

THE

"HINDU MESSAGE"

A Weekly Review of Indian and World-Problems
from the Hindu Standpoint.

Editor: T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B.A.

VOL. 3.]

THURSDAY MARCH 20, 1919.

[No. 22.]

The **Hindu Message** stands for

- (1) The Maintenance of British supremacy with self-government for India,
- (2) Co-operation with the different communities of India without prejudice to Hindu Dharma,
- (3) Education of the Hindus as an integral part of the Indian Nation,
- (4) Advancement of Material prosperity on a spiritual basis and
- (5) Dissemination of pure Hindu Culture.

Annual Subscription Rs. 6 only.

For *bona fide* students Rs. 3 only.

Postage As. 13. Extra.

Single copy As. 2 only.

All business communications and remittances to be addressed to the Manager and all literary contributions and books for Review to be addressed to the Editor, THE HINDU MESSAGE, Srirangam.

A Vision Of India.

ASYATTHA IV.

By K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, B.A., B.L.

Kaveri's waters through the live-long year
Now turbid and now pure, now high, now low
By thy tall holy form most gladly flow,
And while they hasten seawards swift they hear
The music of thy rustling leaves that sphere
Above thy stem beneath the full moon's glow,
Their answering song doth sweetly vocal grow
And charms the soul with music faint yet clear,
And at thy base there dreams a modest shrine
Where full and fascinating silence reigns
And speaks to soul with words unuttered wise,
The dreams and thoughts and prayers of ages twine
Around thy roots and makes surrounding plains
Bright blessed bits of perfect paradise,

The Hindu Message

THURSDAY EVENING 20, MAR., 1919.

The Emergency Powers Bill.

Since we wrote last week on the Coercion Bills, much water has flowed under the bridge. For the first time in its history the Imperial Legislative Council sat continuously both day and night with just enough interval for satisfying the cravings of the animal body. These nocturnal sittings forebode no calm deliberation worthy of the momentous nature of the subject under consideration. They betokened unnecessary obstinacy lending room for the impression that the Government did not much care to correctly gauge the views and arguments of the non-official members who represent the three hundred millions of His Majesty's Indian subjects. They showed clearly that the Government was quite prepared to use to the fullest extent the official majority at their command whatever the non-official Indian members might say. Amendment after amendment was thrown out and the non-official members got even disgusted. No good can result from this flouting of the reasoned opinion of the people. It was clearly pointed out in the Council Chamber that the Bill "is opposed to all canons of civilised administration" and that the second part of it especially "is the most objectionable and most anti-British part of the Bill." But it fell on deaf ears. Where was the necessity for this indecent haste and undesirable obstinacy? Local Governments, High Court Judges and Public Bodies

were not consulted; reasoned criticism was not welcomed; calm deliberation and mature thought were not bestowed on the Bill and its several unwholesome features. In the current issue of the *Modern Review* the Bill is compared with the most hated Spanish Inquisition which as is well known has been condemned as a terrible engine of oppression by all the historians. We may quote here the points of similarity as expounded by the *Modern Review*. They are (1) sudden arrest without warrant on mere suspicion, and detention without trial; (2) conduct of the proceedings strictly in camera; (3) the person under trial ignorant of the name etc. of his accusers or of the witnesses against him; (4) the accused not confronted with his accusers or the witnesses against him; (5) the accused not enjoying the right of defending himself with the help of lawyers; (6) The accused having only the right to a written account of the offences attributed to him; (7) No witnesses allowed in defence; (8) Judicial procedure quite different from that to which we are accustomed and (9) Trial or investigation of indefinite duration. The *Modern Review* goes a step further and shows that these Bills are far more drastic and far more dangerous than the diabolical Inquisition. For, the Inquisition like the Defence of India Act prohibited only the possession of *published* documents, whereas the Bill No. I penalises the possession of *unpublished* documents also! Again the Hon'ble Pandit Malavia has shown clearly in his note of dissent that by upholding as final and sufficient, the decision of the majority of the tribunal and by refusing the right of appeal from that

decision, the present Bill is excelling in severity, even the Irish Crimes Act which has been universally denounced. Thus it is clear that these Bills are far more terrible engines of repression than any known to history. These considerations have not weighed with the official majority. They have not noted the argument of such a high authority as Sir Narayan Chandavarkar that this remedy will rather inflame the disease than subdue it. His contention is that if the official majority will pass this Bill in the teeth of non-official opposition then the anarchists would say that the Government carry everything by force and any Government which does not respond to public opinion has no right to be called a constitutional government. It is simple autocracy. The guilty must no doubt be punished but as the Hon. Mr. Shastri said even heinous criminals like Roger Casement have their rights and so the guilty must be punished according to the approved ways and means. It is this equitable way of dealing justice that is the pride of a civilised Government. Suspend it and its claim to civilisation is suspended. Abolish it and civilisation becomes *non est*, with the result that full-fledged despotism is stalking abroad in the land. The Government of India, constitutional by nature and intent on establishing Responsible Government in India, can never reconcile itself to this despotic measure if it calmly reflects on the true nature of these Bills. They are now almost passed into law and people have begun to adopt counsels of despair. We make a last frantic appeal to the Government of India to desist even at this last stage from proceeding further with the Bills. Such a gracious act

would simply make the country dance with joy and will endear the Government to the people as nothing else has done. It will be an immense source of strength to the Government and will tie the people to it with bonds of deep devotion. India is eagerly expectant. India is confident of British ideals of justice and freedom. Her best friends both in India and England are ardently working for the progressive realisation of responsible government in the country. India is hopeful in the fair-mindedness and sturdy love of liberty of the British race. India is cheerful, expecting to receive the first instalment of self-government magnanimously granted to her in recognition of her status in the comity of nations. Let not India be baulked of her desires. Let her not groan under repression when the whole world rejoices in the victory of right over might. Let not India which has nobly sacrificed her men and money in upholding righteousness and has manfully helped to root out autocracy and despotism in Europe, be subjected to indignity and ridicule at home. On the other hand let India feel proud of her rulers and let her be allowed to hold her head high in the league of nations.

