

TRUTH ABOUT
THE TRAVANCORE
EDUCATIONAL POLICY

JOSEPH THALIATH, M. A., Bar-at-Law,
Retired Chief Justice, Travancore

TRIVANDRUM
14 OCTOBER 1945

TRUTH ABOUT
THE TRAVANCORE
EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Joseph Thaliath, M. A., Bar-at-Law,
RETIRED CHIEF JUSTICE, TRAVANCORE

TRIVANDRUM

14TH OCTOBER, 1945.

FOREWORD

This booklet contains the full text of a speech delivered by Mr. Joseph Thaliath, M. A., Bar-at-Law, at a meeting of Catholics held at Trivandrum on 14th October, 1945. We recommend this to all who desire to get a correct view of the question involved in the controversy relating to the primary education in Travancore. The speech also reveals certain undesirable features connected with the agitation that is being carried on, in and outside Travancore against religious education.

Mr. Joseph Thaliath has been a judge and Chief Justice of the High Court of Travancore for over seventeen years. He was also a Judge of the High Court of Cochin for some time. In both the States he enjoys the highest reputation as a judicial officer. It may be doubted, if any man ever sat in these High Courts, whose judicial career answered more exactly to the conception of a "just and upright judge".

In what esteem he was being held by the Members of the Bar is evidenced by the fact that at the time of his retirement, the Members of the Advocates' Association of the Travancore High Court put up a portrait of his in their hall, an honour they have extended so far in their long existence to only one other Judge, viz., the late Mr. Karimpet Rama Menon, M. A., Bar-at-Law, another Chief Justice of the High Court of Travancore.

Publishers.

TRUTH ABOUT THE EDUCATIONAL POLICY

E

Introduction

We are passing through very exciting days. In the welter and confusion created by the agitation against our schools and colleges, many false charges are also being levelled against us.

We are accused of teaching our religion in our schools to Hindu, Muslim and Non-Catholic students and that we are insisting to continue to do so in future. This charge is not made by outsiders alone, who may not be familiar with the conditions in Travancore; but it is being indulged in by other people here, who have held responsible positions, and who could have known even otherwise, the actual state of affairs. The real fact is that we teach Catholic children alone our religion in our schools and that only outside class hours. Not even general ethics is being taught to Hindu, Muslim or Non-Catholic students in any of our primary schools. This is not a practice introduced in recent times. The Catholic schools have never imparted religious instruction to any except Catholic children.

We are also accused of standing against the introduction of free and compulsory primary education in the country. You know this is also a false charge.

There is also a set of people who are saying that we started an agitation quite unnecessarily. They contend that there has been no change introduced recently in the matter of imparting religious education in denominational schools, or in the matter of getting grants for such schools. According to them, we have no grievances at all, and that we have started an agitation with some ulterior motives.

At the very outset, let me state what is the real position of the Catholics. We welcome the introduction of free and compulsory primary education in the State. Our demand is that we should have the liberty of maintaining our denominational primary schools, where we can teach our religion to *our own children*, outside class hours. Though the Government, by their decision, published in the Gazette Extraordinary, concede this demand, the Catholics had reasons for entertaining real apprehensions, that all their primary schools would be taken over from them by the State. At present the only remaining question, as far as we are concerned, is whether our denominational schools will in future get reasonable grants from the public funds.

The resolution for taking over the management of all the private primary schools by the State was passed in the Assembly and Council only in last August and the Gazette Extraordinary announcing the Government's decision came out only on 12th September. Still most of the people who accuse us with all kinds of wild charges, seem to have forgotten entirely the sequence of events, that led up to the present position. To get a correct perception we have to look back a little.

The Education Reorganisation Committee

Let us begin from the date of the appointment of the Travancore Education Reorganisation Committee. The Committee was constituted by a Government Order, dated 24th November 1943. The Committee's terms of reference were "to enquire into the existing educational system in the State and to formulate proposals for its reorganisation with due regard to post-war developments". The Committee consisted of 43 members representing various sections interested in the education in the State. The Chairman was Mr. H. C. Papworth, Pro-Vice-Chancellor of the University of Travancore, who was a former Director of Public Instruction in the Madras Presidency. Besides Mr. Papworth, there were on the Committee the following Government Servants: The Director of Public Instruction; Acting Director of Public Instruction; Director of Research; Principal, Engineering College; Principal, University College; Secretary, Government Central Stores; Principal, Training College; Registrar, University of Travancore; a Lecturer of University College; a Division Inspector of Schools; Organiser, Vocational and Welfare work in Schools; Inspector for Muslim Education; an Additional District Judge and the Secretary to the Committee. Apart from these 15 Government Servants there was also on the Committee, Mr. Ulloor S. Parameswara Iyer, who is the Dean of the Faculty of Oriental Studies, University of Travancore; but he is not now a full-time Government Official. There were 13 members altogether from the Upper and Lower Houses of the Legislature. Among these I find the name of the Deputy President of the Assembly as well. There were 11 members to represent aided schools and colleges and of these 9 were Christians. Out of these 9 Christians, there were 4 Catholics, 3 of the latter being Bishops and the other the Principal of a First Grade College. These with two members to represent Commercial Community and a retired Division Inspector of Schools, made up the 43 members of the Committee. From the above enumeration it is abundantly clear that there were enough and more

members on the Committee to safeguard the interests of the Government. Also it will be apparent that the 9 Christian members interested in aided schools could not have unduly influenced the rest of the 34 members of the Committee. The Committee was a thoroughly representative body, and most of the members on it were men who could speak with authority and experience on educational questions in Travancore. This learned Committee took one year and 5 months for their deliberations, and their Report was signed by the members on 22nd March 1944. The Report is unanimous; no dissenting or explanatory note has been recorded by any member.

Some of the unanimous recommendations of the Committee which are relevant for our present controversy are:

- 1) Primary education should be made free and compulsory for all boys and girls between the ages of five and ten.
- 2) The two main branches of Educational Management, *viz.*, Government and Private, should continue.
- 3) On the one hand, Government should have adequate control over all private agencies; on the other hand, there should be provision for liberal grant-in-aid.
- 4) The Committee accepts the principle that all teachers, whether in Government schools or private schools, should receive the same rate of salary and that, in respect of conditions of service and security of tenure, there should be no distinction between the Government school teacher and the private school teacher.
- 5) As a practical measure, in primary schools Government should pay a grant equal to 75 per cent of the salary of the teachers, and although the managers are expected to pay the remaining 25 per cent, this need not be made a condition of recognition in the case of schools already in existence. No private management, however, should be permitted to open new schools unless at the time they apply for such permission they are already paying their teachers the minimum salary given in Departmental schools.

The three Catholic Bishops and the Catholic Principal of the First Grade College who are members on the Committee have subscribed to the above recommendations. All the Catholic members of both the Assembly and the Council supported the motion that primary education should be made free and compulsory when it came up for

consideration in the respective Houses. In all the articles that appeared in Catholic Papers, in the speeches made and resolutions passed at the Catholic protest meetings, you will not find a single word against the introduction of free and compulsory primary education. If any mention is made at all, it will be only to welcome it. Yet in the confusion created by the agitation directed against the Catholic schools and colleges, we are accused in the Press and on the Platform as standing against the introduction of free and compulsory education and thus constituting a bar against all progress in the State.

Another aspect of this unanimous Report which I would ask you to note is that it was signed by all the Government Servants on the Committee without the slightest demur. If the Government had even the haziest notions of taking over the management of all private schools on 22nd March 1945—the date the final Report was signed by the members—do you think that all the Government Servants on the Committee would have subscribed to the proposition that there should be provision for liberal grant-in-aid and that as a practical measure, in primary schools Government should pay a grant equal to 75 per cent of the salary of the teachers or that they would have approved the statements like these in the body of the Report?

“From these figures it is clear that a very considerable and worthy contribution to primary and middle school education is made by private agencies and that the State cannot afford to lose this valuable asset. Although the introduction of compulsion may involve the opening of new schools by Government wherever necessary, every help and encouragement should be given to private managements to improve their schools and to open new ones..... We are definitely of opinion that well-conducted and efficient schools should be generously aided by Government”.

