

THE MORAL FOUNDATIONS
OF NATIONAL GREATNESS
M. TIMUR

THE
MORAL FOUNDATIONS
OF
NATIONAL GREATNESS

BY
M., TIMUR, M.A.

PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH, ISLAMIA COLLEGE, PESHAWAR.

RAMA KRISHNA AND SONS,
BOOKSELLERS, ANARKALI, LAHORE.

1925

**Printed by L. Gopal Das, Manager, at the
Mercantile Press, Lahore.**

PREFACE

Ethics like Politics is a subject in which every body takes interest and considers himself something of an expert. It is difficult to write anything new and startling on such a subject. Moral truths, indeed, are as old as the human race itself, but every age has its own peculiar problems and it is to adapt the old truths to the new conditions that we have to examine them again and again in the light of new experience. In the words of Goethe, "Everything that is wise has been thought already ; we can only try to think it once more."

The object of writing this book is to point out the deficiencies of the Indian character and the directions in which it ought to be improved. It is not enough to place high ideals before young men ; we must also tell them what stern qualities they must possess for their attainment. I cannot say if I have succeeded in my object ; but even if I have failed, my failure may help others to steer more cautiously. There is room for a series of books to be written on this subject. If our object is to reform character, we must try to influence it in all possible ways. I have confined my efforts to making a direct appeal to reason. This method is sometimes very useful. It conquers through conviction and makes sure and sincere converts. The method of teaching morality by biographical anecdotes is also effective and we may say its influence is more subtle ; but both methods could not be employed in the same book without inordinately increasing its size.

The only justification for writing in a foreign language, a book primarily meant for Indians is that India has not yet been able to develop a common language of its own and that English is understood everywhere in the country. However, if the book has any value, it must reach the masses in their own language and I would therefore, welcome any proposals to render it into Urdu, Hindi or other Indian languages.

August 1925.

M. TIMUR.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
I. WORK	7
II. CO-OPERATION	34
III. JUSTICE	58
VERACITY	75
IV. SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS AND COURAGE	81
V. PERSEVERANCE	100
VI. THRIFT	108
VII. PRACTICAL WISDOM	117
VIII. HOPE	127

ERRATA

P. 17, l. 16,	<i>for</i>	'difficuit '	<i>read</i>	difficult.
P. 18, l. 17,	<i>for</i>	'the '	<i>read</i>	the.
P. 20, l. 20,	<i>for</i>	'matrialistic '	<i>read</i>	materialistic.
P. 23, l. 16,	<i>for</i>	'no rich men is justified '	<i>read</i>	no rich man is justified.
P. 26, l. 24,	<i>for</i>	'something '	<i>read</i>	something.
P. 30, l. 4,	<i>for</i>	'The ideal of an external end '	<i>read</i>	The idea of an external end.
P. 32, l. 7,	<i>for</i>	'transformation '	<i>read</i>	transformation. tion.
P. 40, l. 28,	<i>for</i>	'absoulte '	<i>read</i>	absolute.
P. 53, l. 4,	<i>for</i>	'perfer '	<i>read</i>	prefer.
P. 62, l. 27,	<i>for</i>	'capitilistic '	<i>read</i>	capitalistic.
P. 85, l. 17,	<i>for</i>	'no thing '	<i>read</i>	nothing.
P. 90, l. 6,	<i>for</i>	'their live '	<i>read</i>	their lives.

INTRODUCTION

The secret of the strength or the weakness of a nation does not lie in its numbers or the extent and natural wealth of its country. Numbers are often a great embarrassment and a source of weakness rather than strength. The great problem in the case of large populations is how to inspire them with the same ideals, to impregnate them with the same spirit, to make them reverence and obey the same leaders, in short how to keep them united and to prevent them from disintegrating. The greater the number of men, the greater is the probability of differences arising among them. The fertility of the soil and mineral wealth too are of little avail. Land lies desolate and minerals buried under the ground in absence of the right men to make use of them. Without such men the wealth of a country is a source of danger rather than profit. The greatness of a nation is sometimes attributed to rich coal and iron deposits, to good harbours, navigable rivers and other natural and geographical advantages. This view ignores the more important elements in the making of a nation which are human knowledge and human will. The only true and real basis of greatness is character. Natural resources are only accessories.

There are two important elements in the character of a man, viz., the intellect and the will. In common schemes of education greater attention is paid to the education of the intellect. Either it is considered

that sharp wits and minds well stored with knowledge are sufficient for the advancement of a nation or it is thought that morality develops itself and requires no aid from training. Both suppositions are wrong. Bright intellects unaccompanied with the necessary moral qualities only make a people more miserable in their degradation. To know the right and to be unable to follow it and to see the goal and to be unable to reach it is the real tragedy of human life. Moral qualities which are mostly habits formed by social influences and other circumstances are at least as susceptible of change by training as the intellect. The objects of a man's desire or love which form such a large and important part of morality are greatly the result of imitating the tastes of those whom a man admires. Beliefs which influence conduct so much are mostly formed and confirmed by repeated inculcation.

For success in life and general prosperity the education of the will, the formation of habits and character and the determination of objects of loyalty and devotion are of far greater importance than training the intellect. The intellect is of greater service for the creation or accumulation of knowledge, but in practical life the moral qualities have preference. If a nation wants to be strong and prosperous, it does not require clever debaters and men who can draw nice distinctions in law and put forward their demands and define their rights in the most appropriate terms, but men loyal and devoted to the cause, working for it with their whole might and loving each other like brothers.

When people recognise the importance of morality for national advancement, they sometimes in their zeal to make men perfect in morality lay stress indiscriminately on all moral excellences some of which have no bearing on national life, so that a thoughtful but inexperienced person becomes sceptical of there being any relation between morality and national greatness. There is much loose thinking on the subject of morality. A great deal of exaggeration is used in teaching it and it is presented in such a transcendental and unearthly form that instead of attracting the mind it repels it, and instead of appearing as the more natural way of achieving the development of the mind, it appears as hostile and antagonistic to all human desires. There is a need for presenting moral virtues in an earthly form, as modes of conduct calculated to satisfy in the most effective way the highest human desires. National greatness is an object of desire dear to most men and it is attempted in this little book to analyse the moral qualities necessary for its attainment. By national greatness we mean not only material prosperity and advancement in arts and sciences but also political independence. An industrious and prosperous nation which is versed in the theoretical sciences and the practical arts of life cannot long be contented with subjection to foreign rule.

The qualities which we have regarded as the most important constituents of the character of a prosperous nation are, as will be apparent from the titles of the various chapters, Work, Co-operation, Justice, Veracity, Self-consciousness, Courage, Perseverance, Thrift,

Practical Wisdom and Hope. First place is given to Work which indeed is synonymous with life itself. No people can thrive unless they are industrious. The next valuable quality in a people is the ability to work together amicably for a common end. Without this ability a nation is not a nation but a motley crowd of heterogeneous individuals who can neither feel for each other nor understand each other's wants. It has been found by experience that no people can live or work together amicably without possessing just, tolerant and truthful dispositions. Therefore the discussion of these qualities follows that of Co-operation. The moral side of the important problem of the organisation of a people, is discussed as fully as it could possibly be in a short treatise of this nature, in the chapters on Co-operation and Justice. After a people have become united and organised they will require Courage and Perseverance to pursue their aims fearlessly and steadfastly. This is the reason for the inclusion of these two virtues in our scheme. When a nation possesses these virtues it is ripe for the achievement of its aims. The only thing it requires at this stage is the ability to preserve what it has gained. This calls in the aid of Thrift.

It would appear from what has been said above that there is no other quality which a nation requires for success in practical life. It is not so. There are two virtues which accompany every successful nation throughout its career like guardian angels, the one keeping the flame of desire burning in the heart and the other devising means for its satisfaction. These are Hope and

Practical Wisdom. The reason why their discussion is relegated to the end of the book, is not that they are most needed when a nation has achieved its aims. Their need on the contrary is more imperative during the struggle than at its end; and at no time in the life of a nation may it be said that it does not want them. They are the Alpha and Omega of all human exertion. They are discussed at the end in order not to break the continuity of the first six chapters.

CHAPTER I.

WORK

Life's no resting, but a moving,
Let thy life be deed on deed!

GÆTNE.

Work in the physical world means moving a body in space. Mental work is of a different nature. When the mind exerts itself to solve a problem, to analyse a notion or to note the exact nature of a phenomenon we cannot speak of it as moving these ideas in space except by a far-fetched metaphor. Exertion however seems to be common to all human work, mental or physical. Another concomitant of work is fatigue. No man can work incessantly. All men are tired after work and want rest. Some can work more than others. Generally speaking children can exert themselves more than young men and young men more than old men. A time comes when an old man is capable of nothing else but taking rest. Thus by slow degrees he loses his capacity for work and prepares himself for the final rest.

From the physiological point of view a man works as long as he lives. He ceases to work only when he dies. Life is nothing but potential work and complete idleness means death. We take work in a different sense in the moral and social world. Here a man may live a life of idleness. He does not die when he gives up work. We take work in the sense of useful and hard work which may be adequate to provide him with the necessities of his life and the means of attaining his ideals. Without hard work the beautiful world which man has created for himself out of the raw

materials provided by nature, could not exist. The moral problem before man is: "Will he allow this beautiful world to decay or will he build a bigger and more beautiful one for himself?"

If a man prefers idleness to work he must be contented with the life of a savage—a life without knowledge, without comfort and without power. Moral life as we conceive it, is impossible without work. Work is the first principle and foundation of moral life. It is the material out of which moral life is created whatever shape we may give it afterwards. The shape is a later and a secondary consideration. The first commandment is: "Thou shalt work with all thy might to build and create a world and a life for thyself." It is foolish to tell a man not to do this and not to do that when he is willing to do nothing. We have said above that a man does not die when he gives up work. No doubt, his physical death does not occur but he is morally dead. And death itself is a relative term. When a man suffers physical death the matter lives, although the animal dies. Similarly the animal lives when the moral man dies. Man is a builder and creator. When he ceases to build and to create he is no more a man.

Destruction requires as much human exertion as creation but destructive work is not moral. If its object is not to clear the way for new creation it is the negation of moral life. Our ideal is the largest amount of useful work. The murderer who is very active in killing men does not assist us in building a moral life. He is depriving the world of its workers. Not only the murderer but the man who destroys

facilities for work is the enemy of moral life. Every man has a capacity for work and anything which may be done to impair his capacity is immoral.

The difference between workers and idlers is not so marked in the life of individuals as it is in that of nations. Among individuals one man may live on the fruits of another man's labour. But nations jealously guard what they have produced and do not give it in charity; nor do they allow it to be stolen, if they can help it. There the distinction between rich and poor nations roughly coincides with those who work and those who do not work. A nation of idlers can never prosper.

An important question is: what are the signs of a decadent nation and what is the secret of the success of a rising nation? The characteristics which clearly and unmistakably distinguish progressive nations from decadent people are the love of work and inexhaustible energy in the former and an aversion to hard work and love of pleasure in the latter. A nation begins to decay when its members begin to dislike work. A savage possesses an immense capacity for work. He toils ceaselessly, knows no fatigue and has few needs. If he is taught the civilised arts, he will produce three times as much as a civilised man and will consume one tenth of what is required by the latter. An army composed of such men who have been taught all the methods of scientific warfare will overrun the whole world in a few months. As labourer and soldier the civilised man with an idea of a standard of living is no match for the barbarian who has got the necessary scientific training. The

savage is superior to the civilised man in possessing a greater capacity for work. If the civilised man's love of ease and pleasure increases and his capacity for work decreases he is already on the downward path. A time comes when work becomes painful and hateful to him. Then he is a true decadent. His soul is full of fatigue instead of energy.

The story of a savage people conquering great civilised empires has been repeated many times in the history of the world. The civilised armies possessed a far better knowledge of the art of war, but the savage was the more efficient human machine. The application of science to war has greatly increased the power of the civilised man over the savage, but any one who has seen a fight on the North-West Frontier of India between the British and the semi-civilised tribes on the border will admit that human energy, endurance and courage are still very great assets. The savage ancestor of the civilised man possessed the same inexhaustible energy. How the change exactly takes place is not known. Something like fatigue may be transmitted by one generation to the next by heredity. Or the social environments of civilised life may have a weakening influence on the character. One or both of these may cause the deterioration. The influence of the social environments is undeniable, but man can modify them and can eliminate the deleterious elements, if their true nature is discovered in time. The influences of heredity however, if they are really powerful, are difficult to control.

There are several stages of the transition from the

love of work to the love of idleness. The deterioration begins with the condemnation of certain kinds of work as too low for a gentleman or in the case of a people believing in permanent and hereditary caste distinctions for any member of certain privileged castes. Not only are members of certain castes forbidden to do some works, but those who do them are treated with contempt.

It was an unfortunate decision on the part of the ancient law givers of India which with the sanction of religion condemned the working classes to the most abject position in society. The very touch of a weaver (Megh) or a shoemaker's (*Chamar*) hand pollutes the body or the food of a member of the gentleman class. All craftsmen are considered men of low caste and most of them are untouchable. A man of a low caste has no openings for him in life except to follow the trade of his particular caste and live their despised life. There are just a few names mentioned in the history of India who by their superior ability and intrigue with men of the high castes succeeded in gaining power and position for themselves. If these men really belonged to the low castes and the tales of their low origin are not due to the calumny of their enemies, they did nothing to raise the status of their castes. On the contrary they probably concealed their origin in the same way as in our own times a shoemaker's son who has got Western education and adopted what is considered a respectable profession, takes it as an insult that any mention should be made of his father's occupation. Probably they did more. They set the Court astrologers to trace their origin to the Sun, the

Moon or some other luminary. An individual may have succeeded in breaking the barriers of caste in this way; but the guardians of society who were always on the watch to safeguard their supremacy and power and preserve the purity of their race, lost no opportunity to increase the rigidity of the system which condemned millions of intelligent and handsome men and women to a despicable existence. The result is that the castes are as rigid to-day as they ever were before. In the opinion of the high caste Hindus the weaver, the shoemaker, the blacksmith, the carpenter and other craftsmen are as impure as ever. If under the influence of Western ideas a few high caste men have changed their opinion about the eternal inferiority of the low castes, there is no change in their practical treatment. No low caste man however much educated and civilised he may be, can ever hope to dine with a Brahman. The only way for a low caste man to better his position and to free himself from this oppression is to change his religion and become a Muhammadan or a Christian. The Arya Samaj tried to stem the tide of conversion to the foreign religions by converting some of the low castes to Hinduism. They may have succeeded in preventing them from joining the new religions, but they have certainly failed if they ever intended to raise them to anything like equality with the high castes. The point which concerns us here, is not that the high caste men despise and oppress the working classes, but that they despise all manual work. This mental attitude has been highly detrimental to the prosperity of the country. A Brahman or a Chhatri would prefer starvation to making shoes for his living. Under the submissive exterior of the Hindu there is a

spirit of deep pride unparalleled in the life of any other aristocracy in the world.

The professions which the gentleman class chose for itself were the literary professions, fighting and trade. It was a sign of the times that the common soldier was given a position of honour in society, while the common workman was considered too impure to be touched. What we see to-day is that a skilled workman is far better as a man and more useful to society than a soldier. The soldier's profession will be valued only so long as the present fighting instincts of the human race are strong. With the development of peaceful tendencies the workman will be honoured more than the soldier. The distinction between the labourer in the field and the craftsman was also characteristic of the age and the country. A skilled weaver possessing a far more developed intellect than a field labourer was considered far inferior to the latter in social position and privileges. This shows that dress and other comforts of life were less valued than food. Men could do in the warm climate without clothes and shoes but they could not live without food.

Despising manual work and living for long in an atmosphere unfavourable for the creation of patriotic soldiers, the high castes which comprised the most enlightened section of the whole population, specialised in trade and the literary professions. In a society where the literary men live absolutely apart from the common working man and have no experience of how things are done in a practical way, literature and philosophy become unreal. There is nothing im-

possible for these men to believe. Imagination is their sole guide. Literary grace is a sufficient criterion of truth. The desire for a thing and a few false assumptions to make its attainment probable, are sufficient guides for action. We do not know what was the condition of things in ancient India. What we see in the present time can give us an idea of what may happen in any country under similar circumstances. In India of the present day our education is purely literary. We read and talk about wars, peace and foreign politics, but we have no occasion to associate with men who actually conduct these affairs. The result is that when our politicians begin to speculate about what may or may not be done for the country, the knowledge of the hard and unalterable facts to guide and moderate their schemes is absent. This is the drawback of living in a country where men have to depend upon books or imagination for everything that is worth knowing.

On the other hand the illiterate Indian soldier who does the actual fighting and the ignorant coolie who toils in a factory, struggle unaided by any book knowledge, through experience which they cannot comprehend. Still the ignorant soldier is a better guide in any real struggle than a learned visionary. It was surprising to hear from highly educated men during the Great War, stories of huge armies of Germans and Turks marching right through Persia and Afghanistan to invade India. A mere knowledge of the transport difficulties through these countries and the baggage required for a modern army could have dispelled such fears. The simple fact on which these rumours were based

was, that two Turks passed about a year among the Afridis probably persuading them to take up arms against the Indian Government.

It was therefore a bad policy for the brain workers to look down upon the craftsmen and to forcibly deprive them of all literary training. It injured the crafts by keeping men of superior intelligence and training out of them and philosophy by depriving it of its very foundation. The economic foundations of the country were undermined at the same time. To regard brain workers and manual workers as two antagonistic sections of the population, one infinitely higher than and irreconcilably separate from the other has proved a fatal mistake.

The followers of the prophet who did not consider it below his dignity to mend his shoes and put a patch on his shirt with his own hands at a time when he was the supreme ruler of Arabia, would be expected to exhibit a more democratic spirit even when living among the highly aristocratic people of India. But the spirit of aristocracy is a spirit of such potency that even among the Muhammadans of India the weaver and the shoemaker although the equals of the greatest monarch when praying in the mosque, are regarded as men of low caste. The teaching and the example of the prophet have no influence outside the mosque. A high caste Muhammadan feels ashamed to adopt a manual profession even when the income he expects from it is higher than what he could earn in any other way. He adopts it with an apology and considers himself degraded in the eyes of his friends and relatives. This

is a purely Hindu spirit which the Muhammadans of India have imbibed from their fellow countrymen. It is strong where the Hindus predominate, but in places like Peshawar where the Muhammadan element is stronger, one may find even Sayyeds earning their living by making shoes. Fortunately, under economic stress and through inability to compete with the industrious Hindus in trade and the learned professions, the Muhammadans of every part of India are returning to the original Islamic spirit of democracy and are making no nice distinctions in taking up manual crafts for their living. But the spirit of aristocracy is a dangerous spirit and no man can ever be safe from its secret influence.

