls for a much larger degree of social and economic equality than most people dream to-day. The constant endeavour of society should be to enable every man to be the very best person that he possibly can be within the limits of his capacity. There should be a practical reconciliation between the principle of equality and the fact of natural inequality. Every individual should be given the fullest and freest opportunity possible for the development of his capacities. Talent should not perish for want of encourgement. There should be "open career to talent." It should be recognised on all hands that human institutions have a value only to the extent to which they are conducive to the development of personality. Failure to recognise this simple truth has meant the slow death of many an ancient civilisation.

Although slavery is a thing of the past over a great part of the world, it is only dimly that we are perceiving the value and dignity of every human being, not only in the sight of God, but also in our own estimation. That gifts and capacities vary and that some are more richly endowed by nature than others are incontrovertible facts which it would be foolish to deny. To admit this difference, however, is not to justify the exploitation or oppression of one person by another or of one class by another. In a couutry like ours where the shackles of caste and communalism still remain unbroken, where equality of opportunity and equality of consideration are still largely existent only in the realm of ideas, and where we are still a long way off from realising the principle of "open career to

Herr Berhard Rust, a Reich Minister of State, says: "Excessive importance had been attached to the individual as such, while it was almost forgotten that each individual is at the same time a member of a racial community and that it is only in that capacity that he can perfect his powers to the fullest extent."

talent," we need to assert and re-assert the sacredness of every human personality.

(2) *Social Solidarity.*—No society can endure long if individuals and groups of individuals fight for their own narrow interests. Fortunately, in many cases, individual good and social good do not clash with each other. It is a truism to say that the ideal good of the individual and the ideal good of society never clash, but in the world of ordinary experience social good and individual good do clash at times. When they do, the good citizen should have no hesitation in choosing the higher good in preference to the lower. True citizenship means the harmonious adjustment of the legitimate claims of the individual and of society. Plato sought this harmony in his well-known doctrine of justice, according to which functions are to be distributed in accordance with fitness and the first two classes of society are to practise a community of property and a community of wives and children. The Hindus have sought this harmony in their doctrine of 'Dharma' which is not much in operation to-day. The mediaeval attempt at harmony in Europe was through a universal church-state, but it ended in failure. The conception of moderate idealists in recent times has been summed up by T. H. Bradley in the canon "My station and its duties." The Soviet motto is "From each according to his ability and to each according to the work performed," while the Nazis and Fascists claim that harmony in society can be established only when the individual joyfully surrenders himself to the service of the State, as that service is interpreted by a narrow group of individuals. For ourselves we believe that the good of a national community should have precedence over the good of a linguistic, racial, sectarian or provincial community and that the good of a world community should have precedence over all. In every community which seeks to be progressive there should be a strong sense of solidarity, an intense conviction of unity, (and) a pervasive feeling of communal life" (Hearnshaw); and the good of mankind should have

priority over the good of any government or even of any State.

(3) *The Meaning of the State.*—If we are to have a body of good citizens, we need to give them a right view of the State, even when they are young. We cannot accept the anarchist position that the State is an unmitigated evil, nor the extreme individualistic position which looks upon the State as a necessary evil. Rightly interpreted, the State is a true friend of man, and in obeying the will of the well-ordered State we obey ourselves, our own wills purged and purified of their selfishnesss.

This view of the State is not to be interpreted to mean State absolutism or State worship, for citizens do not exist for the sake of the State, but the State exists for their sake. In the inimitable language of Edmund Burke, the State is a partnership in a life of virtue and is " not to be considered as nothing better than a partnership agreement in a trade of pepper and coffee, calico or tobacco, or some other low concern, to be taken up for a little temporary interest and to be dissolved by the fancy of the parties. It is to be looked on with reverence, because it is not a partnership in things subservient only to the gross animal existence of a temporary or perishable nature. It is a partnership in all science ; a partnership in all art ; a partnership in every virtue and in all perfection. As the ends of such a partnership cannot be obtained in many generations, it becomes a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are dead and those who are to be born."*

If the State, then, is a partnership in the sense interpreted by Burke, its end is the promotion of the highest well-being of its individual members. When such a State becomes selfish and fails to reflect and carry out the general will of the people, it is time to change it radically, using criticism, persuasion, argument and reason, rather than violence and force. In

* Reflections on the Revolution in France.

extreme cases, it may be the duty of the individual to resist the State, but even when he resists he must remember that he is still a citizen. Believing as we do in the supremacy of human personality, we cannot submit to a blind and uncritical obedience to governmental authority. We cannot accept without reservation Mussolini's dictum : " All within the State ; none outside the State ; and none against the State." For everything depends on the quality and character of the State under consideration. There is no justification whatever for the idolising and idealising of the State. It is after all an instrument for the realisation of man's highest purposes. The end of the State is, as Aristotle says, good life or the promotion of a community of well-being ; and, if this end is to be realised, what we need is not mechanical discipline but " a liberal and reformed loyalty to chosen ideals."

Assuming that the State which we are called upon to obey is a reasonable one and allows change by peaceful means, one of the first lessons which we should teach children and youth is that the policeman in the street corner directing traffic, the judge who pronounces his verdict upon cases from day to day, the tax-collector who sends periodically unwelcome notices reminding us of our dues to the Government, even the sweeper who cleans our streets—these and others like them are our true friends. It is because this kind of constructive citizenship is lacking in India that we find a good many people remaining supremely unconcerned even when the enemy is knocking at their doors, threatening to destroy life and property indiscriminately.

(4) *Correlation of rights and duties.*—One of the first lessons to learn in good citizenship is that rights do not stand alone. Every right carries with it a corresponding obligation. Rights and duties are correlative. In the words of the Right Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, they are " the same thing looked at from different points of view." Rights and duties are like the two sides of a coin; and yet emphasis is too often placed upon rights to the exclusion of duties. If, for instance, I have the right to

vote, surely it is my duty to exercise that right, and exercise it intelligently and conscientiously. I have no business to vote for a person just because I like his looks or because he happens to be a friend or relative of mine. I must vote for a person because, of the several candidates seeking my vote, I consider him to be the best fitted for the position. Similarly, if primary education is the right of every child, surely it is the duty of every earning member of society to assist the State in providing this right.

A right is by no means a selfish claim. It is a disinteresed claim on the part of the members of society to realise a common social good, of which individual good is an intrinsic part. Correctly understood, rights are the outer conditions essential to man's inner development. Rights being unselfish in their nature, one can fight for the rights of others, even for those of an enemy. In this connection, it is well to remember that the ancient Hindu law of 'Dharma' lays more emphasis upon duties than upon rights. In the significant words of Dr. L. P. Jacks, we can even speak of "a right to duty." Thus I have a right to support my parents when they become old and helpless, and resist the State if it seeks to deprive me of such a right by placing them in an old people's home. I have a right to pain, a right to suffer, and a right to rejoice with them that do rejoice and weep with them that do weep.

The right to 'free life' is a right from which all other rights proceed. Without such a right no man can become the best he is capable of becoming. It includes the right of freedom of thought, speech, and writing within the limits of public order and peace, freedom of conscience and worship, freedom to acquire property within limits and use it to the greatest possible advantage of both the individual and the community, and freedom to pursue the occupation of one's choice. In making these rights available to the members of a community, equality should be the rule, and inequality the exception necessitated by special circumstances.

(5) *Training in Character.*—If our contention that training in citizenship is nothing less than training in character, utmost care should be taken to train children and youth in healthy habits, dispositions, and attitudes. Mere theoretical teaching and sermonising can be of no avail in producing the kind of citizens we desire. Teachers of youth should themselves be men and women of character, if they are to influence youth in the right direction. No man or woman has a right to be a teacher of youth who is not thoroughly honest and honourable and is not filled with "an enthusiasm of humanity" and "a passion for improvement." A good teacher should first and foremost be a good man inasmuch as training in citizenship means training in right social living.

While the training of habits, dispositions, and attitudes is of the utmost importance in producing the right type of citizens, it is regrettable that in the name of religious toleration, there is in India an increasing antipathy to the teaching of religion and even to morals in State-aided educational institutions. Nobody except the religious bigot wants the indoctrination of pupils in any religious or sectarian dogmas. But this does not mean that we should throw overboard moral training and training in social living. That would be to throw the baby along with the bath water. It would be disastrous to good citizenship to bring up generations of children who have no instruction in elementary morals, children who do not understand and appreciate the value of honesty, truthfulness, justice and fair play, dependability, mutual good-will and co-operation, and public-spiritedness. No religion worthy of the name can object to the inculcation of these simple virtues, especially when they are inculcated more by indirect than by direct methods. Citizenship, we repeat, means character and without character no democracy can endure long.*

The Art of Citizenship

From a science or philosophy of citizenship, we now turn to the art or practice of citizenship. In dealing with this

* For a fuller treatment of the philosophy of citizenship, refer to E. Asirvatham: Political Theory 1st ed., pp. 536-41.

subject, it is usual to distinguish the legal from the moral duties of citizenship. For our purpose, it is not necessary to adhere to this distinction, since we believe that the legal obligations of a citizen in a well-ordered State are also his moral duties.[1] "The one foundation of the State," says E. Barker, "is the moral foundation."