As I said, the final Report of the Committee was approved and signed on 22nd March 1945. It is seen from the printed Report that it was presented to the Government in May 1945. Some time before the Assembly and Council met for the Budget Session, each of their members was presented with a copy of the Report of the Education Committee, but those copies were marked “Confidential”. The Discussions on the Report began on 3rd August 1945 in the Assembly, which met first, with an introductory speech from Mr. Papworth, the Chairman of the Committee. It was only then that the general public could have had any correct notions about the recommendations of the Committee. Though the Report was not published and not available to

the public, since there were 43 members on the Committee representing various interests, and since there were also certain newspaper reports giving the bare outlines of some of the important recommendations of the Committee, all those agencies, anxious to know about the Committee's recommendations, must have had an impression, that nothing revolutionary was recommended by the Committee. So people were lulled into that belief, and they went on in that peaceful atmosphere till they began to read in newspapers about the discussion in the Assembly, on the resolution that private primary schools should all be taken over by the Government. This resolution—which, if carried in the House and assented to by the Government, would have put out of existence 2169 private primary schools in the State—was taken up for discussion after lunch time on 8th August 1945, and the discussion was concluded and resolution carried before lunch on the succeeding day. One interesting feature of the voting is that the Pro-Vice-Chancellor of the University, who was Chairman of the Education Committee, the Director of Public Instruction, the Deputy President of the Assembly and a few others, all of whom had subscribed to the Committee's Report, as well as all the other Government members in the Assembly, voted *en bloc* for taking over all the private primary schools by the State. Those Government members who signed the Committee's Report and who had come to certain definite decisions after deliberating for nearly a year and a half and who, in the meantime had consulted, as mentioned in the introduction of the report, many learned educational reports and also had the assistance of several experts, had all to go back on their views, because of the persuasive eloquence of the mover of the resolution, who, I am told, is a contractor by profession, and three or four of his supporters. The discussion on the resolution could not have lasted for more than two or three hours altogether. The conversion of Mr. Papworth and other signatories to the Report must have been sudden and complete as in a revival meeting.

The Historic Resolution in the Assembly

Let me also say a word about the resolution. The members of the Assembly sent in no less than 69 resolutions on the Report of the Education Reorganisation Committee for discussion in the Assembly. On the 2nd August, the Secretary to the Assembly printed and circulated 65 resolutions. The offending resolution was not among them. Evidently it had not then reached the Secretary. Almost all these resolutions were for implementing the recommendations of the Committee. On 3rd August, the Secretary to the Assembly again

circulated a list of 4 resolutions, and the resolution, that has now become so famous, is the 69th and the last. On going through the 69 resolutions I find a number of members sending in resolutions on the same subject such as religious education in Schools, the increase of the salary of the teachers, etc., etc. But for taking over all the private primary schools by State, there was only this solitary resolution.

The resolution was carried, as I said, before lunch time on the 9th August. The house was engaged with other matters after lunch. That was the final day of the Assembly. The next day, the 10th August, the Council met and the Dewan President announced at the very commencement of the proceedings that the Government have decided to take over all the private primary schools. You may be startled to hear this. I was, indeed, taken aback when I came across such a statement in *The Deepika*, while I was going through some issues of that paper, containing the Assembly and Council proceedings. The official Report of the proceedings even of the first day of the Assembly is not yet out, and so we have necessarily to depend on reports published in the newspapers. It was in a report issued by the A. P. I. and published in *The Deepika* that I read about the Government decision. The relevant portion reads: "The Dewan also announced that the Government have decided to take over all private primary schools". At first I could not believe this statement to be correct, because of the suddenness of the decision and also because it goes quite counter to the tenor of the Press Communique, the decision announced by the Gazette Extraordinary, and the statement to the Press issued by the Dewan all of which came subsequently. Another consideration also stood against my accepting the correctness of the report. The Dewan was announcing the Government decision to the Upper House even before that House had an opportunity to discuss the same question and express an opinion thereof. Though the A. P. I. Report was published in *The Deepika* with bold headlines: "Government Decided To Take Over Primary Schools—Statement In Council By Dewan", I wanted yet confirmation from some other source. I sent for a copy of *The Bharathi*, a pro-Government paper, of the corresponding date, and there I found the same announcement appearing in the Dewan's speech with which he opened the Council proceedings. In *The Bharathi* the report appeared under the headings: "Government's Goal—Dewan's Important Statement Thereon—Plain Hints Regarding Assembly's Discussions". *The Bharathi's* report also will tell us why the decision was announced

before the Council itself had an occasion to express its opinion. *The Bharathi* Report reads: "The Dewan continued; Now let me explain to you the Government's policy on certain questions. What I am going to mention here had the approval of the Assembly. If you think that there is any defect in the Government's policy, I am prepared to give you enough time to express your opinion. The Government have decided that no religious instruction should be given during school hours. Government think that this is necessary. The Assembly adopted the resolution by 39 votes against 19. Next the question arose, if the Government could give 75 per cent of the cost of the primary education as grant, why not the Government take up the whole primary education under their direct management. The Assembly has decided by 52 votes against 8 in favour of Government's direct management. Considering all the circumstances, the Government have decided to do so on the basis of a ten year programme. Under this system the whole pay of the teachers have to be met by the Government. But this being an important duty Government have resolved to strictly carry out the decision".

So the Government have decided the question and announced its decision openly in the Council on the 10th August. But in the Press Communique issued by the Government on the 31st August, we are told that the Government have yet to make the decision. I have to come back to this Press Communique later on, but for the present purpose let me read to you one or two statements from it: "If the Government accept the recommendations of the Assembly and Council... and assume responsibility for the management of primary education..." Again "Even if the Government decide to make themselves responsible for the management of primary education etc". And now let us see what is stated in the Gazette Extraordinary dated 12th September, announcing the Government decision. The Government order begins like this: "Having bestowed their anxious consideration on the subject, Government have come to the conclusion...and decided to assume control and management of primary education, etc." And in a statement issued to the Press on 22nd September by Sir C. P. Ramaswami Iyer, the claim is again put forward that the decision was arrived at after mature consideration. For, the statement says: "It is needless to add that Government arrived at their decision after the most careful consideration". But it is not clear whether the decision referred to here is of 10th August or of 12th September.

After the Dewan President had announced the Government's decision in the Council, you can more or less imagine what must have

been the nature of the discussion on the resolution in that House. When Catholic members however strongly urged the necessity of having Catholic schools for educating Catholic children, the Dewan relented a bit from the position that the State itself should manage all primary schools and conceded that Catholics may have their own schools and if these schools come up to the standards fixed by the Education Department they will get recognition but no grant. The Dewan was quite definite on this point. *The Mail* of August 23rd reported: "The Dewan said that there was absolutely no objection to conduct religious classes in the schools outside the class hours and that there was nothing to prevent the private agencies from running schools, provided they conformed to the standards set by the Government". The only thing was that they will not be given any grant by the Government. The Council approved by a majority vote the decision the Government had already taken.

When the Education Committee Report was being discussed in the Council, *The Deepika* came out with one or two leading articles contending for the continuance of the Catholic primary schools under Catholic management and at the same time receiving aid from the Government. *The Powraihwani*, another Catholic daily, took up the same attitude. About this time Rev. Fr. Carty also wrote a letter to *The Mail*, calling upon the Travancore Government to decline to accept the resolution passed in the Assembly and Council.

The Government Communique

A Government Communique was issued on 31st August as a reply to the above mentioned critics. I shall go through this Communique in some detail. It states in one place: "It is a well known fact that in a very large number of privately managed schools, the teachers receive nothing more than the Government grant and in many cases not even that. This disgraceful and dishonest treatment accorded to large numbers of teachers has not been rectified in any way as a consequence of the Joint Pastoral Letter of the Catholic Clergy of Kerala to which one of the articles refers". Leaving aside the venom that is exhibited here against the Catholics, let me ask how the Communique can assert as a fact, that in many cases the teachers do not get the whole of the grant given by the Government. For the last one year and more the Government were paying the salary grant directly to the teachers. Even the contribution the managers had to give to the teachers as dearness allowance, was not allowed to be paid directly into the hands of the teachers. The manager's contribution

should first be deposited in the Government treasury, and then the Government would add their contribution to the salary grant of the teacher and it was for this consolidated amount, cheques were issued to individual teachers in private schools. Some people seem to think that starting private school is as lucrative as starting chitties and restaurants. If it is so, why is it, in these days of struggle for existence practically one community alone has entered this field?

