CHAPTER IV

PROMOTION OF PATRIOTISM

Before discussing Hardekar Manjappa's approach to patriotism, it is necessary to analyse the concept of 'patriotism' itself.

1. PATRIOTISM: ITS MEANING:

The word 'patriotism' cannot be defined precisely, and there are vague and varying ideas as to the psychological springs, historical origins and characteristic manifestations of the sentiment of patriotism. All may agree that patriotism is love of one's own "Country". But there is little agreement among equally intelligent and public spirited men as to what is meant by one's country, who one's fellow countrymen are, what services one owes them and what sort of social conduct follows naturally from the patriotic attitude...... Whatever its values, patriotism in some form appears to be a universal
attribute of man in society.  

As the term is more generally used, in historical writings as well as in controversial and propagandist discussions, patriotism means devotion to a political community. Patriotism it is said, attains its most characteristic development only in a society where the state exists in its fully developed form and civic bonds and duties have come to be recognized explicitly and rated supreme among the social loyalties of man. This sort of patriotism reached a high point in the Greek city-states and the Roman empire state but disappeared or came to be very much in abeyance during the Middle Ages. In the latter period, the dominant group loyalties were not territorial or political; they were narrow or wider than patriotism, feudal, ecclesiastical, vocational, municipal. Local loyalties superseded loyalty to the state .... Political patriotism emerged, or re-emerged, only with the rise of the modern nation state, in which the political is definitely differentiated from other

social loyalties, and in the nation-state it first reached its perfect form. English patriotism began in the thirteenth century, and Edward-I was the first "patriot king" of England. French patriotism began early in the fourteenth century, when Philip the Fair set the loyalty to the French against loyalty to the Pope, it displayed its power in the expulsion of the English in the fifteenth century; and it attained its characteristic phase in the sixteenth century with the break up of Catholic unity and the great political achievements of Francis-I. In the immediately subsequent centuries patriotism came to be associated with nationalism; a politically consolidated people rather than a monarch, dynasty or government now constituted the ultimate object of political loyalty, and patriotic wars could be fought on behalf of popular or national interests and rights against an existing governmental regime.² Thus in all its manifestations patriotism appears as a force of cohesion, uniting different individuals, whatever their real motives, in devotion to a single group regarded as supremely important to the safety and welfare of each.

². Ibid, p.27.
Coming to India, it is, nevertheless, true that India could not evolve patriotism or a national consciousness, according to the Western nations, in the period before the British rule. Among the most important results of British rule in India were the emergence of an Indian nationality and the growth of a spirit of nationalism so strong that it led inevitably to independence. Before the modern period, that sense of separateness and solidarity which is the only criterion of nationality did not exist, nor were there present all the elements from which it might have been built. Diversities of race and language had encouraged the existence of large numbers of separate and hostile states; religion, since the Muslim invasions, had been a dividing factor and the cultural unity formerly provided by Hinduism had been destroyed; social traditions were enshrined in the caste system, which was a strong stabilising element but was nevertheless too narrow to lead to the growth of nationality; while that 'identity of political antecedents', which Mill regarded as the most important basis of nationality, was wholly lacking.
In the 19th century two new factors began to weld the people of India together. The first was the relentless pressure of a uniform system of law and administration which, by imposing on the Bengali, the Madrasi and the Punjabi a uniform code of behaviour in certain important matters, gave them in the process a common substratum of thought. This process was made easier by the vast network of roads and railways, by which the towns of India were linked under the rule of the British Crown. 3

The second important factor was the decision, in 1835, to provide English rather than vernacular education. From that time onwards, the best brains of India drank deeply at the wellsprings of British liberal thought. They learned from Edmund Burke and John Stuart Mill the meaning of 'Liberty'. 4 Thus their political consciousness was aroused and they soon began to apply their newly acquired ideas of rights of


4. Ibid, p. 54.
individuals and of the peoples to their own country. The development of national consciousness was greatly stimulated by the growth of an active and independent press, both in English and in the vernacular.

When Curzon partitioned Bengal in 1905, it had much to commend to it on logical grounds, but Bengali Hindus regarded it, perhaps without justification, as a deliberate attempt to destroy their influence and so weaken the nationalist movement of which they then considered themselves the leaders. The emotional Bengali temperament was easily influenced by the extremist propaganda to which certain sections of the press lent themselves without restraint. Extremist leaders like Lala Lajpat Rai, Bal Gangadhar Tilak and Bipin Chandra Pal opined that the division of Bengal should be considered as a national issue. They thought that it was a national calamity. The whole country opposed this particular measure of British rule. In Karnataka too, some leaders criticised the Government Policy. Shri Hardekar Manjappa of Banavasi was one of them. He came under the influence of the Nationalist

5. Ibid., p.58
movement and produced patriotic literature. Under the auspices of 'Rashtra Jeevana Granthamale' he wrote a book in 1921, entitled Bhāratīya Deshabhakti wherein he advocated the promotion of patriotism among the people of India. He wrote about this book in his autobiography as follows: It is altogether a new kind of book in the Kannada language. I had to read a large number of books before writing it. I expounded and defended all my political and social views in it. I consider it to be, of all my books, the one embodying high research work. The author has analysed in this thought-provoking book the principles of patriotism which generally move the people to patriotic endeavour. After examining the validity of the basic principles of patriotism, he has attempted in this book to find out the causes for lack of patriotism among the Indians in the past. Manjappa is of the opinion that Indians attached greater importance to religion rather than nation. Further,

6. Manjappa started this "Rashtra Jeevana Granthamale" in the year 1921, with a view to publish a nationalist literature in Kannada. Besides Bhāratīyara Deshabhakti, he proposed to publish translations of Shri Swami Rama Tirtha's Lectures. He had a plan to publish at least four books in a year under the auspices of this publication series.

he has vividly shown how, on account of internal dissensions, they lost their freedom. The impact of the British Rule, Western ideas and institutions on Indian life has also been explained in this scientific work of Manjappa. The book, therefore, deserves to be read by all those who are interested in the cultural and political evolution of India and her future growth as a nation. This is a rare writing of very high order adorning Kannada literature, as it introduced for the first time Kannadigas to the modern western concepts, such as nationalism, liberty, socialism etc. As the father of nationalist literature in Kannada and a pioneer in the field of the literature of thought, Manjappa occupies a distinct place and enjoys a high reputation as an ardent nationalist. Apart from the thought content, the way he presents his ideas in Kannada language is an eloquent testimony to his literary ability. One finds throughout the book a scientific and dispassionate attitude on the part of the author. That such a book should have been produced as early as 1921 in his "Rasthra Jeevana Granthamale" is a matter of pride not only to Kannadigas but to every Indian.
2. **SALIENT FEATURES OF PATRIOTISM**

Hardekar Manjappa advocated certain principles that would promote patriotism among the people of any nation.

The first and foremost essential condition of patriotism according to Manjappa is a 'country', which should have natural frontiers, or at least artificial boundaries. Manjappa states, "The land surface of this earth is about fifty million square miles in extent. . . . This land area has been divided into a large number of countries". 8 A few questions may be raised here as to why there should be such territorial divisions, each with a different name? What principles, what traditional beliefs, what social factors, have guided this division? "The primary cause of national divisions", according to Manjappa, "is the separation of one country from another by water or mountains: nature has divided the world into different countries". 9

---


natural boundaries, there are in some cases artificial boundaries separating countries, made for political reasons". He further states that blind attachment to racial conformity, attainment of irresistible political power, have also been factors which are responsible for the formation of such artificial boundaries between countries. Thus in the opinion of Manjappa, every country should have natural frontiers, or at least artificially created; boundaries otherwise, it cannot be called a country.

Further he discusses the meaning of Swadesh (Mother-land). He is of the opinion that the mere fact that a man is living in a country does not make it his homeland. If it had been so, India should be the motherland of the British since they are living in it; they never think of India as such. Even the land of his birth cannot make it a mother-land for a person. Many Indians are born in England; none of them thinks of that country as his mother-land. It is also not possible to say that a man's homeland is the country of his parents, as Napoleon's Code defined it, for, what is the mother-land of a person who is born to a British

10. Ibid.
mother and German father,--- England or Germany? Thus Manjappa concludes, it is impossible to set a criterion as to the factors that contribute to the concept of mother-land. Still people call a country their own either by reason of their being born in it, or by the fact of their having lived in it for generations, or for some other reason.

Thirdly, Manjappa says that a firm faith that one's country is the only and proper place for one's advancement in life, and an intense and undying love for that country constitute patriotism. Working devotedly for the progress of one's countrymen by fair means is national service. Love of mother-land consists in believing that our interests are bound up with those of our countrymen and our respect, our dignity, are inseparable from theirs. Love of one's countrymen which forms the basic fact of patriotism may thus manifest itself in a different way, and may be called by different names. Mazzini has aptly said that the love which unites the people of a country into a fraternity is patriotism.  

Some, in these utilitarian days of expecting adequate return for every effort, may ask as to why they should love their country? What do they gain thereby? Manjappa is of the opinion that these people refuse to be satisfied with the answer that everyone should be a patriot since patriotism has been enjoined in our sacred books as an imperative, or with the reply that service of mother-land is an act of moral and religious merit and will lead to eternal bliss in the next life. So Manjappa tries to convince them on the question of patriotism from the rationalistic point of view, since the old way of acceptance through faith is no longer in vogue. Butler, the celebrated philosopher, says that gratitude is an intrinsic quality of human beings. It is this quality that makes man love his parents, even to adore them. To the extent this feeling of gratitude develops among individuals or nations, their culture also grows. We find that this quality is more developed among the civilized people than among the uncivilized. The former are grateful not only to their parents who brought them up from childhood, but also to all other elders including their teachers, who helped their progress.  

