No. 17 Gokhaleana Feb 19, 1979

Gokhale Statue in Madras.

Edited by : **S. R. VENKATARAMAN**
SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY,
8 West Cott Road, Royapettah, Madras - 600 014.

BIO-DATA

Prof. M. BAZHEER HUSSAIN

Born in Mudigere. Chickmagalur District, Karnataka Principal and Professor of Law in the University Law College. Bangalore-9; Head of the Department of Laws Dean, Faculty of Law, Bangalore University

M.A. in Political Science.

LL M.

A.M. (Miichigan)

Was a Professor of Political Science in Maharaja's College, Mysore. Was awarded Fulbright Scholarship for studying International Law and International Organisation n the University of Michigan.

On return joined to the then Government Law College, Bangalore, as a full-time Assistant Professor of International Law and subsequently promoted as Professor and Principal. Now the Dean of the Faculty of Law of the Bangalore University. Attended the Summer School Programme of the Hague Academy of International Law.

Published articles and book reviews in the newspapers and scholarly journals.

Published a book on Cauvery Water Dispute — Its Legal Aspects (1972). It was very well reviewed in the press.

FOREWORD

Gokhale left us on the 19th February 1915, sixty four years ago, after a life time of dedicated service, in the educational economic and political life of the country trying to find solution for the several problems from which the country was suffering under a foreign yoke.

This issue of *Gokhaleana* contains articles from eminent students of Public Affairs ; ' 'Gokhale on British Rule in India" by P. Kodanda Rao, "Gokhale and Hindu-Muslim Unity" by Professor Basheer Hussain, "Gohale's Personal Religion" by D. V. Gundappa and lastly an extract from the diary of K. J. Chitalia, a member of the Society giving extracts of a speech of Gokhale, the founder of Society, to the members of the Society. All these have relevance to the problems facing the country today.

I am grateful to Sri Nittoor Srinivasa Rao, Secretary of the Gohale Institute of Public Affairs, Bangalore and to Mrs. Mary C. Kodanda Rao for permission to reproduce in this issue of Gokhaleana, the above mentioned articles which appeared in the issue of Public Affairs November 1966, and the Gokhale Institute of Public Affairs. Bangalore 4.

Editor.

Gokhale and Hindu-Muslim Unity

By Prof. BASHEER HUSSAIN,

(Summary of a lecture delivered at the GIPA on 30-7-1966.)

GOKHALE in his younger days called himself an agnostic. Paranjpye says that Gokhale never dogmatically accepted any religious formula. But according to Gandhiji he was a religious man. Gandhiji described the man of religion as one "who leads a dedicated life, who is simple in habits, who is the very image of truth, who is full of humanity who calls nothing his own-such a man is a man of religion, whether he himself is or is not conscious of it".

If this is the true definition of the religious man, Gokhale was certainly a man of religion. At this point it is worthwhile to recall to our minds an incident from Gokhale's life. At Calcutta, he had formed friendship with a highly cultured Brahmo lady, by name Mrs. Ray. Later she became a great admirer of Gokhale and founded a Girls School to perpetuate his memory. One evening during the course of conversation she seemed to have taunted Gokhale for not living upto his convictions. She is reported to have said "Now Mr Gokhale, with all your ideals of unity of India and political freedom tell me which of your men are sincere and truthful. You can't even give up your caste system; You don't believe in idolatory and still your biggest political leaders go to Banaras and do their pinda etc, according to old rites, yet want to unite India and govern. I am sure with all your liberal views you have a sacred thread under your shirt to denote that you are a Brahman born. Even you have not got the strength of your convictions". Gokhale, she tells us, listened to this attack with grave attention Next morning he sent her a sealed envelop enclosing his sacred thread cut into two pieces along with the following note : "Many thanks for rousing

me to order. I own that I had no business to wear my sacred thread when I did not believe in it. Henceforth I shall try to act according to my convictions. Forgive".

Natarajan tells us that Gokhale in his later life came to believe that God was love. Beyond this Gokhale never seemed to have believed in any religion, Undoubtedly he was a secularist. He said: "I am by birth a Hindu, but for many years it has been the earnest aspiration of my life to work for the advancement of the country only as an Indian".

Gokhale's secular outlook, his liberalism and broad based tolerance made him popular among Muslims and other communities. R. P. Paranjpye says that: "there was no Hindu leader as acceptable to Muslims and other communities as he. He was an ideal mediator in inter-communal disputes."

When the Muslim League was formed in December 1906, he welcomed it and said that: "it was undoubtedly a cause for sincere congratulations that their Mohammedan brethren had at last shaken off their apathy of years in political matters.". But when the Muslim League assumed an exclusive communal character, he did not conceal his displeasure. As a counterpoise to the Muslim League a Hindu League was formed in Punjab. Gokhale became indignant and said: "The antagonism has always led in upper India, to a movement (which).....is frankly anti-Mohammedan, as the Muslim League is anti-Hindu and both (the Hindu and the Muslim) Leagues are anti-national."