The Communique deals with the argument that if the Government could give 75 per cent of the pay of the teachers as grant they could as well pay the whole salary and manage all the schools themselves. I shall deal with this aspect later on.

Next the Communique says: "This resolution was carried in the Assembly by 52 votes against 8, and in the Council by 30 to 4, and it would have made no difference to the result in either House had the official members remained neutral". Even if the Government members had abstained from voting, the resolution would have perhaps been carried in both the Houses; but, the fact that the Government members *en bloc* voted for the resolution must have considerably influenced the voting of other members, especially of the nominated members. At any rate, if the Government members did not vote, the majorities would have been far less impressive and the Government would not have been able to state in the very next sentence: "The large majorities by which the resolution was carried show that there is overwhelming consensus of opinion that, if Government are called upon etc., etc." For this overwhelming consensus of opinion, the votes of the Government members have contributed substantially, though perhaps not overwhelmingly.

Papal Encyclical Misquoted

The Communique extracts the following statement from the Encyclical of Pope Pius XI on Christian Education of Youth:

"It is an inalienable right as well as the indispensable duty of the Church to watch over the entire education of her children in all institutions, *public or private* not merely in regard to the religious instruction there given, *but in regard of every other branch of learning and every regulation* in so far as religion and morality are concerned".

The italicised is as given in the Communique. And the Communique then comments thus on the passage extracted: "In other words, the Church claims a divine right to *dominate schools*".

By extracting a quotation from the Encyclical some people might think, that the person who drafted the Communique must be well versed in that Encyclical. It is, however, certain that the author of the Communique has not carefully read the Encyclical. He may not have even seen it. If he had carefully read the whole of the Encyclical he would not have expressed his comments in such categorical terms.

I shall presently read to you the same extract and also some other passages from the Encyclical which will show that the interpretation put in the Communique is entirely wrong. There is internal evidence in the Communique to show, that its draftsman is more conversant with rationalistic literature than with Papal Encyclicals. For the extract from the Encyclical and the opinion expressed on the same, appear to have been taken from an article written by one J. W. Poynter in the *Rationalistic Annual of 1937*. The Encyclical under reference is known by the name *Divini Magistri*; Poynter mistakenly calls it by the name "*Rappresentanti*". There is not even such a word in the Latin language. The same mistake occurs in the Communique. Poynter also after extracting the relevant portion of the Encyclical adds: "In other words the Church claims a divine right to dominate schools". So it is the opinion of Poynter that was reproduced in the Communique without acknowledgement! The only originality shown here is to emphasize the last two words in the comment by underlining them. Let us now see what sort of a person is this Poynter, who was taken by the author of the Communique as a reliable guide to the teaching of the Catholic Church on the question of educating her children. In one portion of his article, Poynter himself admits that he is a renegade.

In the extract from the Encyclical a wrong impression is given by underlining certain words, which Poynter himself has not done. I shall read to you the same extract as it ought to be read and emphasizing certain words and expressions so that what was meant by the passage may become quite clear.

"It is the inalienable right as well as the indispensable duty of the Church to *watch over* the entire education of *her children* in all institutions public and private, not merely in regard to the religious instruction there given but in regard to every other branch of learning and every regulation in *so far as religion and morality are concerned*".

It refers exclusively to the religious teaching of the Catholic children and also their studies in other branches of learning in so far as religion and morality are concerned. It is not difficult to realise that in other branches of learning the questions regarding religion and morality may often crop up. What is wrong on the part of the Church to be solicitous to watch over the education of her children in secular subjects, *in so far as it affects religion and morality?* If the draftsman of the Communique had the full text of the Encyclical with him and had carefully read it, I think, he would not have been so very assertive. For it is explicitly stated in the very same Encyclical that "the Church does not interfere with the regulation of the State, because the Church in her motherly prudence is not unwilling that her schools and institutions for the education of the laity being in keeping with the legitimate dispositions of the civil authority; she is in every way, ready to co-operate with this authority and to make provisions for the mutual understanding should difficulties arise".

Voting by Christian Members

"Special attention", continues the Communique, "must be given to the fact that the majority of Christians both in the Legislative Assembly and the Council voted for the resolution that the Government should take over the management of primary education". This is indeed a very bold statement since it is entirely untrue. In the Assembly Messrs K. M. Paul, K. A. Mathew, P. Yesuadian and A. Nesamony are the 4 Christian members who voted in favour of the resolution. The 8 Christian members who voted against are: Messrs P. K. Kuriakose, Chazikatto Joseph, J. T. Morais, K. T. Michael, K. Varghese Ithacc, J. E. A. Pereira, P. O. Thomas and D. Thomas. Three Christian members, Messrs P. M. Varghese, V. I. Indicula and K. G. Thomas remained neutral. Even if we add the votes of the Christian Government members in the Assembly, viz., Messrs Papworth and Kumara Das, who really had no choice in the matter, only 6 Christians voted in favour of the resolution while 8 Christians voted against. In the Council, Messrs Sathyanesan and T. W. V. Park are the 2 Christians who voted for the resolution, while Mrs. Kora and Messrs K. S. Joseph, Paul Thaliath and K. C. Chandu were the 4 Christians who voted against. Mr. A. Gabriel Nadar remained neutral. Even if we add the vote of the Government member, Mr. Papworth, there were only 3 Christian members who voted in favour, whereas 4 voted against. In reference to *The Powraiwani* the same paragraph of the Communique said: "It is quite untrue to say that the proposal is an unpardonable insult to

Christian educational endeavour and that it will cause grief to twenty lakhs of Christians". If these statements of *The Powradwani* are characterised as quite untrue, I do not know with what terms we have to characterise the attempt on the part of the author of the Communique in making out in a Government Press Communique that the majority of Christians in both Houses supported the measure. The statements whether the proposal is an unpardonable insult to the Christian educational endeavour or that it would cause grief to twenty lakhs of Christians, are difficult to prove or disprove. But the fact that who all voted for and against the motion among Christian members in the two Houses must have been well known to the draftsman of the Communique and was a matter for easy verification and proof.

The last two paragraphs of the Communique refer to the letter written by Fr. Carty to *The Mail*. Fr. Carty has already replied to this and I do not wish to add anything except to say one word in reply to the following statement in the Communique: "To state without any attempt to verify the statement that the Legislature has decided to eliminate all private educational institutions is an abuse of the privileges of public controversy. The proceedings of the Legislature are available for all to read". This statement was made on 31st August 1945. We are now in the middle of October; even to-day the proceedings of the very first day of the Assembly are not available for any to read.

Before I leave this Pres Communique I have to draw your attention to the stand taken therein by the Government as regards the important question that is agitating us to-day, viz., whether our primary schools will get financial aid from the Government if we teach religion to our Catholic children outside school hours. This is the relevant portion on that point in the Communique: "If Christians or any other body of people desire to conduct their own schools in their own way and for the benefit of their own body, they will be free to do so; and if such schools satisfy the standards of attainments prescribed by the Education Department, they will be granted recognition, but they will not be eligible for financial aid from Government. There are already schools of this kind recognised in the State". The intention appears to be firm not to give any grant to our primary schools as they exist to-day.

Bishop's Pastoral Letter

Some time after the date of the Communique I was referring to till now, viz., 31st August 1945, the Pastoral Letter of the Bishop

of Changanacherry came to the notice of the Government and on the 6th September the Government issued notice to His Lordship to withdraw the Pastoral Letter and to express open regret for having issued it. Two weeks' time was given to His Lordship to comply with the Government's demand. As I told you, the notice was issued on the 6th September. In some of the daily papers of Travancore that came out that very day, there was an A. P. I. news item relating to the denominational schools in Ceylon. The news appears to have emanated from Colombo on 29th August, though it found a place in the Travancore Papers for the first time only on the 6th September; that is, after 8 days, exactly synchronising with the issue of the notice by the Government to the Bishop. The news also was very depressing to those who were contending for the rights of the private management. The last paragraph in the news item alone is relevant in this connection. It reads: "The schools that are likely to be affected are Christian Mission Schools, which after 1948, *will either have to hand-over the management to the Government to be run as State institutions giving free education and without religious bias or stand on their own legs in the matter of running the institution according to their religious faiths. In the latter case, most of such institutions can stand only a slender chance of survival*". (Italics mine.) Both the Trivandrum Dailies, *The Bharathi* and *The Kaumudi* on the 6th September published this news with prominent and attractive headlines. That was in Malayalam. On the 7th September *The Kaumudi*, which contained the A. P. I. news that the Government have asked the Bishop of Changanacherry to withdraw His Lordship's Pastoral Letter, also published the news that came from Colombo, this time in English. The editor must have realised fully the importance of that news before he decided to publish the same news twice, once in Malayalam and then in English. The Dewan also has relied on this news item in his Ampalapuzha speech. After stating the position of schools in Ceylon as mentioned in the A. P. I. news, he observed: "It was quite clear that Ceylon was treading the same path as ourselves". The same idea the Dewan repeated in the interview he gave to the representative of the Associated Press of America. I have to deal at some length with the position of denominational schools in Ceylon. Just now I need only say that the portion I have quoted out of the news item is extremely misleading. In Ceylon, if existing denominational schools come within the free system, they can continue to be under their own management and also will receive the full salary of the teachers as grant from the State.