One of the first duties of a good citizen is the duty to earn his own living. He should lift his own weight and not depend upon the earnings of others for his livelihood. Parasitism is anti-civic and anti-social. Even when they are young, children should be taught the importance of earning their bread as soon as possible, as well as the dignity of labour. Competence, thoroughness, and excellence should characterise every bit of work undertaken by the good citizen. He should develop skill. In the words of Dr. L. P. Jacks: "If you would be a man choose a vocation that puts you on your mettle by challenging your skill." The good citizen should beware of soft jobs, "scorn delights and live laborious days." He should cultivate a pride of workmanship. To quote Jacks again, "Citizenship includes trusteeship on the moral side, competent technique on the scientific side, and skill on the practical side."

The good citizen should not only be a good workman, but also one who is thoroughly scrupulous in the methods he employs in earning a living. In making a living he should be careful to see that he does not interfere with the opportunities of others for earning a decent livelihood. He should strive for equal justice for all. This places a great moral responsibility on the able and gifted members of society who should refrain from the temptation to amass wealth at the expense of others.[2]

1. In making this statement, we do not advocate the untenable proposition that law and morality in any existing State are identical with each other. All that we mean to suggest is that under ideal conditions all legal obligations should be capable of moral justification.

2. In the words of Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari: "The days of high salaries in government service, days of fabulous incomes in the legal and other professions, the days of building up phenomenal wealth by trade, are all of the past."

Such scrupulousness should be found not only in the relations of individuals to one another but also in the relations of the citizens of one country to those of another. The imperialist often adopts two codes of morality, one for the members of his own tribe and another for those under the imperial heel. The good citizen should bridge the wide chasm which we find to-day between individual honesty and social dishonesty. He cannot justify himself saying that he is thoroughly honest within a system which is altogether dishonest.

In educating children for citizenship, we should devote much attention to order, tidiness, and cleanliness. A good citizen cannot afford to leave his surroundings untidy and dirty. "Cleanliness" says an old proverb "is next to godliness." In India one finds considerable personal cleanliness, but not much attention is paid to the cleanliness of one's surroundings. The civic sense is so low that streets, roads, public drains, and open places are often kept in a filthy condition. The common people spit wherever they happen to be. Litter is thrown about everywhere and drainage water is emptied on public roads and thoroughfares. A dustbin in the streets of Madras has been rightly described as "a bin *around* which rubbish is thrown" Alongside of such carelessness, one finds an utter disregard of public property. Times without number one has seen electric lights burning brightly and water taps and electric fans going at full speed in hostels, schools, and colleges, even when they are not needed, and students marching up and down the corridors as though nothing mattered. The rectification of such carelessness is possible only when we pay much more attention than we have done hitherto to proper civic training through the home and school.

Together with an utter disregard for public property, one finds in India an utter disregard for the feelings and conveniences of others. Such disregard has almost become an art in this country, and the contrast is most striking when we compare the situation with what obtains in some of the Western

countries. Speaking loud in conversation with wild gesticulation even while eating, impatience in listening to others, disorderliness at public meetings, and noisy marriage processions in the small hours of the morning to the accompaniment of loud street music and louder fire crackers—all these show that we as a nation have made very little progress in the direction of good citizenship.

What India needs to-day, if she is to have a band of intelligent patriots and loyal citizens, is a high degree of public spirit, which is woefully lacking to-day. We often think in terms of ourselves, our own families, caste, sect or community. The working principle of many a person seems to be "ourselves, ourselves alone." We so often see human need and suffering and pass by unconcerned. There is a distinct disinclination to assert our own rights or to stand up for the rights of others. One often finds a brutal husband ill-treating his wife, third class railway compartments packed like sardines, policemen and other poorly-paid servants of the government doing things on the sly, vehicles turning at wrong corners, buffaloes and oxen loaded to death, and accidents happening on the street; and yet very few raise even a feeble voice of protest or lift a little finger to help the unfortunate or the one who is ill-treated.

Public spirit is lacking not only in this negative manner, but also positively. There is a distinct disinclination to sacrifice one's time, energy, and convenience in the service of the various concentric communities to which one belongs. In making this indictment we are not unmindful of the services of a great number of genuine nationalists whom the country has produced in recent years, many of them unknown to fame. Our contention is that public spirit as yet is not widespread. Even in the case of those who possess it, it is not practised systematically and consistently. They lack a staying power. Public spirit should begin in a small way in one's own neighbourhood, but should express itself eventually in relation to the international community and fellowship. In India one

often finds that even those who have the time, ability, and opportunity to serve the public grudge to do so. There is a marked unwillingness to serve the public by serving on social welfare committees, giving talks and lectures which aim at popularising knowledge, writing useful newspaper articles, taking the lead in social service, and the like. On the other hand if a Viceroy, Governor or some other high Government official patronises cricket, dog-show, stud bulls or even social service, there are many among the *elite* to follow suit. It is a sad commentary upon our honesty and public-spiritedness that even genuine pieces of community and neighbourhood service languish for the lack of funds and deficiency of volunteers unless they are sponsored by those in authority. A good many are prepared to render public service even at some inconvenience to themselves, if they can be sure of being in the limelight all the time adding to their prestige and vainglory. Every good citizen will do well to remember the dictum of Pericles : " A citizen who plays no part in public affairs is not ' quiet ' but ' useless ' ".

One of the directions along which public spirit could express itself is in the direction of building up a tradition of honesty and integrity in the conduct of public affairs. It is the duty of every good citizen to promote the purity of political life. Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Iyer speaks of a candidate in the Madras Presidency who spent Rs. 10,000 on a contested seat to the Legislative Council under the " Montford " Reforms ; and of another person who spent Rs. 60,000 in securing the presidentship of a district board. Still another person had spent a lakh and a half of rupees on a similar election. Such candidates probably feel that after being elected it is their right and duty to make good their loss by some means or other, putting into practice the Scriptural saying " He that sows in tears shall reap in joy." When we turn to England by way of contrast, we find that the difference is most striking. A tradition of noble and disinterested service has been built up by families such as the Balfours, the Greys,

the Chamberlains, the Cecils, and the Churchills. The foundation for such service has been well and truly laid in our country by men like Dadhabai Naoroji, Ranade, Gokhale, Mahatma Gandhi, the Nehrus, C. Rajagopalachari, and Rajendra Prasad, and it is for us to build upon that foundation. In every village, town, and province, we need a good Citizens' League to protect people against bribery and corruption.

The creation of an enlightened public opinion is another duty of every public-spirited citizen. In India we have many individual and group opinions, as well as the assertion of the selfish wills of a variety of vested interests. But the need of the hour is for a genuine national opinion and national action. Public opinion should be both 'public' and 'opinion.' For the attainment of this end we need a high degree of literacy and popular education as well as a thoughtful and discriminating electorate. The public, as we know it to day, easily succumbs to panics, because a great part of it has not cultivated the habit of thinking and judging for itself. At times it is open to high idealism, and leaders of the public should place before the people worthy objects upon which such idealism may be spent.

Newspapers in the modern world play a very important part in the moulding of public opinion, and it is a pity that many of them are under the undue influence of vested interests. In order that children when they grow to youth and manhood may find their way through a maze of opinions and prejudices, parents and teachers should guide them in the selection of good newspapers and cultivate in them a capacity for discrimination and criticism. If freedom from prejudice and independence of thought and judgment are the essential marks of an educated person, we should do everything possible to inculcate these qualities in the young. Some one has aptly defined an educated man as "one who can read newspapers without being humbugged." No democracy can endure long unless there be a vigilant public spirit and a fearless and independent press.

Public opinion at times may become tyrannical, and in such cases the good citizen should be prepared to defy it. A danger of modern democracies which J. S. Mill foresaw long years ago is the tyranny of the prevailing opinion and feeling. If such a tyranny is to be combated, it is of the utmost importance to develop a readiness to defy convention. "Every great man" it has rightly been said, "is both a child of his age and a rebel." Some one has observed that the terrible unity of the U.S.A. during the Great War was most heart-rending. The good citizen will do well to remember that "general will" is not the same as public opinion or majority will and that in exceptional circumstances it can be better represented by the will of one outstanding and selfless person than by an overwhelming majority which may be led by the feelings and passions of the moment. He should realise the fact that if it is possible for one person to be selfish, it is equally possible for a whole group of people to be selfish. Collective selfishness is often more thorough-going than individual selfishness, and the good citizen should be able to detect it and combat it with all his might and main.