In 1932, when Gandhiji attended the Round Tabel Conference in London, Lady Minto told Gandhiji that Gokhale was responsible for the communal electorate. In view of the fact that separate electorate was chiefly responsible for the deterioration of the Hindu Muslim relations which finally resulted in partition of the country, the views of Gokhale on communal electorate and the circumstances under which they were introduced should be fully examined.

The history of communal electorate, in our country, can be traced to the partition of Bengal. Lord Curzon decided to partition Bengal with a view to drive a wedge between the Hindus and Muslims and to deal a blow at the Bengalis who were in the forefront of the struggle for freedom. But when Curzon found that even the Muslims were opposed to the idea of partition, he undertook a tour of East Bengal in February 1904, to convince the people, particularly Muslims of the virtues of the partition. By his personal efforts he was successful in veering Muslims away from the national movement. The people of Dacca who had earlier condemned the partition as a 'bastardly arrangement' were not only won over to the views of Curzon, but developed a strong anti-Hindu feeling. Communal riots broke out in Dacca and other places.

At this time there was a fear in the minds of prominent British men that the Muslims would soon throw in their lot with the Congress. Minto writes to Morley on May 8, 1906: "I am thinking a good deal lately of possible counterpoise to Congress aims." Morley writes to Minto on June 6, 1906, "Everybody warns us that a new spirit is growing and spreading over India; Lawrence, Chirol, Sidney Low, all sing the same song ; you cannot go on governing in the same spirit; you have to deal with the Congress party and the Congress principles, whatever you think of them; be sure that before long the Mohammedans will throw in their lot with the Congress against you."

On October 1, 1906, Minto received a deputation of Muslims who submitted a Memorial to him demanding that "the position accorded to Mussalman community in any kind of representation direct or indirect.....should be commensurate not merely with their numerical strength but also with their political importance : and that, in estimating the latter, due weight should be given to the position which they occupied in India a little more than hundred years ago, and of which the traditions have naturally not faded from their minds".

In reply to the Memorial, Lord Minto said; "I make no attempt to indicate by what means representation of communities can be obtained but I am as firmly convinced as I believe you to be, that any electoral representation in India would be doomed to mischievous failure which aimed at granting a personal enfranchisement regardless of the beliefs and traditions of the communities composing the population of this continent. In the meantime, I can only say to you that the Mohammedan community may rest assured that their politieel rights and interest will be safeguarded in any administrative reorganisation with which I am concerned."

The same evening, Lady Minto received a letter from an official which said: "I must send Your Excellency a line to say that a very, very big thing has happened today. A work of statesmanship that will affect India and Indian history for many a long year. It is nothing less than pulling back sixty-two millions of people from joining the ranks of the seditious opposition."

It would be unfair to conclude this chapter without mentioning some facts relating to the Deputation of the Muslims. On August 8, 1906, Minto writes to Morley that he has received a letter from Mohsin-ul-Mulk, Mehdi Ali Khan' Secretary of the Aligarh College, and that he was undecided whether to receive the deputation or not. On August 9, Principal Archibald, of the Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental College, Aligarh, who had prepared the first draft of the Memorial, which, because of its moderation, was not acceptable to the Muslims, wrote to his friend Dunlop Smith, Private Secretary to Minto, to get the Viceroy's approval for receiving the deputation. On August 10, Denzil Ibbetson, a Member of the Viceroy's Council, wrote to Dunlop Smith that the Viceroy should receive the deputation. Later, on the same day, Dunlop Smith informed Archibald that the Viceroy would receive the deputation.

It is an interesting revelation to know that the points to be included in Minto's reply to the Muslim deputationists

were suggested to Minto in a letter by L. Hare, Governor of East Bengal and Assam when the Muslim deputationists Memorial was not before Minto. Later Minto informs Hare, and also Dunlop Smith writes to Hare, that the letter was freely used by Minto in his reply to the Memorial.

From the above facts it is clear that Minto received the Muslim deputation on account of the pressure brought to bear on him by Archibald, Dunlop Smith and Denzil Ibbetson. In replying to the Memorial, he did not consult either Morley or any national leader but solely relied on the suggestions of the Governor of East Bengal and Assam.

Morley appreciated the reply given by Minto to the Memorial and said that ' It was admirable alike in spirit, in choice of topics and in handling." Arthur Godley, the Under Secretary of State for India, wrote to Minto that it was an 'excellent performance' and produced 'admirable effect' in England. Encouraged by this support the All India Muslim League was formed on December 30, 1906.