Very soon after the notice was issued to the Bishop it became known that His Lordship was not going to withdraw the Pastoral Letter. In the event of the refusal by the Bishop, the Government had to carry out the threat held out in the notice for non-compliance. Better counsel, however, prevailed and by issuing a Gazette Extraordinary announcing the Government decision about primary schools even before the time of grace allowed in the notice, the question of the withdrawal of the Pastoral became a mere side issue.

The Government Order in this Gazette Extraordinary states that, "in view of the agitation sponsored by certain organisations and the misconceptions that, notwithstanding what has been stated publicly more than once by me and on behalf of the Government, still persist, the Government wish to make certain points clear". The only question that was agitating the minds of Catholics and most Christians after the date of the Press Communique was whether they will get grant from public funds for conducting their schools as they do at present. On this point the Government Order is extremely vague. A close reading of the Order, however, leaves in me the impression, that it wants to carry out the intention expressly stated by the Dewan in the Council, viz, the denominational schools may continue to exist, but they will not get any Government grant.

On 16th of September, the Dewan made his Ampalpuza speech. The speech, even as it appeared in *The Mail* which, I am told, undergoes a double distillation before it goes out, shows that the speaker must have been very much agitated while making the speech. See, for instance some of his statements: "Speaking on behalf of His Highness's Government and as a fully accredited representative of that Government, the recent Order whereby the Government has assumed responsibility of the primary education of the State, together with the financial burden involved therein, will be implemented and no obstruction and no threat will prevail against the inerradicable resolve of the Government to implement the scheme". "This is an occasion of the assumption by the Government of the responsibility for primary education and the financial burden of such education, which were an essential, inescapable and inevitable policy of the Government from which they will not depart". Why all this talk about threats and counterthreats? The Dewan had only to make clear whether the Government were prepared to give grant to private primary schools in future if they will conform to the existing type of denominational

schools, that receive grant now. The report of the speech given out by A. P. I. to the local papers and published in some of them, gave a glimmering of hope. For there were in that report passages like this: "It was actually suggested in the Assembly that a Catholic might teach the principles of Catholicism inside school hours to the Catholic students, and leave the others to play about in the compound. It was then pointed out how such a system would not work and therefore it was suggested that religious instruction should be given outside school hours. The whole question, said the Dewan was very simple. Are you going to teach the religion within or without school hours. If the management wants to give religious instruction outside school hours they might continue to do so". The Dewan also concluded his speech in these words: "I trust in sober moments there will be time for reflection and ratiocination on the part of those, who, on the basis of a misconception, have uttered wild and whirling words ignoring their complications". But the actual words the Dewan used about the conditions which will entitle a school to receive grant from Government was as vague as ever. His actual words are: "Representing His Highness's Government and charged with the duty of administering to his various subjects belonging to several creeds and faiths, it is my duty to see that I do not swerve to one side or to the other, but preserve an attitude of strict neutrality. It is therefore only those institutions which come within the ambit of the neutrality and conformed to that neutrality and preserve to themselves the possibility of religious instruction outside those limits and boundaries that will be eligible for Government grants". The Dewan was saying all these "for the benefit of the few who do not want to understand". The speech as reported in *The Mail* did not contain the passages which I said might give a ray of hope; the report in *The Mail* left us high and dry with expressions like, 'ambit of neutrality, conformation to neutrality, limits and boundaries'. We are at this stage even to-day.

Popular Support?

The Press Communique said that the large majorities by which the resolution was carried show that there is an overwhelming consensus of opinion behind it. The report of the Education Committee was kept as secret till the resolution came up for discussion in the Assembly. The public had no knowledge of it. The members of the Legislature had no opportunity to know the real views of their constituencies, since the issue was never placed before them. In the circumstances how can the voting be said to reflect the view of the

constituencies? Will the voting in both the Houses really amount to anything more than the expressions of the members in their individual capacity. One of the Christian members, who remained neutral in the Assembly, at the time of voting, has subsequently issued a statement that he remained neutral because at the time of voting he had no opportunity to ascertain the general view of the voters of his constituency. There was also no discussion in the newspapers on this question at that time. Yet the whole world is now reverberating with the news that for the recent measure adopted by the Travancore Government they had the overwhelming support of the people and that a few reactionaries alone stand against. I want to make it clear once more that we welcome the introduction of free and compulsory primary education in the State. Our demand is that, if our denominational schools conform to the standard fixed by the State, they should be given reasonable grant out of public funds.

Even granting for argument's sake the measure had the popular support, the Government is not bound to accept it. Many seem to think that 49 men in a community should submit always to the views of the 51. Some of the vernacular papers pinned their faith so much on this principle that they even challenged us to hold a referendum and show that 51 per cent of the people are not for taking over the management of all primary schools by the State. An unjust act will not become just for the reason that 99 men out of 100 support it. You must be all familiar with the description of democracy as given by the Prime Minister Attlee in his recent Blackpool speech. I shall not therefore refer to that. I shall, however, read an extract from a speech on the same subject delivered by Lord Greene, the present Master of the Rolls, in Lincoln's Inn Hall, at the end of last year. In precedence the Master of the Rolls come next to the Lord Chancellor in the Judicial hierarchy in England. Lord Greene said:

"In order that a democratic system may work well the spirit in which it is worked is all-important. Democracy—or at any rate successful democracy, as we know it—is not merely, as some persons who do not understand it, seem to think, Government by a majority, and the statement that its object is to secure the greatest good of the greatest number is, like most simplifications, hopelessly inadequate and misleading. A democratic system, if it is to work, must be something far more subtle, far more complicated, far more dependent, upon imponderable and often indefinable qualities in the character of the people.

"Democracy at bottom is in truth an attitude of mind: a democratic system is one which makes it possible for that attitude to achieve practical results. A spirit of toleration, an inborn dislike of oppression as such, the belief that it is better to compromise than to go to extremes, the knowledge that an excessive use of its powers by a majority is not only unjust, but will, in the long run, defeat its own ends, an insistence on incorruptibility in the public service, a strong but not capricious public opinion—all these things and many more play an essential part in our democratic attitude of mind and in the working of our system. I must assume their continued existence. But it is right to point out in passing that their continued existence itself depends in a considerable measure on the efficiency of the machine and its ability so to function as to enable the aspirations of the people to be fulfilled and its sense of justice satisfied. If the machine fails to work satisfactorily, so that those aspirations are frustrated and that sense of justice is violated, toleration may relapse into intolerance, the spirit of compromise may give way to intransigence and a majority may aim at the permanent oppression of a recalcitrant minority".

Before I leave this subject I would ask those who now wield the strong weapon of public opinion whether they would confine the use of this weapon to the question of the management of primary schools alone or are they willing to extend its use to other problems that are now facing the people of Travancore?