Imperial Economics and India's Future.

BY BABU BIPIN CHANDRA PAL.

Ten years ago the *Times* delivered a new presentation of the British Empire, which represents the real spirit of British Imperialism even to-day. The war has altered many things; but we are afraid, it has not worked any change in this inner spirit of British Imperialism. Indeed, as Sir Rabindra Nath predicted in course

of an interview to a representative of the *San Francisco California Examiner*, during his last tour in the States, the war has offered a new menace to India's political and economic future which was not so pronounced before. Sir Rabindra Nath said:—

"In my own country in India, it is impossible to predict what effect the war will have. England will undoubtedly be sorely crushed in her material resources, no matter which way the war will end; and nations pressed for means often become more oppressive and exacting on their dependencies."

This premonition of Sir Rabindra Nath seems to be coming true in the new economic policy of the British Empire. In the last century England applied, what Horace Hayman Wilson described as "the arm of political injustice," to kill India's industrial life, with which she found it impossible to compete upon fair terms. She did this, first by the imposition of heavy duties on Indian imports to England; and then by forcing her subsequent free-trade shibboleth upon us. She refused to have free trade when free trade might have saved our ancient arts and crafts and secured for our manufactures an open and profitable market in Europe. And she forced it upon us, when in the face of the new and fatal competition with her new industries, protection was our only means of industrial and economic salvation. But, now, when we are reduced to a mere agricultural country, on which the industries of all the modern nations so largely depend for their raw materials, England has thrown away her old free-trade policy which alone could place the markets of the world at our disposal for the sale

of our raw products. This new development of Imperial economics fully bears out the *Times'* view of the Empire, and may be very profitably recalled to mind just now.

The *Times'* ideal of the Empire was that of a dual Empire, composed, on the one part, of the self-governing Dominions of the Empire, including Great Britain herself; and, on the other part, of the Crown Colonies and Protectorates and the great Dependency of India,—these latter being included in what might be called the Dependent Empire. In plain English, this *Times'* idea of the Empire, is of a White Confederacy within the Empire severally and jointly engaged in the political and economic exploitation of the non-white races and peoples of the Empire. Ten years ago, in its Empire Day Supplement, the *Times'* tried to bring out the following essential features of its Empire-idea, which, by the way, was really not the *Times'* own idea, but was that of Lord Milner, who has been so powerfully influencing imperial policy during the last four years of the war. These features are:—

(a) That the British Empire is not one Empire but really two Empires,

(b) These two Empires are (1) the Self-Governing Empire consisting of Great Britain and the Dominions; and (2) the Dependent Empire including India,

(c) That those two Empires supplement each other, and thus form one composite Whole.

(d) That the function of the Self-Governing Empire is to rule the Dependent Empire for the benefit of both parties.

(e) That there must be equal

partnership among the Self-Governing units of the Empire for the government of the Dependent Empire.—This “partnership in the Empire has something to offer to the junior States, something well worth acquiring. They already enjoy the white-man’s birth-right of free self-government; Imperial union offers them the great opportunity of sharing the responsibility of the white-man’s burden.”

(f) But this “substitution of the partner-States as a whole for the United Kingdom as the power directly controlling the affairs of the Dependent Empire, must wait for further constitutional developments.”

(g) In the meantime “the way towards it may be prepared” and the establishment of “preferential trade relations between the Dominions and the Crown Colonies and India can do much both to awaken the consciousness of mutual interests, and to increase on the part of the Dominions, their knowledge of the nature of the inheritance which they are to administer in the future.”

This ideal is being slowly materialised in the new economic policy adumbrated in the Election Proclamation of the present Premier. He has already accepted Imperial Preference to which the *Times* referred as the first step towards substituting the Self-Governing Empire as a whole for the United Kingdom, as the power directly controlling the Dependent Empire.

The co-partnership in political administration of the Dependent Empire has not been openly formulated, and may, indeed, not be possible of realisa-

tion at all. Because, there is already a very powerful political consciousness in the Dependencies and Protectorates and Crown Colonies which has commenced to agitate for full political freedom. This demand might have been more or less ignored, if the Empire did not stand in need of organising the whole man-power of the Dependent Empire for its own self-preservation. The recent war has brought home to even this blatant White Imperialism the supreme necessity of organising the military and naval resources of the Dependent Empire for the protection of the Empire as a whole. And, it could no longer be safely ignored that it is impossible to organise the man-power of any country in modern civilisation without first removing the patent political disabilities of its people. No statesman would recommend recruitment upon a large scale from among a politically discontented population. India’s political discontent had, therefore, to be removed before seriously trying to tap the immense man-power of the country for the defence of the Empire. This is the true meaning and inwardness of the Parliamentary Pronouncement of August 20, 1917; and the Reform Proposals formulated in pursuance of it, by the Indian Viceroy and the Secretary of State for India.

But, even in these proposals, the authors have taken very great care to keep the door absolutely open for the final realisation of the *Times*’ ideal. In the first place, we are asked here seriously, (Para 323)—

“Do the changes which we propose point to the gradual, possibly the rapid, extrusion of the Englishman with all the conse-

quences that may follow? Is it conceivable that India's only surviving connexion with the Empire will be found in the presence of British troops for the purpose of defending her borders?"

And the illustrious authors of this Reform Scheme reply, "We may say at once that the last contingency cannot be contemplated." And they add: "We cannot imagine that Indian self-respect or British common sense would assent for a moment to such a proposition." And, what does it, then, mean?—These constitutional reforms, we mean. It means in plain English this—that so far as British Imperial idea and policy, as these are conceived by Lord Chelmsford and Mr. Montagu go, British troops will always continue to defend our borders, and British civilians will continue to control our administration. In any case, to adapt Lord Morley's historic dictum, as far as our imagination goes, India shall and must continue to be defended and governed by Englishmen. This idea has been forcibly reiterated by the Viceroy's assurance to the Civil Service, that whatever may be the nature or measure of the proposed constitutional changes in India, their position, prestige and prospects will remain as now.