Viewing the matter in this light says Manjappa, one can see that it is everyone's duty to consider and work for the welfare of one's countrymen as a whole. It is their unceasing, devoted efforts, struggles and tribulations that have contributed to make our lives comfortable; their unselfish exertions have gone to the creation of the amenities and conveniences of life which we are now enjoying. Thus, to Manjappa, it becomes one's duty to extend one's gratitude which one must bear towards his parents and to his compatriots also. Failure to enlarge the field of our gratitude in this way to our countrymen also is tantamount to behaving like the lower animals which discard their own parents as soon as they are grown up. It has been well said that, just as it is right and proper to be devoted to one's parents, it is equally appropriate and just to be loyal and devoted to one's mother-land.

In the same way, as it is imperative for man to try to widen the field of his gratitude from the confines of his family life to include the whole of his country, Manjappa opines, it is necessary for him

13. G.S. Halappa, op. Cit., p.34.
to work for the welfare and advancement of the whole human species. Again he states, "scientists have shown that it is a characteristic of all animals to try to protect their species from other animals in addition to protecting themselves. It has also been established that this characteristic varies in proportion to their intellectual development, while even the lower animals show the spirit of mutual help and protection, that spirit should be more pronounced and more extensive among men; otherwise man would be inferior to other creations. If the premise that mankind should be protected from harm is accepted, service to one's countrymen becomes an imperative duty. It is a part of one's national service to do all one can for the improvement of the material conditions of life of one's countrymen.  14 He further says it is incumbent on man that he should develop a natural sense of gratitude and spirit of mutual service and cooperation with other men; for his behaviour and actions are not limited to the guidance of his instincts. He has the ability to conquer the evil in himself and his ignorance, and also, by sustained effort, to develop virtue and wisdom; it

is this quality which distinguishes him from other animal creations...... As a man, the master-work of God's creation, he must conceive this as his imperative duty, and strive to improve himself and to improve the condition of his compatriots. There can not be national regeneration otherwise. 15

Manjappa is of the opinion that inter-dependence seems to be growing in modern times, chiefly owing to the phenomenal advance in science; in proportion to the growth of this inter-dependence, grow also men's responsibilities and duties to one another. The great scientist-philosopher Darwin, author of the 'Theory of Evolution of Species', has opined, 'as the species evolve to a higher state of existence, their mutual dependence also grows.' 16 Modern experience has established the truth of this statement. Manjappa asks when what happens in one country may have its repercussions even in distant countries in these days, is it right to say that what happens in our own country does not concern us? It has been well said that just as there is no pot

without clay, there cannot be a mother-land without people to call it their own.\textsuperscript{17} Manjappa is of the opinion that, we are sharers in the joys and sorrows, success and failures of our countrymen; in trying to strive for the good of our countrymen, we are working for our own good also. Our own welfare is implicit in the welfare of our country, and one who serves his country serves himself too. Seen even from this selfish point of view says Manjappa, service to one's country becomes an imperative necessity. Thus Manjappa could convince the people that patriotism is of vital necessity to every one for the proper growth of man's innate quality of gratitude, for the protection of one's species, and for bringing about harmony and the benefits of cooperative endeavour among the people. But still there are certain people who argue as follows: what, after all, is the capacity of the individual, and why should he think of national service? At best he lives for about seventy or eighty years; and national service concerns, so many millions of people and is of such magnitude that an individual's contribution to it is of no importance at all and the benefits he receives in return are doubtful. And such people refrain from

\textsuperscript{17} G.S. Halappa, op. Cit., p.37.
contributing what they can to the national good. Manjappa says such an attitude, and of thinking is not only bad for the country but deleterious to the individual also. Every action, however small, howsoever seemingly insignificant, has an effect which is inseparable from it. One cannot separate a lamp from the light that it radiates, and in the same manner one cannot separate an action from its result. People work hard at great sacrifice to amass wealth so that their children and the succeeding generations might live in ease and comfort; should they not also think of working for the strength and stability of their country so that those who come after them might be free from national dangers and calamities? Thus Manjappa opines that working for the good of the country is the primary duty of everyone living in it. All thinking men should endorse the observation of the great thinker Gilbert that those who are reluctant to serve their country for fear of hardship or even death are unfit to live.18

The service of the mother-land according to Manjappa, is another essential condition of patriotism.

Manjappa has his own views on how one should serve the country or what kind of service constitutes real contribution to the good of the mother-land. According to Manjappa all the work done by the people in a country, and for the country, can be roughly divided into two categories: one which is mainly physical labour, and the other chiefly intellectual labour. Those who belong to the former group are engaged in protecting the country against enemies internal and external, or in some other kind of physical service, while those who belong to the latter group are busy with producing or collecting the means of living or in guiding the people along the path of honest righteous living. All the important items of national work are included in one or other of these four divisions.\(^{19}\)

It is natural that occupational divisions in a country should develop according to men's qualities and aptitudes. Such divisions are inevitable and are to be seen in all countries. Taking the case of modern advanced countries, one can see that in each country one is bound to belong to some occupational group, like teachers, traders or labourers, for no one can live without an occupation which gives him his means of

\(^{19}\) Ibid, p.43.
livelihood..... Whatever one's occupation might be, he must belong to one of these social divisions. If only he carries on his own work honestly, fairly and satisfactorily, he is serving his country well.²⁰ According to Manjappa, this is the primary stage of national service; though it is strange and facile to some people. Mazzini maintains that love of the motherland starts with the individual and goes on expanding. He says that an evil minded person can never be a patriot. It follows that a patriot should be a person of unsullied character and good conduct.²¹ Mahatma Gandhi also held the same views. If every individual in a country strictly conforms to a moral code, the evils of selfish unscrupulous pursuit of gain are eliminated, and this is no small a contribution to national welfare. Manjappa warned that by improper or immoral conduct an individual harms not only himself but his country also. Thus Paul Richard in his book, To the Nations, rightly opines whatever is injurious to the individual is injurious to the country also. Let each person in a country go on doing his own work honestly and conscientiously; consideration of the question of national service will not arise at all.²²

²⁰ Ibid, pp.43-44.
²¹ Gaetano Salvemini, op. Cit., p.58
Manjappa says that every one should sincerely try to examine whether he has been honestly doing the work which has fallen to his lot, then his own deficiencies and shortcomings will become clear to him. He feels sorry to state that such a self-examination, such introspection, has become rare in these days. With the result, the question of national service has become urgent and important. In our own families we see how the welfare and progress of the whole family is assured if each member does his duties. In the same way, states Manjappa, 'if only the different occupational groups in a country carry on their work diligently the peace and progress of the country is certain.

Is it possible for all the people of a country to realize this? Manjappa opines, those who have such understanding, form only a small minority. The rest are lured by the attractions of power and pelf and try to advance their own selfish interests. The self-interest of the latter makes them blind to the harm that they may cause to others. Manjappa says, "the preponderance of egoistic and self-seeking people in a country leads to the concentration of means of comfort
like wealth and knowledge in a few individuals, family or classes; since men's energies are directed to self-aggrandisement, while some people, with scope for developing knowledge and wealth live a comfortable life, others, less gifted and with little scope for advancement, are living in a life of ignorance, poverty and misery". 23 Thus, differences in the manner of living are natural among the people of a country — while some are affluent, progressive and comfortable, a large number of others are poor, backward and miserable.

Manjappa says, whosoever, through ignorance or stupidity, continue to act in a manner harmful not only to themselves but also to the country, should be made to understand their folly and give up their wrong path. Thus it becomes, according to Manjappa, the duty of the people of knowledge and understanding in a country to wean their selfish and acquisitive compatriots away from their unpatriotic path and to create conditions that make them think of and strive for what is conducive to the progress and welfare of people as a whole.

It has been said that a country is like a ship and its citizens are its passengers and crew. Whosoever among these causes a leak in the ship, all have to face the resultant calamity. So it is not wisdom to be indifferent when some individuals or classes fail to do their duties in the corporate life. The larger the number of such delinquents in a country, the greater the harm not only to the country as a whole but also to those who render honest loyal service. If the number of people stricken by diseases goes on increasing, the greater will be the danger of others being exposed to the contagion; when the number of destitutes swells, the burden of providing for them will fall on the opulent to a greater extent. Manjappa opines that those who remain backward will invariably become a clog upon those who are more advanced; for co-operation is fundamental to a healthy corporate life, and interdependence is a characteristic feature of social life. Thus, he concludes, every one should work for the physical, economic and cultural advancement of his countrymen; and this ensures his own welfare also. According to Manjappa, this is the second aspect of national service.

24. Ibid, pp.48-49.
Manjappa further says that considerations of creed, race or group should never interfere with such patriotic service. Such differences do exist in every country, but service to one's countrymen and concern for their welfare are paramount. "It is often said that one should willingly sacrifice his religion or his dharma if it is contrary to the interests of his country, or tends to hamper his growth". According to Manjappa, this should be the attitude of a true patriot tending to the greater glory of his mother-land; this is his patriotism, his sacred, imperative duty.