There is no doubt that it was Minto's reply to Muslim deputationists that started the idea of communal electorate for Muslims. But it must be said in fairness to Minto that he was not responsible for the introduction of separate communal electorate. In October 1908, Minto sent a despatch to the Secretary of State, Morley, on the subject of constitutional reforms in India in which he had traced the history of communal representation and quoted extracts from the observations of Lord MacDonald, Lord Dufferin, Lord Kimberley, Mr. Gladstone, Sir William Plowden and Richard Temple who had at one time or other spoken in favour of communal representation. In this despatch he had not suggested separate communal electorate for Muslims but instead had suggested a general electorate supplemented by separate electorate, a suggestion similar to that of Gokhale. It was Morley who because of the criticism of this scheme in England had to abandon it and instead introduce the separate communal electorate.

Gokhale was deputed in April 1901 by the Presidency Association of Bombay, to lay before the authorities their views on the proposed constitutional reforms In England he met the Secretary of State, Morley, who gave him the most patient hearing. At the suggestion of Morley, Gokhale drew up a note embodying the chief features of reforms which he wanted the British to introduce in India.

Following the publication of despatches between the Government of India and the Secretary of State and the Statements of the Secretary of State made in the House of Lords, a feeling developed among the Muslims that their special interests would not be sufficiently safeguarded in the proposed reforms. The Muslims thought that it was the result of the Hindu intrigue. Gokhale's name was mentioned in this connection. To defend himself from this unjust attack he had to make his note, which he had submitted to Morley, public. The stand he had taken on the question of representation of minorities was the same as that of the Government of India. Speaking in the Imperial Legislative Council he said: "I think the most reasonable plan is first to throw open a substantial minimum of seats to election on territorial basis, in which all qualified to vote should take part without distinction of race or creed, and then supplementary election should be held for minorities which numerically or otherwise are important enough to need special representation, and these should be confined to the members of the minorities only....The great advantage of this plan is that is provides for composite action by all communities upto a certain point and then prevents injustice by giving them special supplementary electorates". Speaking again in Poona on July 11, 1909, he said: ".....that in the best interests of their public life and for the future of their land they must first have elections on a territorial basis in which all communities, without distinction of race or creed should participate and then special separate supplementary elections should be held, to secure the fair and adequate representation of such important minorities as had received less than their full share in the general elections.....As far as he could see the Government

of India's original proposals had been very much on those lines. And if the Secretary of State had not unfortunately disturbed them in the first instance very probably they would not have heard much of the demands that had since been made." Two years later, on January 24, 1911 speaking on the same subject in the Imperial Legislative Council he said; "The original scheme of the Government of India, as I have already said, was eminently fair, the Secretary of State, no doubt from the best of motives, sought to substitute in its place another scheme theoretically perfect but practically, I believe, rather difficult of application in this country; and when that scheme came to be hotly criticised in England, owing to the exegencies of debate in the House of Lords, he not merely threw it overboard, but also threw over the Government of India's proposals and himself went much further than the Government of India intended."

One of the reasons for his acquiescence in the separate electorate and over representation for Muslims was that in the proposed reforms numerical strength of Hindus and Muslims was not of any consequence. Speaking in the Council he said: "What does it really matter how many Hindus and how many Mohammedans sit in the Council? The more important question is; how many of us work and in what spirit we work here? The numbers would matter on some future occasion when probably questions will have to be carried here by the weight of numbers; today we certainly do not propose to carry our points by the weight of numbers."

It should be noted that Gokhale by himself was not in favour of the separate electorate He proposed his scheme for the representation of Muslims as a compromise between the protagonists of separate electorate and their opponents who advocate joint electorate. Above all, he wanted to remove soreness from the minds of Muslims. If this were done, he believed that Muslims would soon identify their interest with the national interest and there would be no need for separate electorate. But he was also very much

aware of the drawbacks of this system. Speaking in the Council he said: "My Lord, it has been urged by some of my countrymen that any speeial separate treatment of minorities militates against the idea of union of all communities in public matters. Such union is no doubt the goal towards which we have to strive but it cannot be denied that it does not exist in the country today and there is no use proceeding as though it existed when it reality it does not. Not only this, but unless the feeling of soreness in the minds of minorities in removed by social supplementary treatment, such as is proposed by the Government of India the advance towards real union will be retarded rather than promoted. One thing however must be said. The idea of water-tight compartment for Hindus and Mohammedans separately will not promote the best interest of the country and moreover it is not really feasible."

Gokhale was the master of the possible, leaving the door open for the desirable. V. S Srinivasa Sastri says: "Gokhale accepted this as a necessary evil, a working arrangement for practical purposes. But never regarded it as good in itself."