Promotion of public health is another important duty of the good citizen. Children should be taught the necessity of not only lifting their own weight but also of keeping themselves in health and strength. Health is the best capital which they can have in life. In the words of Alfred Marshall (quoted by Sir George Newman in *Citizenship and the Survival of Civilization*): "The most important capital of a nation is that which is invested in the physical, mental, and moral nature of its people." Stressing the importance of health Franklin has observed "Public health is public wealth." Voltaire contends that "the fate of a nation has often depended upon the good or bad digestion of its Prime Minister." Niebuhr (also quoted by Newman) writes: "Almost all great epochs of moral degradation are connected with great epidemics. Newman further quotes Herophilus, a Greek philosopher and physician who lived three hundred years before Christ, to the

effect that "strength is incapable of effort, wealth useless, and eloquence powerless, if health be wanting."

Public health, then, being of such vital importance, we in India should pay much more attention to it than we have done hitherto. It is easy enough to blame the foreign government for having spent a mere pittance upon this all-important social need. But a great deal can be done by the people themselves within the limited means at their disposal by observing simple rules of hygiene and sanitation and by giving greater attention to the importance of nutritious food. The public is as yet so apathetic regarding public health that it does not bother itself about the swarms of diseased beggars that one finds at bus stops and entrances to railway stations, cafes, and restaurants.

Alongside of public health, the good citizen should stress the importance of public education. Ignorance and illiteracy are the greatest stumbling blocks to the development of citizenship. It is regrettable that in spite of more than a hundred and fifty years of direct British rule nearly 90 p.c. of the people of India are still illiterate. The removal of this blot should be the first duty of any national government. If, as Diogenes says, "the foundation of every State is the education of its youth," it is necessary for everybody to educate himself and his children. We need a well-thought-out scheme of higher education which will eliminate waste and duplication and keep out those who are physically and intellectually unfit to profit by it. But even more urgent than that is mass education, both for children and adults, which will enable people to take an intelligent interest in the world around them and use to the best advantage possible the gifts and talents with which God may have endowed them. The oft-repeated plea that government does not have enough funds to provide mass education is not acceptable when we take into account the tremendous improvement in education which has taken place in countries such as Soviet Russia with a will to fight against heavy odds.

If public funds are limited, we should either find additional sources of income or cut down the present undue expenditure on overhead administration, expensive public buildings, and the like. Besides, there is no justification for the disproportionately large amounts of money and effort spent on European and Anglo-Indian education, while the children of the soil do not even have an opportunity of learning the 3R's.

The good citizen, particularly in India, should fight all separatist tendencies which raise artificial barriers between man and man. He should avoid sectionalism, provincialism, and communalism in thought, word, and deed. He should further resist meaningless social gradations and rigid class distinctions which we find in the various walks of life. He should have a passion for equality and fraternity. He should remember that the only aristocracy worthy of spontaneous respect and honour is aristocracy based on merit. This being so, he should do everything possible to build up a body of good workingmen who would follow the Scriptural injunction " By love serve one another."

He should prevent party politics from becoming a synonym for partisanship. Parties should be based on differences in principles, policies, and methods rather than on differences of religion or on vested interests. It is to be regretted that a good many of our parties to-day are based on communal differences and centre in personalities.

Those engaging themselves in party politics should remember that they are not personal enemies. They should bear in mind the fact that there is a political etiquette just as much as there is a social etiquette. They should counter argument by argument and not have recourse to the big stick or the long tongue. In no circumstance, however provocative it may be, is there a justification for slinging mud upon one's political opponents. The good citizen should cultivate a desire to know the different points of view on every public question and endeavour to arrive at a balanced judgment.

Hooliganism and rowdyism which are at times countenanced in the name of party politics are bound to make democracy a mockery and convert it into mob-rule.

At the present stage of our national development, it is the bounden duty of every well-meaning citizen to engage himself in some form or other of social or neighbourhood service. Such an obligation is easy to talk about but difficult to practise. Even the Congress has discovered that while it can command the services of thousands of volunteers for a non-co-operation or *Satyagraha* campaign, it is not able to command the same numbers for quiet and unostentatious but constructive work. At school and college we should infuse in pupils an abiding interest in slum clearance, beggar relief, hospital visitation, famine and flood relief, Red Cross work, adult literacy, and the like. Public service should really be service to the common people. The good citizen should place service motive above every other motive, such as profit motive, the motive of gaining glory and honour, and the motive of winning power and authority. Children and young people should be imbued with a desire to render self-effacing service. Place-hunting and honour-seeking which are so common in our public life should be nipped in the bud at school and college. So also should the tendency to fight for an office and going to sleep after winning it till the next election comes. Whatever be the station in life to which a person may be called, disinterested service should be his governing passion.

A further duty of the good citizen to which we turn our attention is the study of political institutions and the honest performance of one's civic duties. Turgot remarks : "the study of the duty of citizenship ought to be the foundation of all other studies." We have no sympathy with the erroneous view that civics or citizenship as such is not a subject which needs to be taught to youth, but that lessons in citizenship can be taught indirectly through history, geography, economics, etc. Political institutions and public affairs can and should be taught to youth directly, making a beginning during

the adolescent period. Interest in current events may be created through newspapers, school journeys, visiting speakers, and school and college societies. Grown-up children (say above 14 years of age) and youth should be taught the meaning of law and rights, the importance of the rule of law, the necessity of maintaining peace and order, the duty of serving on the jury, and of promptly paying one's taxes, rates, and cesses. In imparting such direct instruction, Mr. W. L. Shelden (quoted by Hadow in his book *Citizenship and the Duties of a Citizen*) has devised a course of thirty lessons which " range from the family to the 'universal state' and cover on the way such topics as voting, taxes, obedience to law, crime and punishment, arbitration, the future of the industrial state, and the other main issues of civic life. Each lesson is on the same model : first an aphorism or as Mr. Shelden calls it "a memory gem " to be learned by heart, then a dialogue, followed by an epitome of its main points, then in succession a list of duties, a poem, a selection from a patriotic speech, and a conclusion containing personal hints to the teacher. The only variation is twelve of the thirty contain short stories—Florence Nightingale, Magna Carta, the death of Socrates—which are chosen as specially illustrative of the matter in hand." A similar course of studies can be drawn up for Indian schools too.

In teaching the history and meaning of political institutions to our boys and girls, it is assumed that we shall regard the democratic way of life as the best and highest. In inculcating lessons in democracy we shall endeavour to show youth the importance of knowleege, clear thinking, and freedom from prejudice. We shall enable them to separate opinions from facts and see the validity of Morley's definition of democracy as "government working directly through public opinion." We shall further seek to give them an abiding faith in liberty, in freedom of speech and of criticism, and "freedom of action up to a point where it does not clash with the freedom of others." We shall also teach them the importance of choosing their leaders wisely and of placing confi-

dence in them. Borrowing the words of Sir E. Simon, we shall make it clear to them that the good citizen of a democratic state must have.

"1. A deep concern for the freedom and good life of his fellows.

2. Such knowledge and power of clear thinking as will enable him to form sound judgments as to the main problems of politics and to decide wisely which party will be most likely to achieve the ends he desires.

3. The power to select men of wisdom, integrity, and courage as public representatives, and such knowledge of his own limitations as will dispose him to trust and follow his chosen leaders." *

Finally, in educating children for citizenship, we shall stress the importance of character and leadership based on it. As the old saying goes, it is men, not walls, that make a city. Citizenship on its moral side means nothing less than character, discipline, and the formation of healthy and socially valuable habits. We shall teach youth that if they are to become leaders in the realisation of a new social order they cannot do it by climbing on the backs of others or by leading people by the nose. Mere cleverness and brilliance cannot be of much avail. A person can become a true leader only by virtue of sound knowledge, strong character, and self-effacing service. He should appropriate the mind of the common people in an uncommon degree and be deeply in sympathy with their needs and aspirations. Such leadership alone can be abiding. To such a leader will apply the description of the citizen of Zion as given by the Psalmist in the 15th Chapter of Psalms: "Lord, who shall abide in thy tabernacle? Who shall dwell in thy holy hill? He that walketh uprightly and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart. He that

* Education for Citizenship in Secondary Schools, pp. 9-10.

backbiteth not with his tongue, nor doeth evil to his neighbour, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbour. In whose eyes a vile person is condemned; but he honoureth them that fear the Lord. He that sweareth to his own hurt, and changeth not. He that putteth not out his money to usury, nor taketh reward against the innocent. He that doeth these things shall never be moved."

In other words, the citizen of Zion or the citizen of the new social order, to use the language of Dr. Hadley, should be a straightforward man, a broad-minded man, a man of judgment, and a man of principle.