While thus disinterestedly striving for the good of his own country, a man should think of the condition of other countries also. With a sense of complacency that the culture, traditions and manners of his own country are superior, he should not look down upon or traduce those of other countries. Some people believe that such an attitude is a mark of patriotism; and they praise and admire their own customs manners and traditions howsoever defective or retrograde they may be. This is nothing but an ill-founded and offensive pride in one's own country and

not patriotism; such people will only undermine the progress and welfare of their own country. Manjappa says that we must study the customs and manners of the people of other countries with sympathy and respect; and adopt those that are good, useful and elevating. This is true patriotism: this the way of self-improvement and advancement of one's own country. Criticizing or defaming beliefs and practices simply because they are our own is rank bigotry. Such irrational prejudice is most harmful. Thus Manjappa suggests, we must readily welcome and adopt good customs and practices however novel or recent they may be and to whatever country they may belong. Likewise, those which are harmful should be discarded, however time-honoured or native they may be. This is true patriotism according to Manjappa.

Manjappa's conception of a patriot, therefore, is a person who lives an honest and upright life and helps his countrymen also to the best of his ability to live such a life. But a patriot's work does not end with this. The final test of patriotism is the readiness to sacrifice one's life for the country, if

such an occasion should arise. To a true patriot, says Manjappa, the soil of his country is something sacred; he feels that it is defiled when some outsider occupies it by force. Whether the invader may belong to his own religion or not, it should not master. Thus Manjappa concludes that in a country where patriotic service is not considered as subordinate to the loyalty of the citizen to his dharma, there the progress of the country is assured only when each individual lives a life of honesty and moral integrity and induces others to live likewise. 27

Manjappa further says that a time of national insecurity or peril provides the best test of a people's patriotism. For instance, he says, when there is an invasion of one's country by a foreigner, all the people of the country should realize that it is a national calamity and prepare for the defence of the mother-land. He also says, differences of race, creed and community should disappear in the face of this danger to the country; every one must do his best to defend the country in the best way he can. There should be no distinction of high and low in patriotic

27. Ibid, p.53.
service. Honest service in the defence of the country, howsoever small it may be, is sacred. If the people of a country fail to rise above their mutual differences and bickerings, they will not only place the integrity of the country in danger, but will also endanger the safety of the future generation. Manjappa requests thus, that everyone should be prepared for a total sacrifice if necessary, for the good of his country. It is his most sacred duty. This is the ultimate test of his patriotism.

There are two antagonistic views regarding the duty incumbent on everyone of sacrificing his life if necessary when his mother-land is exposed to danger from a foreign foe. Henry Sidgwick opines in his book *Elements of Politics*, that it is right and proper that we should defend ourselves by force when a foreign power invades our country, and we must take the offensive against them if we are convinced that they harbour inimical designs upon our country. He goes even further to say that if they practise hypocrisy and use violence we are justified in

retaliating with similar measures. Such things, according to western political conceptions, constitute a patriotic duty. Gandhiji holds quite the opposite view. In an article in the *Young India* entitled "The Doctrine of the Sword", he has said that violence in defence of the honour of one's country is preferable to a cowardly acquiescence in dishonour, but still, methods of non-violence are preferable to those of violence in such cases. In another article dealing with *Satyagraha*, he says that greater courage is needed for enduring the violence of the opponent than in inflicting it on him. In Manjappa's opinion, this spiritual character of the feeling of patriotism (Satwic) is far better than the utilitarian and mundane conception (Rajas) of Henry Sidgwick. Patriotism of the former type is seen when the people of a country make it possible for the foreign enemy to rule their country by withholding all help and mutual co-operation to him, by disobeying the rules which he imposes on them, by enduring the punishment which he


inflicts without retaliating with violence. This patriotism of non-violence and suffering of facing the violence and hatred of the enemy with the spiritual weapon of love and non-retaliation, is of a higher type than the patriotism of Sidgwick's conception. Further Manjappa says, where the nation is not educated enough to have the patriotism of Gandhiji's conception, the other patriotism at least must exist, so that the people may fight for the integrity of their country with weapons of violence; instead of submitting in a cowardly manner to the domination of the foreigner, it is better to sacrifice their all in the defence of their land, though in a violent fight. This constitutes, according to Manjappa, the true spirit of patriotism.

One may ask: we offer our utmost sacrifice in the defence of our country when a foreigner attempts to conquer it; if we show a similar spirit of sacrifice in invading and conquering a foreign country, and in despoiling it of its wealth for the enrichment of our mother-land, does it not also constitute patriotism? Is this not another aspect of devotion to one's country? In Manjappa's opinion, it is not patriotism to inflict
loss and suffering on another country for selfish gain. Patriotism is sacrosanct. Sacrilege and causing harm and suffering to others cannot be called patriotism. Manjappa says, 'real patriotism should contribute to universal brotherhood. It is a travesty of patriotism to maintain that it gives a patriot the right to go to war against other countries. Such a thing will ultimately recoil on the country which takes the offensive. Mazzini exhorts people to keep their patriotism pure and unsullied by selfish motives; and has condemned the exploitation of the weakness or poverty of another country for the advancement of their own country.'

Thus Manjappa opines that the contention of warlike and aggressive nations that their invasion and conquest of other countries contributes to peace on earth is only sophistry. Enriching one's own country by destroying the peace and happiness of other countries is always reprehensible.

Social sciences tell us that the desire for war is pronounced where people are in an uncivilized condition. People in the earliest stage of civilization in ancient days believed that war was not only

necessary but also a sacred duty. A country with superior fighting ability would invariably commit aggression on a weaker country and carry on depredations, with no thought of right or wrong; for in those days might was right. Every country is bound to pass through such a stage of savage aggression before it becomes civilized. There was a time in history when such war-hungry countries were preponderant and that period is called the Age of Wars. It was considered a characteristic of the patriotic spirit to invade and conquer other countries. The world has advanced much from that age, and this is the Age of Industry. It does not mean that there are no countries at all with that bellicose spirit today. They are fewer in number, but countries having the spirit of industry form a large majority. So war is considered an evil in these days. Going to war against other countries is therefore harmful not only to the aggressor country, but also to international peace and wellbeing. Thus Manjappa says that the age of wars is a thing of the past and the present is the age of industry. He further says, it is time that nations came to realise

33. G.S. Halappa, op. Cit., p. 60.
that territorial aggrandisement offends the spirit of the present age, and any desire to harm other nations in the selfish interests of one's own country degrades the human spirit.

There are some people who contend that advanced countries should conquer and rule over backward countries for some time in order to help them in their progress and raise them to their own level, so that, ultimately, world's progress is achieved. But according to Manjappa this contention is wrong. He says, to help another country in the path of progress it is not necessary to conquer and rule over it; it is wrong to say that a backward country can advance only when it is under the rule and tutelage of an advanced country. Manjappa cites here the example of Japan; whose amazing progress is not the result of any tutelage under the rule of another progressive country. Manjappa is of the opinion that with the rapid advance in the means of communication, nations have come closer to each other. It is now possible for backward countries to learn from the advanced countries

34. Ibid, p. 62.
without being ruled by them. Foreign rule and imperialism are against the very spirit of modern age, and are contrary to the basic principles which govern man's progress as a whole. Manjappa further says, a prominent feature of patriotism in modern days is the desire on the part of an aggressive nation to rule the countries which it conquers in such a way as not only to benefit itself but also to help the countries which it rules. Patriotism in this industrial age has acquired a tinge of benevolence also towards the subject people.

In the next stage, Manjappa envisage, the **Age of Industry** which inturn will be replaced by the **Age of Peace**. In the **Age of Peace**, Manjappa opines, patriotism acquires a spiritual content, and no nation will exercise its sway over another nation. Every country will be governed strictly in accordance with the wishes of its people. Secondly, every country will be free to live as it wants. There will be co-operation among nations. Manjappa foresees a day, which will surely come, when war will be a thing of the past, when disputes among nations will be settled
by adjudication or arbitration. Further Manjappa states, there may be wars in future; even the League of Nations may acquire a different shape; but ultimately the cause of peace is bound to prevail and patriotism will acquire a spiritual content, becoming a 'Sattvic force' in man.

Hardekar Manjappa poses a very important question at this juncture. How should a patriotic citizen act when there is a clash between the interests of the rulers and the ruled in a free country in which the reigns of Government are exclusively in the hands of the rulers, or in a country ruled by an alien power? He further argued that supporting the rulers would be a betrayal of the people; taking up the cause of the people would be disloyalty to the rulers. How can a patriotic individual best serve his country in such a dilemmatic situation? In Manjappa's opinion, a patriotic individual must support the cause of the

35. Ibid, p.64.

36. According to Manjappa's logic, the 'League of Nations' underwent a change after the World War II, as The United Nation Organization, for the same purpose Manjappa advocated in 1921.
people, for that is true patriotism. He says, "the welfare of the people is more important than the interests of the rulers. It is no patriotism to support a government in preference to the good of the people. Patriotism consists in serving the cause of the people and not that of the rulers is an imperative maxim." 37

According to Manjappa there are three ways of serving the people.

(a) The first one is to put an end to the selfish, arbitrary rulers by violence --- like murder. When this is successfully accomplished, it helps the cause of the people and serves the interests of the country no doubt. Such acts may also be inspired by real patriotism. But Manjappa says, such patriotism, however, is misanthropic, venal, and even if human, it harms the country and is an outrage on humanity. In Manjappa's opinion purity of intention is not enough; the means of accomplishment also should be pure. Where mankind has not yet passed the stage of

37. Ibid, p.65.
barbarism, people who adopt means of cruelty and violence with patriotic motives form a large majority; promotion of the country's welfare in the *Age of War* was achieved mostly by such violent and crude means.\(^{38}\)

Now many nations are opposed to the methods of violence. Thus Manjappa advises, a true patriot should never think of such methods of violence.