There is no doubt that separate electorates were caused to be introduced in India to serve the interest of British Imperialism by persons like Archibald, Dunlop Smith and L. Hare. Later, British Statesmen realised this mistake. In 1918, Montagu, the Secretary of State, and Chelmsford, the Viceroy, in their joint report observed: "Division by creeds and classes means the creation of political camps organised against each other, and teaches men to think as partisans and not as citizens; and it is difficult to see how the change from this system to national representation is ever to occur."

Montagu in his reform wanted to undo the mischief of separate electorate. But it was not possible. The Indian National Congress in its eagerness for political advancement, had entered into a pact with the Muslim League in 1915 accepting the principle of separate electorate The agreement

between the Congress and the League on Communal representation, P. Kodanda Rao writes, "added to Montagu's difficulty in trying to eliminate it in the reforms which he promoted in 1919."

Had Gokhale's view on minority representation been accepted, possibly, the relation between the two communities would have improved and the division of the country could have been avoided.

Gokhale was popular with Muslims. R. P. Paranjpye tells us that Gokhale received rousing receptions from the Muslims in Aligarh and other Muslim centres of India. Jinnah's official biographer, Hector Boliths, writes that "Jinnah the Muslim, and Gokhale the Hindu, had liked each other from the beginning." Jinnah said in April 1913 that it was his one ambition to become the Muslim Gokhale.

S. Abid Ali writes that "Jinnah in 1913 for the first and last time established close relation with a fellow human being to which the term friendship could be applied." This was all because of Gokhale's liberal outlook, deep humility and his restraint in speech which would leave no soreness behind.

Gokhale was deeply concerned with Hindu-Muslim unity. He was not only deeply concerned with it but it was almost a matter of life and death for him. But the growing differences between them made him very sad.

In 1912, the Muslim League, at its Lucknow session, passed a resolution pledging co-operation with the sister community in all matters of national welfare and progress. Mrs. Sarojini Naidu who attended the session knew well how happy Gokhale would be to hear of the new resolution of the Muslim League. At that time, Gokhale was in Poona laid up with heartache and diabetes. Mrs. Naidu had travelled non-stop from Lucknow to Poona, to convey this happy

news to Gokhale. She tells us that when Gokhale heard the news of the new resolution of the League his worry and pain-worn face lighted up. After sometime when Gokhale started climbing the stairs of the Servants of India Society's building, she cried that he should not climb the stairs as he was very weak. Gokhale replied : "You have put new hope into me. I feel strong enough to face life and work again." He died after three years on Febuary 19, 1915.

Of the condolence meetings held, those of Poona and Bombay were most important. Speaking at the condolence meeting at Bombay, the Aga Khan, who made the longest speech, paid glowing tributes to Gokhale's power of winning love and affection and said : "We often regretted that as we sat by him, that there was no counting house in our universe where we could go and transfer a few years of our healthy life to the account of Gopal Krishna Gokhale." Jinnah who also spoke at the same meeting, said : "Personally, I have had the honour of being one of the colleagues of Mr. Gokhale in the Imperial Council for some years, and to me it was a matter of pride and pleasure to listen to him and often follow his lead. The whole officials and non-official had the greateet respect and regard for him. His loss is difficult to make up. It is almost irreparable."

Had Gokhale lived longer, by his personal qualities he would have been able to win over Jinnah. Had this happened the history of this sub-continent would have been quite different.

Gokhale's Personal Religion

By D. V. GUNDAPPA

PROF. BASHEER HUSSAIN'S very interesting and useful study of Gokhale's work for Hindu-Muslim unity begins with a reference to Gokhale's personal religion. Other writers on Gokhale have also raised this topic. It is therefore pertinent to inquire what precisely the position is, — for people who take religion seriously and hold Gokhale in high esteem,

Preliminarily, it should be observed that a man's personal religion is not relevant to the subject of his work or national unity. One may be a staunch Hindu or a staunch Mussalman or a staunch Christian and yet be a sincere worker for national unity. One may as well be an agnostic or even an athiest and yet work as effectively as any positive believer for the nation's integration. Let us remember that national unity is a secular end and is an ingredient of the ethics of secular citizenship. Religion or no-religion, one may give one's allegiance to the cause of national unity with all one's heart and soul. This attitude implies the non-assertion of one's private faith in a field where it is irrelevant. If we cannot concede this right of private faith to find expression fully and in every detail in a field where the public interest does not come into play, we might as well abandon all hopes of national integration. If national unity requires that we should all be men of tepid faith or latitudinarians in religion, our aspiration towards nationalism should be content to see a bleak and hopeless prospect. The present writer's position is that one can be a good and strong Hindu, or a good and strong Mussalman, or a good and strong Christian, and at the same time a good and strong nationalist. There is no antagonism between loyalty to the nation. The question of Gokhale's personal religion is thus not relevant to the question of his attitude toward Hindu-Muslim unity.