If India has to learn anything from Europe, it is the love of work. The beautiful roads, the magnificent houses, the well cultivated fields and the busy factories of Europe are a sure evidence of the hard work habitually done by the people. Workman is not a term of reproach there, as it is here. It is a term which signifies independence, determination and honour with the added significance of danger for those who, till now, considered themselves the masters of the land. With the increased application of science to manufacture, the skill and power of the workman has increased in all European countries.

Victories in the battlefield depend more on the work done in the factories at home than the courage and skill of the soldiers. Without railways, motor cars and an enormous supply of guns and ammunition the soldier is powerless. The chief lesson of the

Great War is that wars of future will be more of the nature of economic wars than military expeditions. The country which can bear the economic strain longest will be victorious in the end in spite of reverses in the field of battle. When the wealth and power of the great empires depends upon workmen, the producers of this wealth and the creators of this power can no longer be despised. They demand their legitimate share of wealth, enlightenment and power and have succeeded in establishing their own rule in the two most aristocratic countries of the world, Russia and Germany. A Brahman would be thunderstruck to hear of the Shudaras depriving the high castes of their divine right to rule and keep in ignorance the multitude.

It was a difficult dilemma for the aristocrats. If they had left the masses ignorant and unskilled, there would have been no wealth and no power in the country to carry out their own ambitious schemes. When they taught them the skill and imparted the knowledge which made them more efficient for work, the slaves turned against their own teachers and masters. An Indian aristocrat has never made this mistake. He values the subordination of a number of paupers more than any increased power or wealth for his country or himself. He purposely keeps his servants ignorant and never runs the risk of making them efficient.

The next stage in the deterioration is the commercial spirit. The pen-and-paper aristocrat despises manual labour and exalts brain work but the trader

fixes the value of all work in terms of money. To him what brings more money is a nobler profession than what brings less. This spirit is the result of centuries of commercial habits formed behind the counter. It is a real spectacle to see a father in an Indian home measuring the worth of professions open to his educated son. The chief consideration in determining what the son shall do is never his natural bent of mind or the nobility of the work, but the money it will bring to his pocket.

It is a matter of common knowledge that our educated men stop all work when their ambition for money is satisfied. Our rich men love no work; they have no hobbies. Our doctors, our lawyers, our engineers, our administrators and even our teachers do very little to increase their efficiency when they do not expect a reward in money. The man who works for money alone and takes no interest in the work itself can never do it well. This is why there are so few Indians who are really efficient in anything.

The last stage is the spirit of idleness. It is a spirit peculiar to the Muhammadans of the modern times. Love of ease is their chief characteristic. It was not always so. There were bold navigators, industrious scientists, able administrators and clever workmen among them, but now the spirit of idleness and despair rules supreme over the soul of every one of them. There is not much physical deterioration visible in them, but the souls are mostly decayed. The Europeans read and praise the philosophy of Omar Khayyam and the Muham-

madans practise it. It is not wine which they drink and which deprives them of their energy, but there is something within their souls which is far more poisonous than wine or opium. They still possess some of their old soldier qualities and display fitful energy on occasions, but are incapable of patient and steady work.

In order to fight against these evils from which India is suffering we must alter our standard of judging men's worth. Our present method of appraising men's value is by asking the question: 'How much money does the man possess; how much does he earn?' We have a proverb in our country that a fool becomes wise when he has money. There is no position to which a rich man may not aspire in this country. He is considered fit for each and every kind of work. He becomes an educationist, a politician, a councillor and an administrator without possessing brains or training for any of these things. There is no society to which he may not gain admission. He need have no manners and no education. He will be honoured and respected everywhere. He may not be able to pronounce a couple of sentences correctly in any language, but he will invariably be made the president of every public meeting. All this must be altered. The position of honour so long occupied by riches in this country must in future be taken by merit and efficiency. Those who possess merit have been too tame and servile. They should have a greater pride than the pride of the rich. They should display their contempt for the merely rich. The rising generation

must be made to feel that merit and not riches is to be their chief aim in life. The wealthy have a certain prestige in every country, but the situation in India is quite extraordinary. Here no one has any prestige except the rich and the powerful. A man possessing merit without money in this country is more pitied than honoured. If a clever man devotes himself to unremunerative work which is calculated to bring neither money nor honour nor power in the immediate future, people begin to doubt his sanity. The Mammon worship of Europe is nothing as compared with the Mammon worship of India.

People in India often condemn the prosperity of Europe as materialism and extol their own poverty as a result of devotion to spiritual pursuits. The inference is not sound. A rich country which has a greater control over the forces of nature is not necessarily a spiritual bankrupt. There may be more intense love of dirty lucre and a greater engrossment in materialistic pursuits in a poor country. Every poor man is not a devotee of the spirit, nor is every rich man a besotted brute. In fact there are far more men in Europe who devote themselves to intellectual and spiritual pursuits than in India. The purity of motive with which European scientists, professors, artists, inventors, discoverers, missionaries and other philanthropists work, is unquestioned. The reason why there are few men in this country who devote themselves to learning or higher pursuits is plain. Here men love money more than Art or Science.

In spite of its Mammon worship, India is one of

the poorest countries in the world. Our rich men are like poor men in other countries. We have the most intense desire for riches, we save as much as we can and still we are poor. The very intensity of our desire for wealth is the cause of our poverty. In the hurry to get as much as we can, we forget that the road to prosperity is through love of work. The individual should forget that his aim is his own well being. Rather he should renounce all ideas of becoming rich. He should only aim at becoming efficient in the work he has chosen for his life. His work, if it is successful, will enrich the world and if he lives long enough, it may enrich him too. But every worker must be prepared for failure and poverty. To console his own mind he must create for himself an interest in the work and consider the efficiency he attains the highest reward of his labour. He must take pride in his work, not the pride which scorns what others do, but the pride which while appreciating similar efforts by other people may sustain him through his labours and increase his zeal for work.

There are three types of honest workers. There are those who sincerely strive to work but through natural deficiencies are unable to acquire a high degree of efficiency. They are praiseworthy from the moral point of view as men who have done their best and who may serve as healthy examples for imitation to young men. The second class of workers are those who being gifted by nature with a brilliant intellect have attained a high degree of efficiency and gained true light but are placed in unfavourable circumstances and fail to achieve their end. They

are the teachers and inspirers of the world. Finally there are those who like the second type have brilliant intellects but are more fortunate than they, in having their efforts crowned with success. All honour must be reserved for the workers, whether they are intellectually gifted or not, whether they succeed or fail. They should rank above every other man in society. They are the benefactors of the world. They make the world rich with their work. They are true high caste men. In contrast with them are the low caste men, the idlers and those who by legal or illegal dishonesty enrich themselves, making the world poor. They are the true untouchables whom every high caste man, the worker should avoid. Their very touch makes men idle and dishonest.

Thus our standard of worth shall be, not what a man takes from the world, but what he gives to it. How many honoured and respected people will fall into disgrace by this new standard? How many men in apparent disgrace will be raised in our estimation?

It may be objected that our principle would condemn many rich men who do not work, but who have given proof of their philanthropy by founding or helping charitable institutions. These rich men it may be said, do not work, because they have no need to work. Now, there are two answers to this objection. One will appeal to the selfish interests of the rich men themselves and the other is based on the true nature of the difference between the rich and the poor. If a rich man loves his riches the only way

to increase them is by work. Even the money-lender has to work hard in the law courts to get his money back from his clients. The second reason why a rich man should work is, that the wealth he has amassed is seldom the result of superior merit. It depends upon chances and opportunities which one has in life. Men of equal or greater ability might be living in ignominious poverty. He should be thankful to society and its laws that he is allowed to keep his wealth which is not his by any divine or natural right. Now, when society has allowed him to keep more than his due, it is his duty to pay back to it with hard and conscientious work in the interest of those who are less favoured by circumstances. If there is a single man in the country who cannot supply his needs by his own efforts, no rich men is justified in sitting idle. It is the duty of rich men to create employment for the poor. If a rich man persists in thinking that his wealth is his own by divine right, he should be warned by what workmen have done in Russia, and what they may do in other countries. If a rich man has no need to work for himself he should work for those who have given him his wealth.

The sons of rich men are worse than their fathers. The man who has made his own fortune has in most cases had to do hard work for it. His habits of industry generally last through life; but the man who gets wealth without knowing how it was acquired, begins to believe that he is a favourite of God and that it is his right to misuse it. His existence means not only a waste of his own wealth and energy, but he is a source

of danger to society. He becomes the leader of fashion and the idle habits he cultivates are slavishly imitated by the lower ranks of society. He is more dangerous to the health of society than the most virulent physical disease.

Many idle men confess that it is a sin to be idle, but there are some who consider idleness to be the highest enjoyment in life. They do not care for their own or their nation's prosperity and well-being. Prosperity and well-being they contend, are after all desired for the happiness and satisfaction they bring to the worker. If a man can be happy without being prosperous there is no reason why he should work. Still more, when a man can only be happy if he does not work, if he holds idleness as the highest form of pleasure, if he regards it as the noblest virtue by inclination and conviction and if he feels an incurable dislike for work, he should not be persuaded to work against his nature. This is the strongest position which can be taken by a man who does not wish to work. We may admit that he has a strong dislike for work and that his highest pleasure consists in being idle. We may admit this as a phenomenon in nature, but we cannot accept it as a desirable end. It is a natural phenomenon like the phenomena of physical diseases and as undesirable as they. In normal human beings this mental lethargy follows physical disease and therefore may be compared to it. But it may be urged that if a man finds the satisfaction of his mind in disease and hates all forms of health which involve activity, he should be allowed to live as he likes. Certainly, if a man exists in whom

the springs of activity can never be awakened, we have to give him up as a hopeless case. We may even allow him to live as he likes, but we cannot allow him to contaminate others. The final measure to prove to such men the folly of their mode of life would be that they should be deprived by society of everything which is the result of human activity. They should not be allowed to consume what others have produced. If they have any desire for food or clothing they should work for them. There should be only two alternatives for them: work or starvation.

Many men extol their idleness by regarding it as the necessary result of the virtue of contentment. Their argument for doing no work is that what they get is enough to satisfy their modest wants. They imply by this that the sole motive for work is gain and the man who is satisfied with little need not do much. We admit that to have modest wants and to be satisfied with little is a virtue, but to do little, because a man wants little, is the result of a low selfishness. There is so much to be done in the world that it is enough to keep the whole human race busy for ever.

Contentment means to be satisfied with one's lot. If this satisfaction means that a man should not disturb the tranquillity of his mind by complaining against the injustice of providence which has given him a lower position than he deserved, it is indeed one of the highest virtues. A calm and unruffled mind and an unclouded reason are the essentials for work. If discontentment increases it makes a man unfit for work. There are many men who say they would do this, that or the other

thing if they had position, wealth or power; but they are not willing to make any use of their present opportunities.

But contentment with the present condition does not imply that a man should be willing to continue in the same state for ever. He may be contented with his present position as something to start with, but may desire to alter it for a better one. Progress is only possible when a man combines the following two opposite tendencies in his mind: satisfaction with the present but dissatisfaction with the idea that the future should be like the present. Absolute contentment and absolute discontentment are both inimical to progress. No man with an absolutely contented mind can ever think of improving himself. In the same way the man who is absolutely dissatisfied with himself contracts a sort of mental paralysis.

The next question before us is: what should be our aim in work? Should it be to benefit ourselves, our country or the world at large? Or should it be without any such aims? No doubt, the ultimate aim of all good work is to make the world richer, more beautiful and in every way better, and if a person acts from this high motive he will always find something to do, but this motive has a tendency to degenerate into narrow selfishness. Instead of aiming at the betterment of the whole humanity including himself, he will directly aim at his own interest. Instead of cultivating the more enlightened selfishness which realises that no man can rise much higher than the general level of his community and that in order to rise higher he must raise his community with

him, he is inclined to cultivate a narrow and more directly useful selfishness which raises him somewhat above his fellows and gives him an opportunity to exhibit his superiority over them. A wise man knows that it is better to be a commoner in a civilised community than to be the sole master of barbarians, but it is difficult even for a wise man to remember this in practice.

A more effective method of achieving this end is to forget that our object is a philanthropic one. We need not aim at the good of others, but each man at his own good. Only the idea of what is good for a man should be changed. Instead of regarding rest or idleness as the end of his selfish life, he should regard work as its chief aim. Instead of making his pleasure consist in eating and drinking alone, he should add work to his category of pleasurable things. Work should be one of his selfish pursuits; it should be like one of the other amusements of his life. It should be pursued for its own sake like music, dancing, love-making, hunting and other games. It should no more be a means towards an end, but an end in itself. The worker should be unmindful of results. The only result for which he should care must be the perfection of his work. His desire for work should be as insatiable as his passion for other forms of pleasure. Let him be selfish by all means. Only his selfishness should have work as the most prominent of its aims. Now, if this work is creative it is sure to benefit others. A selfish worker benefits the world more than a philanthropic and generous idler.

The greatest advantage of creating a passion for

work which should find its motive force within the work itself is that we get an ever active force which constantly impels us to work. In the case of all external motives the work stops when the motive ceases to operate. When the motive for the work is within the work it will go on for ever. The passion for work will increase the activity and the activity in turn the passion. Thus, perpetual motion which is an impossibility in the physical world becomes possible in the world of the mind.

Of all other ends for which work is regarded as a means, money is the most injurious for human progress. It is undeniable that money and the comforts which can be purchased with it are indispensable for every human being. Every man has to do something to enable himself to live, but that the thought of eating, drinking, and clothes should occupy his whole mind and employ his entire energy, is a sign that he is incapable of undertaking anything which involves risk and danger. All great deeds are full of risks and danger. The greatest inventions which have enriched the world were made without any idea of direct and immediate gain. In many cases the undertaking involved the inventor in bankruptcy and ruin. The man who cares for money and nothing else can never risk his all on a scheme in the air and hence can never do anything great. He always walks on the beaten path which is safe and sure. Adventures and discoveries are not in his line. The most prominent characteristic of all men who have achieved great things is a religious zeal for their work. It is this holy zeal for work which though

unprofitable in the beginning bears the richest fruit in the end. The adventurer is a fool in the eyes of his contemporaries, but he proves wiser than all the prophets of despair combined. His wisdom enriches others, not himself. His achievement is the sole reward for which he cares.

It is a matter of common knowledge that our educated young men do little to further their knowledge after they finish their studies in the universities. The cause of this is the powerful commercial spirit which reigns supreme in our hearts and which keeps out all ideas of 'work for its own sake.' This is the result of our habit of counting men's worth in terms of money. This system of calculating men's value is simple and convenient, but entirely erroneous and injurious. It is surprising to see our small children making anxious enquiries about men's income and deducing conclusions about their relative position in society. The fatal seed of commercialism is sown so early that it takes a firm root in the mind and allows nothing else to flourish. It may be admitted that there are men who work merely for money even in the most advanced countries of the world, but the greatness of those countries depends upon the number of men who love work for its own sake. Our object in this discussion is not to do away with money as a motive for human action. It is indeed one of the most powerful factors in human life and the great majority of human beings are kept from idleness solely through its influence. But unless it is combined with love of work for its own sake nothing great can be achieved.

It may be objected that to work without having an object in view is against nature and impossible. As to the first part of the objection that it is against nature, nothing could be more erroneous. The ideal of an external end is a later development in the life of a man. It is most prominent when a man is old. The child manifests ceaseless activity not for any end which he has in view, but simply to satisfy his craving for being active. A healthy child plays, runs about and never sits idle. He loves play more than his food. As he grows up and his energy decreases the idea of an end gains in importance till in old age when the animal energy is at the lowest point, very little is done except to satisfy some need of the mind or the body. Thus the idea of an external end is an idea peculiar to old age. It is characteristic of old men and aged nations. The men of a young nation are full of energy and playful activity. Action and adventure are their chief interests. Petty prudential considerations do not weigh with them. It is not money which lures them to distant lands and perilous undertakings, but love of adventure. They make mistakes, but they are as quick to correct them as to make them. Boundless energy and not prudential wisdom is their chief characteristic. This is the reason why Europeans discovered the sea route to India and not the Indians to Europe; why Europeans discovered Australia and not the Indians or the Chinese who are geographically placed closer to it.

The second part of the objection that it is impossible to work ceaselessly without an external end in

view is refuted by the examples of hundreds and thousands of explorers, discoverers, inventors, authors, and scientists who had nothing to sustain their courage and promote their energy except the immense love they had for their work.

A grave defect of regarding work only as a means towards other ends is that clever people soon discover methods of gaining their end without doing the work required for it. Society may suffer for their neglect, but they have their full share of the good things of the world and are often better off than those who work. The trick by which they gain their end without doing work is simple and easy. It only requires an elastic conscience. Instead of doing honest work they spend their whole energy in producing the impression upon others that they are "the hub of the Universe," while in reality they are doing nothing at all. If we compare the number of these trickers with that of the honest workers we shall certainly find that the former preponderate over the latter at least in the East. The courts of Indian princes are full of such men. They are the leading men everywhere. A conscienceless intriguer has a far greater chance of success in such places than an able and honest worker.

Patriotism, religion and love of fame are some of the other motives which impel men to action. Religious zeal and love of glory are responsible for the greatest upheavals in the social life of mankind. These motives have proved far stronger than the commercial motive of mere gain. They have carried nations from one end of the Earth to the other. We do not praise the

conquests made by these nations, but the energy displayed by them. The motive of gain was no doubt combined with the motives of religion and patriotism, but the chief impetus came from these and material interests helped to stabilize action.

All these motives including the commercial motive when sufficiently strong undergo a transformation. Interest in the work itself takes the place of the external motive. What is undertaken in the beginning for fame, religion or patriotism becomes a self-sustained passion. There are numerous instances of such transformation of motives in history. Painting, Music and Sculpture which were intended in the beginning to serve religion are now pursued for their own sake. The higher branches of Science, Philosophy and Mathematics which were meant to serve practical ends are now studied for their own internal interest which is proving inexhaustible. In the lives of individual persons too an action often results from rivalry, love of fame, patriotism or religious zeal, but becomes a habit in the course of time.