(b) According to Manjappa, the second way of serving the people is: by bringing to the notice of the Government the difficulties experienced by the people as a result of wrong policies and measures adopted by the administration and keeping the people also correctly informed about them; educating the people about their rights and privileges and through appropriate, peaceful but firm agitation creating in the Government an awareness of their own mistakes and short-comings, and thus to promote the country's progress and welfare.\(^{39}\) This is called 'Rajasa' way, of the patriot with a practical utilitarian outlook; and a majority of the people pursue it in modern days.

---


(c) Manjappa says that the third one is Satvic. The patriot tries by all peaceful means to make the Government understand the difficulties of the people and redress their grievances. Where the Government is unsympathetic towards these representations and obstinately follows its own way, then the people refuse to co-operate with the Government in any manner and thus make the administration come to a stand still; while carrying on this non-co-operation, they are careful to guard against causing any harm to the person or property of the people who run the administration, for non-violence is the cardinal principle of all their actions; if the Government retaliates with violence and tries to punish them, they calmly endure any indignity with no trace of anger or hatred in their hearts towards their oppressors; they disobey the unjust laws of the Government and patiently endure any punishment which is meted out to them; and by the use of their soul-force in this manner they compel the Government to mend its ways and promote the welfare of the people. Such is the true patriot's Satvic way of serving his countrymen.

This is described as 'Satyagraha' which is an improved version of passive resistance, advocated by Gandhiji.

Thus Manjappa says that the patriot must abandon the Tamasic or selfish and violent, and the Rajasic or the mundane and utilitarian outlooks in the service of the country. He must first have recourse to persuasion and negotiation. If it should fail, then he should pursue the Satvic but arduous course of Satyagraha and thus serve the country.

3. PATRIOTISM IN EARLY INDIA:

We discussed in the foregoing the salient features of patriotism and its advantages. Now, we will examine whether patriotism obtained among the Aryans of India in the ancient times. Some people might object to this and say: why should we worry ourselves with the dead past? If the people were patriotic in the past what do we gain thereby? Is it not enough if we try to be patriotic here and now? Why should one waste his time in thinking of what is by-gone? Such way of thinking is in-correct and
unfair. What happened in the past has a bearing on the present and is an invaluable guide to our conduct. A knowledge of the past enables us to avoid many pitfalls and makes our progress easy and smooth. More than that, it provides us the necessary enthusiasm, fortitude and confidence in our actions. Carlyle says that the best means of understanding the present and visualising the future is a clear knowledge of the past.\textsuperscript{41} Emerson echoes the same thought when he says that history is a great prophet spreading his message among mankind.\textsuperscript{42}

Manjappa argues that the importance of a study of the past being so great, can any one say that a knowledge of Indian patriotism in the by-gone age is of no value? India was a civilized country even in the remote past. If, in spite of its hoary traditions, there was no patriotic spirit among Indians, what could be the reason for it? What were the effects of that deficiency? Are these deficiencies still


persisting? If they do, how should they be weeded out? The answers to these questions can be found in a study of our history. History is a storehouse which supplies man with the knowledge of his past. To us Indians, unfortunately, this source does not exist, except Kalhana's *Rajatharangini*, which gives us a glimpse of the history of Kashmir. Of course the *Ramayana* and *Mahabharata* do contain historical facts, but they are not written from the historian's standpoint.

The famous Greek historian Herodotus who lived in the fifth century B.C. has given some information about our country. Again in the writings of Arrien, the historian of Alexander, Megasthanese of Greece, Hieun-Tsang of China we have the accounts of their visit to India. But it is indeed unfortunate, opines Manjappa, not only for India but for the other nations of the world that the early history of the Aryans, who were the first among the people of the world to advance in civilization, is not available to us.

Literature is another source, says Manjappa, which helps us in building up a history of the past,
though literature as a source-material is not so reliable as historical accounts. But even then our Vedas which are the oldest literary treasures of mankind are accepted by all scholars as reliable. Thus Manjappa examined whether people had the spirit of patriotism in these earliest days with the help of some of these sources.

The great scholar Sreepad Damodar Satavalekar has observed that one can find in the Atharva Veda significant statements about patriotism like: "My beloved mother-land, I shall speak well of you whether in the village, town or in popular assemblies," and "O, my mother-land, we have come to sacrifice our lives in your defence". This opinion is reinforced by the great historian Dr. Radhakumud Mookerjee, who goes further and maintains that patriotism did exist in those days because first, we find in the 'Prithwi Sukta' of the Atharvana Veda sixty-three Ricks or hymns speaking of the mother-land; secondly, one comes across a passage in the Vishnupurana which says that hallowed is the land of Bharata; and thirdly there is the widely-known Sanskrit sloka which says that the "Mother and the mother-land are more precious than even
heaven".  He goes still further and maintains that the very object of establishing places of pilgrimage and religious monasteries was to inculcate the feeling of patriotism among the people. The Rishis of the Vedic Age were aware of the need for the growth of the patriotic spirit among all people and that they would have expressed their thoughts in some verses. Manjappa argues that this cannot lead to the conclusion that the people of those days were filled with the patriotic spirit. If this were to be true, there would have certainly been instances of that spirit revealing itself in action. Though the Vedic Aryans were conscious of the sanctity of the mother-land, they did not have that sense of patriotism. Thus Manjappa concludes, it is nothing but an offensive pride to maintain, on the basis of a few dubious references in the Rigveda that Indians possessed a feeling of patriotism in ancient times.

Then Manjappa refers to the historical period. Some people are of the opinion that devotion to
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mother-land did exist among Indians up to the time of Chandragupta Maurya and Shri Harsha, that it was dormant for a few centuries afterwards, and was manifest again during the time of Shivaji Maharej. But Manjappa rejects this view, with the following explanation: He says, just as the courage and fortitude of an individual is tested at a time of crisis in his fortunes, the strength of a people's devotion to their mother-land is tested at the time of calamity to their country.

The first occasion of a foreigner invading our country was when in 327 B.C., Alexander came to India with his army, and first entered the Punjab. There were two kingdoms in the Punjab then, one ruled by Taxeles and another by Porus. Taxeles concluded an alliance with Alexander for destroying the power of Porus, and got a bridge built over the Indus to facilitate the movement of the Greek troops and also went with an army of his own to help him. King Porus was defeated and captured. But Alexander, admiring the heroism of his enemy, gave back his kingdom. Thus Manjappa proved that patriotism was a virtue unknown in those days; otherwise, whatever might have been his differences

with Porus, Texeles would not have co-operated with the country's enemy and consented to remain as his feudatory. He would have set aside his enmity towards Porus for a while and joined him in driving the foreigner out. Such a combination of two powerful kings would certainly have succeeded. According to Manjappa lack of a sense of patriotism was the only cause of this national humiliation.

On the other hand, Manjappa gave the example of Greece; which was known from very early times for the patriotism of its people. The early annals of that country were radiant with the spirit of patriotism. Greece in those days was a country of small city-states like Athens and Sparta — each not larger than a modern city. The spirit of independence was so strong among the Greeks that they hated submission to the rule of one of their own countrymen if he belonged to another city-state. In such a situation, Greece was invaded by Darius, the powerful emperor of Iran. In the face of this common danger, the Greeks forgot their mutual differences and disputes, combined against the enemy, and with amazing valour and strength born of their love of mother-land,
defeated his superior forces in the battle of Marathon in 490 B.C. This is real patriotism, says Manjappa, and it imparts a strength which nothing can overcome. He further said that if Athens or Sparta had adopted the policy of Taxeles, Greeks could not have achieved such a glorious victory. Without patriotism such a combination would never have been possible.

It is said, that as Taxeles allied himself with Alexander for overcoming his rival, Porus, Chandragupta tried to secure Alexander's help for his ambitious projects. His plan was to induce Alexander to invade the countries to the east of the Punjab and in the political confusion thus created, carve out a kingdom for himself. Chandragupta Maurya was shrewd and resourceful. After the return of Alexander he succeeded in consolidating his strength and making himself master of the Magadha empire. But Chandragupta's intentions were not patriotic, opined Manjappa. On the other hand he was motivated by the desire for self-aggrandisement and not by patriotism. Otherwise, he would not have thought of inviting a foreign ruler
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to invade his own mother-land! Megasthenese, who was the Greek ambassador in the court of Chandragupta, had written an account of the condition of the country at that time as follows — there were 118 states in India, people were valiant, truthful, peace-loving and happy, that the Government was carried on the lines laid down in Manusmriti and the rural divisions were like independent provinces. But he had not mentioned anything about patriotism.