It seems to me that this new policy has been forced upon the Government in London by the stern demands which the war has created upon the finances of the Empire. Ever since the times of the East India Company, exploitation and administration have gone hand in hand in the Government of this country. Lord Curzon only stated this historical fact when he declared to the coal miners of Jheria in 1904, or 1905, that administration and

exploitation are parts of one and the same duty in the Government of India.

The process of exploitation must be continued and accelerated if the Empire is to be saved from bankruptcy. The war has imposed fresh and very heavy burdens upon the Imperial Exchequer. The interest and sinking fund on the new war debts, with the increased pensions for the army and the navy due to the war, come up to near eight hundred million pounds, we are told, a year. And the question is whence is this huge sum to come from? The total revenues of the United Kingdom before the war was a little less than 200 million pounds. It was increased during the war through the Excess-Profits Tax. These excess profits were due to war conditions, and particularly to the demands of the Munition Board and the Army Clothing Department. With the close of the war these profits will automatically go down and there is no prospect of keeping up the income from this source to any appreciable figure. Means must, therefore, be found to find this additional money from other sources. But Mr. Amery speaking the other day in the House of Commons on behalf of the Government, and in the name really of Mr. Bonar Law, distinctly said that there was no chance of increasing the receipts from the normal revenues of the country. What, then, will the Government do to save themselves from bankruptcy?

The new economic policy indicates the fiscal policy which will be adopted to meet this serious fiscal situation. This policy had been adumbrated, about three years ago in a series of articles that appeared in the *Times* on "The Elements of Reconstruction." These

articles were subsequently published in book form with an Introduction by Lord Milner. These may therefore be reasonably accepted as a more or less authoritative exposition of the new economic policy of British Imperialism.

This is how the authors of these articles present their new economic gospel :

"While on the one hand the bulk of reasonable men in the Empire have come over to the primary Socialist assertion that food production, transport, all the big industrialism are matters not for profit-seeking of private ownership, but for public administration, it has also come to the completest realisation that it is impossible to wrench these services suddenly from the hands that control them today. We cannot cut to-morrow off from yesterday ; the world will be of the same men. Without any preachment or propaganda we all find ourselves today drifted into a virtual agreement upon the reasonable course of economic development. It is a development towards nationalisation ; so far we go with the Socialist, but it is a development not by the Socialist's panacea of "expropriation" at all, but by amalgamations, by developing the crude beginnings of the "controlled establishment," by the *quid pro quo* of profit sharing and control in the national interest in exchange for the national credit and helpful tariff."

And Lord Milner in his "Introduction" says

"...Let me specially commend to them, and to others, what our authors have to say about the true

place and also the limitations of a Tariff, or indeed of any form of Protection in a national economic policy. Their wise and discriminating words on this subject should show us a way out of what has now become a barren and boring controversy between Protectionists and Free-Traders, obviate any further misunderstanding, and allow us all to get to practical business."

What this getting to "practical business" would mean to the fate and future of India, I will discuss in a separate article.

Notes and Comments.

Sir Valentine Chirol, writing in the *January* number of the *Fortnightly Review*, suggests that Constantinople, with all its suburbs up to the lines of Tchataldja, should be placed under the government and control of America. We suppose that this is meant as a reward for her co-operation with the Allies in the Great War. He calls his suggestion a "great and almost Providential call." Sir Valentine has now won the Tilak case, and so he need no longer have any qualms of conscience about his call being identical with that of Providence. It is no longer "almost" Providential, but the same as the Providential. When he wrote his volume on "*Indian Unrest*," he played the part of Providence to India. More recently, Mr. Lionel Curtis has played a similar role. British travellers and several other "lords of human kind" have, in more or less degree, astutely and successfully played the role of keeping the conscience of Providence, and with a keen and unfailing eye too, to the main chance. There is nothing, therefore, inconceivably absurd in the supposition that Sir Valentine Chirol will yet live to accomplish the leap from being a messenger of the Almighty and making an "almost Providential call" on the American nation, to the very seat of the

Almighty and thence issuing the awful mandate itself with all due solemnity and irresistible might! We say, Amen! Who will not?

Sir Valentine Chirol, in the same article, authoritatively dictates to the world another maxim of supreme wisdom and universal application:—"Subject races exposed to constant oppression are peculiarly liable to the vices that are bred of servitude, and those amongst them who are admitted to the service of the state are prone to demonstrate a loyalty always open to suspicion by the most abject servility, even at the expense of their own kith and kin." We would like to know whether Sir Valentine would apply this to those "distinguished Indian Mohammedans" whom he condemns for "declaring that Constantinople is the 'city of Islam' and that the whole of Islam would resent its passing out of Turkish hands." Indian Mohammedans, whether "distinguished" or not, only avow the *spiritual* authority of the Sultan of Turkey as their Caliph. Even such of them as belonged to what Sir Valentine calls "the new school of Indian Mohammedans who were gravitating towards the more advanced forms of Indian Nationalism,"—even they have never done or said anything to justify any "suspicion" of their loyalty to the British connexion and suzerainty over India. It is very improper in Sir Valentine to subject their motives in raising subscriptions for the Turkish sick and wounded in the Balkan wars and ascribe their efforts to "a distinctly political and often anti-British flavour." It is suspicious of such puerile character that bring on troubles of all sorts even to high-minded Indian lovers of Great Britain.