CHAPTER XVI

CONCLUSION

Among thoughtful people everywhere, there is general agreement that the social order in which we live to-day requires considerable change. Difference of opinion is bound to arise as regards the nature and amount of the change as well as the means by which it is to be attained. For ourselves, we believe that the changes required are in every major field of life—social, economic, and political. We further believe that if these changes are to be really genuine and lasting, they should be rooted in and accompanied by great moral and religious changes. What experience has shown all through the ages is that a mere transformation of man's environment without the transformation of his heart can be of no avail.

Experience further shows that by taking thought and awailing ourselves of the lessons which can be learnt from the mistakes of others we can shorten the historical process and abbreviate the time-lag. In accomplishing this purpose we need to embody our ideologies in clear practical programmes and bring the national will to bear upon them in such a manner that real progress and achievement can be attained within a limited period. Five-year plans and three-year plans are the order of the day; and if India is to progress we need at once a programme of action which will be capable of realisation in our own time.

In bringing about the new social order of our dream, it would be a folly to depend entirely upon the State and its agencies. The modern State can, and should, do a great deal more than its counterpart in the past, rapidly transforming itself into a 'Social-Welfare' state making possible radical social and economic changes. But that does not mean that we can dispense with the invaluable services of the family, the

school, the church, the trade union, the professional organisation, and the like. Voluntary group effort should normally precede compulsory State action, particularly in the field of social reform. In India we need enthusiasts who would band themselves together in a crusade against caste tyranny, communal jealousy and bickering, child marriage, the prohibition of widow re-marriage, the iniquitous system of dowry, mass illiteracy, etc.

Education and enlightenment are spreading fast among the middle-class people of India. But the masses remain unaffected. If they are to be roused to action, the educated people of India should carry the torch of learning to every nook and corner of India in a spirit of disinterested service. In recent years in China the educated young men and women of that country have played a laudable part in giving a lead to the common people and in organising them for determined resistance against the depredations of Japan. While what they have done may put us to shame in India, it can also serve as an inspiration for the future.

What the family and the school can do in training children and youth and for effective citizenship has been sketched already in the two preceding chapters. In the economic and political fields, the State can do much more than what it has done hitherto. If the State becomes a superhuman monster imposed upon the individual from without by interested persons or parties, as in the Nazi and Fascist States, we need to be mortally afraid of it. But where the State remains a faithful instrument for the realisation of the highest good of the people as a whole, there is no need to be unduly nervous about it. This does not mean that we should not devise carefully-thought-out and practical methods by which we can keep in check the possible excesses of those who wield political authority. The nature of power is such that it wants to expand indefinitely, constantly increasing its scope and prestige. That is why we believe that it is only in a genuine

democracy that the State is likely to be a faithful ally and servant of the people.

Vested interests, whether it be on the part of the rulers of the State, incorporated companies or private individuals, are the greatest stumbling block to the realisation of a new social order. Modern democracies are not genuinely democratic. Some of them are plutocratic ; and some, imperialistic as well ; and so long as these aberrations continue we cannot expect the common man to wax eloquent over the virtues of democracy. If democracy is to have a bright future, it should free itself from the trammels of finance-capital and devote itself entirely to the well-being of the people as a whole. No State, as Burke insisted, can afford to be democratic at home and autocratic and imperialistic abroad. Such democratic States as still have imperialistic possessions will do well forthwith to transform dependency into equal and voluntary partnership. They should further move along the direction indicated by socialism. We cannot say that the experiment which on the whole has been successfully tried in Soviet Russia will produce the same results everywhere. In general, we may say that a slogan which every State may usefully adopt is "private property small, common property large". The modern State should own and control the principal means of production, providing for the people a great many national services such as public health and education, housing, insurance against ill-health, unemployment or the premature death of the wage-earner, facilities for travel and the acquisition of culture, etc. In other words, the ideal which we should aim at to be realised in the near future is one where common property and national services will be so large that there will be no need for more than a nominal amount of private property, through the individual use of which a person can express his personality.

In bringing about this end, care should be taken to see that every individual receives an income, apart from the social services rendered by the State, which will enable him to render the maximum possible service to society. There is no

justification of any kind for 'cooly' labour or any other form of exploitation, where the primary producer receives a pittance, while the shareholder, the entrepreneur, and the middleman get away with the bulk of his produce. Equality should be the rule and inequality the exception. So far as India is concerned, we should work for a net work of co-operative village industries dovetailed into a system which aims at the nationalisation of heavy industries based on the service principle. The good citizen should support all schemes that work for equality of income and status.

When a society of this nature is realised which gives everybody adequate bread, the other attributes of a new social order, viz. brotherhood, freedom, and justice will easily follow. Nearly all our social, national, and international troubles are due to the striving of some people to get for themselves much more than what others get. The sure ways to peace are the abolition of the excesses of capitalism, the liquidation of imperialism, the renunciation of war, the concerted exploitatation of the resources of the earth in such a manner that no country will be a loser but everyone a gainer, and the regulation of all international questions by a world federation with a world government.

Human beings everywhere are at a primitive level of moral development. They fail to see that mere scientific invention or the skilful use of the instruments of modern warfare does not make a people great. They need a wholesome revolution of the heart which will make them realise that they have a claim to greatness only so far as they pursue peace and the ends of peace. The value of personality should take precedence over every other good. When the present war is over, it is to be earnestly hoped that nations will realise the futility of war and bend all their energies to the improvement of the moral and material conditions of man everywhere.

In the light of what we have said, we may sketch the following programme of action for the good citizen in India to

be realised by individual, family, group, and State effort as the case may be.

1. He should eschew caste in every walk of life, actively promote sub-caste marriages, and place no impediment in the way of inter-caste marriages. He should endeavour to abolish untouchability and have no scruples to eat with people of all castes and no caste, so long as the food is cooked and served under hygienic conditions. He should particularly aim at brotherhood with Muslim and Harijan brethren in a practical manner, co-operating with them in all possible ways in eradicating caste. In the matter of appointments and promotions, he should give the first and foremost place to efficiency and character and not allow considerations of caste, creed, and community to blur his vision.

2. He should refuse to countenance meaningless class distinctions, remembering that distinctions based on economic earnings, wealth, status and worldly position have no abiding value. He should realise the fact that the worship of money bags is the worst form of idolatry. The only aristocracy which he should be prepared to recognise and respect is an aristocracy based upon character, intelligence, and service to the community. The good citizen should be "a born democrat." He should not use his superior education or greater talent to levy a toll upon those who are less fortunate than himself.

3. He should avoid communalism in thought, word, and deed. If he is a Christian and wants to band himself together with other Christians, it should be for the service of the entire national community, putting into operation the noble principle which guided Jesus in the days of his ministry: "For their sakes I sanctify myself." He should learn the importance of secularising politics and free himself from the habit of looking at every public question from the point of view of the good of his own community. Communalism often means selfishness of the most degrading kind. Without sacrificing the fundamental truths of his own religious faith,

he should understand and appreciate the best in the teachings of others and wholeheartedly co-operate with those of other faiths in realising a better order of things than is found to-day. He should minimise the causes of religious conflict, meet objections in the spirit of love and charity, and emphasise unities. He should enable the Hindu, Mussalman, Christian etc. to worship together as the common children of God.

As a man of culture, he should freely borrow the best that he can derive from the cultures and civilisations of others. He should be sympathetic, tolerant, and broad-minded and possess an understanding spirit. He should earnestly work for an Indian culture which would synthesise communal cultures and transcend them. Not only by profession but also in the make up of his very personality he must become an Indian and cease to be a mere Brahmin, Hindu, Christian or Mussalman in the communal sense.

4. He should fight all racial discrimination and preach and practise the gospel of human brotherhood. If he happens to belong to any of the White races of the world, he should make ample amends for the sins of the members of his race in their treatment of the non-White races. He should give up all cheap talk about the inherent superiority or inferiority of different races, and the delusion that his own race is "the chosen race." He should recognise the fact that God has endowed different races with different gifts and that if some races have not made much progress in the past, it is largely because of lack of opportunity and suitable environmental conditions. In no circumstance should he allow alleged racial inferiority to serve as an excuse for the exploitation and domination of the weak and helpless, denying to them the elementary rights of citizenship and equality before law. He should remember that the incessant clamour for racial equality is not a subterfuge for indiscriminate race mixture.