After the death of Chandragupta in 290 B.C. Ashoka was the most illustrious among his successors. As a ruler, he was much more benevolent than his grandfather and introduced many healthy reforms. By his active support to the spread of Buddhism, he contributed to the growth of kindness and peace among the people. But according to Manjappa he did nothing to foster the spirit of patriotism in them. Among the numerous inscriptions of Ashoka which have come to light, none of them contains any reference to patriotism. Thus Manjappa contended that when the successors of
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Ashoka were found to be weak, the Greeks who had established themselves in Bactria to the north-west of the Himalayas entered India and penetrated up to Madurai in the south and Cutch in the west, denuding the country of its wealth. Then in the early years of the Christian era came the Scythians from Central Asia, supplanted the Greeks, and established a powerful kingdom in the Punjab. This is the second invasion of foreigners. Wars were frequent between these foreign rulers and Indian princes. The result would always depend on the strength of the opposing forces and the capacity of the commanders. The people at no stage opposed the foreigner inspired by patriotism. The Scythian rulers were defeated and their territories were conquered by Indian kings like Vikramaditya and Salivahana; their victories were entirely due to their military strategy and the valour of their armies and not to the patriotic support given by their subjects. 48

The political condition of the world changed radically within a century or two after Mohammad the Prophet established the religion of Islam. The Muslims, fired with their new religious zeal, conquered many

countries of Asia, Africa and Europe and forcibly converted many people of those countries to Islam. On the ostensible pretext that Hindus had confiscated some Arab ships, the general Mohammad Kasim invaded Sind with an army of six thousand. Manjappa says that this was invasion of India for the third time by a foreigner. He further noted that the Muslim conquest, however, was not transient and limited like those of the Greeks and Scythians. The Muslims ruled India for about a thousand years. At the time of Mohammad Kasim's invasion of India there was a Rajput king named Dahir ruling Sind, who invited the neighbouring Rajput rulers to help him in expelling the foreigner, but no ruler came to his help. He fought singly against the superior Muslim forces and died on the battlefield at Alore in 711 A.D. When a foreign power invaded the territories of an Indian prince, other princes would remain indifferent to it, or would help the invader if there was malice or rivalry against the prince in question. Thoughts of the danger impending their own countries would not come to them. Mohammad Kasim's occupation of Sind, so to say, opened the gateway to India; for Muslim armies could invade the country again and again. Manjappa declares, had
there been patriotism among Indians, all the Rajput rulers would have combined to fight the invader, as the Greeks did in the early times against Iran, and the establishment of Muslim rule over India would not have been possible. The king of Kanauj sought the help of the Rashtrakutas of the south for expelling the Muslims from Sind, and the Rashtrakutas, instead of helping him concluded an alliance with the Muslims! Further, the Hindus of those days were not inferior to the Muslims either in martial valour or in generalship. But even then they were often overcome by enemies. This was in the opinion of Manjappa due to, the absence of patriotism in them.\textsuperscript{49} Thus unity is impossible among such people.

After the departure of Mohammad Kasim from Sind the Muslims did not establish any large kingdom in India for about four centuries. Mohamud of Ghazni came to India many times in the tenth century and carried away enormous amounts and treasure, but he did not establish muslim rule as such in India. It was Mohammad Ghori who made the beginnings of a Muslim state in India. When he invaded India in 1191 A.D.,
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this Muslim ruler had been decisively defeated and forced to retreat. Some time after this there was an internecine dispute between Prithwiraj and Jayachand, over the inheritance of the territories of the latter. Prithwiraj also carried away Samyukta the daughter of Jayachand and married her. This gave rise to a serious enmity between the two. At the same time, though he was the victor, he soon gave himself up to carnal pleasures of the palace in the company of Samyukta, neglecting the welfare of his people and remained indifferent to the danger to the country from the foreigner. His allies were concerned about the safety of the country. When one of his feudatories, Hahuli went to see Prithwiraj in order to remonstrate him about his indifference to state affairs, Samyukta, the wife of Prithwiraj, insulted Hahuli. Hahuli in a moment of fury, vowed that he would drink the water of Delhi only after Samyukta became a widow, and rode away towards Ghazni. Hahuli went to Ghazni and represented to Shahabudhin (Mohammad Gori) the anarchy that prevailed in the kingdom of Delhi. He gave the Sultan hopes of an easy conquest of Delhi if he should invade the country. Mohammad sent his spies to Delhi and made sure that the account given by Hahuli
was true. Then he marched towards Delhi and defeated Prithviraj. Mohammad Ghori installed himself on the throne of Delhi, and soon after, conquered Chittor and Kanauj. Jayachand avoided capture and death at the hands of the Muslims by drowning himself in the Ganges. Manjappa concludes that the fire of hatred lit at the time of the abduction of Samyukta by Prithviraj blazed out into a fratricidal war which involved the sacrifice of thousands of the finest Rajput warriors, until finally it was extinguished by the heinous treachery of Hahuli who sold away the freedom of his own motherland. From this time onwards, says Manjappa, India had to experience a thraldom which she had never known before. Manjappa thus concludes that if Indians had real patriotism, there would not have been such a calamity.

Further, the Rajputs made a desperate attempt in the fifteenth century to destroy the Muslim power in India. Among them was Rana Pratap Singh, who took a solemn oath that he would fight for the freedom of his mother-land from the Muslim yoke; and that, until this sacred task was accomplished and until he saw his mother-land smiling in freedom and plenty, he would
sleep on the bare earth, he would never use silver and gold vessels, and he would not live in a palace. He failed in achieving his goal; because he was not helped even by the Rajput princes themselves who were actually on the side of Akbar. Thus, according to Manjappa, Pratap Singh's heroism was of no avail when that sense of patriotism itself was totally absent among the rulers and people alike.

It is discussed in the foregoing as to how patriotism was absent among the people of northern India, and now we may turn to the conditions of south India. The Cholas had attained a position of great prominence in South India from very early times. If we look into the history of the kingdom of Kerala of the ancient times, says Manjappa, patriotism was absent among its people. He further says that the Raja of Cochin, with the object of crushing the power of his enemy, not only made friendship with the Portuguese, but also got a fort built for them. The result was that the power of the Portuguese grew; and later it made way for the Dutch, the French and the English to enter the country. Thus according to Manjappa if the people in South India had been patriotic, it would
never have been so easy for the Europeans to enter India.

The Muslims invaded and conquered our country with the object of converting the people to their religion. But the Europeans like the Portuguese, says Manjappa, came here initially with the objective of trade, and did not think of conquering the country for sometime. But the autocratic and unpopular Muslim rule and the unseemly internecine rivalries and disputes among the Hindu rulers, says Manjappa, made them think of acquiring political power in the country. Prof J.R. Seely opines the same way in his book, Expansion of England. Seely begins with the sweeping statement that when the British saw India for the first time, the anarchy and tyranny that they found there did not exist anywhere, in any period of European history.

Hindusthan was the name of an extensive area of land, and could on no account be called a country. As for the patriotic feeling among the people that Hindusthan was their country, there was not a trace of it. In the armies which won India for the British, the British formed only twenty per cent and the rest were Indians. Seely says that it was like Englishmen entering France,
enlisting French soldiers in the army and conquering that country. He concludes with the categorical statement that it was not only superiority of the British that won India for them, but the absence of patriotism among Indians themselves.50

The great Indian historian, Govind Sakharam Sardesai, also holds the same opinion in his British Riyasat. "Though there is some truth in the statement that the British conquered India by enlisting in their army the dregs of Indian society, those who were warriors by profession did little to fight for the protection of the mother-land. If they had made a concerted attempt to defend the integrity of their country the foreigners would certainly have been driven out."51

Thus Manjappa maintains that patriotism was unknown to the people, prior to and after the Muslim conquest of India. He further says, the love of the motherland implied a desire to keep the foreigner


away from the country. But our people made no attempt to stop foreigners from invading our country. The practice of States going to the help of each other in times of such danger from foreigners was unknown. There were, on the other hand, instances of Indian states helping the enemy. The Rajputs and the Marathas separately fought against their common enemy—the Muslims, but they did not join hands to vanquish him. The Rajputs believed that the Marathas were their enemies. When there was war between the English and the Marathas, the Rajputs were on the side of the former! Manjappa concludes, this was only because of a lack of patriotism.

Manjappa also examines the claim that Shivaji was a great patriot and that it was his patriotism that enabled him to establish Swaraj. Following is the analysis of Manjappa.

During the centuries following the interference of the Muslims into the realm of religion or Dharma, their harassment of the Hindus on account of their Dharma had become intolerable, especially the outrages
that they perpetrated on Hindu women. To the Hindus, their Dharma is the most important concern in their life.

Usually the Muslim rulers were guilty of barbaric outrages on their Dharma. Again after the death of Raja Jaisingh, Aurangzeb openly set about destroying the Hindu religion by destroying the Hindu temples, and mosques were built in their places. Hindus were being forcibly converted to Islam. At this juncture, Shivaji was born to protect the Hindu Dharma by building up a Hindu kingdom. Naturally all Hindus rallied round him and helped him in the defence of their religion. But Manjappa says, Shivaji established a kingdom for the defence of Hindu Dharma, and not for the defence of the country. It is significant to note that, after he was crowned king, he was addressed with the title 'Protector of Cows and Brahmins'. It is obviously wrong, opines Manjappa, to maintain that Shivaji established the Maratha kingdom out of patriotic fervour. It was his devotion to the Hindu Dharma that prompted him in this task. The great scholar, Chintaman Vinayak Vaidya wrote about this as follows in the Cfitramaya Jagat of May 1948: "If the Marathas had patriotism and unity, the great
Maratha state would never have fallen into the hands of the small minority of Englishmen. The total absence of those two qualities contributed to the disappearance of the Maratha and other Hindu kingdoms. The Marathas did not possess those qualities from the earliest times. The unity and patriotism they showed during the time of Shivaji and Rajaram were not genuine. Shivaji built up a kingdom for the defence of Hindu Dharma; and the Marathas gave him full support with the same object. "Real patriotism was absent even in those days of heroic endeavour". The same views are expressed by the historian G.S. Sardesai, who writes: "The fact that Shivaji established Swaraj has led some people to think that there was patriotism among the Maharastrians. This is not correct. The patriotism of the type that obtains in western countries did not exist before Shivaji, nor during his time. Patriotism is an unwavering devotion to the mother-land; it implies our perceiving that we are members of a large society, and that, since this country is ours, it is our sacred duty to defend and protect it". Thus Manjappa opined such a realisation

was absent in Maharastra before and after Shivaji and further Shivaji was not a patriot and he did not build up his kingdom out of purely patriotic fervour.