Sir Valentine Chirol thinks that if the seat of the Sultan's government were removed from Constantinople, there would not be any room for the apprehensions arising from a Pan-Islamic propaganda of the kind which was proclaimed by the Sultan of Turkey when he had the stupendous folly to cast his lot with Germany and Austria in the Great War. We can-

not follow Sir Valentine in this wonderful effort of his non-pareil dialectical genius. What pan-Islamic appeal the Sultan made from Constantinople, he could make also from Smyrna or Aleppo, and with equally useful results! Moreover, so long as Sir Valentine can honestly avow and declare of the Indian Mohammedans that "their own loyalty is above suspicion," why should he complain if any of them believed that it was in the interest of the world of Islam that their Caliph should continue to hold, and rule at, Constantinople?

No doubt, the Sultan and his advisers committed an act of stupendous folly in joining the Central Powers in the Great War. But the world is hereafter entering on a new era in which the new League of Nations will settle the fate of the nations and other people inhabiting it on principles of "impartial justice." Germany will henceforth be disabled from repeating her unholy aggressions on humanity, or of hoodwinking the credulous Sultan of Turkey into believing in his promises of protection against his enemies, the Balkan powers and Russia. Turkey in Europe, already shorn of the greater part of its territories and dependencies, remains but an interesting historical relic of the once mighty Ottoman domination in Europe. The career of the German people and their unmentionable atrocities have shown that there is nothing intrinsically sublime or worthy in what Sir Valentine speaks of with much pride as "Western knowledge and Western civilisation." There is nothing special in the soil of Europe to justify the claim that Asiatics must be excluded from the sovereignty or occupation of any portion of it.

The Hindu doctrine of *Adhikara* or qualification is one from which the modern mind strongly dissents. The Christian doctrine too as ordinarily expounded, proclaims that all are at all times fit to receive the truth and the whole truth concerning God and salvation. But, to one who reads the teaching of Jesus to his disciples without any pre-conceived bias, the impression conveyed is somewhat different. Jesus

said on one occasion ;—"I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." This shows that spiritual instruction must be adapted to the capacity of the learner, and must be different for different stages of mental and spiritual growth in the same person. If this is granted, we can easily understand that it must be also different for different men in different stages of evolution in order that there may be a true appreciation and understanding of it and a gradual and progressive growth in spiritual evolution.

* *

Even among our *novi homines*, there are some who, after the manner of the Christian *padre*, proclaim that the knowledge of God is something which is easily attainable, that every one *knows* that there is an *Ishvara*, and that it is only the wicked or ignorant Vedantin that proclaims that the knowledge of God is attained only as the last step in a course of spiritual training and evolution. Nothing can be more absurd. In the Gita, the blessed Bhagavan himself has said that only one in a thousand makes the effort to know him and that, even among such as make endeavours, only one in a thousand truly knows him (VII-3). There are many among us who read the Gita ever so many times for themselves, and yet derive little benefit or none thereby. If one wants to know the Gita truly, one ought to place himself under the guidance of a Guru who not only knows the teaching, but is a *tattva darsi*, one who has realised its true import as a matter of personal experience. Otherwise, the result will be only a case of the blind leading the blind. There are many blind guides abroad in these days, and the mischief they do is incalculable. The only consolation lies in the Vedic assurance that "truth alone will conquer, not falsehood."

The Dreams of the Soul.

(BY A DREAMER.)

V

The long reign of the night is over and the golden array of the forces of light is coming with its conquering tread.

The shining spears of light are hurled all over the sky and the development of darkness is rent in a million places.

Over the pathless plains of the sky the surefooted rays of the sun speed on their resistless campaign of conquest overthrowing the settled glooms of night.

The tuneful songsters of the earth break into a melodious chorus of joyful praise, and glorify the victor's prowess.

The earth wakes up in her maiden beauty like a bride and the morning dews shine like tears of joy at her beholding the golden face of her beloved lord the sun.

Light, light, light everywhere. Ah light up my heart also and there shine in the sky of the soul.

VI

O woman, light divine plays around you and kindles radiance in your face and the fire of love in our hearts.

The bliss of life is spread like a path of flowers for your flower-soft feet to walk upon.

The buds of our thoughts have blossomed and send their fragrance of yearning love as tribute to thy queenliness.

The fruits of our service rejoice at your touch and desire the grace of your acceptance.

The ravishing melodies of our love speed from the harps of our hearts and quiver in rapture at the doors of thy golden ears and seek gracious admission into the palace of your heart.

The splendours of our passion have lit up the face of the earth and shine forth in the sunlit skies, the sky-kissing peaks, the flashing waterfalls, the majestic rivers, the odorous glooms of forests, the flower-gemmed trees, and the fair creations of Art. They seek the honour of thy approving looks.

Come into your Kingdom, O queen, and rule there with the might of purity and beauty and softness and sweetness as the full moon rules in argent splendour in the summer sky.

Our Social Problem and the Bhagavad

Gita By K. S. Ramaswamy Sastri B.A., B.L.

Price per copy Annas 4 only,

For 50 copies Rs. 10 only.

The Bhagavad Gita.

With an English Exposition

By K. S. RAMASWAMI SASTRI, B.A., B.L.

(The substance of the lectures now being delivered at the Students' Sanatana Dharma Sabha Trichinopoly.)

ADHYAYA II.

(continued.)

स्वधर्ममपि चावेक्ष्य न विकम्पितुमर्हसि ।

धर्म्याद्धि युदाच्छ्रेयोऽन्यत्क्षत्रियस्य न विद्यते ॥

Looking at your own Dharma, also, you ought not to falter. For there is no higher good and auspiciousness to a Kshatriya than a war which does not swerve from Dharma.

NOTES :

1. The Lord means that Arjuna as a Kshatriya prince should regard war as natural to him. The Lord is going to show this in Chapter XVIII verse 43. Also a righteous war is to protect men and establish Dharma through the means of victory and conquest. This is in answer to Arjuna's statement in Chapter I, that he will go to hell if he kills men in battle. नरके नियतं वासो भवति । न च श्रेयोऽनुपदयामि हत्वा स्वजनमाहवे । The Lord shows where true श्रेयस् is for a Kshatriya.