The motive of fame according to which a man only cares for a good name has a special weakness as compared with patriotism and religion. Love of fame can make a man efficient for work only when the general opinion in the society in which he lives regards work as a noble thing and idleness as a base condition. There are however societies in which a man can win a better name by extravagance and ostentation than by doing useful work. Thus the motive of fame is unable to produce good workers unless work is the standard of

worth in the society.

Religion and patriotism too have their defects as motives for action. The religious zealot works for the ascendancy of his religion. The patriot, for the supremacy of his country. Their action will be quick and continuous as long as the ascendancy is not attained. When this object is gained the efforts of both begin to slacken. The well earned rest is welcomed. What is rest in one generation becomes a cult of idleness in the next.

Therefore there is always the necessity of stirring up the minds of every generation and reminding them that work is the highest virtue in life. Love of work should be their motive for work. Work should be a habit and not a necessity. No man should ask the question: 'Why should I work?', as no man ever asks the question: 'Why should I be happy?'

CHAPTER II.

CO-OPERATION

Hold fast by the Cord of God (Bond of Union), all of you, and do not break loose from it; and remember the favour of God on you when you were enemies, then he united your hearts, so by his favour you became brethren. THE KORAN.

The literal and fundamental meaning of co-operation is to work together to the same end. The simplest instance of co-operation occurs when two men combine their efforts to lift a heavy weight. From this simple beginning to the ruling of mighty empires and the leading of huge armies, we see illustrations of this principle. People often wonder how a hundred soldiers can control a district containing lakhs of inhabitants. They perhaps imagine a hundred men standing on one side and a hundred thousand on the other, and the hundred men driving before them the hundred thousand. It would really be a wonderful phenomenon if a hundred men overcame a hundred thousand. What actually takes place is far from marvellous. The fight is between a hundred men on one side and one man on the other; only it is repeated a hundred thousand times. However often it is repeated, the hundred men will always win against one. The power of the disunited hundred thousand men is no more than that of one man. It is certainly less than that of one brave man. On the other hand the hundred men acting together acquire a reputation for miraculous prowess which adds to their self-confidence and actually increases their vigour. Each of these hundred men when acting on behalf of the body represents the strength and the might of the whole body and can do

the work which the whole body alone could do. If there are many of these representatives, each of them can act as efficiently as if the whole body were acting in several places at one time. This is a real miracle. For a body to act with its whole might in several places at one time, is nothing but a miracle. Each of the representatives of the central body carries with him the full import of the power he represents. The power of the sentinel on duty is not the power which his tiny limbs supply. It is the might of the vast organisation behind him which enables him to do what any man in the street could prevent him from doing.

This is only one instance of how might can be created by co-operation. In fact, nothing great can be achieved by human beings without co-operation of some sort. It would be no exaggeration to say that society could not exist at all without it. Could there be any buying or selling, cultivation of land or the manufacture of the simplest articles without men acting together for a common end? If men had acted in such a way that no one had contributed to the welfare of another, the human race would have died out long ago. The very institution of marriage, on which the continuation of the race depends, is an excellent example of co-operation. Rising above these primary instances, if we cast a glance at what modern civilisation has achieved, we shall find it all to be the manifestation of this wonderful principle. Could knowledge, for instance, be created without co-operation? Modern science is the result of the joint work of thousands of scholars during the last three centuries.

The writing of a single book sometimes requires the joint labours of thousands of scholars for generations. Writing in the preface to the first volume of the Oxford Dictionary Dr. Murray says:—"The scheme originated in a resolution of the Philological Society passed in 1875 at the suggestion of the late Archbishop Trench when Dean of Westminster. It was proposed that materials should be collected for a Dictionary which by the completeness of its vocabulary and by the application of the historical method to the life and use of words might be worthy of the English language and of English scholarship. With this view it was resolved to begin at the beginning and extract anew typical quotations for the use of words, from all the great English writers of all ages, and from all the writers on special subjects whose works might illustrate the history of words employed in special senses, from all writers whatever before the 16th century and from as many as possible of the more important writers of later times. Several hundred readers accordingly entered on the task of selecting and transcribing such quotations and many eminent scholars undertook to arrange materials thus gathered. The time requisite to complete even this preliminary labour of reading books and collecting quotations proved so long that several promoters of the undertaking died and many became absorbed in other duties, before it was possible to take in hand the actual preparation of the intended Dictionary." As a result of the labours of hundreds of scholars for more than thirty years Dr. Murray was able to publish the first volume of the dictionary in 1888. He had, however,

to admit in the preface that their attempts laid no claim to perfection, but they represented the most that could be done in the time and with the data at their command. Thirty three years have passed since the first volume was published, and sixty-five since the work began. Dr. Murray and several of his colleagues have died, and the work is still incomplete. If the preparation of the record of what a small section of human beings speak requires so much time and labour, how much would be required to prepare a record of, or to study the infinite manifestations of the Spirit of Nature? It is inconceivable how anything which contributes to the knowledge or comfort of mankind could have come into existence, if men had been incapable of co-operating with each other. The greater the number of men who act together, the greater is the achievement.

The contrast between the people of the West, whose whole national life is such an admirable example of co-operation and those of the East who find it difficult to run a small commercial company with success, cannot but strike every unprejudiced observer. The difference is not due to want of education among the Easterns, if education means mere knowledge. Knowledge and intellectual enlightenment may teach a man what he ought to do, but they cannot make him able to do it. A man is not always weak in morals because he is deficient in knowledge. Ignorance too does not always make a man immoral. The spendthrift generally knows the consequences of his action, but he cannot resist the temptation of the moment. Education in order to

influence action must be an education of the will. It must enlighten the will and not only the intellect. It should create new desires and new passions. No doubt, a knowledge of what a man ought to do, influences his actions; but the influence is so weak and uncertain that we cannot depend upon it in the affairs of the practical world. The intellectual recognition of the principle must become an object of the will and must be capable of exciting emotions, before it can be counted upon as a source of energy in life. The Arabs who followed the prophet exhibited a remarkable ability for co-operation when almost all of them were illiterate. These very Arabs were disunited and disorganised at a later period, although they were then the leaders of the world in science and letters. The free citizens of Athens were held together with difficulty by the eloquence of Demosthenes. They led the world in science and philosophy, but were unable to stand against the well organised army of Philip of Macedonia. The Roman Empire disintegrated at a time when Roman civilisation was at its height. These examples show that educated communities are not always capable of united action. We do not depend for the truth of this statement on historical instances alone. We see in modern India that some low caste tribes are far better organised than the highly educated stratum of society. Co-operation is an art as well as a science. It has its laws and general principles, but no people can acquire this skill by a mere knowledge of these principles. It requires a certain aptitude in them

and a certain type of character.

The first requisite for co-operation is the existence of a unifying principle. It is some object of desire which is common to a number of men and the attainment of which is their common end. None of them is able to attain it without the help of others. They work for it like one man. They regard themselves as parts of a single whole and not as separate and independent beings. Their private selves are lost for the time being in the common self; their private interests are lost in the common interest. This common end may be the attainment of a moral or religious ideal like the one which united the factious Arabs under the prophet. It may be the advancement of science and learning, or the encouragement of art. All learned societies have some such end. Or again, it may be the glory and greatness of a nation or an empire. The idea which united the French people under Napoleon, was the idea of making France great. Napoleon was evidently the person who could lead them to the desired end. Therefore he was the idol of the French nation as long as he was successful. The idea, which holds together the members of a nation, is the idea of preserving its independence. An English man loves his national independence more than his private property. He is prepared to defend it with his life. There is hardly any family in the United Kingdom which has not lost a member in the Great War. England acted like one man. So did France. So did Germany. The principle, which enabled each of these nations to act as they did in the War was

the love of independence and glory.

Wealth is also one of the objects which may unite a number of men for common action. The avowed object of all commercial companies is gain. But the undertaking would not prosper if the interest for which they work, is not truly common. If each shareholder regards the prosperity of the company as his chief object, the company will prosper. If on the other hand he thinks more of his own share of the profit, he will soon discover reasons to desert it. The rulers of an empire besides other things aim at increasing wealth and prosperity, but the nation cannot remain united for long if each individual thinks more of his private gain than of the prosperity of the whole body.

The person of a great leader, a statesman or a king is often a very effective force which draws to itself masses of men whom no common ideal or interest can unite. The ideal is a vague and abstract thing in the eyes of the average man. He is more powerfully attracted by a personality. The leader is the concrete representative of the ideal. Many party men have no clear idea of the cause they uphold. They admire the leader and follow him. For them the common end does not exist except in the person of the leader. The presence of men, who should completely identify themselves with the cause is of absolute importance for successful co-operation. The greater the ignorance of the people, the greater is the need for such men.

If the common interest is a real interest for which

men care, nothing that is incompatible with it should be allowed to stand in its way. All desires, passions and little selfish interests, which divert the attention from it, should be sacrificed. The less valuable should be sacrificed for the more valuable. All religions and all governments recognise this principle. Duty and moral obligation hold the foremost place in every society. No man who fails to do his duty or shirks his moral obligation, can be excused on any ground.

On many occasions, when a man thinks he is sacrificing his private interest for the common good, he is in reality making no sacrifice. The sacrifice is only apparent; the ultimate gain is real, though not so evident to short-sighted persons. The man, who gives up his ten rupees for the sake of his nation and gets twenty after a time, is making no sacrifice. The patriot, who risks his life in defending his country is safer when fighting in the ranks of his countrymen than when fighting alone for the same end. In the former case he has a chance of safety, in the latter he has none.

Co-operation thus means the enlargement and expansion of the self. It brings greater prosperity and greater power to the individual. The advantages of co-operation are undoubted. No man can fail to see them. But pride prevents many from standing on the same platform with their fellow beings. They prefer to live alone. They are proud of their littleness. Perhaps they call it independence. They do not wish to lose their liberty. The loss of liberty

which co-operation involves, is more than compensated by an increase in the power and privileges of the individual. The independence, which the individualist cherishes ends in dependence on persons who have no sympathy with his aspirations.

It is true that the common interest is nothing but the real interest of the individual and its attainment will benefit him in the end more than any narrow idea of private gain; but man is so little under the control of reason that he cannot reconcile his private interest with the common interest, without a struggle. There are elements in the character of every man which tend to estrange him from his fellow beings. The material needs of all human beings are the same. All require food and clothes. All value land and houses. The supply of these good things of the world is so small, or at least men think it is so small that every man tries to take possession of all that he can lay his hands on, fearing that if he did not do so, nothing would be left for him. They dispute and often fight over the division. This breeds hatred and enmity, which last from generation to generation. Each calls the other the enemy of justice and righteousness. Young children are taught to know the enemy from the very beginning. Any co-operation with the enemy even for a worthy end is impossible. It is a point of honour to injure the enemy and avenge the family wrongs. Such things are more common among a sensitive and hot-tempered people. They find it difficult to control themselves at the sight of what they imagine to be a wrong. They are always disunited among themselves

and are always at the mercy of better organised and more temperate nations. It was said for the guidance of such as these: "Love your enemies, bless those that curse you; do good to them that hate you and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you."

Great religious, social, and political movements have a wonderful effect in uniting men. The ideal is presented in such vivid colours and it makes such a deep impression on the mind that nothing else looks real to those who are under its spell. Their own personalities appear to be of trivial value as compared with the ideal. Among such people the causes of discord and dissension are reduced to a minimum. They become a true brotherhood. The character which takes centuries to form under ordinary circumstances is formed in a day. The transformation is really wonderful. Misers become generous. Cowards become brave. Qualities which have been lying dormant for centuries unsuspected even by the possessors themselves become active and astonish the world. They may be called narrow-minded as certainly narrow-minded they are, having closed their eyes to the merit of everything besides their ideal. They are fanatics, because they have an exaggerated notion of the importance of their aim, but they are a power in the world which cannot be despised. They have a firm conviction in the righteousness of their cause and an unshakable faith in its ultimate success. If they succeed, they are the masters of the world and if they fail,

they become martyrs. The sceptic who sits by and watches may have a clearer vision, but he is a man of no consequence in practical affairs.

The cultivation of certain qualities may make the task of co-operation easy. It may even make it pleasant. The first of these is the strengthening of the natural tendency of love. As there is a great amount of hatred in human society, there is also a large quantity of love. It is one of the strongest tendencies of human nature. Love and friendship are the sweetest things in life. Love is the subject of the sweetest songs and the consummation of human happiness. It is a pleasure to watch a man going through all the experiences of agony at the sight of a friend or even a stranger in distress. Many men cannot bear the sight of an animal being slaughtered. Old associates are always remembered with affection. Besides special virtues and qualities which endear one man to another, association itself is a powerful factor which fosters love. The very stones and walls become dear by long association. It would be difficult to find a man who could live by himself without regarding the company of his fellow beings as a necessity of life. Many men would kill themselves if they were compelled to live in absolute solitude. In spite of his selfish nature the thing of greatest interest for man is man.

The development of this tendency in schools, colleges and clubs, where young men have to associate for education or pleasure is the best preparation for successful co-operation in life. Young men should be encouraged to form clubs and societies even for trivial objects. Besides training them for co-operation, they will give them a

unique opportunity of studying human nature. A practical knowledge of men is indispensable for successfully dealing with them. One of the favourite pursuits of a young man should be to study the habits and wishes of his companions. He should try to form a correct opinion about each in his mind. He should also study the differences between his companions' views and his own and the ways by which a reconciliation can be effected between the two. Much discord exists in the world owing to an ignorance of each other's thoughts. When two men succeed in grasping each other's points of view, very little cause of discord is left. The advantages of all young men of a country getting their education in big institutions where the future workers of the nation have an opportunity to know each other intimately are very great. They receive the same education, read the same books, hear the same lectures, form the same ideals and learn the same methods of work. Each of them tries in after life to realise the plans he formed in his school days. Many problems of their life are already solved in their debating societies. Many of them have already chosen their future colleagues. When the time comes for them to work, they have not to deal with strangers. It is friends with whom they have to co-operate.

The old commandment was: "Thou shalt not kill." After an experience of thousands of years mankind has realised the importance of this principle. No doubt, murderers are still to be found in the world, but the consciences of all men are against the deed. The murderer himself secretly condemns what he does. This

signifies the triumph of the moral principle over brute nature. The commandment of the future will be: "Love thy fellow creatures." The common man does not yet recognise the truth of this principle. However, if peace, prosperity and power are desirable ends, men will have to give their adherence to this rule. Loving each other is desirable in itself and leads to many other desirable ends. In ancient times the rule of love obtained within the narrow circle of a family only. Each family was at war with its neighbour. When peace was made between families, the tribe was the widest limit of its operation. This is still the case among the backward people of the East. The more advanced people of the West have extended the application of this principle to those living in the same country, speaking the same language or those who are supposed to belong to the same nation. The time has yet to come when love will be the guiding principle in determining the mutual relations of all human beings to whatever race, country or religion they belong. That time will come when all nations recognise each other's worth. The weak and backward peoples can help to bring it about by making themselves worthy of the companionship of the advanced nations. As long as there are weak and ignorant people in the world, the strong nations will be tempted to exploit and maltreat them. The only way of establishing universal peace and making the rule of love supreme over every other principle which guides human conduct, is to raise all nations to the same level of power and prosperity.

There are two alternative courses for human beings. One is for each man, family, tribe or nation to seek its

own interest without caring how its action affects other people. As long as the belief is that individuals, families tribes or nations can prosper by exploiting and subjugating other men or nations, there will be no peace in the world. In such a society each man, family, class or nation is secretly at war with its neighbours. Men have no peace of mind and there is no real security for life or property. The other alternative is for all men, classes, and nations to regard love as the guiding principle in treating each other. Not only should it be considered a sin to kill other men, but leaving the less favourably placed men and nations to their fate or still worse, exploiting their ignorance and weakness should be considered equal to murder. Before this millennium comes the duty of the weak, disunited and backward people is clear. The way of love is the way to power and prosperity. They should extend their sphere of love from the family or the class to the country, and become united and organised like the advanced nations. As long as they will remain disunited, there will be no peace for them, nor for the world. They will be the bone of contention for which the strong nations will always fight against each other.

There is nothing more useful for the maintenance of brotherly relations among men than the qualities of forbearance and forgiveness. To err is human. All mistakes are not intentional. A man may offend his brother without knowing what he has done. Yet the unforgiving and revengeful nature of some men makes such delinquencies the justification for an unending persecution. There is also the moralist who forgets

when condemning slight oversights on the part of others that he himself has as often offended their moral sense. He often confesses that he too is liable to err, but his belief in his infallibility increases with his confessions. There is another type of man, whose chief pleasure is in damaging the reputations of all those who are unfortunate enough to come in contact with him. He revels in creating discord and differences. It is but just that society should look down upon this disturber of the peace and regard his machinations as mean and unworthy of a gentleman. To forgive and forget and to be generous in forming opinions about others are the first qualities of a gentleman. Akin to the scandal monger is the tale bearer who poses to be everybody's well-wisher and friend. His business is to keep men informed of all the evil which they speak of each other. Very often he elicits evil remarks by making false reports and then faithfully conveys these remarks to the person for whom they were intended. A clumsy man would even invent entire falsehoods. He declares to each party that he is their friend, while in reality he is the inveterate enemy of the human race. These are some of the types of men who act as Satan's emissaries to destroy peace and happiness among men and to work for the destruction of the race by setting man against man. Many backward nations suffer to such a great extent at the hands of these mischief-mongers, that it would be no great exaggeration if the unprogressiveness of these people were attributed to the presence of this type among them.