The famous historian Vasudev Vaman Khar writes in his preface to Kelkar's *Marathas and the English*, to this effect: "The fundamental drawback of the Maharastrians was the absence of patriotism in them. While the lack of it was common among all the other countries of India, how could it exist in the people of Maharastra? Any foreigner may invade our country and make himself master of it, so long as he does not interfere in the affairs of our town, our religion, our customs and practices, and our territorial possession, we do not care to know who they are or what they do. We know well that tolerance and charity are great virtues in matters of religion, but we do not know that it is a greater virtue to be intolerant of foreign domination. Some people are inclined to believe that there was patriotism among the Marathas from the time of Shivaji to that of Rajaram. That feeling can better be termed as a craving for territorial gain rather than patriotism." Even Shri Kelkar opines

in his book *Marathas and the English* same thing. There was no patriotism among the Maharastrians and even in his own time there was little of it. He says that the people were unable to realise the consequences of the British ousting Baji Rao and making themselves Masters of the country; they only felt that they were rid of an undesirable ruler. 55

It is also argued that there was patriotism during the time of the Peshwas. But Manjappa rejected this view also. Had there been the love of motherland they speak of, Balaji Vishwanath would not have usurped royal power from Shivaji's grandson Sahu just because he was incompetent to rule, and incurred the resentment of the Maratha Sardars. He would have installed another prince of Sahu's line and retained the co-operation and loyal support of those Sardars. Manjappa contends that the Peshwas acted out of purely selfish motives and thus alienated the sympathy of Sindhe, Holkar and Bhonsle, who even took up an attitude of opposition to them; and this provided a chance for the British to interfere in their quarrels. And in
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the end the Peshwas engaged themselves in an internecine quarrel, sought the help of the English, and lost everything. Thus concludes Manjappa, patriotism was conspicuous by its absence in them.

Manjappa marks another tendency that is, the Muslims, Marathas or the Peshwas— whenever disputes arose among them — would seek the help of the English. On the other hand, English people did not seek the help of any Indian prince when they had their own internal quarrels. But those Indians who served under Indian princes took service under the English or the French and fought against each other in their battles. Manjappa observes, Indians were pitted against Indians, and they were not conscious of it! They only knew that they must fight for those who paid them; they felt that it was their Dharma to work for those 'whose salt they ate'. They never visualised the dire consequences to their country of such an attitude on their part. On the other hand Manjappa stated, the British, too, obeyed their masters; for obedience to authority was a virtue with them. But they could discriminate. It was on this account that, when they accepted service under a Hindu ruler, they would
impose a condition that they should not be asked to fight a compatriot of theirs. Muslims also observed it. Further they would decline service under a ruler who would not accept this condition. When their Indian master had to fight the British, they would never participate in that fight. Their loyalty to their master would never make them take up arms against their own countrymen. To Manjappa, this was true and genuine patriotism.

It is, therefore, established beyond doubt that there was utter lack of patriotism among Hindus. Further, when a country whose people are patriotic is conquered by a foreigner, those people make unceasing attempts to win back their freedom. Likewise, the Hindus, with their intense loyalty to their Dharma, sometimes attempted to protect their own Dharma by destroying those countries which differed from them in these matters. Thus, Manjappa said, though there was no loyalty to their mother-land among the Hindus there was loyalty to their Dharma in an ample measure. This intense and unreasoning attachment to their own Dharma and not patriotism that was responsible for their establishing new kingdoms and for their attempts
to drive out aliens. Moreover the two famous insurrections that took place in our country were due to such loyalty to Dharma.  

Among the insurrections against Muslim rule the most serious was the revolt of the Sikhs. They largely contributed to the weakening of the Muslim power. Their insurrection was due to their religious zeal. Emperor Jahangir ordered in 1607 that Arjun Singh, the fifth Guru of the Sikhs, should be beheaded; and this provoked the Sikhs to desperate acts of retaliation against the Muslims. Hatred of the Moghul rule grew among the Sikhs; and the rulers employed all means, even torture, to put down the Sikhs. Manjappa says, no wonder that attempts were made to destroy such an inhuman regime. But these attempts were not prompted, says Manjappa, by any feeling of patriotism. Religious bigotry was the cause of the inhuman measures to suppress the Sikhs and the desperate attempts of the latter to resist. Patriotism was not at all the cause of the struggle, — the resistance and sacrifice of the Sikhs.
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As in the case of the Sikhs, blind attachment to faith or Dharma was the motivating force behind the insurrection of Nanasaheb during the rule of the East India Company. In the early days of 1857 Government issued a new type of bullet to the sepoys of Bengal. They also started a factory for manufacturing them at Dum Dum, near Calcutta. This somehow came to be known by the Hindus, and led to vehement arguments. That the new bullets were smeared with animals fat became a common talk. The cow is sacred to Brahmins and a Muslim feels that he is debased by the touch of a pig; and both Hindus and Muslims felt that the British were trying to destroy their caste. They were roused to rebellion against the rulers. Nana- saheb exploited this situation to his own advantage and the horrible events that followed gave to this popular opposition the colour of a serious outbreak or mutiny. But one thing is clear from this sorry episode: all that happened was due to loyalty to religion and was not inspired by any feeling of patriotism. Thus Manjappa concludes that the establishment of new kingdoms and political convulsions that took place in our country were prompted by loyalty to religion, vanity of individual rulers and not at all
out of love of the mother-land.

After the Muslims, the East India Company emerged as the ruler of India. They exercised their authority for about a century, from 1757 to 1857. As a result of their rule, notes Manjappa: (a) Political contact among the different sections of Hindus increased. This was because their sway extended over a large part of India than at any time before. (b) They provided stability and tranquillity to the country. These were the good effects of the Company's rule. Manjappa of course was also alive to the evil consequences of their domination were far reaching and calamitous: Impoverishment of the country due to trading activities of the Company that killed our trade,\textsuperscript{57} and the colonial policy which sapped the country of its economic strength and political virility.

The Government of England took over the rule of India from the Company, in 1857. Its effects on India, were as follows : The British disarmed the
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Indians. The result was a decline in the martial spirit of the people. There were a few good results also. (a) For the first time the whole of India came under a single rule and this helped the growth of political consciousness. (b) Construction of communication facilities such as the Railways, Post Offices and Telegraphs made travel and communication easier and helped the growth of a sense of nation-hood, among people in addition to promoting better understanding among each other. (c) An unprecedented peace and stability reigned over the country, and every one could confidently work for his progress. Individual freedom, unknown so far as it was crippled by social and religious restrictions, came into its own. (d) British Government established a large number of educational institutions in which all Indian children, irrespective of race, religion or colour, could receive education. The progressive ideas of the West which Indians imbibed through this education were of invaluable benefit. 58

Some people maintain that, if the Company rule had not followed the Muslim rule, India would
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have remained an independent nation like the countries of the West, under the Peshwas or some others, and would have achieved greater progress. But Manjappa totally rejects this view. He argues, while Muslims, far less civilized than the Hindus, were able to conquer India, would it have been difficult for the British who were more civilized than they, to bring India under their subjugation? In the technique and weapons of warfare the British were far more superior to the Hindus; and they had also the mighty weapon of patriotism. In India, on the other hand internecine disputes were rampant between Hindus and Muslims, and among different sections of the Hindus themselves, unity was conspicuously absent. Thus he observed India needed the steadying influence of a progressive rule and it appeared that western domination had become almost necessary for removing the evils that were eating into the vitals of Indian life.

Muslims and Hindus, compelled by loyalty to their Dharma, fought each other incessantly; and the country suffered from all the horrors of internecine warfare. Not that the Muslims alone were guilty of crimes in the name of religion, says Manjappa. Hindu
rulers were also guilty of it and committed crimes against the Muslims. Manjappa complained that the fall of Vijayanagar was chiefly due to the indignities which the Muslims were made to suffer at the hands of Ramaraya, the Vijayanagar ruler.

Even Mr. Sewell, holds the same opinion in his *A Forgotten Empire*. He says that, when the Adil Shahi and Vijayanagar armies reached Ahmadnagar in 1558 the Hindu Soldiers of Vijayanagar desecrated the Holy Koran, committed outrages on Muslim women and carried on orgies of pleasure in masjids. Later a Muslim envoy who was sent to the court of Ahmadnagar represented to Sultan Hussain Nizam Shah that it was necessary to destroy Vijayanagar since the Hindus were perpetrating intolerable atrocities upon the Muslims and desecrating their masjids.\(^{59}\)

That is why, to an India torn by the fanatical warring factions of the Hindus and Muslims, the only way out was the rule by an outside power. Manjappa

says, initially, there should not have been the Muslim conquest and domination of India. When that could not be helped, the rule by a third power stronger than both the Hindus and Muslims was the most natural thing. Muslim domination of India, as anyone could see, was the initial cause of the misfortunes of India, and their rule was made possible by the absence of the spirit of patriotism among the people. Thus Manjappa concludes, we ourselves were responsible for our helpless, deplorable conditions at that time. Development of patriotism was the only solution to the ills of our country and the people.

Hunter says that the British wrested India from the Marathas and not from the Muslims; and this shows that, at that time the Marathas were the most powerful political force in India. Thus Manjappa says, if no new foreign power had come to India at that time, Maratha sovereignty might have been established over the whole country. But one could not say with equal certainty that the Muslims, who were also powerful, would have acquiesced to the Hindu rule without making
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any attempt to wrest political power from them.
Further Manjappa opined, that the Marathas had done nothing to guard against any attempt by the Muslims to recover the political power they had lost. Moreover, there were a number of foreign countries to come to the help of the Muslims, while there was not a single country to help the Marathas. Again the Marathas did nothing to win the friendship and good-will of the Muslims, and never thought of bringing about unity in the country. Thus, a sober and unbiassed study of the period led to the conclusion that the domination of a third power was necessary and inevitable too for the ultimate good of both the Hindus and the Muslims.