5. In the economic field, the good citizen should stand for justice and equality. He should fight the iniquities of

capitalism and work for a system where everybody will have an adequate wage for the satisfaction of his physical, intellectual, and spiritual needs. The work which he does should provide him not only a living but also a life. He should look upon his work as service to the community, developing skill and the highest form of workmanship. If he should happen to be an Indian, be should exhaust the possibilities of a revived system of co-operative village industries and not blindly imitate the industrial system of the West, which makes a man a mere cog in the wheel, depriving him of all initiative, leadership, and originality. He should strenuously work for a civic minimum for everybody and the provision of a large number of social services for the entire community. While dubious of the State being able to enforce such an ideal as "from each according to his ability, and to each according to his need", he should make it his own personal faith and the goal of his endeavour. He should work for a co-operative, as against a competitive society and learn the beauty and eloquence of the simple life and not unnecessarily multiply his needs. He should extend the co-operative spirit to all aspects of life, as Kagawa insists, and make the co-operative movement which is unduly official-ridden to-day—genuinely popular and democratic. Co-operative farming and community kitchen might also be encouraged. The clearance of slums, the removal of unemployment and the abolition of beggary should all be essential planks in his programme. He should support every piece of legislation which aims at an equal and equitable distribution of wealth. He should encourage the utilisation of science for the promotion of life purposes. He should insist on the duty of those who acquire more than the legitimate share of material goods which is the general average to return the excess to those who secure less than the average. In making purchases he should take care to see that he does not enrich the already rich and impoverish the poor. He should patronise goods made by factories which give just wages to the labourers and companies which distribute the profit to workers. Schemes which

seek to eliminate the tyranny of middleman should receive his enthusiastic support.

6. In the political field, he should range himself on the side of liberty and democracy realising that the highest good of man is the development of his personality and that "good government is no substitute for self-government". He should interpret and apply democracy as a form of government, a type of State, and order of society, an industrial condition, and a great moral and religious principle. He should remember that so long as democracies deny social and economic equality to large masses of people, their foundations are weak. He should contribute his share to the building of a sound public opinion and enable the government of the day to discover and carry out the "general will" of the people. He should rely on argument and persuasion to bring about desired changes in government rather than on force and violence. In a country like India, he should take into account the fact that "democracy" is a term which covers a multitude of sins and should see that democracy does not easily degenerate into a mere majority rule. He should be just, and even generous, to minorities and respect their reasonable fears and susceptibilities.

7. He should be a nationalist of the highest sort, expressing the nationalism in the economic, political, and cultural fields. The motto of his nationalism should be "live and help others to live". He should strenuously fight the tendency of nationalism to glide into sectionalism to the one side and imperialism on the other. In the promotion of nationalism in India, he should support all movements aiming at unity, and fight provincialism and parochialism. He should cultivate a love of the country as a whole and promote the study of a common national language. He should patronise *swadeshi* goods in a spirit of love and service to the toiling masses. He should set his face resolutely against the false philosophy which says :

"For forms of government let fools contend
Whate'er is best governed is best."

He should develop a passion for self-government and fit himself and his countrymen to the realisation of that end. He should realise the truth that self-government without should begin with self-government within, viz., self-mastery.

8. The good citizen should make up his mind to part company with imperialism once and for all, knowing as he does that in the modern world it means economic rivalry, political jealousy, a race for armaments, periodical warfare, the subjugation and exploitation of large masses of people, the prostitution of truth for low ends, and the general debasing of moral standards. Imperialism makes for an unstable world, for it whets the appetite for power and possession on the one side and engenders sullen discontent on the other. Therefore, the only way to world peace and world order is the rapid transformation of imperial connections into free and equal partnership. For a time international mandates may be established in very backward areas such as those in Central Africa and in the islands of the sea. But even there the mandate should be for a limited period and for a specific purpose. The imperialist should remember that there is no use of trying to govern an unwilling people. It exasperates feelings and hurts souls. What trade and commercial relations there may be should be on a basis of mutual advantage which can be readily recognised by all intelligent and impartial persons. Trade and flag should be divorced from each other, and the Bible from both of them.

9. The man who works for a new social order should be a good nationalist and a better inter-nationalist. He does not need to go through "the half-way house" of imperialism in order to pass from village politics to world politics. It is as clear as daylight that unless the people of the world decide to hang together they shall hang separately. The conception of a world community is not a mere dream or fancy. It should,

on the other hand, become a living reality. It is the business of the good citizen to devise the necessary institutional framework for the realisation of the growing sense of a world community. He should support schemes of world federation, seeking to bring the entire world under a single federation or, if that is not possible, under a small number of regional subsidiary federations related in some agreed manner to a bigger federation. In the attainment of this end, the outworn doctrine of external sovereignty should be surrendered in favour of a unified control of world trade, commerce, and banking; and there should be a common currency, common citizenship, common civil service, and common foreign policy and defence, so long as some States remain outside the federation and war is a contingency. If a world federation is to succeed, it should be free from the trammels of the colonial system and the control of finance-capital.

10. The good citizen should eschew war. There may be exceptional circumstances, where war is the lesser of two evils. But such circumstances are not often found and, even if they be present at the commencement of a war, they are not maintained till the end. War soon becomes bestial. Non-violence based on courage and love of the highest sort expressing itself in a resoluteness not to yield to force and injustice, is very much better, even though a great many people are afraid to try it, especially when they find that some nations of the world seem to be devoid of all mercy and humanity, worshipping at the altar of sadism and brutality. The good citizen should realise that war does not settle anything and that one war leads to another war. Both the victors and the vanquished suffer equally.

11. The good citizen should be a firm believer in the permanent monogamous family on the basis of genuine respect for personality. He should set his face resolutely against child marriage, the prohibition of widow re-marriage, the dowry system, extravagant wedding expenditure, and the dedication of girls to temples. While granting the

rightness of divorce in certain situations, he should emphasise love, service, and mutual forbearance, as against lust, in marriage relations. He should realise the immense value of the discipline of the family. He should make his home a nursery of social virtues and a miniature Kingdom of God, instead of reducing it to a prison house of selfishness. He should faithfully carry out his responsibility to his wife and children, to close relations who for some reason or other are obliged to be dependent on him, to the servants who minister to his comforts, to the neighbourhood, to the country, and to the world at large. He should train his children to take an active interest in programmes of social amelioration and care for the poor.

12. The good citizen should make a right use of his leisure and hours of recreation. He should so plan his life that work and play are given their legitimate part. He should choose those forms of recreation which help to re-create him in body, mind and spirit. Instead of being a mere passive spectator of games, and a silent participator in amusements, he should take an active part in them. He should take regular exercise, cultivate hobbies, and develop whatever musical, dramatic, literary, oratorical or artistic gifts which he may possess. He should live such a full and well-balanced life that the prospect of retirement from active service does not frighten him. Neighbourhood service of some kind or other should form an important part of his leisure activities.

13. He should practise the art of citizenship, remembering that citizenship is more difficult to practise than mere patriotism. He should develop a right attitude to the State, avoiding absolute servility on the one side and indifference and even defiance on the other. He should cultivate a passion and devotion to the State analogous to the affection and loyalty which he has for his own family. He should remember that rights and duties are correlatives of each other. No one has a right to anything unless he is prepared to carry out the corresponding obligation. He should learn to order his

loyalties in such a manner that they do not clash with each other. He should develop a sensitiveness to the feelings and conveniences of others, replacing hyper-sensitiveness for oneself by sensitiveness for the needs of the community.

In particular he should develop a sensitive conscience towards acquisition and expenditure, recognising that any acquisition of wealth which involves depriving others of their just share is anti-social and that greed is a cardinal social sin.

Further he should exercise his vote as a sacred trust and refuse to send up to legislative councils and assemblies those who seek selfish aggrandisement. He might even require of them credentials in the form of social service.

14. Finally, he should develop strong and sterling character both in himself and in others, paying as much attention to the active qualities of character as to the passive qualities. He should remember that to divorce politics and ethics is disastrous to both and that no new social order can endure long unless it is rooted and grounded in such moral principles as truth and non-violence, justice and equality, mutual help and co-cperation, love and service.

INDEX

A

Abraham Lincoln, 5.
Acland, Sir Richard, New standard of morality 8; distribution of wealth in England 10; Common ownership 18; socialistic reconstruction of Britain 19, 21.
Ambedkar Dr. Separate representation for Muslims 92; Pakistan 173; Muslims' wrongs to Hindus 177; will to be a nation 181, 182; Poona Pact 279.
Americanisation 176, 352.
American Individualism 13.
Amery L.S. Throws wet blanket on Indian aspirations 4; the prosperity of India 35; æroplane Industry in India 36; fighting speeches 143; dilatory tactics 189; claims that India pays no taxes to Britain 195; guilty of ethics of evasion 195; India first 203; relation between Britain and India 206; free and equal partnership 212.
Andrews C. F. Difficult to be an imperialist and a Christian 205;
Aristotle, Mitigating inequality 81; the success of a Constitution; Citizenship 352; the end of the State 361.
Atlantic Charter 4, 135, 244; views of an American missionary on its application to India 211; Churchill's views on it 4.
Attlee, Major The issue before the world 149; freedom from fear 263.
Autarky 185, 186.
Appasamy, Paul, Origin of Caste 55; the occupations of Brahmins 58; formation of village panchayat 69; past glory of India 70; polygamy in law 288; allowance for a discarded Hindu wife 289; the position of the concubine 291; Hindu widow remarriage 308.