Evidence is not unanimous as to what was Gokhale's attitude in his maturer years towards religion. On the one side, there is the finding of Prof. Paranjpe the agnostic that Gokhale was, for some time, an agnostic, and also there is the incident of his casting away the *Yajnopaveeta* (Sacred Thread) to satisfy a Brahmo lady's taunt about his practice varying from his profession. On the other side, we have his own declaration of faith in Lord Dattatreya (My Master Gokhale; 1947, by V.S. Srinivasa Sastri, page 149) And we have Gokhale's admiring testimony to his master Ranade's deep and abiding sense of religion. We have besides, Gokhale's numerous reference to Providence (or God) in various contexts.

There is, further, some proof of his faith in astrology which is a matter of the present writer's personal knowledge. He is writing from memory without documents. In 1918, the present writer was in Poona on his way back from Bombay where he attended the special session of the Congress over the Montford Report. Mr. V. Venkatasubbaiya of the Servants of India Society was then in Poona, and through his help the present writer was privileged to look through some of Gokhale's papers. Among them was a bundle of paper sheets containing readings of a horoscope and horoscopic diagrams (*kundali*). The author was a certain Bala Shankara Sastri of Haveri (or Hanagal ?). This astrologer had forecast the movements of the planets with reference to Gokhale and their consequence to him from week to week. The astrologer's advice was — "This day is good for you to meet members of Parliament", or "This day will not be very lucky for your visit to the Secretary of State", or "This day you will have to be careful about your health" and so on. These papers puzzled the present writer very greatly, and later on he asked the Rt. Hon V. S Srinivasa Sastri about it. Mr. Sastri said "They are genuine documents Mr Gokhale was particular about getting these letters of advice week after week. If at any time he did not get them, he would ask me (Sastri) whether I had been sending the money regularly to the astrologer and what the reason might be for the

astrologer's not having sent the letter of advice as usual." Mr. Srinivasa Sastri was himself unable to say what value Gokhale attached to the words of the astrologer. But that Gokhale cared for them is a fact. And to us it is a fact of some significance. The significance may not be conclusive. But it cannot be altogether ignored.

To the present writer, it seems that Gokhale was for a time unable to make up his mind. Between the period of his devotion to Lord Dattatreya and the date of his discarding the Yajnopaveeta, he must have been struggling with doubt. This is not a rare phenomenon at all. On the surface of one's consciousness, winds of doubt raise ripples and waves, while deep in the subconscious strata of the mind faith abides hidden. Time exhausts the winds of disturbance; and faith then asserts itself. This has happened in many men of modern education and Gokhale must be taken as one such.

His most familiar and most famous saying is: "Public life must be Spiritualized ' And what is "spiritualising" without a positive faith in the existence of a Spirit—a something which is superior to man and holds within itself all that is of value to man? Gokhale did not pretend to have formulated a philosophy of rellgion from Alpha to Omega. He did not exhibit any of the outward marks or symbols of religion. But one or two little rituals he seems to have accepted. For instance, when admitting a new Member to the Servants of India Society, he required the candidate to have taken his bath and observed a fast before having the vows administered. For forming the nucleus of the Society, he selected a particular spot on the Parvati Hill and held a small simple ritual there. The spot is marked with a memorial tablet. This is symbolic of the spirit of religion. The evidence thus is compelling and impressive to the effect that Gokhale had a profound and abiding sense of God—that he believed in the existence of a soul in man and in that soul's having a future after life on earth. He believed in the orderings of a higher Providence and in man's duty to work for a higher destiny in accordance with the intimations of Providence.

Gokhale was a rationalist who recognized the limits of nationalism, -which of course is a mark of true rationalism There are regions of reality not available to man's instruments of knowledge and therefore not accessible to his faculty of ratiocination, That supra-ratiocinative region of reality is the province of religion. We believe there, if we believe, without asking for external proof of what we believe

And Gokhale was a secularist who recognized the insufficiency of secularism by itself as a guide to life and felt the need for it to draw breath for its nostrils and light for its eyes from a faith far higher and far larger than itself if its pursuits should be more than gropings in the wild jungles of materialism, The enemy of a sane secularism is not religion but bigotry It is a bigot that is incapable of appreciating the rightness of a secular national unity. To a true man of religion nationalism is one way of realizing the brotherhood of all mankind and all creation.

Gokhale never set himself up as an authority, or even as a guide, in matters of religion. We should be clearly in error to judge him as such He was content to indicate that the source of his inspiration and enthusiasm for public work was in his faith in something more than mere man,—something which held in its power all that is of value to man. We must,—he seems to suggest —look upon our duty to the country as though it were but a form and a part of our allegiance to that Supreme Being. A constant sense of IT as the mysterious author of all life and the final arbiter of all human striving and a sincere expression of that sense in our relations with our fellow-beings are the core of all religion properly called by that name ; and that—we may be sure—was the religion by which Gokhale lived and by which he was sustained in all he did. Religion (in the singular number) rather than any one of the several religions (in the plural) was Gokhale's subject of devotion. D.V.G.