Manjappa further states, if a third power, the British, had not come and reduced both Hindus and Muslims to a state of dire destitution, there would not have been an awareness of their own deplorable plight and a desire to get their own house in order. People tend to forget their internal differences and rivalries only when there is a danger from a third power. The forging of unity between the Hindus and Muslims at that time was due to the imposition of a foreign rule upon both; otherwise they would never
have lived together peacefully as is proved by later events. This unhappy country would have suffered all the horrors of a civil war being tossed between the rule of the Hindus and the Muslims. The existence of other Muslim countries in the neighbourhood, and the almost fanatical attachment of the Muslims to their religion would have helped them to establish their rule again over India. Loyalty to Dharma to the exclusion of loyalty to country would have made the religious group in power to persecute and harass the other groups. 61

Intense loyalty to religion which is so prominent among both Hindus and Muslims, does not seem to disappear either. Of course one cannot expect it to disappear completely. But both Hindus and Muslims should develop the patriotic spirit is imperative. Some may think that the country's deliverance and progress are assured only when loyalty to religion is completely replaced by devotion to the country. To Manjappa this was neither possible nor advisable. Here Manjappa gave the example of ancient Greeks who were exclusively patriotic. The result was, they
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abandoned their own religion and embraced Christianity, and consequently their former religion disappeared.

Manjappa thus declares, 'if the Hindus in the same way allow loyalty to mother-land to entirely replace their devotion to religion, a time might come when there would be only Muslims or Christians in India and the great Hindu Dharma and its culture will disappear. So Manjappa advises, the best course would be for the Hindus and Muslims to be devoted to their respective Dharmas, being at the same time patriotic.

Manjappa further says that sometimes conflict might arise between one's religion and his duty as a patriot. When there is a conflict between our loyalty to our religion and our devotion to mother-land, Manjappa advises, the latter must invariably prevail; for that is more helpful ultimately. This is borne out in the history of England, and it may well be an example to us. In a country like ours, continued Manjappa, where such divergent religions like Hinduism and Islam exist, giving greater importance to patriotism than to one's own religion is the only way to the country's peace and prosperity.

Thus Manjappa concluded, this is the path of wisdom for the Hindus and Muslims of India. In the face of danger to the country from an outsider, and when the interests of the country demand it, they must forget their religious differences and stand united in a close fraternity to fight for the mother-land's freedom and welfare. India could never be free, if Hindus and Muslims had remained blinded by a suicidal attachment to their religion. Further he appealed that Indians should realise the folly of subordinating the country's welfare to their Dharma, and try to raise the mother-land to her ancient glory.

4. DEPRESSIVES OF PATRIOTISM IN INDIA:

So far we were concerned with the absence of the spirit of patriotism in our country from very early times and the troubles and sufferings which the people were exposed to as a result. Now, we shall try to find out the reasons for the absence of patriotism among our people for so many centuries, though Indians were civilized and advanced in fine arts and other fields even during ancient times. Again great seers
like Kapila who gave to the world the most profound philosophy of this life and the hereafter; thinkers like Manu who laid down the laws of social living; rishis like Vyasa who taught the way of the good life; kings like Ramachandra who promoted the welfare of their subjects with paternal concern; — all these lived in the most ancient period of the history of our land. Still, it is surprising to find that patriotism did not develop among our people in spite of this hoary cultural antiquity.

Views differ among thinkers about the causes for this lack of patriotism. According to some, the very largeness of our country stood in the way of the growth of patriotism among the people. But Manjappa rejects this view. It is true that our country is very vast with large population. It is indeed a continent and is rightly called Bharatha Khanda (continent). In Europe a sense of devotion to their mother-land is common. But Manjappa laments that the

people of our country were not so much devoted to the mother-land when it was in danger. Thus, according to him the largeness of our country cannot be the only reason for lack of patriotism.

There are some people who argue that Indians were subjected to the rule of large number of kings, which prevented the growth of patriotism. Manjappa rejects even this view. Though it is true, that there were a large number of kingdoms, as many as 118 according to Megasthenese, in India. But Manjappa asks, whether the people of these states were devoted at least to their own states? Here he gives the example of Athens and Sparta of ancient Greece, wherein people in each of these states were devoted to their own country. In India, Manjappa notes with sorrow, when a foreign enemy invaded one of our kingdoms, the other kingdoms remained aloof as if it was not their concern. The people of the invaded kingdom should have stood united against the enemy to the very last in defence of their homeland. On the other hand, they helped the enemy in many cases to the ruination of their own country. Manjappa also agrees that the existence of a number of independent states in a
country leads to differences of outlook among the people and prevents the growth of a sense of national unity. But he firmly believes that multiplicity of states cannot obviously be the cause of lack of patriotism.

There are some who argue that the growth of a large number of exclusive religious, communal or social groups is said to have prevented the growth of patriotism. But to Manjappa, this is not an appropriate view. He says, though it is true that there are many social divisions which lead to disunion, it cannot be the only reason for the lack of patriotism. Further, he asked, have all people of the same group stood united against the common enemy? He opined that Marathas and Peshwas helped the enemy to raid their own countries. Moreover, the growth of these social groups and their insularity is only a recent phenomenon. In ancient times no such divisions existed. There was only one religion the Vedic religion and one society the Vedic society. 64

Some people argue that it is only when the people of a country take to commercial pursuits that
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there can be scope for the growth of patriotism, and the absence of it in India was due to its being predominantly an agricultural country. But Manjappa rejects this view also. Though he agrees that eighty percent of our people live by agriculture, and India is not a commercial country like England or Germany, yet, he says, this difference in occupational pursuits which we now see between India and many countries of the West is only a recent one. It did not exist in earlier times. Then every country was mainly agricultural. There was not much commerce between countries, since modern transport and communication facilities were absent. If that be so, Manjappa asks, why did this agricultural occupation prevent the growth of patriotism in our country alone? He further opines, Indians in ancient times were in no way backward in commerce. As it is said by the great historian G.S. Sardesai, in those days Europe depended entirely on the trade of India and China. In spite of this progress in the field of commerce, Manjappa says, Indians did not develop patriotism.

65. Ibid, p.72.
Though the four points considered so far do not constitute the depressives of patriotism among Indians Manjappa said, it should not be taken to mean that there was no connection at all between them and patriotism. To Manjappa, they were important factors that 'prevented' the spread of patriotism among all classes. He says, where a country is very large and communication among the different parts difficult, there is little scope for the growth of mutual understanding and sympathy among the people; where this understanding is absent, there is no feeling of oneness. In the same way, he argues, in a country divided into different states each with its own distinctive administrative set-up, there can never develop among the people the feeling that they are all children of the same mother-land.\(^67\) He further says, if in a country the people are divided among exclusive religions, castes or sects, there is bound to be jealousies and mutual recrimination among them; and the group that wields political power tries to oppress the other group. The result is that, instead of understanding and harmony, estrangement and animosity

---

develop. Thus the welfare and progress of the people and patriotism would be impossible. Manjappa also says, 'a people whose main occupation is agriculture, cannot have opportunities for coming into contact with people who differ from them and thereby developing qualities of understanding and sympathy, as people who are engaged mainly in commerce could. Thus to Manjappa, these qualities are essential for the growth of patriotism, because patriotism springs from mutual understanding and love. He further opined, the four points discussed already are, to a greater or lesser extent, contributory factors for preventing the spread of patriotism among people.

But the question arises as to why there was no patriotism at all among Indians? Manjappa says, in a family comprising a number of individuals, one finds that the disposition of each is different from that of the others. Likewise in the large world family composed of many individual nations, the inclination or propensity of each nation is different from that of the others. Joseph Mazzini
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has rightly said that God in the beginning gave each nation distinctive qualities which He wanted them to use for the good of all mankind, and it was by such judicious employment of God-given traits that mankind could proceed in the path of peace and progress. 70 Morley also holds the same view in his book *On Compromise*, that the primary purpose of the British nation is to spread the idea of freedom among all nations, that of the United States is to attain a position of supremacy by scientific advancement, and that of Germany, the proud display of its own might; and that, what each of these countries has been doing is for the attainment of its own ideal. 71

Thus, Manjappa opines, like an individual, each nation has its own special propensity and objectives, and its actions are guided by them. He further says, 'behind all this, however, is the individual as the fundamental factor determining what each nation is and does. Scientists have ascertained that man's intellect works in either of the two ways—
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the way of knowledge and the way of action. This is only a reiteration of what is said in the Bhagavadgita, knowledge and action as the primary compelling forces determining human pursuits. Obviously, Indians also must have been actuated by one of those aims, and performed their service to mankind either by providing knowledge or through action. Manjappa says, one should study actions to understand motives; and if we study the actions of Indians we can easily see the aims which prompted those actions, and know also why patriotism did not grow among them.

In a country wherein the people's inclination is towards knowledge; Sir Frederick Polak says, that they are advanced in religion and philosophy, while in a country where the people's proclivities are towards action they are advanced in political and physical Sciences. Patriotism is related to politics and not to religion or philosophy.73 Thus Manjappa opines, in countries where people are action-minded the science


of politics, and through it patriotism, have a scope for growth. He further states, this does not mean, however, that religion and philosophy are entirely neglected by an action-minded people, nor by a knowledge-minded people politics is totally disregarded. Let us apply this theory to our own country and examine their bent of mind.