Religious Instruction

I do admit that imparting of religious instruction in schools in a country, where people profess more than one religion is a thorny subject; but there are countries where this problem has been very successfully solved. I would like to mention to you of the system that was being worked very satisfactorily in HOLLAND from 1920 till that country was invaded in 1940. Now that the Government have gone back and things have come more or less to the normal the old educational policy, I believe, is being continued. In Holland too there is the question of majority and minority as well as difference of religions. Only one-third of the people are Catholics. The large majority of the rest are Protestants, having different sects among them. There is a large colony of Jews also. All were being treated equally by the State and the greatest harmony prevailed in the State educational endeavours. The Catholics, the different sects of Protestants and the Jews have their own schools, where they teach their religions. These

denominational schools form an integral part of the national system of education. The manager appoints the teachers, but the local education authority can refuse to accept such appointments on the grounds of educational unfitness. Also in the maintenance of the standard of secular instruction, the denominational schools are fully under public control. Those denominational schools which satisfy the standards fixed by the Education Department are given financial help from the State. The measure of grant, according to my information, is what it would have cost the State to educate the same number of students in a State's school. In other words, an aided school with hundred students will get as much grant as it would cost the Government to educate 100 students in a Government institution. In the matter of building, maintenance and equipment grants the same principle was being observed. This is quite fair and just to all concerned. The State has an obligation to educate all. If one or more sections of the people who are anxious to impart religious instruction to their children along with secular education, come forward and start schools, why should they not in fairness get that financial aid, which, but for their assistance, the State would have had to meet from the public funds. The growing realisation that education bereft of religion is incomplete has in recent times made many Governments to give more and more facilities for religious education.

In Travancore, if we go by the only tangible test, available to us to ascertain the efficiency of a school, namely, public examination results, the private schools and colleges are far ahead of Government institutions. We are not claiming any grant out of public funds if our schools do not come up to the standard attained by the Departmental schools. But, if they do, why should they not be adequately supported by the State? The State has the obligation to educate our children even in secular subjects we give a better education in our schools than what is available in State schools—we show better results. Why not give us as grant what it would cost the State to educate our children in State schools? We do not ask a pie for the cost of religious education we give to our children. If we have to pay the teachers anything extra on this account, we shall meet that cost entirely ourselves. We are only asking as grant what it costs us to give our children secular education according to the standard fixed by the Education Department.

We maintain our schools primarily for the education of our own children. If non-Catholic children come they are welcome, but

we are not over anxious to have them. Too many of them in our schools defeat the very purpose of our schools. We are conducting our schools to give our children secular and religious education in a Catholic atmosphere. We do not make any secret of it. The Encyclical of the Pope on education is available for all to read. When I say that, in Catholic schools, education is being imparted in a Catholic atmosphere, our non-Catholic friends need not get alarmed that if they send their children to our schools, they will be breathing a poisonous air. Catholic schools have a Catholic atmosphere in the very same sense, the Sanathana School at Alleppey has a Theosophic atmosphere and the N. S. S Schools have a Hindu atmosphere. Do not non-Theosophists and non-Hindus attend these schools? In our schools there will be the guarantee that no teacher will speak in the hearing of the children anything belittling any religion. Can we have this guarantee in State schools? Have we not had professors in Government colleges whose main hobby during class hours was to ridicule all religions?

Religion is a serious business with us and we are obliged to give our children religious education also from their tender ages. A time may come and perhaps it is coming rapidly when Catholic schools here will have only Catholic pupils to educate. In most centres we will have enough students from Catholics themselves to run our schools, especially when primary education is made compulsory. But the difficulty may arise in centres where there are only small Catholic congregations. Even in such places if a school is conducted for the benefit of the few students and the education imparted there conform to the standard fixed in the Education Code, I think the management, in fairness, is entitled to get per capita grant from the public funds. If, for instance, in a class there are only 10 students, why should not the State give the management that which would have cost the State to educate these 10 students in a State school. Any extra cost incurred by the management to run the school should, of course, be met by the management.

I would suggest that the grant-in-aid should be made so liberal that all sections of the people should be attracted to come forward and start their own schools, where they can teach their children, along with the secular subjects prescribed by the Education Department, their own religion and also where they can impart to their children an education in the atmosphere of their religion. No parent, whether a Hindu, Muslim or Christian, wants his child to grow up irreligious. It is extremely desirable that large numbers of Hindu and Muslim schools

should come up where religious education too can be given in their respective religions. I would certainly respect more a Hindu or a Muslim, who is attached and faithful to his religion, than one who has a vague idea that all religions are good in a way, but has no particular regard for any. It is these latter type of men, I am afraid, that will be turned out by schools where religious education is not imparted. I consider it as the greatest of good fortunes that I had all my education in Catholic schools and colleges till I joined the Inns of Court for my professional studies. I earnestly wish that similar facilities should be enjoyed by my children and my grand-children.

It is not in Holland alone that the denominational system is working harmoniously. In SCOTLAND, where the Catholics are a small minority, the State has afforded sufficient facilities for maintaining the denominational nature of the schools, without the extra cost of a penny on the part of the Catholics. In England even under the old Education Act, in private Elementary Schools, the whole pay of the teachers, all costs of books, stationery, furniture and repairs came from the public funds. By the new Act, in addition building grants up to 50 per cent also will be given. In this connection I would like to read one or two extracts from "A Guide to the Educational System of England and Wales", published by the Ministry of Education last month. On aided (voluntary) schools it states:

"Where managers are able and willing to meet half the cost of alterations, improvements and external repairs, the remaining half is met by direct grant from the Exchequer. Powers and duties of managers in regard to appointments and dismissal of teachers and the giving of denominational religious instruction remain substantially unaltered, and denominational religious instruction continues to be given as before, subject to the rights of parents who so desire to have their children given Agreed Syllabus Instruction. Schools in this category are aided schools".

Another paragraph states: "The results of the provisions of the Act are not only to make available the financial assistance needed by the voluntary schools to enable premises to be brought up to modern standard and enable these schools to play a full effective part in the primary and secondary school system, but also to retain liberty for the teaching of the tenets of the Church with which they are associated by teachers of their own faith".

Though the Catholics are only a little more than three millions in England which gives a percentage very much lower than the percentage of Catholics in Travancore, the Mother of Parliaments has recognised the justice of their demands.

Coming nearer, let us take the case of school in Ceylon. We have seen already of the misleading impression created by the A. P. I. message. I have with me the full official text of the grant-in-aid rules as passed by the State Council on 28th August 1945. From the 1st of October this year free system of education came into force in that country by virtue of which in all State schools and colleges, students will get free education from the infant class to the highest University class. The private schools also can come into the scheme, and they are given time till 1948 to do so. Some private schools have already accepted the provision of the new scheme. If they come into the scheme they will not be able to levy any fees from students except game fees. Even after the private schools come into the scheme they will be under private managements, and will get the full pay of the teachers according to the scale fixed by the Department as grant from the State. This will be paid direct to the teacher or through the manager. In vernacular schools, as maintenance and equipment grant, a rupee per student will be paid by the State. There is also no meaning in saying that after 1948 the education imparted in the schools of Ceylon will be without religious bias. The trouble in Ceylon was that the State Council wanted too much religious bias. The State Council passed a resolution that all religions should be taught in all schools. Against this resolution there was a hue and cry raised not only by Christian denominations, but even by leading Muslim and Buddhist Priests. It is, therefore, considered as dropped. At any rate the rules of grant-in-aid that were passed in the State Council last August, do not say anything on the question of religion. The denominational schools will continue as denominational schools. To get grant amounting to the full pay of the teachers and other equipment grants the only restriction imposed on private management is that they should not levy fees from students.

In British India as well as in our neighbouring State of Cochin substantial grants are given for private primary schools. Why in Travancore alone a new policy should be adopted?

Misstatements by certain Hindu Leaders

A number of distinguished Hindus in British India have arrayed themselves against us. As far as I was able to see, not one of them has grasped the real nature of the controversy that is going on in Travancore. To this unfortunate result certain remarks of Sir C. P. Ramaswami Iyer, in his Ambalapuzha Speech, I think, are mainly responsible. The Dewan in the course of that speech asked: "Supposing the Nayar Service Society or the S. N. D. P. Yogam insisted that Christian or Muslim students coming to their schools should necessarily read the Bagavad Geetha or the Ramayana or the sayings of Sri Narayana Guru, in their course of instruction, what would be the reaction of the Muslim and Christian communities? The difficulty of the problem is realised the moment it is stated in this fashion". Sir C. P. Ramaswami Iyer is an eminent lawyer: but what is the relevancy of this statement as far as the Catholic schools are concerned? We do not teach our Bible or any other religious books in our schools to Hindus, Muslims or non-Catholic students. We teach our religion only to our Catholic children and that only outside class hours, when non-Catholic children are quite safe in their homes. We have also to remember that, when the Ambalapuzha speech was made, the Catholics alone were thought to be insisting on their management of their private primary schools. Is it to be wondered at that outsiders were completely taken in by this misleading statement of Sir C. P. Ramaswami Iyer especially because at Ambalapuzha Sir C. P. was speaking as the accredited representative of His Highness' Government.