The principle which is of the greatest service in settling disputes is compromise. It requires us to recognise the rights of the other party and to give concessions for the sake of justice, or at least for the sake of peace. On many occasions, when a man thinks he is giving a concession he is only giving what is due to the other party and thus doing nothing but bare justice. Even when he is giving away a part of what belongs to him, the peace and good will which he purchases with it are more valuable than what he gives. When the dispute is about the division of wealth or power between men or classes, this principle is of inestimable value. It is difficult in such cases to decide where the right of one party ends and that of the other begins. The settlement can only be made by mutual concessions. In the 18th century the power both in England and France was in the hands of the monarch and the aristocracy. The French aristocracy adopted an uncompromising attitude towards the people and the result was that the whole system of hereditary aristocracy was destroyed and a free democratic republic established in its place. In England the aristocracy adopted a wiser policy. They recognised the power of the rising democracy, gave them concession after concession, adapted themselves to the new circumstances and succeeded in retaining a part of their power and winning honour and popularity. Mr. G. W. E. Russel disparagingly mentions this characteristic of the English aristocracy. He says:—"Of course from time to time there have been acute controversies in which the House of Lords has been brought into conflict with the House

of Commons or even with the English people. But then the Lords saw that their safety lay in retreat and retreated accordingly. Indignation died down. The Englishman's natural love of a lord reasserted itself and as long as their lordships were content with a moderate amount of petty mischief all was calm.†” When the aristocracy saw that the chief political power was passing into the hands of the commons, sons of noble families began to sit in the House of Commons. They were admitted into the people's party and became their leaders. Lord Grey, Mr. Churchill and Lord Crewe, who are some of the leaders of the Liberal Party, are members of aristocratic families*. In order to reconcile the common people to the privileges of a hereditary aristocracy commons were frequently raised to the peerage. “It is only in England” said Mr. Arnold to Arminius, “that this beautiful intermixture of classes takes place. Look at the bottle merchant's son and the Plantagenet being brought up side by side. Very likely young Bottles will end by being a lord himself.†” The same principle is visible in the foreign policy of England. After losing what is now called the United States of America, it adopted a wiser policy. It began a more liberal treatment towards its colonies all over the world. Canada, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand enjoy what is for all practical purposes an independence. Their attachment to the motherland is for their own safety and well-being. A contrast with English policy is afforded by the Russian policy. The

† Collections and Recollections pp. 177 and 179.

* Since the above was written Mr. Churchill has joined the Conservative Party.

Czar and the Russian Aristocrats refused to consider the legitimate aspirations of the people, who were kept down for half a century by sheer force. When Imperial Russia was exhausted by a terrible war, the people who had been waiting for their opportunity, destroyed the old and set up in its place an entirely new system. The loss of life and property in the revolution has been so great that it has crippled Russia for decades. In England the wisdom and adaptability of the aristocracy has avoided a revolution. The patience and liberality with which the English ruling classes have treated the labour party, strengthens the hope that the English people will never have to face a bloody revolution.

It is not, of course, intended by what has been said above that one should sacrifice one's cherished beliefs and principles of morality for the sake of others. As has been already stated, compromise is a useful principle only where a question of the division of power or wealth is involved. Beliefs and favourite theories must always be outside the pale of politics. Men of the most divergent views on religion or in science may work together amicably for any common end. There are some men indeed, who demand that a perfect uniformity of views on all questions is necessary for co-operation. They want to force all men to their own way of thinking and stint the natural growth of ideas. Variety is the law of nature. Variety is wealth. The wealth of ideas lies in their variety and not in the multiplication of the same notion in thousands of minds. Ideas are different

from money in this respect. One idea repeated a million times is one. One rupee multiplied by a million is a million of rupees. The man who possesses one rupee is a poor man, while the one possessing a million is evidently rich. He need not have any varieties of wealth. A sufficient quantity of any one variety, silver, gold, land, etc., will do. The man who wants to be rich in ideas, on the contrary, must possess an infinite variety of them. The repetition of an idea on paper, in speech or in the mind does not increase its value. Therefore it is of the utmost importance that a nation should be rich in all types and varieties of men. It should be able to produce men for every occasion and every situation. The presence of men of all kinds of views should not only be tolerated but welcomed and encouraged. Each may be allowed to pursue his line of thought in his own way. No violence in the form of physical force or social ostracism should be used to divert him from his course. The only demand that should be made on his liberty, is that he should be prepared to work along with the rest for the common interest. Uniformity and difference must exist side by side in society as they do in nature.

A society composed of men whose aim is one, but whose opinions are different, must have some method of reducing their differences to agreement. The common method is to obey the will of the majority. When there is no great divergence of views on the aims for which the society has been constituted, the only points to be settled are the methods of securing them. The actually less efficient party may be in power. It may not work

so well as the minority might do. But the dangers of disobedience to the authority constituted by general agreement are so great, that a wise man will always prefer to submit to the minor evils of a faulty administration, if he can avoid by that means the breaking up of the organisation. It is a hard time for the minority, no doubt, when an evil-minded majority is in power, but to seek separation for this reason is to desert the cause and lose all chances of restoring power to just and capable men. Obedience to constituted authority is a principle of such vital importance that no organisation can exist without it for a moment. Not only is the majority to be obeyed but every official, who represents the majority, must be obeyed within the limits of his authority. If the whole force is to be applied on one point, all particles of matter which compose it, must move together in the same direction. The plan of action must be one. The general orders must come from one source. Even the practical application of these orders should not be left to the fancy of each man. There should be officials whose duty it should be to carry the orders to the members, to interpret them and to see that their action is uniform. If this is not done, there will be disorder and chaos. People will move in all directions and there will be no united action. If the right of issuing orders and initiating action is given to all men, the result would be nothing but confusion. Every mind is an independent entity. It has its own peculiar ideas, plans and methods. It has its own notions and times of working. If it is desired that all men should work on the same plan and at the same

time, there must be some general plan which they should follow and general authority, which they should obey. United action without obedience and subordination is inconceivable as long as human nature is what it is. No human organisation, whether a society, a factory or a government, can ignore this principle. No wonder, oaths of loyalty and allegiance are given such importance by all governments.

It is not pleasant to confess that the inclination to obey and the tact required for ruling are both absent from our people in a remarkable degree. If a man is conscious that the power of his superior depends upon his own willing support and that he cannot be compelled to obey, he will often prove refractory or evasive. These very people obey most meekly when the orders are backed by force. They do not consider obedience a virtue. Our ancestors exaggerated the importance of obedience to authority in one's thoughts and actions concerning every department of life. The young generation has gone to the other extreme. Breaking off the shackles of custom they do not consider themselves bound to obey in any sphere of action. Absolute freedom is not advocated by any school of thought even in Europe. The civilised nations of Europe are characterised by being law-abiding and obedient. They are obedient to the laws made by themselves and are furious when their freedom of action is restricted by others. We are submissive enough when commanded by others, but show an utter disregard for laws made by ourselves. We are not only in fault when required to obey, but show an equal incapacity for ruling. We

want to enforce our authority, when we possess it, with an utter disregard for the feelings of those who are placed under us. We never realise that they are free men who have willingly curtailed their freedom and have placed themselves under our command for the common good and, therefore, should be treated sympathetically. The obedience on their part, in order to be a source of strength for the society, should be a willing obedience and not slavish submission. Those, who regard obedience to authority an encroachment on their personal liberty, should at the same time realise that this is the only way of gaining true emancipation. It is the only way in which the self can be enlarged, enlightened and strengthened.

When a movement is in its infancy and the people are inexperienced, it is often a matter of difficulty to persuade the men that having become organised they are bound to stand together and accept the verdict of the majority and if needful the decisions of their leader, when duly empowered to act on their behalf, even though such acceptance at times involved disappointment and chagrin. The chief difficulty of Moses in his journey from Egypt to Palestine was the disobedience and stiff-neckedness of the Israelites on every occasion. These very Israelites were a weak and submissive race under the tyranny of the Pharaoh, but they had as yet little experience of free and willing obedience. Considering the unpleasant experience which Moses had with his people, it is surprising to know that obedience to authority was not included in the Ten Commandments.

It is not intended by what has been said above that a man should follow authority in his beliefs. The spheres of thought and action are quite distinct in this respect. In thought the rule is absolute freedom. Scientific principles are not settled by votes. Science does not gain by checking the free play of Reason. In the intellectual world no man is bound to obey the dictates of another man's reason or will, much less to follow his lead if he is convinced that the leader is mistaken, in his conclusions. The opinions of the majority are not always right. The intellect of one man may penetrate farther than the intellects of all other men combined. Even in actions which concern the man himself and do not affect others he may have absolute freedom. He need not follow the advice or the practice of any other man if he thinks himself fit to guide his own actions. No man is justified in forcing his own thoughts and ways on another man except by persuasion. But in actions which affect other men or where the object is so great that combined action is necessary, every man is bound to have regard for other men's thoughts and feelings. When the object is too large for one man to attain single handed and there is a need for a number of men to act together, there must be some method to enable their differently constituted minds to take one line of action. If they were left at liberty, each would follow a different course. In order to create absolute unity of action where there is no such unity in the mental constitution of the actors, some wills have to be suppressed. They must subordinate themselves to the ruling will which in modern times is selected by a majority of votes.

The majority selects the leaders not because it is thought that the greater numbers have a more correct view of things, but because they are supposed to represent the preponderating physical and economic forces of the country. In practical affairs as much and perhaps more depends on physical and economic forces than on the correctness of the method. Therefore in selecting a leader the most important consideration besides ability is: how many men are prepared to give him their willing support. When men give their votes in favour of a line of action, it is not only their intellectual judgment which they pronounce by this means, but more important than that is the tacit promise which they make of supporting the policy by every means in their power. The minority follows the majority willingly, because a comparatively defective method has a better chance of success when backed by force than an absolutely correct policy which has no force behind it. But the minority does not give up its right of criticising the policy of the majority and winning power by persuasion. It retains its intellectual freedom, while subjecting its will temporarily to the will of the majority in order to preserve unity. Thus the principle of freedom is reconciled with that of obedience, each working in its own sphere: the one enriching life, the other making it powerful. This obedience is quite distinct from the slavish obedience which contracts both the soul and the body. It, on the contrary, is the only means of welding human souls together, of magnifying the Self and creating a mighty Will, which is infinitely more powerful than the ordinary individual wills.

CHAPTER III. JUSTICE AND VERACITY

It is due to justice that man shall be a God to man,
and not a wolf. BACON.

Love of the self is a fundamental principle of man's life. It is impossible for a man to be without desire and the existence of a desire means the presence of self-love. Even the man who desires to put an end to his life, because life has become a burden to him, loves himself inasmuch as he wants to save himself from further pain. He does not love his present life and circumstances, but he loves himself as dearly as ever. Love of the self is distinct from love of life. The same man who commits suicide under one set of circumstances would be glad to live if the conditions could be changed. A man commits suicide when his desires are not satisfied and he cannot bear the disappointment. He is not willing to accept the lower standard of life which circumstances offer him. He wants to save himself from a life of pain, disgrace, humiliation, inferiority, dependence or subordination. He loves himself as much as the man who is satisfied with the lower standard of life, but has a higher notion of his own value and importance, and the lower life cannot make him happy.

Thus, a man can never be devoid of self-love. Desire is the essence of existence and a soul without desire is a contradiction in terms. Even when the desire is for a simple continuation of existence or for pure knowledge, it betrays self-love. The contradictory of self-love is self-annihilation and not self-abnegation. An example of self-annihilation of this type would be furnished by the man who had succeeded in renouncing all desires of the world and all notions of a moral and

spiritual life and who was not even anxious for knowledge. He would never resent (even in his heart) any wrong done to him or to any other man, or the violation of any moral principle. He would see the whole world being massacred before his eyes without saying or feeling anything. He would not even be able to know anything; for knowledge requires the concentration of the mind and it is impossible to fix the attention on anything without a preceding desire to do so. Such a human being is an impossibility and even if it were possible for a man to be like this, he would be a most undesirable being.

To renounce some of one's desires and to be benevolent to others is not inconsistent with self-love. Charity, philanthropy and a life for others may become the ideals of a man's life. The life which he loves may not be a life of self-indulgence or low pleasures. He may love to make others happy, enlightened and noble. He may make his self coincide and harmonize with the best that is in other selves without sacrificing or annihilating it. He would be prepared to defend his life and ideals with as much zeal and strength as the sensual man. His ideals are his property and he would not give them up to please any man.

Cases occur where a man values another person's self more than his own. He leaves his pleasures, and ideals for the sake of a dear or an honoured one. Lovers and religious fanatics attach very little value to their lives, but it can be said at no stage of their progress in self-effacement that they attach no value to them. The fanatic may love his preceptor more

than himself, but it does not mean that he does not love himself. Even the fanatic is not prepared to throw away his life wantonly. He values it, although there are things which he values more than his life. The case of the patriot is similar.

The conclusion which we require for our present purpose, is that men love themselves and those of the material and immaterial things of the world which are necessary for the preservation and development of their selves and the satisfaction of their desires and ideals. They love these things as strongly as they love themselves, for the existence of the self depends upon an adequate supply of these things. As the supply of the material things of the world is limited, every man tries to take possession of all the things which his strength, circumstances or the opposition of other men permit him to appropriate. Every man fears want and wishes to maintain an unbroken supply of the necessary things. The notions of rights and private property are the result of this tendency. Every man has a notion of what is necessary for the attainment of his ideals and he resents any interference with what he thinks belongs to him. He would be prepared to defend himself and his rights and property against all aggressors. He is naturally the enemy of those who want to injure him or deprive him of what he believes belongs to him. It is, therefore, necessary for the maintenance of peace among mankind that they should have the virtue of not interfering with each other's belongings whether they be material things or immaterial rights, in other words,

whatever a man calls his own. This virtue is called justice.

The rights of a man are settled by the law of every country and so far as men are satisfied with the law, and the law is administered faithfully, there will be no disturbance of peace in the country. It is hardly necessary to state that when there is no peace among men, when they are fighting against each other, there can be no co-operation among them. Co-operation presupposes more love and regard for each other than mere peace. The conclusion is plain. Men cannot act together for a common end, unless they have at least the virtue of respecting each other's rights and possessions. The necessity of peace and co-operation is so great for the prosperity of mankind that the virtue of justice has been known from the very ancient times in all countries and its value and importance is universally recognised. We shall confine the term for the present to the virtue of giving each man what belongs to him by the recognised law or custom, what in other words has been assigned to him by the society in which he lives. A just man would not appropriate what, he knows, belongs to another man, nor would he give to one man what belongs to another. Now, whatever this law of the distribution of rights is, as long as men are satisfied with it, there will be peace among them. The law may give more to one than to another, it may create great inequalities in society, but as long as its administrators faithfully give to each what has been given to him by the law, there will be no dissensions among them, provided that the people have the belief that the distribution made

by the law in spite of its defects, is the best that could be made in an imperfect world. But the moment a man receives less than what is given to him by the law or discovers another man receiving more than his due, there will be discord in the society, peace will be broken, men will not trust each other and they will not be able to act together for any purpose. Man is naturally afraid of working with those who, he thinks, will not give him his full share of the fruits of their joint labour. The force which binds men together and keeps them at peace, is the belief that every one of them will honestly give to the other what belongs to him by the law to which they have given their explicit or implicit consent. This belief in the integrity of others which is necessary for peace and co-operation in society is called trust. Society cannot exist without it. Men fly from each other when they have lost trust.

We have not so far tried to define the rights of a man and have only aimed at proving that as long as the members of a society respect each other's rights, whatever those rights are, they can secure peace and co-operation. What incapacitates men for combined action is the overt or covert usurpation by them of each other's rights. There are no laws of the distribution of rights the validity of which is universally recognised. The most fundamental difference is between the capitalistic and the communistic points of view. In capitalist society a man is allowed to amass as much wealth as he can by making legal use of the opportunities which he possesses. No man is allowed to use physical force in compelling other men to follow

his will, but he can use economic force to any extent. He can buy the opinions and services of any number of men, and so great is the power of money that a man who is compelled to do a thing by threat of physical violence feels aggrieved, while the one who is paid for doing it feels thankful to his oppressor. A single magnate or a group of wealthy men can control the political policy of a country by buying over the most influential newspapers. They can wage war by advancing loans to governments and make peace by withholding them. Those who depend upon them for their living have either to conceal their real views (which clash with those of their masters) or to modify them. Very often a man's whole mental attitude is formed by the economic circumstances in which he is placed. There is no liberty of action or thought for a man who is afraid of losing his employment if he acted according to the dictates of his own will.

The laws by which one section of society gains so much power over the rest is regarded as just and fair by the whole capitalist world. On the other hand, the communists regard it a crime that any man should have more than another or should possess anything as private property. The rights of private property and free competition on which the capitalist society is based are considered robbery by them. Again, the principle of the communist society that every man should be paid according to his needs without regard to the value of his work, is regarded as unjust by the capitalist society. According to them every man has a right to the produce of his labour and it is unjust to deprive

him of it. Although there is a great conflict of views between the two systems on the details of "what is just" (what one calls just is often called unjust by the other), there is no real and fundamental difference between their views of justice itself. The difference really lies in considering which of the two systems can best secure justice for all men. Our aim in this discussion is not to decide which economic system can best secure the rights of men, but to know what those rights are. The final decision between the two rival systems will depend upon the consideration of many practical details. Social and economic experiments may lead to a compromise between the capitalist and communist systems which may combine the merits of both. We may however state the requirements of justice without entering into any of these details.

The notion of justice, as we have seen, arises from every man's desire to have all the things and opportunities which are necessary for the development of his self. When a man appropriates what is necessary for himself, he is said to be working under the influence of self-love; but when he allows another man to do the same, he is called just. Thus, a just man is one who allows others to take what is necessary for the development of their selves according to their own ideas and a just law is one which provides for the development of all men according to the idea of each. Now, as no man wants to have less than another or would be contented with inferior opportunities, if we allow all to have what is necessary for the satisfaction of their ideals, each would try to have more favourable

opportunities than the rest. But as each cannot be superior to the other, they would have to be contented with equality. Thus, a just law should aim at satisfying equally the ambitions of all men. This equality should not however be interpreted in the absolute sense. In applying it to practical life we shall have to take into consideration the capacities of men and the interest of the whole community. As every man desires that the total quantity of the good things of the world should increase, in order that he may have a greater share of them, it would be in the interests of society to discriminate between man and man, when placing economic goods at their disposal. For instance, it would be wasteful and unwise to allot elaborate scientific apparatus to a man who has no knowledge of it in order to satisfy his envious nature which wants to be another man's equal in every respect. It would be apparently unjust to deprive the man of these instruments inasmuch as he has less than another, but it would be just to him and the whole society, because the proper use of them by a capable man would produce results the benefits of which the envious man and the rest of the society would feel in their persons. These inequalities will remain, in spite of the law of equality, as long as there are inequalities in the capacities of men. They are calculated to raise the standard of comfort and well-being for all men. No man would care for absolute equality if it reduced society to a state of abject poverty and ignorance. It would however be just to give equal opportunities to all

men when they are capable of making an equal use of them.