2. The duty of a Kshatriya to be the armed and victorious protector of Dharma is thus stated by Parasara.

क्षत्रियो हि प्रजा रक्षन्स्रपाणिः प्रदण्डवान् ।

निर्जित्य परचैन्यानि क्षितिं धर्मेण पालयेत् ॥

Manu says ;—

समोत्तमाधर्मै राजा चाहूतः पालयन् प्रजाः ।

न निवर्तेत संप्रामातृ क्षात्रं धर्ममनुस्मरन् ॥

संप्रामेष्वातिवर्तित्वं प्रजानां चैव पालनम् ।

शुश्रूषा ब्राह्मणानां च राज्ञः श्रेयस्करं परम् ॥

3. The Sanskrit word Dharma is untranslatable in English. It imports the idea of prenatal tendencies, the idea of morality, the idea of scriptural injunction, etc. It means even God. Hence doing duty in the proper spirit is an act of worship of God.

4. In Wordsworth's *Happy Warrior* we have a fine description of the man who

rejoices in a righteous war and does his work in life in a spirit of joyful elation at his being called to it.

“Whose high endeavours are an inward light
That makes the path before him always bright.”

5. A righteous war causes no ill to the fighter or the slain as the killing of animals in sacrifice causes no ill to the sacrificer or the sacrificial animal but benefits both. This meaning is specially emphasised by Sri Ramanuja.

6. The Lord is pleased by His command to each man being carried out by the latter and not by the latter in doing another act even if it be higher; just as a king is pleased by obedience and not by a disobedient doing of a better action.

यदच्छया चोत्पन्नं स्वर्गद्वारमपावृतम् ।

सुखिनः क्षत्रियाः पार्थ लभन्ते युद्धमीदृशम् ॥ ३२ ॥

O Partha! Blessed are the Kshatriyas who are called to such a war as this where the gate of heaven is flung open without seeking for it.

NOTES :

1. यदच्छया means also what is got by divine agency and grace.

2. Madhusoodana points out that it may be argued that Dharma Sastra says that you should not kill (न हि स्यात्सर्वो भूतानि) while Artha Sastra prescribes war for Kshatriyas and the Dharma Sastra is higher than Artha Sastra and must be followed.

सम्योर्विरोधे न्यायस्तु बलवान्व्यवहारतः ।

अर्थशास्त्रात् बलवद्धर्मशास्त्रमिति स्थितिः ॥

The Lord shows that the fighting of a righteous war by a Kshatriya is a duty cast upon him by Dharma Sastra and that if a warrior fights in a righteous cause and as a Karma Yogi he attains heaven. As righteous war is enjoined the text of prohibition has no application. विधिस्पृष्टे निषेधानवकाशः ।

3. This verse is an answer to Arjuna's question in Chapter I. स्वजनं हि कथं हत्वा सुखिनः साम माधव ।

4. सुखिनः सुखः पुण्य (merit) Sri Desikar thinks that it means antecedent पुण्य. The Lord refers to such antecedent पुण्य and also to the prospective पुण्य. It is said that warriors attain Heaven.

ये सुध्यन्ते प्रधनेषु शरासां ये तनुयजः ।

ये वा सहस्रदक्षिणास्तांश्चिदेवापि गच्छताम् ॥

आह्वेषु मिथोऽन्योन्यं जिघांसन्तो महीक्षितः ।

युध्यमानाः परं शक्या स्वर्गं यान्त्यपराडमुखाः ॥

(To be continued.)

Dharma—XVIII.

(By K. G. NATESA SASTRI, Vaidya Visarad.)

Next the Hon'ble Law Member is reported to have said "my hon'ble friend is very brave and my Hon'ble friend Mr. Ayyangar was braver still though I fancy with a very slight knowledge of the subject." Nothing more is needed to show that the bravest of all was the Hon'ble Sir George, for, like the Magistrate in the "Indian Sketches" of the *Amrita Bazaar Patrika* who held that because a man spoke coarsely he must be considered a lunatic as insane people are often apt to utter most intelligent things, he knows the customs, law, and history of this land better than the Hon'bles Pandit and Ayyangar for he is neither an Indian nor a Hindu and therefore not accustomed to learn things purely Aryan from the lip of his mother. Surely the Hon'ble law member is fit to be classed among the Orientalists of the type of Professor Ross who maintained that the European scholar is the best fitted of all to interpret correctly the Vedas as he has no knowledge of the traditions of the Vedic lore, no not even a syllable of the Vedas he can pronounce with an improper intonation even. Wonderful are the days we live in. The Hon'ble Law Member reminds the Hon'ble Ayyangar that he ought to know that "Manu is probably a conglomerator of texts belonging to a great number of different periods" But how can this invalidate the authority of Manu, Heaven only knows. Says Maxwell:— "Probably the rule as to the exposition of

one Act by the language of another is best and most comprehensively laid down in the broad statement of Lord Mansfield thus:— "where there are different statutes in *pari materia*, though made at different times or even expired and not referring to each other, they shall be taken and construed together as one system and explanatory of each other," (Max 5th Edn. P. 54). It is clear from this rule that even accepting for the sake of argument, the cocksure statement of the Hon'ble Law Member that Manu contains texts belonging to different periods, the authority of Manu in matters of law both personal and real cannot be questioned, for according to Lord Mansfield "they shall be taken and construed together as one system." This rule has been fully explained with scientific precision by the Mimamsakas in the *Padarthaprabalya Adhikarana* commonly known as *शिष्टाकोपन्याय* (Jai I iii. 5) where it has been laid that both the *Sruti* and *Smriti* are to be taken as one homogeneous whole as regards *Dharma* and decisions arrived at so as to be explanatory of each other. But the Hon'ble Sir George Lowndes cannot understand *Mimamsa* but he can at least know the ruling of Lord Mansfield and in the light of that ruling his duty, as a critic and jurist must be to try to harmonise the two conflicting texts of Manu by finding out the *pros* and *cons* of them and the contexts to which they belong. Exactly the same thing has been supplied by the commentators of *Manu* and *Yagna-valkya* by deciding that marriage between a man of one caste and a woman of the same caste as that of the man alone are legally valid while in marriages in different castes the woman is entitled to maintenance only, which is really humane but not entitled to the rights of wifehood or पत्नीत्व. Ignoring the commentators, even the original lawgivers as Manu have expressly laid down this ruling. Says Manu:—