The first victim was RT. HON. SREENIVASA SASTRI. Mr. Sastri came out with a long statement which was supplimented by another a few days later. His whole statement is based on the wrong assumption that we teach our religion to Hindu and Muslim students in our schools. If Sir C. P. confined himself to the teaching of Muslim and Christian children, Bagavad Geetha or Ramayana, Mr. Sastri went a step further and asked: "If a Hindu Management has established a school in a locality and a Christian parent came along and asked for his son's admission could the religious teacher properly compel the Christian boy to worship Genesa and offer prayers to the Guardians of the eight quarters of Heaven"? The implication, of course, is that we are not only teaching our religion to Hindu and Muslim students but also insisting on their participation in our worship. Mr. Sastri makes Catholic managers say: "We are willing to admit non-Christian and non-Catholic Christians where necessary, but such pupils should

submit to our curriculum and our discipline, in all particulars". "There", adds Mr. Sastri, "lies the crux".

Again, according to him we want "all round autonomy in respect of education and at the same time liberal financial support from the general taxes". He further observes: "It would give to a Christian denomination deriving financial aid from the general revenues the right to establish schools and colleges for the benefit of their own community and teaching their religion as a part of the compulsory curriculum even to non-Christian pupils". His whole article goes on in this strain, all on the wrong assumption that we teach our religion in our schools to Hindu, Muslim and non-Catholic students. In his addendum Mr. Sastri has brought forward a new argument. All subjects of the State are liable to the general taxes. The State provides for education of all and all are welcome to it. Not content with or dissatisfied with the State system of education the Catholic community of Travancore would wish to have their own communal schools with liberty to educate their children which is one of the fundamentals of their creed. From the State's stand point this is a luxury, and must be paid for by those who enjoy it.

Along with this I would state another argument of Mr. Sastri which appeared in his first article. He therein states: "Modern conceptions too of national efficiency require the pupils to be thrown together indiscriminately in schools and colleges as a preparation for the efficiency and welfare on all sides of the entire community". I do admit that there is something in the latter argument. But what little you gain by the indiscriminate mixing of children for their education will be at the sacrifice of a much greater good. I shall take parallel case. Mahathma and Rajaji are now advocating intermarriages between different sections in the Hindu community. There is nothing so conducive to the consolidation of the various sections, as intermarriages among them. An ardent Indian patriot may advocate intermarriages between followers of different religions so that the bitter communal feelings now existing in India may be completely eradicated. To achieve this goal quickly you may find him recommending substantial aids out of public funds, to those who enter into such mixed marriages and also for the upbringing of children that will be born out of those unions. If such a national system of aided marriages is introduced, and, to achieve more rapidly the desired end, ingenious financial helps are provided to make the marriages as promiscuous as possible, a man who keeps out of the national system might complain: "I am paying

tax like others. You give substantial aids out of public funds to those who enter into mixed marriages. My religion does not permit me to do so. I got nothing from the State at the time of my marriage. Nor do I get anything for bringing up my children. No doubt you are kind enough to recognise my marriage and also the legitimacy of my children, provided they are kept up to the standard of health, prescribed by the Health Department. In short, I have to pay twice because I do not give up my religion". The patriot will then turn round and say "You medievalist, you narrow-minded fool. We are on the highway of matrimonial progress in India. The national efficiency requires the people to be thrown together indiscriminately. You want to marry from your own caste and in your own religion. And you want to cling on to the same wife all your life. From the state's standpoint this is a luxury and must be paid for by those who enjoy it". I do not know if Rt. Hon. Mr. Sastri will go as far as the Indian patriot I mentioned. Perhaps he will be content with nationalisation of education for the present. When will our leaders realise that there are certain limits beyond which the State ought not to go, and that the man does not exist for the State, but the State exists for the man.

When the new Education Bill for England was being debated in the House of Commons one member proposed that the system of dual control should be abolished and all the schools made State schools and brought under complete State control. In reply to this proposal the spokesman for Government said that they had no intention of introducing totalitarianism in that country. Mr. Sastri now comes forward as the exponent of a system that has been tried and found dangerous and discarded in the West.

Rt. Hon. Mr. Sastri was surprised and grieved to read the recommendation regarding religious education by the Travancore Education Reorganisation Committee. The Committee unanimously stated in the report: "The Committee fully realises that religious teaching is an essential and integral part of education and that the absence of the properly organised religious education as a part of everybody's schooling leads to deficiency in personality and character which cannot afterwards be made good". Mr. Sastri characterises this observation as medieval and narrow. And Sachivothama says, Mr. Sastri's word is final for most Indians. But I doubt whether Mr. Sastri's word will be accepted as equally final by any educationalist outside India. Sir Michael Sadler holds a unique position to-day among the educationalists in the world. In August 1929, Fifth World Conference of the New Education Fellow-

ship was held at Elsinore, Denmark. The fact that the organisers of this world conference requested Sir Michael to write the Introduction to the Record and Synthesis of the discussions held at the Conference, will indicate the esteem he enjoys among the educationalists in the world. In this Introduction Sir Michael has indicated his view about religion in education. He writes: "Of all social services, education - using the word in a wide and liberal sense - is the most important. It is also the most costly of all these services, some of which, like the Health service and, as I think, the services of religion, are inseparable from it". Will Rt. Hon. Sastri dub Sir Michael also a medievalist and narrow-minded?

It is rather amusing to see our ultra modern Mr. Sastri trying to confront the Missionaries assembled in London, with a counsel of perfection which is as old as Bagavad Geetha and take from it. "The common people ought not be disturbed in their faith and mode of conduct although it may seem to superior men as founded on error". "The essence of our religion", Mr. Sastri pointed out to the missionaries, "is not that it lays down certain doctrines for universal acceptance, but that under the disposition of the Almighty Power, each person is fixed in a certain place in society, discharges certain well understood functions and is a necessary part of one coherent community". All this may taste as sweet as nectar in the mouths of the gods of the earth; but it has been wormwood to all others.

Rajyaseva Dhurandhara, Dewan Bahadur, V. S. Subramanya Iyer, who also came forward to admonish the Catholics of Travancore, based all his arguments on the supposition that we teach our religion to Hindu, Muslim and non-Catholic children in our Schools. Mr. Subramanya Iyer has absolutely no excuse for taking up this stand. He was born at Vazhapally, a suburb of Changanacherry, and spent all his time in Travancore. He was a leading lawyer, a Judge of the High Court, and for three years Dewan of the State. As he himself says, he is the President of the Kerala Hindu Mission; and he was holding that position ever since that organisation came into existence some 10 years ago. Kerala Hindu Mission conducts 48 primary schools and he should be aware of what is taking place in rival institutions. Mr. Subramanya Iyer has spent practically his whole life time in Trivandrum itself. Here there are two old established Catholic High Schools, one for boys and the other for girls. Both schools are patronised by all sections of people, including Brahmins. Even to-day there are not less than 125 Brahmin girls studying in the Convent High School. Many of them

are daughters of high Government Officials. A few at least of these children must be daughters of some of Mr. Subramanya Iyer's friends and relations. If really we are teaching our religion to Hindu children in our schools, he as the President of the Kerala Hindu Mission would have had opportunities to make capital out of it. If, in spite of all these circumstances, Mr. Subramanya Iyer is ignorant of what is actually going on in Catholic schools, I can attribute it only to invincible ignorance.

His whole speech is directed against the Catholics. But when he refers to religion being taught to children not belonging to the religion of the management, he is not bold enough to assert that we, Catholics, are guilty of that practice. This is what he says: "With regard to such schools there have been bitter complaints that, though children of several denominations may be in the school, some sectarian denominations insist upon all the children attending classes, when religious instruction according to the tenet of their own sect, is given. From time to time Government have issued strictest instructions against that practice. But it is said to have continued to a great extent". How indefinite are his statements here! Some sectarian denominations, he says, insist upon all children attending religious classes. If he thought Catholics are included in the expression "some sectarian denominations", why did he not say "some sectarian denominations including Catholics", since Catholics alone were the target for his whole speech? He further states "*it is said* to have continued to a great extent". Again, I have to ask, said by whom, and where? Is it said of the Catholics? See how hesitant he is when laying the ground for implicating us. But later on he becomes positive and assertive.