There are three kinds of things for which men care in life, and we shall consider them separately in order to know what the requirements of justice are in each case. In the first place are the ideas and opinions of a man. Every man is the undisputed master of his own mind and the thoughts that arise in it. This is the property which is allotted to him by nature. No man can really take possession of what belongs to another in this sphere. It would appear that nature had provided each man with a separate domain which belonged to him exclusively and in which other men had no need to interfere. Every man has an unlimited supply of his own thoughts and opinions and can borrow the best ideas of other men without reducing their number in the owner's mind. The wealth of ideas does not decrease by distribution. Every man gives to others freely of his most valuable ideas. When their value is recognised by society, he exacts a price for them, but so great is the desire to make them known that books were published even when there was no law of copyright. Where an idea does not directly lead to economic gain, the greatest satisfaction is found by its creator in simply publishing it. It might be thought that this was a commodity the distribution of which could cause no dissensions among mankind. But, as unjust men love inequality in the distribution of economic goods, they desire uniformity in the possession of ideas. The unjust man does not recognise the right of other men to

entertain opinions which he himself does not entertain. He quarrels with them for having opinions different from his. Both in the case of economic goods and opinions he wants to keep them in a position of inferiority and dependence. When a starving man who is unable to get work, steals a loaf from a baker's shop, he is compelled by economic necessity to be unjust. But interference with other people's right to have their own opinions, cannot be excused on any such ground and is purely the result of the spirit of aggression. Instead of thanking them for pointing out to him what his own limited vision could not help him to see, the bigot quarrels with them for daring to expose the weakness of his position. His pride does not allow him to admit that they may see what he has not been able to perceive.

Men also acquire a love for old opinions and theories, and are hurt if any one disturbs them. They do not recognise the right of any man to question the truth of their doctrines, in the blindness of their love for them. Those who have the courage to assert their right of examining every doctrine and principle anew are persecuted and denied the right of existence. Reformers and innovators were freely murdered in ancient times and even now in many countries a professed heretic would not be allowed to live at peace. Justice requires that every man should be allowed to make the full use of his intellect and should not be compelled to stint his intellectual development for fear of displeasing others. Freedom to develop one's ideas is not only just, but highly bene-

ficial to mankind. The progress of knowledge and the economic advancement of the world entirely depend upon it.

After deciding that freedom of thought is one of the requirements of justice, the question remains whether a man should also have the right of expressing his opinions before others. Justice demands that every man should be free to develop his mind as he likes, therefore no man can force another to listen to his opinions. Every man who thinks his opinions are worth presenting to others, may publish them by speech or writing so that every one may be free, without being compelled, to know them. To force opinions upon others is as unwise as unjust. It has no result but to breed hypocrisy. Therefore in most Eastern countries where free expression of opinion is not encouraged and men are required to assent to doctrines by social or moral compulsion, it is often difficult to know a man's real views.

Most of the religious doctrines are hypotheses of various degrees of probability and one wonders at the blind zeal of those who cannot tolerate the presence of men professing a different set of opinions from theirs. Religious intolerance and hatred can be explained by the fact that religious doctrines are held to be the most valuable intellectual possessions of a man, without which he is considered so impure as to be unfit for association with the believers. Some people do not take the food touched by an unbeliever and some do not tolerate his presence in their sanctuaries or places of

worship. The unbeliever is imagined to represent all that is evil in the world. When a difference in opinion snaps even the ties of humanity and each pictures the other as Satan incarnate, there can be little hope of justice in such relations. All this is the result of exaggerating the importance of differences in religious opinions by generations of bigoted priests. The evil results of religious injustice or intolerance are amply illustrated by frequent riots between peoples of different religions in India. The cause is always this, that the followers of one religion do not allow the followers of another religion to worship in their own way. What should have been an interesting occasion for each to observe the ceremonies of another, infuriates the ignorant devotees to murder and incendiarism. Religious injustice is the chief cause why the people of India have never been able to act together as a nation.

The next class of things which men value is that of material things. The just distribution of economic goods is a most difficult problem. But some propositions can be clearly deduced from the principle of justice. If justice means to provide for the full development of every man's mind and body and the realisation of his ideals, every man is entitled to receive the best education of which he is capable. It is a grave injustice in the present system of society that the ambition of most men for knowledge and enlightenment is not satisfied, while much money is wasted on those who have no desire for it. It is bad even from the utilitarian point of view that a dull man who possesses means should have the best opportunities for

education, while a clever man who lacks them should be deprived of it.

The next demand of justice is that inequalities in food, clothing, houses and other comforts should be reduced as far as possible. The standard of comfort for the lower classes should be raised. The food and clothes of a man should suit the condition of his body and should not vary according to his means. Every man is entitled to live a life of comfort and leisure if he honestly does the work that he is capable of doing. The idlers alone should be differentially treated. Only those men should have a full share of the comforts who make a direct or indirect contribution to their production. Those who work more than others or those the quality of whose work is higher, have the right to receive extra reward for their work; but the reward need not take the form of exchangeable economic goods which, if they are more than their need, will either be wasted or employed to buy the liberties of other men. The more efficient workers may be rewarded by being given higher posts or titles of honour which may satisfy their ambition for distinction. Those who love travelling may be given greater opportunities of travelling. Successful scholars and scientists may be provided with special libraries and laboratories for their exclusive use. Distinguished artists may have a greater share of pictures and works of art to decorate their rooms. But none of these things may be sold or bequeathed. The things are given to them by society for their personal use, because they have worked better than other men, but the same cannot be said of their

sons or relatives. Most of the inequalities which exist in the present society as regards the standard of comfort allowed to different classes, are highly impolitic besides being unjust. Inequality in the allotment of the ordinary necessities of life excites jealousy in the poorer classes who frequently try to break the law and create disorder. As the lower classes grow more and more self-conscious, they try to establish equality by violent means. Inequality exists only so long as the lower classes are unconscious of their power, or do not know how to make full use of it.

Last of all are human relations which are prized by men. Justice recognises the right of every man to develop his own personality according to his own free will. Therefore he should have perfect freedom of choice in his relations with other men. The economic and political arrangements should be such that no man may be under the necessity of having any relations with other men against his will. Most of the men who serve under capitalist masters and many of the women who live with their husbands are the unwilling slaves of their masters. Many friends of great men come under the same category. Economic necessity compels all these to live in a position of subservience.

In an ideal society justice would require the abolition of domestic servants. Service should be voluntary and out of love. Dependence creates such vile qualities that the whole world would gain morally if there were no servants. There was a time when people thought they could not do without slaves. Now the small minority which possesses servants thinks the

world cannot go on without them. By the world they probably mean their own world of vanity, luxury, idleness and extravagance. If there are no servants, there would be less lying, stealing and dishonesty in the world. These are the methods by which the servants take revenge on their masters and recover some of their lost rights.

Murder, theft and robbery are some of the violent forms of injustice. The evil nature of these practices is universally recognised except in very backward societies. Where these crimes are common, society remains divided against itself and men are too much occupied with defending themselves against each other's aggression to be able to do anything for the betterment of their condition. There are subtler forms of injustice too which are found among morally depraved but fairly civilised people. Injustice which means too much self-love and disregard for the desires and needs of other men is the root cause of the inability of vast populations like that of India to act together or govern themselves.

Dishonesty, bribery, and partiality are some of the common forms of secret injustice. Opportunities for secret injustice arise when men adopt some system of co-operation in order to increase their power or the productivity of their labour. First of these is the formation of a government. No less important is the formation of commercial companies with the object of producing cheap commodities. Cheap commodities mean greater comfort and abundance for mankind. Further, there is the system of exchange by which the division of labour becomes possible.

Lending money or entrusting property to each other are some other ways of mutual help. The essence of all these forms of co-operation is that the property and rights of one man are in the hands of another who keeps them in trust for him. A few ministers are entrusted with the disbursement of millions of public money. Even the lives of millions of men are placed at the disposal of the ministers and the generals. The judges of law courts are the custodians of the honour and private property of citizens. Not only ministers but officials of all ranks are entrusted with the people's property. The directors of a company spend the money of the shareholders for the latter's benefit. All these are occasions when a man can secretly usurp the property or rights of another. The minister can use public money for private purposes. The directors of a company or other officials can misappropriate the shareholders' money. Government officials can take bribes. A judge who receives a bribe or for some other selfish reason unduly favours one of the parties allots to one what belongs to the other, or does not restore to the wronged party what has been taken from it. The shopkeeper who takes more than the price of a thing from a customer wrongfully takes what belongs to the other man. The first step in moral progress from the state of blind selfishness, is the acquirement of a just disposition which may enable a man to recognise the moral personality and rights of other men when acting towards them. This disposition is the force which draws men together and cements their union. It

makes a nation strong and powerful. No amount of intellectual progress or training in the methods of government can make a people fit for self-government. Systems are of no value without this virtue in the workers. A government cannot prosper if the officials are corrupt. A commercial company cannot be successful if the workers are dishonest. Companies cannot be formed when people do not trust each other.

Trust means belief in one another's honesty or sense of justice. When people are dishonest they cannot long maintain their reputation for honesty. The result of distrust is that every man hoards his wealth in his own house unprofitably. He does not invest it for fear of losing it. He does not even set up a business of his own fearing the dishonesty of his employee. Where confiscation or looting of property become common, people bury their valuables under the ground. If men had not been able to trust the laws of nature, there would have been a similar disorder in physical life. If things had changed their properties without giving indication of the coming changes, it would have been impossible to live in the world. If wholesome things like water and fruit had a trick of becoming poisonous suddenly, without any forewarning in their appearance, taste, smell or other properties, no man would have touched them. Similarly when there are men in society who profess to be honest, but act dishonestly, men avoid each other like poison. The power and prosperity of a nation is in direct proportion to the trust which prevails among its members. If there is no trust there is no

social or political life. As mutual trust increases trade and industry flourish, the nation prospers and becomes powerful. If deception is common each man prefers to live a life of isolation, nothing is done for the community and every one suffers from poverty, absence of peace and uncertainty in every thing.

VERACITY.

Truth, fact, is the life of all things; falsity, "fiction" or whatever it may call itself, is certain to be the death.

CARLYLE.

The quality which aids justice by establishing trust in society is veracity. If a people habitually speak the truth, they have no difficulty in combining for trade or any other purpose. Veracity is the greatest ally of justice, for men are afraid of being known as unjust. Injustice cannot be practised without unverity. The man who takes a bribe or misappropriates public money relies on lying to escape punishment. Other forms of secret injustice too are intimately associated with untruthfulness.

Veracity is the simpler and more natural habit. It requires that the statement must correspond with the fact. It is easier for a man to faithfully translate into words what he has observed than to pervert it. The first impulse is in this direction. When other thoughts and motives intervene, the man first suppresses the true fact and then invents a new one to take its place. Permanent motives exist in the

minds of some persons under the influence of which truth is at once suppressed and a lie invented and substituted for it. The most powerful motive for lying is self-interest. Weak and oppressed people generally resort to lying to save themselves from tyranny. A tradesman lies in order to get a higher price for his wares. In the first instance the man lies in order to get justice for himself; in the second, to do injustice to others. This raises the question whether untruthfulness may be considered a virtue when it is employed to secure the ends of justice. Is the man who speaks a lie to save his life or property from a tyrant justified in doing so? Further, is a man justified in lying to defend the life or property of another? Again, is it right to deceive a man when deception is designed to benefit him?

Lying is condemned because it destroys mutual trust and without trust no social life or co-operation is possible. Where this evil result does not follow, the invention of falsehoods is considered a healthy exercise of the imagination. Writing fiction and painting pictures of imaginary things are not considered immoral. The immorality of lying consists in its trust-destroying quality. In established societies where life depends on mutual help, untruthfulness is accompanied by unlimited evils. Every man has his property and rights allotted to him by law and he has only to appeal to the law to secure them. Untruthfulness in such a society would only be useful to an unjust man who wants to take more than his right. Even when a man thinks the law to be unjust and secretly breaks it, in order to secure his

ideal rights, he creates disorder in society. If he is dissatisfied with the law, he ought to declare war on it openly, and when a new law has been made, the old law need no more be respected. One of the objects of establishing justice in society is to secure peace. Peace may be secured by laws which are only approximately just if most members are satisfied with them, while ideally just laws which are not supported by a majority may fail to secure it. If a man tries to secure his ideal rights without the consent of others, he will create disorder in the same way as an unjust man.

Thus in established societies a man has no moral justification for lying. Wherever a man wants to be trusted he should carefully avoid falsehoods. Wherever social life depends on mutual help and co-operation, trust is an essential mental disposition. Civilised nations, even in war, carry on a sort of co-operation for humane purposes. The object of nations at war is generally not to exterminate each other, but to secure some interests which may place one in a more favourable position than another. Therefore prisoners of war and the wounded are not put to death. Hospitals are not attacked. The private property of the civil population is respected. Women and children are protected. The fighting armies co-operate for these ends. Truthfulness is necessary to secure this co-operation. Where they do not co-operate, is in killing able-bodied soldiers in the field of battle in order to secure acknowledgment of defeat by one of the parties. Therefore the movements of the armies are concealed from each other. Camou-

flage and every other artifice is used to deceive the enemy. A false scent is given to mislead and destroy the enemy forces. The art of deceiving and easily destroying the enemy is called strategy. Thus concealment of the truth and even direct falsehood are necessary aids in war. Acting in such a way as to create false ideas in the mind of a man about facts is a kind of falsehood. Leaving false plans of action or false maps so that they might fall in the hands of the enemy is direct falsehood. Spying is perhaps the most unvaracious profession. The hostile armies do not trust each other and do not expect to be trusted in actual warfare. The limits within which they use unvaracity are definitely marked and generally recognised. The general who employs these tactics in actual fighting is not distrusted in ordinary social or business relations or when settling the terms of peace. The spheres of veracity and unvaracity are clearly understood. Similarly the man who uses unvaracity to defend his own life or the life of another man against an unprincipled, uncompromising and inhuman robber, under circumstances the exceptional nature of which is clearly understood by all, will not lose his credit in society. He will not be trusted again by robbers, but to be trusted by them in such circumstances means the loss of noble lives, which is a greater evil. We should rather say that not to be trusted by robbers under such circumstances is no evil at all. Unvaracity will therefore be employed without incurring moral blame as long as there are wars or the violation of rights by uncompromising violence.

Truthfulness is the law of life, untruthfulness, the law of destruction.

The second question, whether it is right to deceive a man when deception is designed to benefit him remains to be answered. Most persons would not hesitate to speak falsely to an invalid, if this seemed the only way of concealing facts that might produce a dangerous shock: nor do people shrink from telling fictions to children, on matters upon which it is thought well that they should not know the truth. Some of the remarks made in answer to the first question also apply to this. If the limits of unverity are clearly marked and clearly understood by both sides, and there is no chance of imperilling mutual confidence when the falsehood is discovered, one may sometimes escape the evil consequences of speaking a lie. But it must be remembered that it is more dangerous to speak falsehoods to those by whom one wants to be trusted than to robbers or others by whom one does not care to be trusted. If the general habit of a doctor is to tell benevolent lies to his patients, his word would not carry any weight. He need not frighten his patient by painting a lurid picture of his condition, but must indicate its real nature without leading him to despair. It is most important for a doctor to have the confidence of his patients. A habitual consoler gives no consolation.

Telling fictions to children is a very dangerous habit. Children have not the capacity to understand that the speaker is deviating from the truth for a special purpose and is not a habitual liar. They are not even

able to differentiate between a lie and an error. Instead of saying 'you were wrong' they often say 'you spoke a lie.' If they discover the lie they will either imitate it or lose confidence in the man. Moreover they are in the habit of drawing inferences from and exercising their imagination on what they are told. Any falsehood they are told may get rooted in their minds, doing permanent injury to their mental development. If there are any matters about which children, invalids or other persons in a similar position should not know the truth, they may simply be refused the information. Concealment of the truth is not unverity. Veracity does not require that everything known to a man should be published broadcast. Ability to keep a secret is a highly valued virtue. Thus in dealing with children and others of the same sort strictest veracity should be the rule.

We have tried to prove that justice and veracity are the valuable qualities without which it is impossible for human beings to co-operate for any purpose. The cultivation of these qualities is most important for national development. It is even more important than the introduction of self-governing institutions. Systems and institutions are worthless without men possessing the necessary moral qualities. When a people are incapable of union, unjust dispositions are generally the most important cause.

CHAPTER IV.

SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS AND COURAGE

Man is not the master of man but death and life and pleasure and pain.—*Epictetus*.

A man in an undeveloped state of self-consciousness believes without question what he is told to believe, and does what people tell him is good for him to do. He thinks, wills and acts; but his thoughts, desires and actions are the echoes of other people's thoughts, desires and actions. He is a creature of his circumstances and society. He has not yet recognised the separate existence of his own personality. He is an automaton who serves the ends of other people. He is a burden on society whom his friends have to carry like a dead body on their shoulders. He is sometimes valued as a friend, because he is an abject follower; but he cannot serve better than a machine. He is of no use to a man when he stands in real need of help, when the mind is puzzled and the will flags.

The self-conscious man on the contrary regards himself as his own end. He has his own ideals and possesses a sense of his dignity. He does what he feels to be right and bears the responsibility of his actions. He is the final judge of what he believes and does not blame others for misleading him in his opinions or actions. He may not be a discoverer or a reformer and may have to borrow his ideas or morality from more gifted people; but when he selects a doctrine or a course of action for himself, he does so only when his intellect

and will are fully satisfied with the selection. He is not the originator of the doctrine, but he will hold it against the world as long as his reason is satisfied with it. He does not change his opinions or give up his ideals and code of morality merely because other men have done so. He may follow other people, but only when his own mind is clearly and consciously in favour of following them. In whatever he does he never forgets his own personality.

The self-conscious man should not be identified with the selfish man, for he may be the most generous of men. His generosity, however, is not based on unconscious imitation of others, but has a firmer basis in his own conscious will. He will defend the rights of other people (if he so desires) as firmly as his own. He is conscious of his own rights, but is also conscious of his obligations to others. His peculiarity is that he stands on his own feet and recognises himself as a free agent with rights and responsibilities, and is not like a minor who lives under the visible or invisible tutelage of some one else.