B

Baldwin, Lord Peace 264.
Barnes Dr. Leonard Extension of mandatory system 220; Socialisation of Britain 222.
Brailsford, H. N. Disarmament 281; peace built on equality 283; conditions of Peace 284.
Bratachari movement 337, 347.
Briand, M. "Away with Guns" 227; World Federation 235.
"Bridge Builders" 108.
Britannic Alliance A. B. Keith 190.
Bryce, Lord The development of the American Negro 122; Nationality 174.
Burke on the meaning of the State 360.
Burns C. D. Western Home 298; Scout Movement 335; husband and wife 343.

C

Causes of Communal Conflict 87-95.
Causes of Indian poverty 36-39, 84.
Chamberlain, Joseph Commerce and Empire 195 ; Empires could dissolve without integrating 220.
Neville 'Peace with Honour' 233.
Christianise Socialism 19.
Churchill August declaration 189.
Civil Disobedience Movement 199.
Common language 104.
Common ownership 19-21.
Concert of Europe 226.
Co-operation 27.
'Co-prosperity sphere' 269.
Cole, G. D. H. 'Compelling will for peace' 282.
Concentration Camps 148.
Curzon, Lord India's place in the Empire 36.

D

Darling M. L., I. C. S. Richness of Indian Soil and Poverty of Indian People 35.
Dante, Universal Empire 234.
Defeat of Hitler and Mussolini 152.
Democracy Political Justice Ch VIII.
'Din and Millat' 353.
Distribution of wealth among the people of India 10.
Distributivism 28.
Duty of a citizen 356.

E

Economic Justice, Chapter II.
Economic Justice for India, Chapter III.
Education for Citizenship Chapter XV.
Elliott and Merrill Marriage 301.
Elphinstone, Lord Divide et Impera 92.
Encyclopaedia Britannica, education 350.
England's secret treaty of 'appeasement'.
Eradication of Indian poverty 45-52.

F

Faguet Democracy 141 ; 'the cult of incompetence 142'.
Federation World, views of M. Briand federation, 235 ; for western Europe scheme of Ivor Jennings 220 ; Chapter XII, Political Justice.
Follett, Miss 'Core of democracy' 145.
Fundamental rights guaranteed by Poland to her minorities 103.

G

Gandhi, Mahatma Harijans 59 ; (35) ; fast unto death 71 ; raised the status of the Indian peasant 82, 85 ; Hindu outlook, portrait 96 ; decentralised production and distribution 161 : no interference with Britain's war efforts 213 ; Britain's lack of concern for welfare of the Indian 210 ; apostle of non-violent resistance 276 ; personality 278 ; Rajkot fast tainted with Himsa 279 ; discourages communal cricket 338.
Gandhian economy 28-33, 40, 334.
Gauch, Prof. H. Non-Nordic not 100 % human being 118.
General Smuts, Indians in South Africa 115 ; difference in civilization 135.
General, Sherman "War is hell" 259.
Gregg, R. B. The cost of war 251.
Green, T. H. Polygamy 288 ; adultery 301.
Guardian, Madras, on changing commercial conditions in India 212.

H

Haldane, Lord The worth of the individual 357.
Half-truths in talking points in India 214.
Hitler Continuity of leadership 144; recourse to doubles 145; vegetarian 147 ; plain-speaking 204 ; New order in Europe 233; his rise due to Weimar constitution 237; claims to be saviour of the world from Russian communism 267 ; on pacifism 268.
Hoare-Laval Proposals 230.
Hocking Prof., 'Ethics of evasion' 195; remaking human nature 256.
Holy Alliance 226.
'Home and the Family' Chapter XIII.
Huxley, Aldous On mass murder 255, success of non-violent resistance 278 ; international massacre force 276.
Huxley and Haddon 118; Colour 125; reliability of half-castes 126; discriminated ethnic group 128; on the ability of the Non-nordic, "Merry England" 133; definition of Nation 182.

I

Imperialism economic cause of war 14; cause of the present war according to Leonard Woolf 216, 220 ; Chapter X Political Justice; causes 193-198 ; effects 213 ; improvement of imperialism 216-222 ; views of Sir George Schuster 212 ; views of Basil Mathews 205 ; makes for an unstable world 383.
Imperialist, retired 192.
India, land of two nations 96.
Irwin, Lord Revision of Indian constitution in Indian interests 203.

J

Jacks L. P. On the 'greatest skill of the greatest number' 349 ; on a 'right to duty', 362; on the good citizen's choice of vocation 364.

Jesus Christ Prince of Peace 7.
Joint Family 9.
Joint Electorates in Sind successful 90.
" Jim crow attitude " 116, 129.
Jinnah democracy for India 142.
Judge Lindsey ' Companionate Marriage' 295.

K

Kagawa, Genuine salvation 8 ; co-operative spirit to be extended to all aspects of life 381.
Kant, Immanuel 'Politics and ethics 354 ; the worth of the individual 357 ; self-imposed imperative of duty 140 ; perpetual peace 225 ; not a Nordic 121 ; 'man an end in himself' 133.
Kellogg-Briand Pact 232.
Khan, Sir Sikander Hyat 'Communal problem' 89.
Kumarappa, J. C. 'Wolf-pack nationalism' 183 ; 'sheep-flock nationalism' 183.

L

Landlordism f. n. 87 ; 100.
League of Nations 134, 226, causes of failure 227 ; achievements 228.
Leisure and Recreation Chapter XIV.
Locarno Treaties 231.
Lugard, Lord 'Internationalising colonial possessions' 219.
Lytton Cmmission 228, 230.

M

Macdonald award 90.
Machiavelli The Prince 7 ; loss of patrimony 14 ; Machiavallian device 236 ; patriotism 355.
Madariaga, Salvador De Idealism 6 ; the unity of the world 224 ; colonies to be administered as world trust 237 ; war ; spirituality 254 ; sanctions ineffective 230.
Mandatory system 2, 134.
Mandates classified as A B C powers 217.
Mandatory commission 217, 221, right of oral evidence disallowed to inhabitants of mandates 218.
Manu supersession of a Hindu wife, widow remarriage 306.
Mazzini Democracy 141 ; nationalism 171 ; race not essential to nationality 174.
Morley, Lord Definition of democracy 373.
Missionary enterprise an arm of Imperialism 197.
Muhammad Ali, 'command performance' 92 f. n. ; provision for change from separate to joint electorate 102 ; Muslim marriage 290, 300 ; divorce 303 ; widow remarriage 306.
Muir, Ramsay Ownership of property 11 ; tyranny of directors 12 ; nourishing the spirit of nationhood 176 ; important language in the moulding of a nation 179.

Mussolini Race 175 ; sanctions 185 ; will to power 194 ; on pacifism 282 ; on the sphere of state-action 361.

N

National language 104.
Nationality, Political Justice Chapter X.
Napoleon's Crime 258.
Nehru, Pandit Jawaharlal 4 years imprisonment 211.
Neitzsche, on prostitution 342.
Nine-Power Pact 232.
Noblesse Oblige 328, 329.

O

Open career to Talent 358.
Oscar, Newfang World Federation 238.
Ottawa Agreement 232.

P

Pericles The 'city-state 352 ; the citizen's part in public affairs 367.
Political Justice World Federation Chapter IX.
Pope, Peace Points 16.
Pritt, J. N. Economic forces cause of war 234 ; with capitalism and Imperialism, world federation an illusion 242.
Prohibition and Swiss Government 281 ; 340, 341, 342.

R

Rahimtullah, Sir I. India's prosperity 35.
Rajagopalachari, C. Caste and its reform 72 ; Satyagraha 278 ; Ahimsa 281.
Ramsay, Macdonald 'Sit down strike of bankers' 12.
Rengaswamy Iyengar, Prof. K. V. Expenditure on education in India 208.
Religion in danger 180.
'Right ideal of marriage' 318.
Roosevelt, F. D. On the present War 144 ; authority exercised by him 145; freedom from fear 263.
Rousseau Liberty 140.
Ruskin Art and industry 333.
Russell, Bertrand 199 ; Passive resistance 282.
„ Mrs. on 'Free Love' 295.
Ruthnaswamy M. 'Projection of India' 172, 173.