His speech continues: "When the Government decided to bear the whole cost of primary education, they declared that schools under private management, if they wanted their cost to be met by Government, should totally discontinue the practice of giving religious instruction during school hours. It is this last decision that has given offence to Roman Catholic Authority". Unless these absolutely incorrect statements are meant for the consumption of the people outside Travancore, I do not see their purpose. These statements cannot "be thrust down the throats" of the people of Travancore even with the aid of a battering-ram.

In another place of his speech Mr. Subramanya Iyer stated: "They (Catholics) can do it (teach religion) except during five or six hours of the day when children of many denominations and different religions

are together in the school for secular education at Government's cost—even if they do this, Government is prepared to meet the cost of the School". I do not know what is the authority of Mr. Subramanya Iyer to make such an assertion. I have already shown in an earlier portion of my speech that the Government decision published in Gazette Extraordinary and the speech of the Dewan at Ambalapuzha do not warrant any such judgement.

By Mr. Subramanya Iyer's statement that the Government is prepared to meet the cost of the school, some people might be tempted to think, that the Government at present meet all the cost of running aided schools, including the cost of the building, yearly maintenance, repairs, value of the site and the whole pay of the teachers. If we calculate the figures given in the Administration Report of the Education Department for 1119 M. E. (1943—1944) it will be seen that it costs Rs. 7. 9. a year to the Government to educate a student in the Departmental Malayalam and Tamil Schools, while for the education of a student in an aided school of the same type the Government incur an expenditure of only Rs. 2. 7. a year. Even Rs. 7. 9. cannot be taken as correct. For, the expenses incurred for building schools, yearly maintenance of buildings which cost more than Rs. 1000 to construct, the pension of an army of retired teachers, all these which go under other heads, have to be taken into account before we can get at the correct figure; if all these items are added the figure may go up to Rs. 10/- or there about. But the cost of Government to educate a student in an aided school is less than Rs. 3/-

Mr. Subramanya Iyer wisely did not beat the big drum of the overwhelming consensus of public opinion. He studiously avoided that subject in his speech. Perhaps he knows the real nature of this public opinion, or it may be, that, his community constituting only 1. 23. per cent of the people of Travancore he knows the danger of emphasising the popular support for any measure.

The Travancore Press

I have to say a few words about the part played and being played in the present agitation by two of the Malayalam Dailies of Trivandrum. *The Bharathi* and *The Kaumudi* have taken a very aggressive attitude in the present controversy. Almost daily they come out with abusive articles on Catholics. The Catholics are seldom referred to in these papers without the qualifying epithet, "*ignorant, fanatic, or begotted*". Sometimes they indulge in even more offensive

terms. Our Priests and Religious heads are depicted in lurid colours. I shall only refer here to a few specimens which will give you some idea of the journalistic proprieties they observe.

In *The Bharathi* of 19th September the following A. P. I. message was published in English as well as in Malayalam: "It is understood that the Bishop of Changanacherry has addressed a letter to the Secretary to the Travancore Government stating that his Pastoral letter was issued following the examples of the apostles, that the sword and the bomb that were mentioned in his letter were the spiritual sword and the spiritual atomic bomb; that the Pastoral letter was a spiritual exhortation to prayer, that there is no attack either explicitly or implicitly on the Government and that the Bishop has always inculcated in his Pastorals respect for constituted authority and has always stood against all movements tending towards disturbances of peace or tranquility of State. He finds no reason therefore for withdrawing the letter".

I shall now read certain comments from a leading article published in the same issue of that paper on this letter of the Bishop: "Those who are able to judge political affairs will consider this letter as an apology and not as an explanation.....since the letter indicates that the Bishop published the Pastoral in a spiritual sense, that he entertains a high opinion about the administration of His Highness's Government, that he has not expressed anything opposed to Government or with improper motives, and that he has not entertained any such ideas even in his thoughts, it becomes plain that the Bishop has reconsidered about his Pastoral and that the reflection of the guilt in his clear mind has created a peaceful atmosphere in his heart. His statements that those who look carefully inside and outside of the letter will find nothing to withdraw, and that expressions are used in a spiritual sense, can be considered only as an attempt to maintain his prestige outwardly. Actually the contents of his letter is a withdrawal. In our view we cannot expect a stronger admission of the guilt from a Bishop".

Most of you have seen the actual text of the Bishop's reply. A dignified refusal has become an apology and an admission of guilt! Perhaps the editor of *The Bharathi* might have thought that the actual text would not become available to the public in Travancore. In any case, even the A. P. I.'s garbled summary of the letter the paper published, cannot warrant any of the foolish things said in the editorial.

The Bharathi of October 9, in its editorial page, published a report of a speech made by Rev. A. H. Legg at a Church Council meeting. One of the bold headlines under which the report is published reads: "GRANT IS NOT GIVEN TO THE SCHOOLS OF LONDON CATHOLICS". The Report states that in the course of a speech Rev. Legg mentioned that though the London Catholics have been agitating in England for a very long time for getting recognition and grant for their special schools, they have not succeeded so far. Since I could not believe that Rev. Legg would have made any such statement I wrote to him about it. In his reply Rev. Legg said: "I did not say that Roman Catholic schools in England do not receive recognition and grant from public funds. The reverse is, of course, the case". I understand the editor of *The Bharathi*, was present at the meeting which was held for the election of certain office-bearers, and the editor himself was one of the candidates who stood for the election.

Here is a sample of the headlines that are appearing in *The Bharathi* "A WORLD RENOWNED POLICY. REACTIONARIES WHO OPPOSE THIS POLICY SHOULD NOT BE LEFT ALONE—WORLD WILL PROCLAIM GOVERNMENT WEAK".

I shall leave *The Bharathi* with another extract from one of its editorials: "Is that the condition of Catholics? Do not their individual Churches conduct schools out of their huge capitals and accumulate funds for the Churches by plundering the pittance of the school masters and starving them. Will this not amount to a horrible crime?"

The leading articles in *The Kaumudi* are more offensive and provocative. These articles are written to ridicule what the Christians hold most sacred. This paper uses with impunity, expressions like these in its leading articles: "These accursed Catholics"—"These children of vipers" etc. A leading article written to ridicule the Catholics demand for grant is concluded like this: "Instead of proudly saying 'let these thirty pieces of silver be given to the Jews. We have our separate schools', they curse Sir C. P.'s Government and raise their voice so as to reach Rome and are getting ready to suffer martyrdom for that silver cash. Martyrdom for Government grant! Alas! Alas! Not for Christian schools! Who wants them? What is wanted is grant. It is easier for the camel to pass through the eye of the needle than to enter the kingdom of God".

The Kaumudi published the A. P. I. news regarding the reply sent by the Bishop of Changanacherry to the notice issued to him

by the Government. This was printed by *The Kaumudi* on the front page with bold headlines? "CHANGANACHERRY BISHOP ASKS PARDON".

There is much in common between *The Bharathi* and *The Kaumudi*. Apart from a Malayalam daily that has come into existence quite recently, we have only these two dailies in Trivandrum, which is the seat of a University and the Capital of a State, having the largest percentage of literates in India. The editors of both of these Journals had the honour of being nominated to the present Legislature, to represent the fourth estate of the Realm; the editor of *The Bharathi* being a nominated member of the Upper House and the editor of *The Kaumudi* a nominated member of the Lower House.

The Catholics of Travancore are depicted in the two journals already mentioned and one or two others of like attainments as a set of ignorant and begottd boors, groaning under the oppression of a gang of still more ignorant and fanatical clergy. Some of the newspapers have even gone to the extent of advising Catholic young men to rebel against the clergy—complaints are heard that we do not understand the clearest pronouncements, even though repeated over and over again. Are we really such ignoremuses? Somehow we are succeeding fairly well in almost all walks of life in our country. We are running the largest number of educational institutions in the State. Among the literates we stand in the very forefront. Of the Travancore Christians who were returned elected to the Present Assembly 10 out of 14 are Catholics. Similarly among the Travancore Christians who were returned by election to the Council 4 out of 5 are Catholics. Sir C. P. Ramaswami Iyer himself has on more than one occasion, exhorted the other communities here to follow the example of the progressive Syrian Christians in the State. Who are these Syrian Christians? About 60 per cent of these Syrian Christians on this coast are Catholics; and I believe our non-Catholic Syrian Christian brethren will not grudge conceding that we are in no way behind them, in agricultural, industrial, commercial, educational or any other endeavour. There is, however, one department of life where we do not hold our own. We are very few in the Government service. In all other respects we have no reason to be ashamed of the position we hold in our country.