Self-consciousness must also be distinguished from self-conceit. The self-conscious man does not think himself superior to other men. He only insists upon his own person to be recognised as an end in itself, not to be subordinated to other persons without his free consent. Self-consciousness may degenerate into self-conceit, but is easily distinguishable from it. Every conceited person is self-conscious, but every self-conscious man is not conceited. The self-conscious man merely insists upon his own rights to be recognised. The conceited man has an exaggerated notion of his

own rights and ignores the rights of others. Self-consciousness is perfectly compatible with humility.

Self-consciousness may be defined as the recognition of one's own personality and rights as ends in themselves. In other words, it is that state of the mind in which the person considers the satisfaction of his own desires and reason as a moral end. The presence of such men is highly beneficial to society. They are the steel framework of society. Without them society would be all flesh, no bones. They form the backbone of society. They determine its will and steel its purpose. They supply purpose to many aimless lives. For action, all moral purposes are transformed into personal desires, and the man who has the strongest notion of his own dignity and honour will fight best to secure moral and social ends. The man who is not conscious of his own dignity cannot be depended upon in perilous circumstances. His peculiarity is to yield and not to stand firm in face of danger.

As it is desirable for an individual to be conscious of his dignity and to maintain his individuality, so it is for a nation. A nation without an idea of her rights and without a sense of her dignity is a source of danger to humanity. Her weakness is a temptation for strong nations to interfere in her affairs, and interference leads to wars. As long as there is a single weak nation in the world there is little likelihood of permanent peace.

Nothing that has been said in praise of self-consciousness is intended to contradict the principle of subordination to authority. Obedience to authority is the principle which knits together the scattered

individuals of a nation. Self-consciousness and obedience are perfectly compatible. The self-conscious man renders willing obedience, because he is conscious of the importance to himself and to his nation of the cause for which obedience is demanded. He is obedient to maintain the dignity of his nation.

The idea of dignity naturally leads us to the question of 'how to preserve it.' It may look like a paradox, but is a fact that a man can preserve neither his life, nor his dignity without being prepared to lose them both when defending them. Self-preservation requires readiness for self-sacrifice. The man who runs away from the field of battle to save his life fails to maintain his honour and will probably lose his life. Courage is the most valuable moral quality for a self-conscious man. Without it self-consciousness is mere impudence.

Courage is the most universally loved quality. A brave man is respected and a coward looked down upon in every society. It has been variously defined: as 'fearlessness in respect of honourable death'*; as 'a disposition to face danger of any kind without shrinking'†; and as 'the control of a man's fears by his higher nature'‡; but the essential feature of courage seems to be the ability a man possesses to sacrifice in a struggle against hostile powers what is dear to him. Courage is not strength, for a strong man who beats a weak woman is never called brave. It is neither fearlessness, nor control of fear; for a man may be brave without being able to control his fears, and may

*The Ethics of Aristotle.

†The Methods of Ethics by H. Sidgwick.

‡The Moral Life by W. B. Sorley.

he a coward and run away from the field without showing any signs of fear. "It is said of the protestant king Henry of Navarre that his cheek blanched and limbs trembled at the opening of a battle; he was constitutionally a coward; but he led in the thickest of the fight: for he was brave of deliberate purpose, for the sake of honour and glory."§

It may be said of Falstaff that though a coward, he behaved most fearlessly in the field of battle. He flung himself on the ground and shammed dead when he met Douglas in the battlefield showing that he had not lost his presence of mind, which is the necessary result of fear. He carried the body of Hotspur on his back, threw it before Prince Harry and seriously claimed that he had killed Hotspur and demanded a reward for it. He went through the battle like a game, watching calmly, risking no thing and waiting for his opportunity.

Apart from these historical instances we find in our daily experience that a man unused to fighting but determined to defend his cause will show much agitation and fear in face of the enemy, but when the fight once begins he will prove himself a formidable antagonist. On the other hand a veteran fighter who is prepared to run no risks for his cause will calmly submit. He will show no fear, for he knows the nature and extent of his danger and knows how to avoid it. The control of fear is acquired by familiarity with danger and the knowledge of its exact nature. Even when the danger is real and escape is impossible, a wise and experienced man will submit to the inevitable

§The Moral Life by Sorley p. 52.

without perturbation of the mind. This however is not the same as making a voluntary sacrifice and therefore cannot be called courage. It is not necessary that a man who has got self-control may fight bravely for his cause. One may put up a brave appearance, but be a coward at heart. 'To face danger without shrinking' comes nearer to our definition if facing danger means readiness to run risks. There is no courage without the presence of risks and conscious or semi-conscious determination to sacrifice what one loves.

Some of the things which a man loves are his life, property and personal comfort; friends, relatives and nationality; religion, moral ideals and the good opinion of the society in which he lives. His love for these things is not equal. He loves some more than others. Different men have different inclinations. Some give the first place to honour and morality; some to property and personal comfort. Some care more for their own lives; some for the honour of their nation. A man sacrifices the less valuable for the sake of the more valuable. In spite of this he feels the pain of the sacrifice. He feels no pain only when he does not love the thing at all. When a man loses what he does not love he does not feel the loss. It is in reality no loss to him. The pain a man feels at the loss of a thing is in proportion to his love for it. The greater the love, the greater is the sacrifice; and the greater the courage required to make it.

When a man has made up his mind to sacrifice that which is likely to be imperilled in the struggle he

has no anxiety about the consequences. He has reconciled himself to the loss which he will probably suffer and has nothing more to lose. Danger loses its significance for him. He employs his whole power against his enemy, who may be a human being, an animal or the forces of nature. He may be weak constitutionally, but courage prevents the dissipation of his strength through fear and he appears a strong man in the combat. Thus courage makes a weak man strong and a strong man stronger. On the contrary the physically strong man who has not made up his mind to make the sacrifice involved in the struggle does not exert himself manfully. He avoids hurt and does not throw himself in the thick of the fight. He stands at a safe distance and throws stones at his enemy instead of grappling with him. It is not possible for a man to use his whole strength unless he is prepared to receive as well as give blows. Therefore cowardice makes a strong man weak and ineffective in a struggle.

The secret of the universal admiration for Courage is this. Every man admires greatness or superiority of whatever sort it may be. Superior power, knowledge or wealth are the envy of mankind. Every man loves to excel others. Slavery and inferiority are hated by all. Even the man who is admittedly another's inferior finds out some reasons of his own superiority to console himself. If he can establish his superiority on no other ground, the moral ground is always handy. Now courage is a quality which gives superior power to a man. It makes him the master of his enemy if

he succeeds; and helps him in escaping being enslaved if he is worsted in the struggle. If he cannot prove his own superiority, it enables him at least to defy his antagonist and deny his superiority. This is the reason why semi-barbarous warlike people are admired and respected by civilised nations and civilised but cowardly people are despised. The barbarian who has courage has a point of superiority over the civilised man without it. The barbarian has the capacity to be the civilised man's master. No doubt, the lion is called the noble beast and the learned parrot is despised.

It may be asked whether courage is a quality which is equally admirable in men and women. It may be argued that women are not expected to fight and therefore timidity is no sin in them. This would be true if courage meant strength and ferocity. A weak person may not be expected to be aggressive, but he cannot be excused from standing firm in self-defence. He may not be able to inflict losses on the enemy, but must be prepared to suffer losses himself in defending his honour or ideals. The courage required both in aggression and self-defence is of the same kind. The man who is prepared to lose does well both as an aggressor and a defender. The attitude of the brave man is like that of the gambler: either to win all or to lose all, either to live honourably a life of independence or not to live at all. It should not be inferred from this that the courage of a man is measured by his sufferings. What is required, is that he should stand firm in the struggle, for which the necessary condition is that he should be *prepared* to lose what he loves.

Very often the man who is prepared to lose everything suffers no loss and the one who is unwilling to lose, is the heaviest loser.

The courage of the passive resister is non-aggressive but is not fundamentally different from active courage. The difference lies only in the choice of the weapons with which he fights his enemy. The passive resister is conscious of his own weakness and is unable to use more powerful and effective weapons, and therefore defends his liberty by simply refusing to comply with the commands of his enemy. Or, he is unprepared to make the sacrifice which active resistance might entail and adopts passive resistance as a safer course. Or, he regards passive resistance as a more effective weapon in the long run and prefers it to active struggle. The words of Epictetus give a clear description of this kind of courage. "When the Tyrant says to any one; I will chain your leg: he who values his leg, cries for pity: while he who sets the value on his own will and choice says: If you imagine it for your interest chain it." Generally passive resistance requires less courage than active fighting, but sometime it may demand the biggest possible sacrifice and in that case may take an equal rank with active courage. In every case courage is to be measured by the sacrifice which a man is prepared to make for his cause.

We shall now consider a few well-known types of courage. The first is that which involves the sacrifice of one's life or the readiness to suffer bodily pain. This is the most valued type of courage. The

sacrifice of one's life is generally the most painful sacrifice, for it means parting with whatever a man possesses in this world. This kind of courage is typical of the soldier and the patriot. They consider the ideal for which they fight, of higher value than their lives and prefer death to a life of bondage. Without this preference—conscious or semi-conscious—no one can make the sacrifice.

The persons who can bear bodily pains easily find it less difficult to make the extreme sacrifice. The more a man loves the comforts of this life, the more difficult he finds it to bid farewell to them. Some wild people have so slight a regard for their life that they literally throw it away at the least provocation. It would be impossible for the bravest civilised man to rival these desperadoes in courage. There are so many ties (affections and ambitions) which bind him to this life that he will carefully weigh the advantages and disadvantages before he can make up his mind to give it up. His love for his ideal must be sufficiently strong to enable him to risk it. Sometimes people become so effeminate and their bodies are so unaccustomed to hardship that they may find that no ideal is strong enough to enable them to take bodily risks. This danger to civilised communities and men in sedentary occupations is very grave; a life of ease and luxury is always inimical to courage. Wild sports in which there is a taste of the real struggles of life must therefore be an essential part of every man's education. The grim struggle for superiority which is going on everywhere in the world requires so much of

bodily sacrifice, that no nation can ever hope to stand on its own feet if it does not possess this kind of courage. Even when all wars will have ceased and there will be universal peace in the world, this virtue will be in demand for the struggle against the forces of nature. The explorer who risks his life in trying to reach the poles or the summit of a high mountain exhibits as good courage as the soldier in the field.

Next to the sacrifice of life we shall consider the sacrifice of property. It comes under our definition of courage. In a struggle against hostile powers the sacrifice of property is as useful as that of life. Property is the support of life and the man who sacrifices his property indirectly sacrifices his life, viz., the sort of life he wishes to live. Property is a thing which men love and its sacrifice entails pain and suffering of the same sort as those arising from bodily injury. Some men love comfort so much, that they would rather not live at all, than live a life of pain. There are others in whose minds property is identified with the well-being of their children and dependents, and they find it easier to sacrifice their lives than their property, which means much more to them than life. Loss of life in defence of property is a thing of common occurrence. Suicide too after a great financial loss is not a rare thing. Many men would prefer death to the life of a beggar. Such is the love of human beings for property, and the virtue which enables them to part with it is not essentially different from bodily courage. They are in fact two varieties of the same quality.

Although bodily courage is generally more difficult to attain than the courage displayed with regard to property, every brave man is not necessarily bold in the use of money. As we have already said a man may be able to sacrifice his life but not his property. A brave soldier may be stingy in money matters, as a generous man may be a physical coward. At the outset one is inclined to think that the man who can sacrifice his life will be able to sacrifice his property with less difficulty; but every man does not place his life at the top of valuable things and we cannot infer from a man's courage in one sphere of life about his behaviour in another sphere.

This type of courage is useful to the patriot, for life and property are equally in demand for the service of the national cause. It is also required by the philosopher who in these civilised times has no fear for his life, but may have to live a life of poverty for his opinions. The man who conceals his opinions for fear of losing his income is justly called a coward, and the one who fearlessly speaks bitter truth is justly called brave. The cowardice of one and the bravery of the other mean nothing but the ability of the latter and the inability of the former to bear the loss. If a man is satisfied with the consequences he has nothing else to fear. To accept the painful consequences beforehand is the essence of bravery.

We have now to consider that kind of courage which consists in facing the disapproval and ridicule of the society in which a man lives and the good opinion of which he values. This is commonly the mildest penalty

a man may suffer for his actions, but it may result in pecuniary loss and bodily injury as well. Even without these ultimate consequences social disgrace itself sometimes assumes such a terrible form that many people, if they cannot leave the society, would prefer death to life. Disgrace of a milder type too is not easy to face. How many men for fear of it conceal their real convictions and act against them?

.. This type of courage is generally called moral courage. There is no reason for applying the word, moral exclusively to it. All types of courage may equally well be called moral. There is no difference between this and other kinds except in the object of sacrifice. The psychological condition from which all bold actions arise is the same in every case. This is not even the highest type of courage. The quality of courage always depends upon the value of the sacrifice. Although some men find it hard to face social disapproval, there are those who experience no heroic struggle in facing the evil, especially those who are prepared to leave the society. In many cases when a man loses the good opinion of one section of society, by the very act he wins the favour of another. Thus by balancing approval and disapproval he finds the task of offering opposition to society not so difficult as it may at first appear. But no man wantonly brings upon himself shame and disgrace and in every case the sacrifice is painful

Aristotle needlessly restricts the term 'courage' to physical courage 'for an honourable end.' He does not recognise the right of the

man who faces 'disgrace, poverty, disease, desolateness, and death (through natural causes)' to be called brave. He admits that his case is similar to that of the truly brave, but the truly brave is one "who is fearless in respect of honourable death and such sudden emergencies as threaten death; now such specially are those which arise in the course of war." This is taking too narrow a view of courage. We have already said that the sacrifice of wealth is indirectly the sacrifice of life. The same may be said of suffering disgrace. To lose respect is to lose a source of happiness in life, which is partial death. When we speak of life we do not mean only physical life. The wealth, the comforts, the honour, the position and the power which a man possesses are parts of his life. Even friends and relations are constituent elements in one's life. To lose any of these things will, in the long run, be a partial death. Some of them are regarded as even more valuable than life. Very often a brave man does not fear to lose his own life so much as to leave his wife and children unprotected and exposed to the insults and tyranny of the world. The application of the term 'courage' is very wide and we gain nothing by arbitrarily restricting it. It is in fact as wide as the objects of a man's desire and the things he values. Whenever a man voluntarily sacrifices something which has a real value for him, he exhibits true courage.

It is not even necessary that the end should be honourable. We cannot deny courage to bold raiders such as the Afridis and Mahsuds of the North-Western Frontier of India whose object is simply killing and

marauding. Whatever his motive may be, if a man sacrifices what is dear to him he deserves to be called brave. Courage is not necessarily a virtue of good men. The hooligan may possess it in a greater degree than an honest man of an immaculate character. The profligate who squanders his wealth for the gratification of his low desires displays courage in the use of money. It may be hoped that if he changes his objects of desire, he will exhibit an equal degree of generosity in a nobler cause. The desperado with the change of his motives may add virtue to his courage. Even moral courage is not the preserve of the virtuous. A brazen-faced sinner as well as a philosopher or a reformer may defy the opinion of society. The courage in both is the same; the difference lies in the objects for which it is used. Courage is found in different degrees in different men. It is found in the virtuous as well as the vicious. The bold man is bold in virtue and in vice alike. The timid person is timid in his piety as well as his sins.

Although in ordinary times a man's courage is a constant quantity, it is subject to great variations under special circumstances. Cowards become brave and brave men cowardly under the influence of certain psychological and social causes. When a man renounces something, he feels the pain which is natural to him when parting with an object of desire. However, the selection of the more valuable makes the renunciation of the less valuable, less painful. Therefore if some special object of desire gains in value immensely as compared with other things, renunciation of these becomes easier. When the love of religion or country becomes intense

and the man becomes what is generally called a fanatic, no power in the world can equal his courage. He regards this life as a trifle and the wealth of this world as dust, and is all absorbed in the glorification of the power he worships, whether it is real or imaginary.

He may have been a coward before, but when fired by the new enthusiasm he will fight like a lion. Such a man is a very dangerous enemy. The timidity of the Bengalees is well-known, but when these men accepted Syed Ahmed Bareilvi as the promised Mehdi and came to the North-Western Frontier to wage a holy war, their courage was admired even by the most critical among the hereditary Afridi fighters. The timid Bengalees at once became brave fighters. The miracle worked by religion may equally well be performed by patriotism or any other passion of high intensity. Success too has a very potent effect in making men brave. Success gives confidence and confidence, courage. When achievement appears more probable, sacrifice becomes easier. Defeat and failure on the contrary have the tendency to make brave men cowards. Having lost a good deal, they are unwilling to risk what is left. They would rather save what it is possible for them to save by meek submission than stake all on a lost cause. In place of confidence they get a conviction of their own powerlessness. Courage comes to be regarded as rashness and imprudence; and abject servility, as wisdom and cleverness under such conditions.

There is nothing which makes people so cowardly as oppression by a powerful enemy. It drives hope and confidence out of their souls, turns their thoughts from

deeds of honour and glory, and leads them to hug the miserable life which they are permitted to live. The most palpable example in India is that of the people of Kashmir whose cowardice is proverbial and who have been reduced to this pitiable condition by being subjected to foreign and unsympathetic rule for many centuries; but when they migrate to the Punjab and are settled here for some time, they rise with wonderful quickness to the level of courage found in this country.

The standard of courage obtaining in a society has a great influence on its individual members. Every man willingly makes the sacrifice necessary to secure for himself the good opinion of his society. Cowardice is a thing which is universally considered a disgrace. Therefore every man wants to keep up his reputation for courage. This social influence is often very powerful in the case of children and young men who quickly acquire the virtues and vices of their society. Young boys who have been taken from the Punjab in early age and brought up in Tirah are said to be in every respect as good fighters as the Afridis themselves.