From : GOKHALE INSTITUTE OF POLITICS AND ECONOMICS Public Affairs, Bangalore. Volume—X-II November, 1966.

Gokhale on British Rule In India

SRI. P. KODANDA RAO

"THE Members of the Servants of India Society accept the British connection as ordained, in the inscrutable dispensation of Providence, for India's good. Self-government within the Empire is their goal."

Such was the charter of Gopal Krishna Gokhale's political philosophy, which he inscribed in the Preamble to the Constitution of the Servants of India Society. He was neither the first nor the last Indian statesman to value British connection for India. The first speaker on the first Resolution at the first session of the Indian National Congress in 1885, Mr. G. Subramanya Iyer, declared that, by a merciful dispensation of Providence, Britain rescued India from centuries of external agression and internal strife and created the remarkable phenomena of national unity and national existence for the first time. Similar sentiments were cherished by Dadabhai Naoroji, Sir Pherozeshah Mehta and Mahadev Govind Ranade, among other political leaders, in the early days of the Indian National Congress.

It was true that the political party, represented by Bal Gangadhar Tilak, bitterly criticised Gokhale for his attitude towards British rule in India. But even he approximated to Gokhale's view in 1920 in the Manifesto of his Congress Democratic Party when he said:

"The party believes in the introduction of federation to India in the British Commonwealth for the advancement of mankind but demands autonomy for India and equal status as a sister state with every other partner in the British Commonwealth .....

You must not forget that it is the connection with England and the education she gave that have given rise to

the ambitions that fill your heart... .....We want the English people, English institutions, English liberty and Empire."

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who, as President of the Indian National Congress in 1929, rejected Dominion Status and declared for independence outside the British Commonwealth, accepted Dominion Status under the Indian Independence Act, enacted by the British Parliament in 1946, and agreed that Republican India should remain a full member of the Commonwealth, and that the Sovereign of England should be its Head and therefore superior in status to the President of India. He resisted every suggestion to quit the Commonwealth. Gokhale could not have gone further.

BALANCED OUTLOOK

The attitude of Gokhale was conditioned by his knowledge of the situation, British and Indian, at the time. With his balanced outlook, so characteristic of him, he conscientiously examined both sides of every question to do full justice to both He was aware of the strength and the weakness, the good and th evil of both the British and the Indian. Long before the birth of Indian political consciousness and the Indian National Congress a succession of great British statesmen, who in their day represented the highest thought and feeling in England, had declared that, in their opinion, Britain's greatest work in India was to withdraw from a friendly and self-governing India. In 1818 Lord Hastings, Governor-General, said :

> "A time, not very remote, will arrive when England will, on sound principles of policy, wish to relinquish the domination which she gradually and unintentionally assumed over this country and from which she cannot at present recede."

Henry Lawrence said in 1844 :

"We cannot hold India for ever. Let us so conduct ourselves .....that, when the connection ceases, it may do so, not in convulsions, but with mutual esteem and affection, and England may have in India a noble ally, enlightened and brought into the scale of nations under our guidance and fostering care."*

In 1833, Lord Macaulay said in the House of Commons and before he came to India :

"It may be that the public mind of India may expand under our system till it has outgrown that system, that by good government we educate our subjects into a capacity for better government; that, having become instructed in European knowledge, they may in some future age demand European institutions. Whether such a day will ever come I know not, but never will I attempt to avert it or retard it. Whenever it comes, it will be the proudest day in English history."

Such enlightened and noble sentiments were not electioneering promises dangled before an Indian electorate by Britishers seeking electoral victories, nor their reluctant surrender to strident demands of Indian nationalism, but sincere and spontaneous anticipations of India's self-government.

ENLIGHTENED BRITISHERS

There were equally enlightened and noble Britis her who were critical of the evil aspects of British rule. In his letter to Lord Hasttngs in 1817, Sir Thomas Munroe said:

"We cannot expect to find in a nation fallen under a foreign dominion the same pride and high principles as among a free people.....Foreign conquerors have treated the natives with violence and often with great cruelty, but none has treated them with so mnch scorn as we.***

It seems to be not only ungenerous but impolitie to debase the character of a people fallen under our dominion. The strength of the British Government enables it to put down every rebellion, to repel every foreign invasion, and to give its subjects a degree of protection which those of no native power enjoy..... But these advantages are dearly bought. They are purchased by the sacrifice of independence, of national character and of whatever renders a people respectable.***

No elevation of charaeter can be expected among men who, in the military line cannot attain to any rank above that of a subedar,*** and who in the civil line can hope for nothing beyond some petty judicial or revenue office.*** There is perhaps no example of any conquest in which the natives have been so completely excluded from all share of the government of their country as in British India *** Their exclusion from offices of trust and emolument has become a part of our system of Government and has been productive of no good."