S

Sanatayana The results of war 257, 258.
Sarda Marriage Act 305.
Satyagraha 277, 280, 382.
Schiff Irrigation in India 207.
Senart Caste 54

Separate Electorates introduced by Minto-Morley Reforms 90; strengthened by the Montagu-Chelmsford and the 1935 Reforms 90.
Sitaramayya, Dr. P. The lot of the Hindu widow f. n. 307 ; Hindu household 320 ; the Hindu Home 322.
Sivaswamy Iyer, Sir P. S. 'Sowing the dragon's teeth' and authors of mischief 93 ; ahimsa 281 ; polygamy 287 ; sex 300 ; perversion of public taste 317 ; on election expenses in Madras 367.
Simon Commission 92.
'Slave Society' 332.
Social Harmony Caste Chapter IV ; Class Ch. V ; Communalism Chapter VI.
Srinivasa Iyengar, S. Racialism 135 ; professionalism in politics 159 ; India's love of freedom 158 ; polygamy 288.
Srinivasa Sastri, Rt. Hon. V. S. On Indians in South Africa 115 ; rights and duties 361.

T

Tagore, Rabindranath Dr. Encouragement of communalism 92, 93 ; raises public taste 347 ; gives reorientation to education.
Tennyson Federation of the world 235.
Thomas, P. J. Items of expenditure of the Government of India 208.
Thomas Hobbes The causes of war 261, 263, 265.
Two nation theory of the Muslim League 135.

V

Versailles Treaty 263.
Viswesvarayya, Sir M. On comparative incomes from the industries 189.
Voltaire conquests by the French language 104.

W

Wal Wal incident 220.
Wardha Scheme of education 102.
War pays neither victor nor vanquished 253.
War 'pruning hook of nature' 257.
War and Peace Chapter XII.
Washington Conference 231.
Watson, Sir Alfred Industrialisation 37.
White Australia Policy 194.
Women's education 312.
Work, views of Thomas Carlyle, of Theodore Roosvelt, of Ruskin, of Dr. Eliot, 333.

Z

Zimmern, Sir Alfred Nationality 168 ; identity of racial integrity 174.

THE INDIAN CHRISTIAN BOOK CLUB

The Programme

BY P. CHENCHIAH B.A., M.L., *Madras.*

The primary concern of the Indian Christian Book Club will be to focus Indian Christian talent and to turn it into the production of literature that will minister unto his growth and development. It should therefore at every stage of effort and organization, be the achievement of Indian Christians, helped doubtless by the sympathy and co-operation of the friends of the cause. The Club intends to promote scholarship, research and original thinking, paying particular attention to Indian contribution to Christian religion. As far as possible, preference will be given to original work involving talent, thought and research rather than mere industry and imitation. It will be obvious that if the Book Club is to maintain its place in the world of thought, it has to promote quality or high quality, rather than quantity and no temptation should be allowed to admit literary effort that does not satisfy the tests of original and earnest thinking.

It follows from the objects stated above that the literature of the Book Club will cover not only religion but all other departments of knowledge—Sociology, Ethics, Politics, Arts, Belles Lettres, that make for the richness and fullness of Christian life. Herein the Book Club differs from other religious literature societies.

The Indian Christian stands in the unique position of inheriting the Christian as well as the Hindu and Mussalman cultures and is by virtue of historical connections and accidents closely in touch with western cultures. Should he realise his own call and destiny, he should be able to bring to the interpretation of Christianity, the insights and disciplines that Hinduism and Islam impart to him and to transmit to them the energising and redemptive influences of Christianity uncramped and untrammelled by tradition and custom. Equally so the burden is his to transmit such portions of western culture as are useful and helpful for national growth and freedom, to his people and to transmit the living energies of his inherited culture to the west.

The task therefore involves three fold responsibilities: (1) to understand Christ and his Message in the light of God's dealing and leading of India in the past and transmit it to non-Christian friends in a language and idiom familiar to them—and in a spirit of fellowship and love that alone can illumine religious effort and make it fruitful. For this purpose, we have to discern God's purpose for us in history and utilise that purpose in advancing his cause. The Book Club will endeavour to interpret Hinduism and Islam from the Indian Christian standpoint and bring to bear on the Indian Christians, all living influences of those religions which will be helpful to him in attaining a closer and deeper unity with Christ. (2) The counter-part of this task—that of bringing the person and teaching of Christ to the non-Christian—will be undertaken with a full knowledge of the Scriptures of these religions studied reverently and critically. (3) In these days of creative nationalism, Indian Christians cannot stand in isolation. They have to join

the procession and take their part in the new order that is being born in our midst. The Book Club will tell him of what is being done by leaders and seers to regenerate India and will point out where and how he could intervene in the national effort, so as to enrich it and direct it along lines which will be in consonance with the spirit of Christ. We are living amidst literary, art renaissance in India and the Indian Christian has to throw himself into them wholeheartedly.

* * * *

Religions. The Book Club will try to bring into existence an Indian Christian School of Hinduism and Islam a school of thought which will interpret Indian history and religions in the light of God's purpose as disclosed in Christ. Surveys of religious trends and currents in Christianity and non-Christian religions, reinterpretation of the doctrines of Hinduism and Islam in the light of Christ's revelation and teaching and exposition of other religious classics from the Christian standpoint, will occupy our attention. The object of these studies will be to discover what in Hinduism is in line with Christ and what distinctive gifts Christ brings with him for India. A critical survey of religious movements (later than those included in Dr. Farquhar's *Modern Religious Movements in India*) is being undertaken. It will be a study of recent tendencies in Hinduism, Islam and Christianity. A study of the doctrines of Karma and Incarnation are also in contemplation. It may be stated that there is room for a new interpretation of both these doctrines in such a way as may challenge the attention of the Hindu and Christian alike.

Indian Christian Theology. The Indian Christian is passing from the absorbing to the reacting stage and it is not too early to think of Indian Christian theology. Two books are being projected, one a study of the prospects of Indian Christian theology, with a programme for immediate study; the other and more ambitious one—'The Fundamentals' as the Indian Christian sees them Then there is room for pioneer thinking with regard to Evangelism. A new orientation of the spread of the Gospel based on a study of the recent controversies on conversion, the expansion of religions in India, the psychology of Hindu religious mind—will we hope yield rich results. Great institutions of the past are being taken over by the Christian community. The Sadhu, in the person of Sunder Singh, and asramas have already arrived. What ideals they embody and what they meant to the Hindu and what they might mean to the Christian has to be elucidated. In view of the world-wide interest in Asramas, a book on the subject was the first book issued by the Book Club. It needs no mention that all this involves an intensive study of the Bible, which field is also within our scope.

A New Life Movement for India : The call to bring the ideals of Christianity from the clouds to the earth has been insistent. The Indian Christian has to think deeply how to bring to bear on national efforts the true Christian ideology in economics, forms of government, constitution of society. A series of books starting a life movement for India will we hope be possible. The Church has come to us from abroad. What shall we do with it? There are Union movements,

Christian Action Movements—Where do they take us? Sooner or later we have to face the issues.

Literature and Art. The Indian Christian has entered the literary and art world. He is interested in music, architecture, painting. We hope to get our artists to tell us of their work and plans. In the field of literature, poetry, novel and short story in the vernacular and in English, there is talent to be exploited. As a foretaste, a book of short stories is anticipated early.

Western Culture and Thought. We live in a world that has lost all sense of limitations and isolation. We can no longer live for ourselves. Western cultural movements and theology have to be studied. Our complaint is that the Indian Christian is starved out of the riches of the west. The Book Club will help him with periodical surveys of western literature and theology, arts. When we say west, we mean not British alone but European and American as well. The Book Club can select and recommend a book for the month for the readers. They can also arrange, as Book Clubs do, cheap editions of costly books. But this depends on the membership. There is urgent need for a Library Movement.

* * * *

We are sure this coming of age of the Indian Christian will be welcomed by Missionaries here and western friends abroad. They can promote the cause by joining the Club. Once we start, the talent will discover itself and we will do our best by means of an Editorial Committee and Indian Christian Writers Association to help them in all possible ways—with candid opinion first and sincere help next. The Book Club will encourage vernaculars and books in vernaculars will be published. It will endeavour to create a style of writing by Indian Christians which has some literary quality about it and as such readable by the public. Should we serve our cause as we hope to do, a band of sympathisers in Hinduism and Islam will join us and give their assistance. We seek, through the Book Club to quicken the pulses of the Indian Christian to fuller life.

Further Notes on Programme

In the initial stages of the scheme, it would not be desirable to announce a precise list. The following considerations will guide the Club :—

(i) The urgency and necessity of stimulating thought on fundamental as well as current problems of religion and of national life and the promotion of Oriental and Christian Scholarship.

(ii) While all of No. (i) cannot be of popular character, topics that would meet the general needs and appeal to general tastes would receive consideration.