Ignorance makes men timid or bold according to the occasion. If a man overestimates the strength of his enemy, he will not risk anything in a fruitless combat against him. If he does not know the secret of his enemy's strength or is ignorant of his weakness, he will behave like a coward. If he underestimates the strength of his enemy, he may show courage and overwhelm him by making the necessary sacrifice. If, however, the estimate is too low, the sacrifice may result in nothing. Knowledge, skill and physical

strength, though they are not to be identified with courage, ensure success and create the atmosphere in which courage is generated. They may be valued as the preliminary conditions of courage. Animal spirits and a sanguine temperament promote courage in the same way. Sometimes, however, a man who possesses superior skill or who is ignorant of the enemy's strength, makes a false show of courage; but when he is disillusioned about the power of the enemy, or when the power of the enemy increases unexpectedly, he behaves in a most cowardly fashion. There is no courage without sacrifice and unless the above named qualities create a desire for sacrifice by bringing the goal within reach they are of no service to courage. A man may possess superior strength or skill and may be flushed with success; but if he is not willing to run risks, he cannot be said to have courage. Mere constitutional ferocity and animal spirits, unless they lead to sacrifice, have no kinship with courage.

We have said before that when a special object of desire rises greatly in value as compared with other objects, sacrifice of the latter becomes easier, and the man is able to manifest the noblest form of courage. Similarly when some objects of desire greatly sink in value relatively with other objects, the sacrifice of the former becomes less painful. The man suddenly discovers courage and behaves like a bold man. This happens when a man has lost a greater part of what he valued highly, when his heart is broken and he has no more the old love for what remains. Things lose their value for him and he fights not for his own success but

to injure his enemy. He gives up all hopes of success for himself, and the only value of his life to him is that it may be used to destroy his enemy. He is in a state of desperation and exhibits the most terrible form of courage. He may be compared in his fury to a wounded lion. We have said before that failure sometimes makes men cowardly. However, if failure reaches the degree of desperation, it has the opposite effect. A wise despot therefore would never drive people into desperation. In order to kill their spirits most effectively he would always leave something with which they may console themselves. It appears possible, however, that a people may sink so low that even desperation may fail to rouse their spirits.

CHAPTER V

P E R S E V E R A N C E.

Go to the ant, thou sluggard; consider her ways, and be wise.

Old Testament.

“God said, let there be light : and there was light.” To create Heaven and Earth and all that is found in them with a word is the way of God, not of man. “In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread” is the lot of man. Poets and magicians have in all ages imagined easy short cuts for doing the business of this world, but the world is not the rose garden of their imagination. It is a grey and grim reality. It requires patient and fatiguing work. The labourer in the field is the true symbol of human life. Men are either labourers or beggars or thieves. There is no fourth class.

Man cannot build like God with a single stroke. He has patiently to lay brick upon brick and repeat the same dull process every day. It is doubtful if God himself could bear the dull monotony of human life. That man was created in the image of God, seems

to be one of the many ways in which man has flattered himself. Yet corresponding to every evil which he has to suffer in this life, there is a virtue, and one of the most useful virtues is perseverance.

To bear patiently and to be constant and steadfast in the struggle of life is the virtue of perseverance. It is not a heroic virtue like courage and does not appeal to the imagination of the poet. There is no exalted appellation for the man who possesses it. It is the virtue of the bee and the ant and not that of the lion. But in spite of its humble position, life would be impossible without it. What exists in the world as the distinct creation of man is the result of the patient labours of millions of unknown workers whose chief virtue was perseverance. The success of the man of genius too whose business is to discover and invent depends upon patient research, but when once a principle has been discovered, the work of applying it to practical use, rests entirely upon this virtue. The man of genius cannot build up civilisation. He can only invent and guide. The work of carrying out his plans is done by persons of a humbler rank. The mechanic who manufactures in millions the design invented by genius, the compiler who makes it possible for every man to know the truths discovered by rare intellects and the humble teacher who impresses them on young minds, all render valuable service to the cause of humanity and are the real builders of civilisation. It is not only the general who serves, but every soldier who does his duty patiently and perseveringly serves as well as

his superior. The man of genius is often too impatient for such work. When Faust asked Mephistopheles, if he himself could not brew the potion for restoring youth, and whether none but an old hag was so skilled as to be able to make it, he replied :—

“ Nor skill, nor lore suffice to brew

The draught. There must be patience too.

A tranquil spirit works on, whilst years still lengthen.

Time only can the delicate ferment strengthen.

The Devil showed them first the way,

And yet the Devil cannot do it.”

The work of genius too as we have said before owes not a little to perseverance. The lives of men of genius are lives of persistent and untiring labour. Every man is a slow drudge however high his position may be among his fellow men. It is only by piecing together little bits that he arrives at great conclusions. The sweep of his eye and the power of his arm are limited and it is only by persistent repetition that he succeeds in achieving anything. Genius alone cannot produce great results. Many men who could have done great things failed, because they lacked the humbler virtue of perseverance; while many men of average ability achieved great things by sheer industry.

In the ordinary walks of life so much depends upon persistent application that genius cannot compete with perseverance. If we carefully study the lives of men in the front rank in every profession, they will

generally be found to be men of average ability distinguished by great industry. In the learned professions, in trade and even in politics the man of industry generally outstrips the man of genius. The opportunity for the man of genius arises only when the situation is of special difficulty. Then is the need recognised for a man of genius to be at the head of affairs and he is often found in the lower ranks on such occasions. The ordinary business of the world can so well be done by an industrious man of average ability that people can hardly distinguish between him and a man of genius.

The life of an individual is much shorter than that of a nation. We measure the life of an individual by years and that of a nation by centuries. If success in the life of an individual cannot be achieved without perseverance, much more persistent work is required for building up a nation. If the performance of such a humble task as driving a nail requires repeated strokes, what amount of repetition would be necessary for heavier tasks ? "Repeat" is the great lesson of human life. Repetition is no doubt a dull business, but man is not born a hero and he has to make up by repetition what he lacks in power. In order to be able to act upon this precept one must learn to wait. Waiting, which means to hold one's desires in abeyance, is a kind of self-sacrifice. The processes of nature are essentially slow. The creation of the world, the evolution of the human race, the development of civilisation are extremely slow operations.

In a world where the law is slow growth, hurry is the enemy of success. Among things of distinctly human creation too such as great empires, great arts and great civilisations the development is slow. But 'slow' does not mean that the workers should be sleepy. What is required is that there should be no undue hurry, no attempt to outrun the laws of nature. The motto of the practical man is "slow and steady."

Time is a great builder and the man who ignores time, ignores the law of nature. Nations can be built and empires raised only after the patient work of centuries. "Too quick" often means too feeble. Napoleon who was quick like an earthquake failed, because he wanted to achieve too much within too short a time. The fall of the great German Empire too is due to the impatience of the German nation which wished to win supremacy too quickly. The man who is not satisfied with the laws of nature and the speed they allow him retards his progress instead of accelerating it. A quack or a saint alone can suggest easy nostrums, and promise quick and miraculous achievement. A conscientious man who knows the world can only advise slow, hard and patient work before success can be hoped for.

Every man, however changeable his mind, and fickle his temperament, has some degree of perseverance. There is no life without constant interests. The very fact that men form habits and have a uniform character throughout life shows that they have some permanent objects of desire which they constantly pursue. The mere repetition of an act makes it dear

to the doer. The very organs of the body obey the law of repetition. What a man does once, he wishes to do again. The love of one's native country and the love of friends owe much to constant association. So great is the love for old things that sometimes a man is disturbed by the idea of change and does not desire it. However, both these tendencies, *viz.*, the desire for change and the desire for old things have a real hold on the human mind and both contribute to human progress. One conquers new lands and the other consolidates what has been secured. A natural desire for repetition is exactly the thing required for a life under such conditions as man finds in this world. With his tiny arms he has to remove mountains from his way and with his tiny legs to traverse continents. The vastness of space and the tremendous power of the forces of nature would have annihilated man long ago if time had not come to his rescue. Time is the great saviour of man. Give him time and he will do anything. The man, who understands this secret of his power and has the patience to wait, knows the way to success.

Perseverance in action depends upon the durability of the desire from which action emanates. The durability of a man's passions and desires is easily separable from their intensity. Some men have such strong desires and overmastering passions that they are completely under their sway as long as the passion lasts. But their passions, desires and loves have no permanence. Their minds are like open space where winds blow in whatever direction they please. They

can neither curb and control their passions, nor renew and stabilize them. The opposite type is the man whose mind runs in the same course like the water of a stream. His desires may not be violent but they are constant. The man who has temperate and stable desires is more in harmony with his environments than the one whose mind is subject to stormy and short-lived passions. The world is large and the power of man is small. He who does his duty calmly and waits for his opportunity patiently without over-haste for results, has the best chance of success. The man who in a moment of passion wants to carry everything before him, but is soon tired and disgusted has no chance in this world.

If a nation had to choose between perseverance and courage, the choice of the former would be wiser in the long run. Perseverance would secure for it prosperity and material well-being and courage would enable it to maintain its liberty. But poverty and lack of material sap the very foundations of liberty, and no nation can hope to be free which cannot feed and arm its soldiers in time of war. In ancient times courage was all that was required of a nation in order to maintain its liberty. Since the industrial revolution in Europe a brave nation which lacks adequate material equipment has as little chance of survival as its cowardly neighbours. Material equipment requires long, persistent and systematic work and their courage will not avail to a people who are not capable of it. In ancient times the soldier was the defender of his country. In modern times the worker

in the factory is no less important than the soldier. Science has raised the humble worker, to the rank of the proud soldier who was the idol of the ancient times. It has not only ennobled the worker ; but has enhanced the value of perseverance, his characteristic virtue.

CHAPTER VI

THRIFT.

Live on what you have; live if you can on less; do not borrow either for vanity or pleasure; the vanity will end in shame and the pleasure in regret.

Johnson to Boswell.

Another humble virtue like perseverance is thrift. It requires that a man should carefully measure his resources and so adjust his expenditure to his income that he may be able to provide for future want or increase his resources with the ultimate object of increasing his own or other men's happiness. The income of a man is not always in proportion to what he requires at the time to satisfy his needs. Sometimes he gets more; sometimes, less. There are well-known periods in the life of a man when he has little or no income and when his wants are great. These are times of illness, unemployment and old age. Besides this he has the responsibility of providing for his children and other needy persons who may lie within his sphere of benevo-

lence. Thus the earning time of a man's life is much shorter than the time of consumption. His income is irregular and expenditure, constant. From this arises the need of saving from the plenty of good years to meet the scarcity of bad years. Persons who have fixed incomes or who are owners of large estates stand equally in need of practising this virtue. There are good and bad years in their case too. Times of health alternate with times of illness, when the drain on their resources must needs be greater. The object of thrift is to manage the income in such a way as to establish a parity between income and expenditure extending over a long period. The length of this period varies with the ideals of different persons. Some men are satisfied if they can pass their own lives comfortably and provide for the education of their children. Some are not content till they have provided a comfortable living for ten generations or more. The needs of men too vary. They also grow with the growth of the power to satisfy them. No minimum of comfort can be fixed which may be acceptable to all. What thrift requires is that a man should so husband his resources that at no period of his life he should have to starve his body or mind, which he could have avoided by a more careful use of his wealth.

The question how much a man should spend and how much he should save, requires further elucidation. The desires, ambitions and expectations of men differ so greatly that it is not possible to fix a common standard of living for all. What is thrift for one man, is extravagance for another. Every man has to estimate his

own resources and to fix a standard for himself which may allow him to live a comfortable life. What he should aim at, is never to be in want. He should never have to beg directly or indirectly from others. If a man is over-sanguine about his future, he will leave less for the future and may have to pass a less comfortable life in old age than he is in the habit of doing. If he is less hopeful, or is too much afraid of misfortune, he may be inclined to live a miserable life in order to provide for the misfortunes which may never come. A more just estimate of the future would allow a man to live an equally comfortable and happy life in the present as well as the future. This would be the ideal distribution of a man's wealth over the years of his life. Generally a man requires more comforts in old age than when he is young. He may therefore be justified in living a simple life when he is young in order to provide for the needs of old age. A young man on the other hand requires more means to satisfy his desire for knowledge, amusement and adventure than an old man. If he sacrifices these to provide for the comforts of old age, he sacrifices the best part of his life. The old man too who has a miserable life to look back to, although all his present needs are satisfied, is not very happy. He has a poor notion of life. Life is nothing without its knowledge, enjoyments and adventures and the man who sacrifices these for the tottering misery of old age, when the capacity for every enjoyment is diminished, if not extinguished, sacrifices life in order to provide for death. An ideal distribution of a man's wealth would

be that which provided for the development of every faculty and the satisfaction of every desire at every stage of his life. To starve the present in order to pamper the future is as bad economy as to leave the future unprovided for. The only difference is that in one a man has misery without anxiety and in the other anxiety as well as misery. The evil of anxiety is not so great as that of stunting the growth of one's life. Very often the old age of a man is brightened by the reflected light of his young and vigorous days and he requires no more for his happiness than the provision of a few simple bodily comforts.

Miserliness does not come under our definition of thrift. Even miscalculated thrift is not miserliness. The object of thrift is the more equable distribution of the means of happiness throughout a man's life. A miser has no object in hoarding wealth except to enjoy its existence (if there is any enjoyment to be found in its mere presence) and to have the satisfaction of being known as a wealthy man. All the other advantages which accrue from wealth require it to be spent. The miser does not make use of his wealth, but loves it for its own sake. In common parlance a man whose living is much below his station in life is called a miser. But if he devotes his savings to charity or some other useful purpose, he does not deserve the opprobrious epithet of miser. Saving money is a common feature of thrift and miserliness. The difference comes in with the object for which it is saved. The object of thrift is to make life richer and happier. The object of a miser is to amass wealth and impoverish life. The miser and the

prodigal both agree in not deriving full benefit from their wealth. One lets it lie idle with no intention of using it, and the other throws it away. It is not necessary that a man should be a perfect miser in order to be classed as such. Any man who does not derive full benefit from his wealth which it is capable of yielding and hoards it simply that it may increase, with no ulterior object, is a miser. In this way many enormously rich men who live a luxurious life on a fraction of their income, but let the rest lie idle, would be classed as misers. The miser does not necessarily dress in rags. He may as often be found in a silk gown boasting of his extravagance.

One thing every man is bound to do, whatever his income or resources and that is to avoid waste. This economy becomes incumbent upon every man on comparing the needs of the whole human race with the total resources of the world. The existence of famines and the abject poverty of the great majority of men furnish a conclusive proof of the fact that the supply of useful commodities in the world is short of the demand. A rich man can afford to waste, if he considers his own needs only, but widening his outlook he ought not to throw away anything which can satisfy the hunger or cover the back of a poor man. In a communist society where the state will guarantee to every man the supply of his needs and where no man will be able to make any use of a surplus which he puts aside, there will not be much room for individuals to exercise this virtue, in their own interests, but it will always be employed in managing the affairs of the community and

the state. The foundations of this virtue are deeply laid in the shortness of the world supplies and as the population of the world will increase, men will have to be more and more careful in the management, distribution and use of their resources.

Since the Industrial Revolution in Europe, although the resources of mankind have immensely increased, thrift has gained in importance from another cause. When a community has little wealth the difference between thrifty and unthrifty persons is not so marked as when the community is rich. In a poor country people cannot very much realize the advantages of economy. But in a wealthy community where there is so much wealth to be distributed among the individuals and where the thrifty person gains such a great advantage over his unthrifty neighbour in power, position and happiness, no one can fail to recognise the value and power of this virtue. Whatever the condition of human society is, whether a country is rich or poor, whether the distribution of wealth is equal or unequal, thrift will never cease to be a valuable quality. It would cease to be a virtue only when the supply of the necessities of life is as abundant as that of the air.

Nations and governments have greater need of carefully balancing their income and expenditure and of retrenching their less useful expenses to provide for more useful purposes. The extravagance of a man is confined to himself or his family, but the extravagance of a government affects every member of the community. An indigent person may be helped out of his misery by his well-to-do neighbour, but the burden of

national poverty is so great that the richest nation in the world cannot maintain a poor nation on charity for any length of time. A nation cannot be fed except by its own exertions. The spirit of international charity is not only less strong but also less effective. No more than temporary relief can be expected from another nation. A nation has ultimately to depend upon itself in a much more strict sense than is known among individuals.

The man who lives beyond his means and has to beg or borrow from another, cannot for long maintain his independence. Wealth not only leads to happiness but to power ; and poverty not only to misery but to dependence. The poor man has to sell his time, body and mind in order to earn his living. However brave he may be, he has to cringe before his cowardly creditor whom he despises in his heart of hearts. Liberty of thought and action is so important for the proper development of a human being that nothing should be done to jeopardize it. In mental servility the powers of the mind are starved and its growth is stunted. The mildest form of slavery is that in which a man sells his time for wages. He retains the independence of his thought and action and sells only a portion of his time. But when he does six or eight hours' work for others, he has hardly any energy left to do anything for himself. It is not possible for every man to be the master of his time; but if he can gain economic independence by thrift, he should not waste the opportunity. This is specially important for those who care to develop their minds in their

own way.

Thrift is not only necessary for the free development of one's own powers, but more so for doing good to others. Good intentions are of no use in the real world if a man has not the power to carry them out. The more power a good man has, the more good he can do to others. It is therefore highly important for a liberal and generous man to use care and thrift in the management of his wealth. The man who wastes his money on undeserving persons is powerless to help the deserving and one who lavishly spends on every occasion, has nothing to give on the right occasion. It is generally the thrifty who are liberal and the extravagant who are stingy in a worthy cause. The thrift of a generous man is only the preparation for being liberal.

As we have said in the beginning thrift is a humble virtue. When a man denies a desire or saves an expense, he has to curb his pride and confess his littleness. He recognises that his means are limited and his position is humble. For this reason many noble and generous men find it difficult to be thrifty. Thrift is a check on their generosity. But a generosity without control defeats its own end and thrift in the long run proves an indispensable helper to it. Extravagance is often the result of vanity. The person whose ambition is to excel others in dress, furniture or the general display of wealth will not think of his means when satisfying the whim of the moment. The consequences may be bitter, but he is for the time being under the complete control of the passion and does not

care for the coming misery. His object is to make a good show. When this show is over and the man is ruined, a bright moment of foolish joy is followed by a long and gloomy night of want and repentance. The desire to excel others is a legitimate passion, but it is sometimes carried to such an extent that it defeats its own end and results in disgrace and humiliation. Thrift in the long run allows a man greater power to satisfy his pride than extravagance. In a civilised society where the evil consequences of prodigality are commonly known, the prodigal is despised instead of being admired. Even those to win whose praise is his object and those who live on his bounty, pity him and thank their own cleverness instead of his generosity for the benefits they receive from him. The prodigal fails in securing even his immediate end.