"असपिण्डा च या मातुरसगोत्रा च या पितुः ।

सा प्रशस्ता द्विजातीनां दारकर्मणि मेथुने ॥" (मनु. ३. ५)

Here 'दारकर्म' means the particular rite which brings on her the right to enjoy the responsibilities of wifehood and 'मेथुने' means

"both the religious rites which requires both of them to be partners and also sensual pleasures." Next the very same Manu says

"कामतस्तु प्रवृत्तानामिमाः स्युः क्रमशोऽवराः ॥"

(मनु. ३. १२.)

which clearly establishes that the marriage between men and women of different castes are allowed for sensual purposes but it cannot bring on the woman the rights of wifehood. Where is that passage which the Hon'ble Sir George triumphantly declared that he could point out "which directly recognise the legality of such marriages and the succession of property under them?" Nowhere in Manu do we find them except in the imagination of Sir George Lowndes. Evidently he has not understood the difference between a moral law and a positive law, or in the words of the orthodox jurists of this holy land the difference between *krativartha* (कृतवर्थ) and *Purushartha* (पुरुषार्थ), where कृतवर्थ is positive law and पुरुषार्थ is moral Law. The moral law of any country requires that once a man reposes his love on a woman of a lower caste whether publicly or secretly, she is entitled to claim maintenance from him and hence the ancient jurists of India acting on this sane principle have laid down rules for setting apart a certain portion of the property for the proper upkeep of that woman and her children and this the Hon'ble Law Member unfortunately confounds with the succession of property. In this connection it is well to point out that in India moral laws as well as religious laws were not mere ideals to be fondly cherished and achieved but were realities in the past and are even now to a large extent, being maintained in every community. Time may rapidly come when the pure Aryans of India will cease to exist as a nation but that is no reason why the actually existing thing should now be ignored or whittled down simply to satisfy the modern historians like Ramanand Chatterjee and others. So long as "इतिविवान" or the "manifold manifestations of the world" seem to be real and are to be aspired after, passions cannot but

taunt human beings and this, eminent jurists whether ancient or modern, must take into account and must provide for these frailties, but it cannot be maintained on that score that one should not strive to make the ideal real. This has been achieved in India to a remarkable extent while other countries allowed themselves to drift along the path of passions. To Mr. Ramananda Chatterjee this may seem a *myth* for according to him "pure blood is a myth in the science of anthropology," but to us these ideals are not mere ideals but real facts, for according to the science of practical knowledge handed down by tradition pure blood is seen even now in every part of India, and hence the science of anthropology which is the result of mere illogical guesses cannot stand before actual facts. Mr. Chatterjee has to learn more before he can venture to pronounce anything in regard to the history and customs of India. But of this later on. The rulings laid down in the ancient laws of India in regard to the status of women of different castes married by a single man cannot but seem horrible to men of these days but an impartial critic will have to bear in mind that the ancient laws are based on a religious basis and marriage being a sacrament with us Hindus, even the right to succession of property both in the *Mitakshara* school and the *Dayabhaga* school is so arranged that it may create the minimum amount of friction in the proper discharge of religious rites. Those who cannot reconcile themselves to the religious efficacy of these arrangements can have no legitimate grievance with the ancient lawyers: they are perfectly at liberty to have laws convenient to them. When once they ignore the religion as traditionally understood in India they must be brave to declare themselves not belonging to that community which puts faith in religion. There is the Act III of 1872 to protect them; they can have a claim on the ancestral property though they cease to be Hindus under that Act. But let them not lure the people into the belief that they are Hindus and yet can violate the rules of Hinduism.

Olla Podrida.

The matrimonial quests are proceeding apace. One named Sinha wants a Vysia educated handsome virgin widow for an young Vysia of 23 who holds a decent post of Rs. 100 in Government. All correspondence for further particulars should be strictly confidential. Photos may be sent to Sinha. What is Sinha going to do? Eat them up? The passion for handsome virgin widows seems to be on the increase. What is to become of those who are not handsome and who are not widows, I wonder! What handsome widow can resist that captivating qualification—holding a decent post of Rs. 100 in Government. Is the advertising bridegroom otherwise handsome? Let the photographers flourish! What the photographer puts together let no man put asunder.

Next comes the advertisement of Box No. 111. After the beast comes the box. What does Mr. Box want? "Wanted a suitable Brahmana match whether unmarried or virgin widow having a fair knowledge in any one of the South Indian languages with little English between 16 and 20 for a widower aged 34 employed in a commercial firm on a decent salary. A Tamil knowing Smartha girl is preferred! So Mr. Box has no overwhelming passion for widows. While Sinha does not stipulate for English, Mr. Box wants a "little English." Mr. Box leaves photos out of the negotiations presumably because he is 34. This is the age of advertisements. Even God has no chance unless He advertises in the dailies.

Such are the momentous announcements in New India on 11-3-19. The second grade pleaders are holding a Conference and have issued bulletin No. 1. The midsummer season of conferences is about to open its campaign.

The Trivandrum Law College students are going on strike. Evidently we are living in very striking times. The Madras Tramway Men are on strike. The Tinnevely Sugar Refinery Men are on strike. Strikes are here, there, and everywhere.

SCRUTATOR.

Gleanings.

Democracy versus bureaucracy.