No Indian patriot could have made a more just and devastating criticism of the British administration as this Britisher.

Gokhale made a similar criticism :

"A kind of dwarfing or stanting of the Indian race is going on under the present system. We must live all the days of our life in an atmosphere of inferiority, and the tallest among us must bend so that the exigencies of the situation may be satisfied..... The full height to which our manhood is capable of rising can never be reached by us under the present system. The moral elevation which self-governing people feel cannot be felt by us. Our administrative and military talents must gradually disappear owing to disuse, till at last

our lot as hewers of wood and drawers of water in our country is stereotyped."

PRAGMATISM

Why then did Gokhale not agitate for immediate self-government? To an Indian critic he said :

"Do you think that we are so devoid of self-respect and so base as to be happy at our country being under foreign yoke? I would have my country free to-day, if it were possible. But is it possible?"

Sadly Gokhale recalled that disorder was India's fate for centuries and acknowledged that British rule had brought to the distracted country peace and order, without which no progress of any kind was possible. Memories of misrule were still fresh in the minds of his generation. John Malcolm, in his eye-witness account of the plight of the people, recorded :

"The scene which presented itself to the British officer was beyond all description shocking. The different quotas to be paid by each inhabitant has been fixed; and every species of torture was then inflicted to enforce it. Men and women, poor and rich, were suffering promiscuously.....Their cries of agony and declaration of inability to pay appeared only to whet the appetite of their tormentors.***

Indeed, they were so far distracted with hunger that many of them, without distinction of sect, devoured what was left by the European officers and Sepoys for their dinner."

Gokhale took a realistic view of the situation, however humiliating it was, when he said :

"Whatever the shortcomings of the bureaucracy and however intolerable at times the insolence of individual Englishmen, they alone stand today in the country for order, and without continued order, no real progress is possible..... It is not so easy to substitute another form of order for that which has been evolved by Englishmen in the course of a century."

A MIXED BAG.

British rule was neither all good nor all bad from the Indian point of view. If there were Britishers like the late Gen Dyer, there were also Britishers like the late Rt. Hon. Edwin S Montagu. In his Political Testament, drafted by him in his death-bed in 1915 Gokhale envisaged "responsive" government as the next step for India's political progress. But Montagu, who had criticised the Government of India as "wooden and antediluvian", made a spontaneous offer of "Responsible" government. He elevated Sir S P. Sinha to the British Peerage and made him Under Secretary of State for India, in spite of the powerful opposition of the late Lord Curzon, the most imperial and imperious Viceroys of India and later Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in England. Montagu planned that Sinha should be Secretary of State for India while he would work under him as Under Secretary. This was in 1917 when no Indain dreamed of it.

There have been many Britishers who had served India as well as the most patriotic Indians. Allan Octavian Hume was the Father of the Indian National Congress. Sir William Wedderburn, Sir David Yule, Sir Henry Cotton and Mrs. Annie Besant were Presidents of the Congress. Among others may be mentioned Messrs. W. S. Caine, Charles Bradlaugh, Keir Hardie, Eardly Norton, C. F. Andrews, John Bright and Henry Polak. Mr. E. B. Havel, Mrs. and Mr. James H. Cousins and Mr. Arundale had pioneered in-

valuable services in different fields like Indian Art, Women's Movement, Scouting, etc.

BENEFICIENT RESULTS

Queen Victoria's Proclamation was a most unusual and a most generous gift by the victor to the vanquished.

Dadabhai Naroji paid a very high tribute to British rule in India when he wished that it was "British" and not 'Un-British", for a truly "British" rule would be a "blessing to India and a glory to England, a result worthy of the foremost and most humane nation on the face of the earth 's Gokhale hoped that the evils of British rule would pas' away and its beneficient results would survive in India under Swaraj His anticipation and hope that India could rise to her highest political ambition within the British Commonwealth and by constitutional means has been realised in full.

(Public Affairs, Gokhale Annual 1972. Gokhale Institute Of Public Affairs, Bangalore-4.)

NOTES FROM CHITALIA'S DIARY

Servants of India Society special session 25th to 30th November 1914.

26th November 3 P.M. First Meeting.

Associates Room.

First Member, Mr. Gokhale addressed.

Traces History of Servants of India Society emphasized 100% living for the country.

Reverence for authority — love for Society.

Clean hands — Clean hearts.

Explained his own discipleship to Mr. Ranade for 14 years.

27th November Discussion—Constitution.

29th Message from First Member.

Implicit obedience ; reverence ;

Renunciation — self—money.

Service only goal.