CHAPTER VII.

PRACTICAL WISDOM.

Hast thou reason? I have. Why then makest thou not use of it? For if thy reason do her part, what more canst thou require?

Marcus Aurelius.

Wisdom when considered as a moral quality does not mean deep insight into the laws of nature. The man of genius who is familiar with the most recondite truths depends entirely on a keen intellect and an ardent love of his subject for the profound knowledge he possesses. Practical wisdom is a more complex quality. It combines the keenness of the intellect with a control over the irrational passions. Genius is a quality of the intellect. Wisdom is the ability to know the best means for the attainment of an end and the will to put them into practice. The wise man is not necessarily a man of genius, nor is the man of genius always wise in the practical affairs of the world. The man of genius may know the best method of attaining his end, but his passions may be so strong that he may be led by them to act against his reason. The wise man may on the other hand possess an average intellect, but

having tamed his passions, he will always act according to his reason. Thus a man with a keener intellect may act foolishly and one with an average intellect may act wisely.

The disparity which exists between theoretical and practical wisdom is based on a deep fact of human nature. The desires of a man are not regulated by what it is possible for him to get in the real world. The desire soars higher than reality. Things which cannot exist together in the real world are often found closely connected in the human mind. The objective world has an independent existence and is not subject to man's will. Man can only conquer it by submitting to its authority and obeying its laws. He cannot command nature, but can use it for his own purposes by watching it patiently and providing facilities for it to pursue its own course. What a man of strong passions, however, wants is to make nature his slave, so that it may leave its own laws and follow the dictates of his will. Such a man acts in defiance of the laws of nature. He may know the consequences of defying nature, but like an ignorant warrior he rushes sword in hand against the firing line. He wants to subdue nature by his will when it can only be subdued by reason.

The things which obscure or extinguish the light of reason are the human passions. There are many ways in which they operate on the human mind. Sometimes a man is so much under the influence of his desires that he gets no time to think. Action follows the desires without stopping to think of the

suitability of the means which are often the most primitive and inadequate. When he meets with ill success he curses his luck and repents of his folly. On a retrospective view he discovers his mistakes which he could not perceive when under the influence of his passions. His folly is thus due to overwhelming passions and not to a defective intellect.

Another way in which a man is misled by his passions is when he loses sight of his real end, being allured by a more immediate object of desire. If the ends are such that to take the one is to lose the other and one of them is more valuable than the other, reason would bid him to go for the more valuable one. If he gives up the more valuable end for the sake of the less valuable, he defeats his own purpose and gives a death blow to the plans of his life. The more immediate objects of desire often exercise a more powerful influence on a man's actions than the remoter ends. This is the occasion for self-control and self-denial. If a man wants to live a happy and contented life, he must sacrifice the lower self for the sake of the higher self. If he does not do this, he will be the victim of his own accusations and his mind will be tormented by the thought of having neglected his opportunities. The profligate who prefers the pleasure of the moment to the happiness of his whole life is an example of the unwise man. He loses a pound to get a penny. Probably his reason is clear, but his passions make him believe that the evil consequences of his actions will not follow. He half believes that nature will have a special regard for him

and will break its own laws to make him happy. When the time comes, he is disillusioned and finds that nature is no favourer of persons.

Sometimes the desires of a man are so many that it is impossible to satisfy them all with his limited energy and within the limited time allotted to him in this life. A wise man should form a correct estimate of his own powers and possibilities and recognise his limitations. He who aims at getting too many things may lose all. Sometimes the desires which try to take possession of a man's mind are in conflict with one another and he is unable to decide which to admit and which to reject. The result of this conflict is either inaction or ill considered action, both of which are injurious for the ultimate end for which he tries. Equally injurious is it to make the aim too high. The desire naturally soars high. Every man aims at the highest human achievement and considers himself equal to the best among his fellow beings. He thinks himself fit for every position and worthy of every honour. The stronger a man's desires, the greater is the self-deception. The wise man who watches the results of his endeavours carefully and judges his powers impartially is sooner disillusioned than others. The sooner a man is disillusioned, the better is it for him. By moderating his aims and making his methods more rational he approaches nearer his goal than otherwise.

The ambitious man and the man who has fallen from a high state to a low position find it most difficult to act in the light of reason. The one lives in the future and

the other in the past. Both fail to see their real position in the present time. The one is like the man who has never ridden a horse, imagines himself to be riding one and goes to the race course to run a race. The other is like the man who has fallen from his horse, lies on the road and refuses to move imagining himself to be still riding. Proud and once successful nations let centuries pass without adapting themselves to the changed circumstances. The shock of falling from a high position is tremendous and if it does not drive a man mad, it makes him irrational. To begin anew after reaching the goal and to follow those whom one was in the habit of leading, is an experience far from pleasant. A man prefers not to compete at all to competing with those from whom he had once won the race. Yet compete he must, whether he will or no, as long as he lives, and it is better to make the best use of the little that is left than to give up all when the greater part is lost.

The cases we have considered above are instances of reason being overpowered by irrational desires. Noble aims and enthusiasm for high moral ends sometimes also persuade a man to defy the dictates of reason. Patriots who struggle for the liberty of a nation, religious enthusiasts who endeavour for the salvation of the world or for the preservation of their religion and philanthropists who work for the good of mankind at large sometimes think that their end is all that they should care for, and if they do not totally neglect the means, they do not at the same time bestow the same care on their selection as a man of the

world does for his worldly ends. The indifference to the means is the result of the belief that the truth must prevail and the just must win in the long run. The belief is not supported by facts. We find in the experimental sciences that if the method is wrong; the result never follows whatever be the aim of the experimenter, whether to benefit mankind or to injure it, whether to support the just side or the unjust one, whether to enlighten men or to deceive them. Human life is subject to no less rigid laws than the physical sciences. Correctness of the method is as much necessary in one as in the other to ensure results. Nature does not work to secure the moral ends of man. It is man who by a skilful use of the laws of nature secures his ends. The just do not always win and the truth does not always prevail. No doubt, justice and truth have an attraction for the human mind, but selfishness and prejudice too are forces which can keep it under their control if not successfully counteracted by the former. Whole nations have been destroyed or reduced to a state of subjection for thousands of years by their more powerful assailants and so long as the means employed were not adequate and effective, no nation was able to secure justice for itself. Error and ignorance too prevail for thousands of years and show no signs of mitigation until proper means are adopted for their removal.

A careful study of method is thus an important condition for success in life. If method is an indispensable condition for success in the arts and sciences, it surpasses one's understanding why it should not be

so in the art of arts, viz., the art of living. If a man wants to build a ship, he does not expect, after placing a few logs of wood together, that they will shape themselves into a ship and also attract the materials necessary for its completion. He prepares a plan of it in which every detail is carefully considered, collects the best materials and employs the best workmen to build it according to the latest methods. Yet in many spheres of human life it is considered enough to make a beginning and to leave the rest to fate. Providence, it is considered, will take cognizance of their noble intention and crown their ill directed efforts with success. They think their only duty is to fill their souls with enthusiasm and to struggle violently and it is the business of Providence to make their efforts fruitful.

This belief is against human experience, which teaches us to make thorough preparation, to provide for every emergency and to leave nothing to chance. The reason why it still lingers in the minds of men, is that the art of life is much more complex than the smaller arts and depends for its successful working on many factors which are not completely under the control of man and therefore cannot be calculated beforehand. This element of uncertainty makes some men think that every thing depends upon chance and that no method is of any use in managing the affairs of life. The greatest uncertainty in human life is about life itself. No man can say whether he will live to reap the fruits of his labour. Then there are rain, snow, changes in the

weather, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, storms and epidemics, forces which are yet uncontrollable by man and on which his life and happiness so greatly depend. Besides these, man himself is an incalculable factor and it is upon the quality of men with whom one has to deal that the prosperity of an individual or a nation depends. Because there are certain forces which cannot be controlled by man, it does not follow that those which can be managed by him should also be neglected. Because it is not within the power of the farmer to have rain whenever he wants it, it does not follow that he should also neglect to plough the field. He who makes the best preparation for the rain will get the greatest advantage from it, when it comes. He who goes out to catch fish may make a big or a small catch according to the circumstances, but he who does not stir from home will catch nothing. As knowledge advances and man gets a greater control over the forces of nature, most of the uncertain factors in life will gradually disappear and less will depend upon chance than it does now. Many spheres of human activity which used to be the special provinces of fate, have become subject to calculation and science. Yet it cannot be predicted that the element of chance will at some definite time totally disappear from life.

It is sometimes said that fortune favours fools. It is true that a dull man may get better opportunities than a clever person and may be better off than he in life, but the clever man is sure to make a better use of his opportunities (if he acts wisely) than the fool. The incalculable forces of nature or society on which partly depends

the fortune of a man, show preference neither to a fool nor a wise man. They shower their favours indiscriminately on the wise man and the fool, the good man and the evil-doer. The fool whom fortune is said to favour may not always be a fool and may be so called only through the envy of his rivals. The saying itself savours of envy. Again, a fool may be wise in the conduct of his life, while a clever man may in practical life be a fool. The clever man who acts foolishly has no right to complain against fortune. For all men whether they are favoured by fortune or not, the best course in life is to act in the light of reason. It is said that the instinct is in certain cases on the whole a safer guide than prudential calculation. If it is so, it would mean that unconscious knowledge is sometimes more correct than conscious knowledge. A man may know the right method of doing a thing without knowing why it is right. If after a careful examination the consequences of such impulsive action prove to be favourable, it may be justified and a rational system may possibly be evolved by analysing the situation. But where the impulse leads against clear reason and the consequences of the action are known by previous experience to be harmful, it would be highly unwise to follow the instinct.

The supremacy of reason is confined to the selection of means for an end. When the question of selecting the end arises, the desire or the natural inclination becomes the final judge. The decision rests on what a man loves to do. No argument can be given in favour of one end or the other, unless the

ends themselves become subordinate to a remoter end, in which case they become means towards the chief end. One man regards knowledge as the highest aim of his life. Another gives that position to philanthropy. Another, to the perfection of some art. It cannot be said that one is wiser than the other, unless there is a higher aim above these. For instance, if their higher aim is to amass wealth or win fame, the values of these three may be compared as more or less effective means to secure the end. Reason cannot make a man like or dislike a thing. His inclinations are not under its control. It can bid him deny a desire only for the sake of satisfying another desire.

CHAPTER VIII

HOPE.

Hope, like the glimmering taper's light,
Adorns and cheers the way,
And still as darker grows the night,
Emits a brighter ray.

Goldsmith.

Hope is the source of all human activity. Man always works in order to gain some end. If there is no external end, the desire to gain proficiency in the work itself is always present. A man begins to work only when he has the hope of success. It is hope again which sustains him through his exertions. When the hope dies, he gives up the attempt. Thus, without hope there can be no work, no progress and no life. The man who has no hope of completing his work or reaping the fruits of his labour will not work at all. The army which has no hope of victory will not fight. Hope keeps men and nations active, vigilant, and happy. Despair makes them idle, sad and indifferent. Hope leads to work and work to success. Hope is the cause of success, but is also born out of it. When a man attempts something and succeeds in it, he becomes more hopeful. Next time he works with greater

assurance. Those who succeed easily become self-confident. Those whose success has cost them no pains are often over-sanguine and sometimes impudent. As success leads to hope, failure leads to despair. The man who fails once begins to doubt his ability. Next time he believes that the circumstances and Providence are against him. One's hope must be very strong to survive repeated failures. The moral effect of success and failure on nations is even more marked. The power of a nation before it is tried is a totally indeterminate quantity. It bears no proportion to the number of men composing it, but depends almost entirely on their moral quality. If a nation is successful in any field of action, the spirits of its people rise and they do deeds which excite the wonder of the rest of the world. If it fails, the people are dejected and fail to achieve what would have been well within their power under different circumstances. Defeat in the battlefield has a very lasting effect. A nation may not recover from the dejection and despair it suffers in losing a war for decades and even centuries. And a war of retaliation may be necessary if for no other reason than simply to regain the lost confidence in its power.

Leaders of great religious, social and political movements have generally been distinguished by a strong conviction in the final success of their cause. They excel other men not so much in intellectual powers and knowledge as in the intensity of their love for the cause and a strong faith in their success. There were men even among their contemporaries who

possessed keener intellects and had a more profound knowledge of things, but they did not become leaders, for they lacked the fire of enthusiasm and the firm faith which are necessary for leadership. Reason can show the way, but it cannot make men go. The thing which sets a movement going is hope. To create a living hope in the dead and despondent minds of men is the most important work of leadership. It may be compared to restoring the dead to life. Its advantages are surely greater than those of physical resuscitation. No one wants a decrepit and feeble-eyed old man who has long lost his powers of work and enjoyment to come back into the world in order to add to the misery of mankind. Nor is the earth wide enough to support an unlimited number of human beings, which would be the case if Death could be banished from the world and procreation was to continue. But if any one could drive away despair from the souls of a people and fill them with new hope, he would work a most beneficial miracle.

Hope and despair are both very highly infectious conditions of the mind. When among cheerful and optimistic companions, a man is full of hope and bright ideas about his future, while in a pessimistic company his mind is tormented by the most dismal and baseless presentiments. The two states of the mind are not under the control of reason. A man is cheerful or sullen often without reason for being so. Sometimes reason bids a man to be cheerful, but his mind is surrounded by such a thick gloom that no ray of light can enter it, although all the time he recognises that he

has reason to be more happy than he is. The tone of the mind depends upon the manner and the special circumstances under which a certain aspect of life is impressed upon it. The impression is sometimes wrong, but too deep to be easily removed. Some men are habitually cheerful, some sulky. The condition of their minds depends more on the way they look at the good or evil circumstances than the inner nature of the circumstances themselves. The same mishap will be felt by two men of different temperaments differently. The cheerful man minimizes the evils of life and exaggerates its comforts, and waits joyfully for what is to come. He makes the most profitable use of his circumstances and succeeds in making his life better than it is. The melancholic person, on the contrary, exaggerates the evils of his existence, spoils his opportunities and makes life worse than it is.

In all religions faith ranks highest among virtues. The intellect does not count as a qualification for sanctity. Except a man become as a little child "he shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven". The sceptic is not favoured in any religion. The clever man occupies an inferior place as compared with the faithful. The reason seems to be that a religion is more like a political party with a definite programme than a school of philosophy. The success of the party depends upon faithful adherents who are attached to the cause and do not lose heart in the struggle, and not on clever reasoners who "at any moment may be dissatisfied with the doctrines and may want to change them to suit new requirements." If the formulas of

belief are unsettled by constant criticism and the truth of the faith is questioned by its followers, the religion will lose its political power. The intellect rules supreme in a school of philosophy where the object is the continual refinement of the formulas. Here, the clever man is the saint. Faith does not count as a virtue in philosophy. The object of philosophy is to discover the truth. The object of religion is to defend the truth which is already known. Therefore what is a virtue in religion is a vice in philosophy and *vice versa*. Persecution turns a philosophy into religion and liberty of conscience may reconvert a religion into philosophy. Whatever may be the position of faith in religions of the future, it will always remain the supreme virtue of practical life. Faith means attachment to a cause and hope in its success. Whenever in the sphere of human action, the issues are doubtful and reason fails to guide, men can work in the light of faith alone.

There is always a degree of uncertainty attached to the results of human activity. No one can penetrate into the future, which is like a sealed book in the hands of fate. The practical life of man is surrounded by a dark atmosphere of doubt and ignorance which only lifts up a little to make way for the forward going humanity but does not open out sufficiently to allow them to have a view of the road on which they are going. No one can see beyond the toes of his shoes. It is pitch dark ahead and hazy behind, and between the two darknesses goes man with the flickering light of his reason. He cannot see anything ahead of him, but he can form

a picture of what is to come on the analogy of what has gone before. As the future is not an exact copy of the past, but resembles it only in broad outlines, there is room for imagination to paint it bright or dark. Where the analogy is complete and reason can predict the future with a degree of probability close to certainty, imagination has nothing to do. But where the probabilities are equal and reason is powerless to select any one possible course as more likely, imagination is the all-powerful master. If a man imagines the future and the unknown as favourable to him, he is under the influence of hope. If he imagines the unknown to be unfavourable, he is a prey to despair. Hope does not contradict reason, but works where reason fails to operate. The importance of hope arises from the large number of situations in our daily life in which reason is powerless. Whether a man will live or die, whether he will be successful in his undertakings, whether the forces of nature will be favourable or unfavourable, are all beyond the range of certain knowledge. All human life is surrounded by uncertainty and where there is uncertainty, there is place for hope. The farmer cannot till the field or sow the seed without hope. The builder, the tradesman, the craftsman, the scholar, the priest, the statesman and the general, every one of them is actuated by hope. Hope gives gaiety and cheerfulness to the lives of the old and the young, of men and women, of the rich and the poor alike. It is the light which guides man when he has no other guide and which solaces him when he is comfortless. It is the corner stone of all religions and the foundation of all success.

Yet great as are the blessings of hope, it becomes a curse for idle and careless people who take shelter with it in order to evade the operation of well-known laws of nature. The man who hopes against reason is like one who closes his eyes in broad daylight and instead of observing the surrounding objects dreams what they are like. The man who always hopes for the best and does not listen to the warnings of reason closes his eyes to reality and makes no preparation to meet the situation. In such cases hope becomes an ally of idleness. It keeps men contented with their inactivity and makes them believe that they will attain success without the necessary exertion. To preach optimism to such people is to protract their disease. The correct remedy for such dreamers is to shatter their hopes in the light of reason and to teach them soberness and moderation in their aspirations. They have wandered from the path of reality and must be brought back to it if they are to be saved from further degeneration. There is nothing more wholesome for a man or a nation than to know the reality. It is good for none to live in a fool's paradise. Every one ought to know accurately his own power and shortcomings, the possibilities and impossibilities of his life. He should never aim at what reason clearly tells him is not for him. The impossible and the undreamt of may sometimes happen, but it is not wise to aim at it. Hope is used by the idle as wine is used by a drunkard to drive out melancholy. The timely soothing only serves to aggravate the evil.