(By SHYAM BEHARI LAL.)

(Concluded.)

Perhaps, a bureaucrat might open his mouth and venture to enquire of me, what would be the result if the principles of Democracy are carried to the extreme and even if the doctrines of the Communists be ever carried into law under the auspices of Democracy, the society would come to a standstill. Gentlemen, it is not so. Certainly we do not know what other forms of government are in store for us besides those with which we are acquainted. But a glance at the past, and a historical review disclose the fact that Democracy is not of spontaneous generation. There is a certain order. First comes Autocracy to be followed by its mate bureaucracy which in its turn gives place to Democracy. Thus democracy has been evolved out of the primitive form of government where might was right,..... Some one might say that it may be a return to Autocracy. But they ignore the very facts of nature. The plan of nature is evolution. If autocracy transplants Democracy everywhere the long and laborious process by which nature has worked would be reversed and there would be again a return to what is called a state of nature. The *laudator temporis acti* may believe that the Golden Age has passed away and forever, but we of this generation believe that the Golden Age is to come. Nations may rise and fall, there may be revolutions of civilisations—but all such revolutions minister to the progress of the civilisation itself, though not of any one particular type of civilization. Even the present war whose happening we all so deeply deplore has brought the world but a step forward. The long Czarism of Russia and brutal despotism of Turkey which no political force could uproot for above 1,000 years have been sapped and undermined by the present war. Would you like to have such Autocracies again and would nature allow it? Indeed, we do not know what form of Government would succeed Democracy, but this much we know that there is to be no retrograde return to either Bureaucracy or to Autocracy after the most gigantic war has been fought for Democracy. But if human foresight and

reason are anything, if the experience which history gives, teaches us something, I may venture to say on my account that individuality as well as society would be directly developed and brought to perfection by Democracy. If it be so, what then? The two extremes of human existence have been moulded and perfected. But this is a mere *speculus*. It is a problem not for me but for time itself to untie.

Now it may be asked what is the lesson which History gives us in this direction. When we turn to the history of the classical nations, we discover legislative attempts that savour of modernity. Even in the fifth and sixth centuries B. C., the Athenians established a form of government which aimed to give an equal voice to all free men in determining the laws that were to control them. Nothing could be more provocative for the modern legislator than to read of the legislative experiments of Lycurgus at Sparta and of Solon and his successors at Athens. If we pass on to latter part of ancient history and consider the attempts at federal government that found expression in the *Ægean* and the *Ætolean* leagues, we shall have been presented a prototype of nearly every legislative experiment of more recent times.

In our own times, France after a century of bloodshed and struggle commencing with the French Revolution attained the ideal of liberty which England and America already possessed only to plunge again into the present world war to preserve the democracy.

As to England, John conceded the beginnings of English liberty in Magna Charta, Charles I and James II questioned that liberty and history records the answer that England gave them. With the coming of the Hanoverians, Cabinet system came into existence and after many cataclysms liberty emerged full-grown.

Italy inspired by Mazzini with the ideals of liberty found its saviour in Victor Emmanuel of Sardinia and in 1818 was conferred upon her a constitution by which the King governed through a ministry responsible to a Chamber of Deputies elected by the people.

Spain and Portugal have their respective *Cortes* and even the Russia of the Czar had its Duma.

America, we all know, revolted at the gross injustices of the Mother country, England. It formed a Constitution and gradually the different States entered into the Union. Even in the East, China is an experimental Republic. Japan instituted a Diet of two Chambers by the Constitution of 1889 and Persia expelled the despotic Shah and established a Majlis or Parliament in 1909.

Even the rulers of India have pronounced Self-government in reasonable time for her to be the goal of their policy, but when that time will come nobody knows. Gentlemen, the greatest of the wars fought for the principle of liberty and justice has come to a long sought victorious end for the Allies. If it be true that the present war is a war of ideals, may we not hope that with the victory of the Allies Democracy will be enthroned all over the world? Indeed the strongest argument in favour of democracy is to be had from the colossal failure of the most efficient and the most powerful Bureaucracy in the world, I mean the Prussian Bureaucracy and the Russian Autocracy. Bolshevism must teach too severe a lesson to the Bureaucrat and the Autocrat. They must know that the *Panacea* for all such evils is the Divine Democracy. Moreover, it has been recognised all over the world, in press and on platform that some sort of league of nations should be established in future. Is not Democracy the most akin form of government in national politics to a league of nations in International Politics?

Gentlemen, such are the forces, not under the control of any one body or even one nation that are gravitating with accelerated speed towards the enshrining of Democracy in the governmental temples of every country in the world.

What is the conclusion then? Bureaucracy has become an anachronism in the

THE HINDU MESSAGE will be posted regularly every week to any address in India, Burma and Ceylon on payment of Rs. 6 only per annum; For all foreign countries within the Postal Union it will be despatched on payment of 10s. 6d. per annum. All subscriptions are payable in advance and should be remitted to the Manager "The Hindu Message",
Briaragam.

twentieth century has been well remarked by Dr. White. It would hardly survive this century. If the laws of mechanics always hold good, and if I may be permitted to draw an illustration from that source, I may say that the top-heavy rod of the bureaucratic government cannot long stand erect and must fall down even when the mildest breeze blows. Democracy has been declared the goal of all government even by the most rigid bureaucrats. Bureaucracy had to play its part in the evolution of the human society and it has done its task. Perpetual it cannot be. On the other hand, the forces of Democracy are so tremendous and overwhelming that one cannot but go in that direction. Democracy as described by Abraham Lincoln is a government of the people, by the people, for the people. The future progress of civilisation lies in the universal triumph of this principle. For when it is fully established all the world over, the long-sought for millennium would arrive and the ideals would be materialised.

Modern Review.

The Week.