Spirituality; Joy in work.

Protection by The Higher Authority

Self suppression

Discipline and Training.

Subordinating self to the judgement of those in authority.

Our duty ; attitude ; and our goal ; joy in the Service of the Motherland

REVIEW:

Gokhaleana and Sastriana :

Servants of India Society, West Cott Road, Madras-14.

Sri S. R. Venkataraman, has spared no pains in presenting these two volumes to the public. At the birth anniversaries of both Sri Gopala Krishna Gokhale and the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, pamphlets containing some of the hitherto unpublished speeches or writings or tributes about them as well as rare utterances and statements from them were assiduously collected by Sri Venkataraman and distributed to members in the audience on those occasions.....They have been in turn now separately bound as volumes and priced with a view to enabling the wider public to avail themselves of these treasures of profound thought and delightful reading.

Gopala Krishna Gokhale's fame consists in the amount of hard labour he had spent in tackling problems—political, economical, educational and financial—of the country and his dedication to the service of the motherland in advancing its progress in all fields of activity.. His competence evidenced in the budgetary discussions of the Imperial Council of his times and his moral fervour in selfless work to improve the lot of the vast majority of our countrymen living in hand-to-mouth existence, are examples of high human endeavour for many generations to emulate.

Apart from the speeches which he had made, there were occasions when he had produced literary causerie of a type unusual for one who was always dealing in statistical figures and facts. Thus we have here a poem in English of fourteen stanzas which give us a token of his ability to enliven general readers with thoughts of a different kind. This volume also contains assessments of Gokhale by men and women such as Lokamanya Tilak, Dr. C. R Reddy and Sarojini Naidu, which portray him as not only a great patriot but as a great gentleman.....

— K CHANDRASEKHARAN

(Page : 88, 89 Triveni October – December, 1978.)

(The Review of Gokhaleana alone is reproduced here for obvious reasons: with that of Sastriana left out: Editor.)

D. V. GUNDAPPA (1888/89–1975): Born at Mulbagal in Kolar District. Having failed to pass the Matriculation Examination he worked as a clerk to a merchant in Kolar till 1907. Emigrated to Bangalore where he maintained himself by giving private tuitions and by contributing articles in English and Kannada journals 1907–1926; Founder Editor of **Karnataka** an English fortnightly; 1913. Nominated Member, the Bangalore Municipality; 1918 attended the session of the Indian National Congress, at Bombay his resolution on Native States was considered. 1926–1940 Member, Mysore Legislative Council; 1926–1943 Member Senate of the Mysore University; President, first Karnataka Journalists Conference Bagalkot, and of the Kannada Sahitya Parishat held at Mercara 1934; Founder President. the Mysore State Journalist's Association. Member, English-Kannada Dictionary Committee, 1933–1939; President of the Kannada Sahitya Parishat. 1939 submitted his note of dissent on the Report of the Committee on constitutional reforms for Mysore, 1932–34 Organized. First Mysore State Journalists Conference; 1941; organixed a series of lectures, as a prelude to the starting of the Gokhale Institute of Public Affairs, 1949 started "**Public Affairs**" a monthly. 1961: Mysore University conferrd on him D Litt Honories causa; 1967; Sahitya Academy award for his book on the Baghavat Gita 1970; The public presented him with a purse of Rs. one lakh which he gave away to Gokhale Institute of Public Affairs. 1974 awarded Padma Bhushan Declined the pension of Rs. 500/- proposed by the State Government.

1975 Passed away.

A great literary figure, author of numerous books in English and Kannada and a great publicist.

He was the founder of the Gokhale Institute of Public Affairs Bangalore-4, which under his able guidance has grown into an active intellectual Centre for the promotion of healthy and virile Public life, art, literature and religion.

P. KODANDA RAO (1889-1974) born on Christmas Day in December 1889, was a Member of the Servants of India Society, Poona, for nearly thirty-seven years; was Private Secretary to Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, in India, England, East Africa and South Africa; was Carnegie Scholar at the Yale University, U S.A., in 1934–35; visited most of the countries in the world where Indians were settled, to study their conditions; lectured across Canada on India in 1935 and again in 1946; was a Delegate to the Conference on Education in the Pacific region in 1936 and at the Conference on Race Relations in World Perspective in 1954 in Honolulu; was a member of the Government of India Delegation to the Permanent Migrations Committee of the International Labour Office, Montreal, Canada, 1946. and was President, Forum of International Affairs, Bangalore.

Mr. Kodanda Rao met Miss Mary Louise Campbell of Youngstown, Ohio, U.S.A. in Honolulu in 1936. They were married in Poona in 1937.

Author of the **Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri.** *A Political Italian Biography and Bubbles of Memory. East and West', active a denial of contrast.*

———

FREE INDIA PRESS, MADRAS - 600 002.