(iii) Availability of writers. Apart from specialists who are competent to deal with selected topics, there may be others with varied talents—literary, historical or research,—whose work will have to be given scope for expression if the intellectual resources of the community are to be availed of.

(iv) The financial solvency of the scheme must be carefully safeguarded, and books can be issued only as each book pays its way. When funds gather, the issue of books will be governed by other considerations as well.

The programme will thus eventually be worked out along three lines :—

(1) Religious. (2) Christian Applications in National life. (3) General.

A systematic programme of No. 1 and No. 2 will be undertaken after a further survey of possibilities. No plans can be forecasted for the item 'General', it being dependent on the tastes of the individual writers. Some of the books contemplated by Dr. Farquahar but not completed may profitably be undertaken.

The following books are in course of preparation or contemplation, priority and frequency of issue being decided by the considerations urged above.

1. *Asramas—Past and Present* } Published.
2. *The Ideal Social Order (Series)* }
3. Indian Christians and Indian National Problems (*A Series.*)
4. Dravidian Contribution to Indian Life.
5. Biographies of Indian Christians (Series).
6. Hinduism and Christianity.
7. Mind of the Indian Labourer.
8. The Place of Art in Indian Christianity.
9. Expansion of Religions in India.
10. Evangelism.
11. Short Stories (Series).
12. Religious Situation in India, Vol. I.
13. Rural Studies (Series).
14. Political Programmes in India.
15. Women in 20th Century India.
16. Indian Theology—Prospects and Programme.
17. Student Life and Outlook in Modern Asia.

The subjects are chiefly of an exploratory nature to prepare for more positive original contributions later.

Indian Christian Book Club

Please enrol me as a member of the Indian Christian Book Club and send books not exceeding in value Rs. 4 during 1942, postage extra. Books may be sent per V. P. P. when ready, unless otherwise instructed.

NAME :

ADDRESS :

Date *Signature, and Address.*

For particulars apply to THE SECRETARY,
THE INDIAN CHRISTIAN BOOK CLUB,
8, BERACAH ROAD, KILPAUK, MADRAS.

RETHINKING CHRISTIANITY IN INDIA

BY G. V. JOB; P. CHENCHIAH; V. CHAKKARAI; D. M. DEVASAHAYAM; S. JESUDASAN; EDDY ASIRVATHAM; A. N. SUDARISANAM.

Second Edition pp. 340. Indian Edition: Rs. 1-4.

Press Opinions on First Edition

Should be in the hands of all Christians in this land, and is a valuable work of reference for libraries.

—*Lahore Diocesan Magazine.*

All those who are interested in religious problems should study carefully this book and ponder over its rich contents.

—*The Hindu* (Madras).

It is well that missionaries and other Western Christians should know of the reactions and attitudes to the missionary movement which are represented and so vigorously expressed by this group.

—*Calcutta Diocesan Board.*

Has considerable interest and value.....There is no mistaking the Christian zeal and sincerity of the writers.....We warmly commend the book to all who are interested in the future of Christianity in India. —*The Madras Mail.*

As to the competence of these persons to write these disquisitions, their heredity, rich and varied Christian experience, vast learning, devotion to the Master and Lord and earnest desire to serve the Church in India, eminently warrant it.

—*Madras Diocesan Magazine.*

'Rethinking Christianity in India' is a reminder that the Indian Church has come of age and can and should think and act for itself. ***This urgent and revealing *cri de coeur.****The book on its positive and negative side, represents a vital factor in Indian Christian thought; it is enthrallingly interesting. —*The Guardian* (London).

This is one of the most wholesomely startling books I have read for years on a religious subject. People who believe in missions, and still more people who don't should read it for the evidence it affords that the Gospel does indeed still take root where it is planted, and achieves a growth of its own in new soil***There is the stamp here of constructive thinking as may well put many so-called Christian statesmen in the West to shame. Altogether this is a book to love and to quarrel with. It will stir up admiration and anger, frequent dissent in detail and sort of passion of agreement in principle, in every open-

minded and warm-hearted reader. It is full of faults and of brilliancy. It augurs well for the free development of a Christendom indigenous and vigorous as a factor of strong and mounting influence in the brightening future of one of the greatest nations on earth.

—*Advance* (Boston).

We have here the aspect that the Christian religion presents to a number of highly educated and thoughtful laymen—For that reason this book must be received with much interest and studied with sympathy. —*International Review of Missions.*

This book ought to be widely read and particularly by all engaged in Missionary work. Its significance lies in the fact that a number of Indians are thinking deeply of the relation of their Christian faith to their nation and to the non-Christian religions of their country. —*Church of England Newspaper* (London).

This is an arresting book. It ought certainly to be read by all missionary leaders. It would be a splendid basis for a discussion group of Missionary leaders.....Christianity must ultimately make itself at home in India. It may require much rethinking before it succeeds. Here is an interesting and challenging attempt so to rethink it. —*World Christianity* (Chicago).

ASRAMAS PAST & PRESENT

BY P. CHENCHIAH, V. CHAKKARAI & A. N. SUDARISANAM

—Pages 330. Price Rs. 2.

Reviews

"Although the book is meant for the layman, it has been worked up in a very thorough and comprehensive way and reveals a keen critical insight and accurate historical perspective.

I cannot but admire the book as explaining with extreme sympathy a certain important aspect in human life which will be a unifying factor between the Christians and the Hindus The book takes up the view that two religious ideals can come together and form a single harmonious whole only by mutual adaptation and assimilation and also by adaptation of the separate ideals to the conditions of the times. The book shows that many things that are called Hindu need not be strictly Hindu but can be taken as institutions that have grown among a civilised nation and can be adapted to the needs of any civilised community. Looked at from this point of view the book is one of the most welcome additions to the literature bearing on ancient Indian life and culture and its contribution to human civilisation."

—*Hindu.*

" This book on *Asramas* is marked by real ability and breaks new ground by putting together a mass of facts from rare Indian sources, and especially by its plea for the *asrama* to be given a much more definite place in Indian Christianity."

—*Dnyanodaya, Poona.*

" Their appreciation of the history and tenets of their ancestral faith are based on deep study. They are as proud of them as any Hindu and they recommend that Indian Christianity should link itself up with the Indian tradition. The institution of Asrama which has played a great part in the Hinduisation of India from the earliest times is studied in this book not only in what is called an objective way but with simple reference to the knowledge of the ideas of which it was an expression."

—*The Indian Social Reformer, Bombay.*

" The book is a gospel of fraternity, a plea for the mutual assimilation of the Hindu and the Christian ideals based on a correct interpretation of history.

By the votary of knowledge and of social service, the book is bound to be appreciated."

—*Madras Mail.*

It is a comprehensive sketch of a subject in which many persons are likely to be interested in the country. The book as a whole is accurate in its statements, sound in its views. It should appeal to a large circle of readers.

—*Hindustan Review, Patna.*

The authors have placed us in their debt in doing research work in the organisation of the asrams from earliest times in India.

—*N. C. C. Review, Nagpur.*

The authors have tried to reconstruct every possible detail of the asrama life by referring to Sanskrit books viz. Dharma Sutras, Smritis, Epics and Classical plays. The effort entailing much labour is indeed admirable- —*Bharatiya Vidya, Bombay.*

It exhibits a good deal of sound scholarship—*Prabuddha Bharata.*

Will be very useful to those who want to study this very promising movement in Modern India.—*Aryan Path*, Bombay.

It is both a challenge and an appeal. . . . As a contribution to a possible synthesis of Indian life, with special reference to Christian outlook and practice, this book is valuable and timely and is worth the most careful study and appreciation.—SIR C. P. RAMASWAMI IYER in *Indian Review.*

The book gives an interesting history of the various types of Asramas or religious retreats, in which Indians from ancient times have sought to practise the higher life. . . . The Western reader will have to pass through a barrage of unfamiliar Indian names and religious technical terms, but the adventure will bring its own reward.—*Expository Times*, Edinburgh.

The book is a worthy inauguration of the Indian Christian Book Club and we trust that others will maintain the standard.—*Ashram Review*, Poona.

There is much in it that will provoke thought.—*Cochin Argus.*

Anyone who has read the book cannot but recognise the fact of the crying need in India to-day of many more ashrams.

—Ann Anchor in *Lahore Diocesan Magazine.*

To the authors of the book who have brought the story of an ancient means to the service of a modern end our gratefulness is due in no small measure.—*Indian Messenger.*

The author of the present review, though it tends to be critical, wishes to makes it clear that he considers this book of a large value in the thinking through of a current problem of method in building the Kingdom in India, realizes the vast amount of work which has gone into its preparation, and respects the purpose actuating its authors.

—*Christian Education,* Jubbulpore.

An excellent little volume . . . will be specially helpful to those who may be interested in the application of this vehicle to the American situation.—*Christendom*, New York.