Babu Bipin Chandra Pal came to Trichinopoly last Friday and delivered three lectures—two at Trichy and one at Srirangam. A very large number of students attended both the lectures at Trichinopoly, the subjects of the lectures being 1. The present political situation and 2 the Rowlatt Bills. The lecture at Srirangam was aptly on Vaishnavism. He visited the Sri Vani Vilas Press also and made the following remarks in the Visitor's Book.

"Through the kind courtesy of Mr. Balasubrahmanyam the Proprietor of the Sri Vani Vilas Press, I was able to look over the numerous valuable works published by it. The selection, compilation and arrangement of the Publications speak highly of the education, culture and critical discrimination of the Proprietor who is also the editor of most of the publications, while the get-up speaks very highly of the printer's art which this Press evidently commands."

The following Manifesto has been issued at Madras during the week.

It is now practically certain that the Rowlatt Emergency Bill will become law on Tuesday, when the Indian Legislative Council will finally meet to pass it, notwithstanding the united and strenuous opposition of the Indian Members. The only course immediately open to us to get rid of the legislation is to secure, if possible, its disallowance by the Crown. In this view we are sending to the Secretary of State the following cable, praying the Crown to disallow the legislation:—

"Rowlatt legislation hurried through Council without adequate opportunity for public criticism, against unanimous opposition Indian Members. Country absolutely peaceful. No need for legislation. Present powers ample for all unexpected emergencies. Country greatly agitated. Atmosphere created prejudicial to successful working reforms and to effective co-operation between people and Government."

Whilst, however, strongly disapproving of the Rowlatt legislation and the manner of its passage through the Imperial Legislative Council and whilst recognising the need for continuous agitation to secure its repeal, we consider the movement in favour of passive resistance highly inexpedient and injurious to the best interests of the country.

Sir P. S. Sivaswami Iyer.

Khan Bahadur Khuddos Badsha.

Dewan Bahadur Kesava Pillay.

Mr. Nyapathi Subba Rao.

Dewan Bahadur Govinddoss Chaturbhoojaddoss.

Mr. K. Srinivasa Iyengar.

Khan Bahadur Walji Lalji.

Dewan Bahadur Ramachandra Rao.

Rev. Dr. Lazarus.

Hon'ble Mr. Venkatapathi Razu.

Hon'ble Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao.

Mr. C. Abdul Hakeem.

Hon'ble Mr. A. Suryanarayana Rao.

Mr. Moulana Abdus Subhan.

Hon'ble Mr. T. Rangachari.

Hon'ble Mr. P. Siva Rao.

Mr. C. V. S. Narasimharaju.

Mr. S. Muthia Moodelliar.

Rao Bahadur T. Subramania Iyer.

Mr. T. R. Venkatrama Sastri.

Mr. G. A. Natesan.

Dr. M. Krishnaswamy Iyer.

Pandit Gopala Charlu.

Mr. M. Kolandavelu Moodelliar.

Mr. P. A. Subramania Iyer.
 Mr. K. V. Krishnaswamy,
 Mr. Koutha Suryanarayana Rao.
 Mr. K. A. Viraraghavachari.
 Rao Bahadur K. B. Ramanathan.

*
 *

Several Office-bearers and members have resigned their connection with the Executive of the Provincial Congress Committee and the following letter gives the reasons for their action.

We feel impelled to resign our seats on the Executive Committee of the Provincial Congress Committee for the following amongst other reasons:—

1. In spite of earnest exhortations to the contrary, the Committee has resolved to address demands on behalf of India to the President of the Peace Conference without reference to the British Government, and we feel that in doing so we are imperilling our political future.

2. There is an increasing and lamentable tendency on the part of various members of the Committee to resist attempts having as their object the securing of co-operation in public questions, even on points of agreement, and we regretfully observe that the amenities of public life and the decencies of controversy are disregarded not only in public gatherings but the meetings of the Committee as well.

L. A. Govindaraghavier, President, Madras Provincial Congress Committee; Annie Besant, Vice-President; K. A. Viraraghavachariar and B. P. Wadia Secretaries; C. S. Govindaraja Moodelliar, Treasurer; C. P. Ramaswamy Iyer and G. A. Natesan, members.

T. V. Muthukrishna Iyer, a third Secretary, has also resigned, but without giving any reasons.

Wit and Wisdom.

A new patient is admitted to an insane asylum. The Director examined him carefully in the presence of his assistant.

"Who are you," he asks.

"Pius X, doctor."

The Director waits to hear no more and orders the unfortunate man sent to the incurable ward. But his assistant does not agree with him,

"I do not think the case a desperate one," he says. "I am sure that the poor fellow, if he is given a special treatment, may recover."

"Very good, try," replies the Director. And the next day he asks his assistant,

"Have you begun your treatment?"

"Certainly. And I am convinced that the patient will recover."

The insane man is brought before the Director who asks—"Well now, who are you?"

"Pius IX, doctor."

"You see, you see!" cries the assistant, "nine days more and the man's brain will be as lucid as yours or mine."

*
 *

Shortly after two'clock one bitter winter morning a physician drove four miles in answer to a telephone call. On his arrival the man who had summoned him said—

"Doctor, I am not in any particular pain, but somehow or other I have got a feeling that death is nigh."

The Doctor felt the man's pulse and listened to his heart,

"Have you made your will?" he asked finally.

The man turned pale.

"Why, no, doctor, it ain't true, is it? It can't be true—"

"Who is your lawyer?"

"Eardley Norton, but—"

"Then you'd better send for him at once."

The patient white and trembling went to the phone.

"Who is your pastor?" continued the Doctor.

"The Revd. G. Smith" mumbled the patient. "But, doctor, you think—"

"Send for him immediately. Your father too should be summoned; also your—"

"Say, doctor, do you really think I am going to die?" The man began to blubber softly after summoning every one through the phone.

The doctor looked at him hard.

"No, I don't," he replied grimly. "There is nothing at all the matter with you. But I'd hate to be the only man you have made a fool of on a night like this."

*
 *