The Catholic Clergy

Now a word about our clergy. It may be that there are not many occasions for our clergy to come in contact with our Hindu

brethren and so their real worth is not known to them. But we know our clergy and what they mean to us. Our clergy is the greatest asset we have. Here, as anywhere else, you will not find a body of men more educated and cultured than the Catholic clergy. A man who spends four years in a University after his School Leaving Examination comes out with one or two letters of the alphabet added to his name; and he is then considered as an educated man by all. But our clergy has to spend eight years of intense study, after the School Leaving Examination, the minimum qualification prescribed for entrance into the Theological Colleges, before they could be ordained as priests. A good many go for priesthood after taking their degrees. During these eight years they learn languages, the humanities, science in general, rhetoric, ethics, philosophy and theology. They have also to learn world religions. Our clergy are educated in different centres like Alwaye, Kandy, Mangalore, Poona, Shembaganoor, Kurseong and Rome. Picked men from such Religious Orders like the Jesuits, the Carmelites, and others are the professors who teach and train them. Always a stream of students is going from here to the Urban College in Rome, which is an International Institution where students coming from all nations live together like brothers for all the seven years they have to undergo their studies there. You will find there Indians, Chinese, Japanese, English, Irish, Americans, Negroes, Turks, in short all nationalities. Our students while they are in Rome study together and often live together with men like Archbishop Spellman of New York and the Archbishop Griffin of Westminster, whom the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of England would be proud to count among their friends. Of our present Bishops four had undergone their studies in that famous International College. Again a good number of our priests are receiving regularly foreign newspapers and periodicals under the remailing system and they are thereby keeping themselves in touch with what is going on in other parts of the world.

Those who advise our youngmen to rebel against our clergy perhaps think, that our clergy constitute a caste by themselves, as it is the case in certain other communities. There is no priestly class among Catholics. Our Priests and Bishops are our own kith and kin, blood of our blood. They are either our uncles, brothers or sons. An uncle of mine was a Carmelite Priest and he was the Prior General of their Order for some years; a grand-uncle held a similar position earlier. A first cousin of mine was a Bishop. And a son of mine is now studying for priesthood. This boy having stood first in the State of Cochin in the School Leaving Examination was the recipient of a gold

medal and a scholarship from the State. But when he expressed a desire to study for priesthood I gladly gave him my consent. And ever since, whenever I had an occasion to speak at the jubilee celebrations of priests or celebrations connected with their ordinations, to bring home the dignity of Priesthood to the common people, I have always said and that most sincerely, that I would be a far prouder and happier parent to see that son of mine working as a priest in a humble parish than to see him occupying the high office of the Dewan of Travancore. Those who advise our men to rebel against the clergy are asking them to revolt against their own uncles, brothers and sons. Can our advisers be employed in a more foolish enterprise than this?

Our cause is just and it is bound to succeed. Some of our Christian brethren had time to express their authoritative opinions after the necessary consultations and deliberations, required by their constitutions. As was expected, they have also taken up a position consistent with our own. I feel no doubt that all our Hindu and Muslim brethren also, who take their religion seriously, will fully appreciate our demand. Our cause, however, is being subjected to all kinds of misrepresentations by high pressure propaganda. But with all that, truth is truth and it will prevail.

Appendix

I

GOVERNMENT'S NOTICE

Issued to H. E. The Bishop of Changanacherry
By The Government of Travancore

R. O. C. No. 3824/45/Edn.

Government of Travancore,
HUZUR CUTCHERRY,
Trivandrum, 6th September, 1945

From

The Secretary to Government.

To

The Rt. Rev. Mar James Kalacherry, Ph. D., D. D.,
Bishop of Changanacherry

It. Rev. Sir,

In the September and October issue of the *Vedapracharamadhyastan*, Book 18, Lekkams 3 & 4, a Pastoral letter No. 123, is published as having been issued on August 15, 1945, under your signature. The letter is published at pages 25 to 33 of the above magazine. You have also issued a command in that letter that it should be read in every church, after service, on the next two Sundays.

This letter is prefaced with a quotation from the Holy Scriptures (St. Luke XXII- 36, 38). It stated that you have yourself unsheathed one sword and that the necessity to use the remaining spiritual sword—atomic bomb—in your possession has arisen, as also the occasion for those who have purse to take them out. The letter goes on to state that if the primary rights of the individual are affected to the slightest extent, as a result of the socialistic policy of Government, nature will grow angry with the Government, rouse up all the forces under the sun, and enter the arena to wipe out from the face of the earth the unjust authors of nationalisation. You attack the Government both explicitly and implicitly, and compare the Government's alleged policy of nationalising schools of the State with Hitlerism, Naziam and Fascism.

The policy of the Government has been made absolutely clear more than once, both on the floor of the Legislature and elsewhere. That policy has been deliberately misinterpreted in the letter under reference. There is bitter attack on the members of the Legislature and imprecations on their heads for doing their duty. The name of

the Sovereign has been needlessly brought into the discussion in a most improper manner.

Government are advised that the whole of this objectionable letter is subversive and seditious, is calculated to bring into hatred the duly constituted Government of this State and to cause communal bitterness and strife leading to violence. Government, therefore, are constrained to ask you to withdraw this publication and to express open regret for having published it. If you do not do so within a fortnight after the receipt of this communication, Government will have no alternative but to take such action as they may be advised to adopt in the circumstances.

Yours faithfully,

Sd/ B. Paramu

Secretary to Government

II

BISHOP'S REPLY

Sent to The Government of Travancore
By H. E. The Bishop of Changanacherry

CHANGANACHERRY,
September 17, 1945

From

The Rt. Rev. Dr. James Kalacherry, Ph. D., D. D.,
Bishop of Changanacherry

To

The Secretary to Government,
Trivandrum

Ref. R. O. C. No. 3824/45/Edn, Dated

Huzur Cutcherry, Trivandrum, 6-9-'45

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter quoted above, referring to my Pastoral No. 123.

Following the Apostles' example, Bishops send letters called pastorals to their flock, and these pastorals are always read to the Faithful in all the churches of their respective dioceses. I have issued on several occasions pastoral letters to my people, and I am bound to do so when necessity arises. The pastoral letter No. 123, of August 15, 1945, which is referred to in your letter cited above, is one of such

pastorals issued by me as Bishop of Changanacherry to the Faithful of my Diocese.

I am amazed at the interpretation given to the words in my Pastoral, and I reject such interpretation as wrong and fallacious. An unbiassed reading of my pastoral will show that I speak of spiritual sword, spiritual atomic bomb, and that the letter is a spiritual exhortation to prayer so that the dangers threatened may be warded off.

A perusal of the letter will show that there is absolutely no attack either explicitly or implicitly on the Government. If my observations are suggested by the resolutions passed by the peoples' representatives in the Legislature, that does not mean that they are suggested by the Government. It is the right of every individual to express his own opinion about the actions of popular representatives, and the reference to them in my letter is nothing but an honest evaluation of those actions.

The name of His Highness the Maharaja had to be mentioned, as I sincerely believe that the suggestions of the representatives of the people will be a stain on His Highness's good name, glorious reign and traditional policy of religious tolerance. Your observation that the name of the Sovereign has been needlessly brought into the discussion in an improper manner indicates that Government have failed to understand the spirit of the pastoral or the significance of the points discussed therein. I vehemently protest against your bringing in the name of the Sovereign as a handle for the unwarranted stand you have taken.

I take this opportunity to state that the advisers of Government are entirely mistaken if they have thought that the pastoral is objectionable, subversive or seditious. It is neither calculated to bring into hatred the duly constituted Government of the state nor to cause communal bitterness or strife leading to violence. I repudiate the charges mentioned in your letter. I may also point out that in pursuance of the principles of the Catholic Church, I have always inculcated in my pastorals respect for constituted authority and I have always stood against all movements tending towards disturbance of peace or tranquillity of the State.

I do not find any reason either for withdrawing my pastoral under reference or for expressing any regret for having issued the same.

Yours faithfully,

† James Kalacherry

Bishop of Changanacherry

THE MAR LOUIS MEMORIAL PRESS, ERNAKULAM