The ancient Aryans who settled in India were knowledge-minded and wrote profound philosophical works. Their aim was the acquisition of knowledge. No other people in the world have left for the future such treasures of philosophical thought as the early Aryans of India. But they were not aware of political science as a branch of knowledge, which is a special field of action-minded people. Their political thought was only a minor part of their philosophical speculations.

On the other hand, the people of ancient Greece, who were action-minded, turned their attention to the fields of social ethics and politics. Further, their philosophical works are meagre in comparison with those of India; and works on politics and social ethics
in India were poor when compared to those of Greece.\footnote{Ibid, p. 79.}

A study of social sciences reveals to us a state in the remote past when there were no kings at all. There was no distinction of rulers and the ruled, every one eking out his livelihood by dint of his physical prowess. The strongest would prevail over the others who would follow him. It is said in Rigveda: "He who killed Ahi and liberated the Saptasindhus, who destroyed Bala the Asura and carried away his cow, and who destroyed many enemies in war, verily he is Indra". Indra's strength and valour are extolled many times in this way in the Vedas. He is the Sovereign in heaven, and valour is represented as his chief characteristic. Even in Manusmriti we come across this reference regarding the origin of kingship and the valour of kings.\footnote{Adolf Kaegi, The Rigveda, Amarko Book Agency, New Delhi, Passim. 135-137.} When people were filled with fear in the absence of a protector, God created the king to protect them.\footnote{Manusmriti with the Manubhasya of Medhati, Tr. by Ganganath Jha, Vol. V, Calcutta University, 1926, p. 198.} Thus Manjappa opines, kingship was evolved as the rule of the strong over the weak. Also, strength and valour came
to be considered the primary characteristics of a king,

In the Seventh Chapter of 'Shanti Parva' of
Mahabharat also it is stated: "in Krita Yuga there
were neither kingdoms nor kings. The result was that
unrighteousness grew in the world. In response to the
prayer of the gods Naputhraprithu became the first
king. Thus came the name Prithwi to this world".77

Thus one can easily imagine that kingship
was evolved for the protection of the weak and kings
derived their authority from their strength. Seeing
his valour, people naturally thought that he possessed
the attributes of gods like Indra. This feeling
developed and people later thought of him as an
incarnation of God. That is why in Manusmriti, it is
said, "though a king is a boy he should not be
treated with disrespect as if he is like all others;
for God Himself is born as a king".78 This belief
that the king was an incarnation of God resulted in
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the king behaving as he pleased. The result was, says Manjappa, absolute monarchy.79

Such rulership continued for a long time. Attempts were then made to impose a restraint on the despotism of the kings. Details of his daily life which he must strictly observe were devised. Rules which he must follow in governing the country were laid down. It was found that it was not desirable for a single person to govern a country, and the practice of taking the advice and help of a few people came into vogue. Thus the system of limited monarchy was evolved. Formerly protection of the country from enemies external and internal was the sole concern of a king; now promoting the welfare of the people in their religious and social matters also became the duty of the king. His powers were curtailed and his responsibilities increased.80 In this way, Manjappa opines, among the Aryans of India curbs were imposed on the despotism of kings, and a system of limited monarchy came into vogue and continued without any further changes.
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But there are some scholars like Satavlekar, Pavagi, who maintains that there was in ancient India democratic government, far superior to the benevolent and limited monarchy explained in the foregoing. Manjappa rejects this view. He argues, on the other hand, the single instance of the tyrant Vena being dethroned by his exasperated subjects cannot be a proof of the existence of democracy in them, there should have been other instances of popular revolt against oppressive rulers who flourished all over the country. It is rightly said in the fifty-seventh chapter of Shanti Parva that people should discard a king who oppresses them in the same way as they discard a leaky ship when they have to cross the sea. Manjappa says, there are no instances of such a type in our history. It appears to Manjappa that, in the ninth century A.D., the Chola king Parantapa was chosen to rule according to the wishes of a majority of his subjects. But he refuses to find this practice obtaining anywhere else in India; and even in the case of the other Chola kings it was not followed. He opines, such extremely rare instances
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only show that people liked to have a democratic type of Government in their country; they by no means prove the existence of democratic rule. Among the political reforms introduced in India, a preconceived, organized democratic system is the very last.

Further Manjappa says that the conception that sovereignty rests in the people was unknown to Indians. The country was considered to be the personal property of the king, and he could dispose it off as he pleased. Manjappa gives a number of examples in this connection. Firstly, Dharmaraya staked his kingdom in the dice game and lost it as if he was its undisputed owner. Even a century ago, he states the example of Sahu who handed-over the rule of his kingdom to the Peshwas and it became the kingdom of the Peshwas; the latter lost it to the British, and they became its owners. Manjappa opines, even today the belief that a kingdom belongs to its king has not disappeared. Rightly he asked, could there have been a conception of democracy among such people? It is obvious that Indians believed that properly directed monarchy was the best form of Government.  
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Now, let us see as a contrast, political evolution of Greece. As among the Indian Aryans, they too had at first monarchies of the absolute and liberal types. These, however, did not continue for long. As early as in the ninth century B.C., that is 3,000 years ago, monarchy disappeared there. An administrator—the Archon was appointed in the place of the king for life; which continued for 160 years. Then Archon's rule was restricted to 10 years and was soon replaced by nine magistrates or archons. Thus Monarchy came to be replaced by an Oligarchy.

These nine Archons ruled as they pleased and caused considerable suffering to the people. This caused widespread discontent and provoked an insurrection in which a very clever and able man, Solan, was able to seize power. He reformed the Government of the country and divided it into four classes. Those whose annual income was 400 drachmas and above belonged to the first class; the second class consisted of those who maintained at least one war-house, and went to war when called upon without
accepting any remuneration for their military service; farmers in possession of small fields, who kept at least a weapon of war with them, formed the third class; while labourers belonged to the fourth class. Archons were selected only from the first class; and those who belonged to the fourth class were exempted from the payment of revenue, and also prohibited from holding any office. Their power was limited to the expression of their opinion in the choice of Archons. This was the fourth political reform in Greece, brought into force in 594 B.C. and this set up is called as Aristocracy.

Later, Cleisthenes, a great statesman, abolished the four classes and divided the citizens into ten sections. He formed an assembly composed of fifty members from each section, so that the assembly had 500 members. To the Greeks a year had 354 days. Fifty members of each of the ten groups would carry on routine administrative duties for 36 days, so that each of the ten sections would get its chance of ruling the country once in a year. Important matters like war were discussed and decided upon in meetings of the whole assembly of 500. Thus, in the 5th century
B.C., alone — that is 2500 years ago — democracy had been established in Greece which was the last of the political reforms in Greece.

The Romans followed the democratic system of government established by the Greeks. Though they made some changes to suit the condition of times, they did not depart from the fundamental democratic conceptions of the Greeks. Cicero who lived in the first century B.C., declared that the opinion of the people formed the basis of all laws. Thus, what has now been recognized as a fundamental principle behind all political reform was known to and practised by the Romans two thousand years ago. From the Romans the ideas of democracy spread to the other nations of Europe. Monarchy, however, was not absent, it continued here and there, propped up by the philosophical justification offered in its favour by thinkers like Machiavelli, Jean Bodin, Hugo Grotius. The case of monarchism, however, found few supporters; and the defence of democracy by stalwarts like Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau was so powerful that the whole world accepted it.
It is very often wondered, when both the Greeks and the Indians belonged to the same Aryan racial stock, why did they advance in different directions? As it is already said by Manjappa, the Greeks attained eminence in the science of politics because they were action-minded and gave prominence to social ethics; whereas Indians were knowledge-minded and therefore advanced in the field of philosophical thought and did not attach adequate importance to political reforms. Consequently, patriotism, which is associated with political reform, had little scope to develop in India. Manjappa concludes, this is the real reason for the lack of patriotic spirit in India for such a long time.

Further Manjappa notes that lack of political development in India was due partly to the existence of the four varnas or castes among the people. Protection of the country was entrusted exclusively to the Kshatriyas; it was as if people belonging to other castes had no concern in the defence of the country. It is said in Manusmriti that Brahmins
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may take up arms only when the Hindu Dharma is in danger. As a result, people of other castes became indifferent to political matters. Thus Megasthenes writes:

"A fourth part of the produce of the land had to be given away to the king. Since warfare was the profession of the Kshatriyas, the agricultural classes were not called upon to fight. With total unconcern they would continue to work in their fields even when a battle was raging nearby." 84

Thus Manjappa notes with sorrow, that political matters were entrusted only to the Kshatriya class, and the indifference of the other classes to those matters made one feel that Indians did not attach much importance to this subject which is of great importance to the welfare of the people. — Politics. The deplorable result of this on India's future is well known. In his book, *British Rajyasat*, Sardesai writes feelingly of Kshatriyas shedding their blood in fighting the enemy while the Brahmins were

84. Ibid, p.91.
immersed in their spiritual exercises and the farmer was engaged in cultivation with absolute unconcern. But things were different in Greece. Though there were classes in Greek society also based on division of labour, protection of the country was the duty of all classes. In ancient Greece military service was compulsory for every man at least for some years. Even Socrates served in the army for some time, because they were action-minded. Manjappa concludes the Greeks went on experimenting in the field of political reforms, while the Indians, being knowledge-minded did not give adequate importance to political matters at all.

5. GROWTH OF PATRIOTISM IN INDIA:

We confined ourselves so far to a study of the reasons for the lack of a patriotic spirit among Indians. Now at this stage, we shall take up the study of the forces which operated to rouse that

spirit among them and how it grew in recent times.

A spirit of endeavour, of hard unremitting toil, is the first requisite for the flowering of patriotism among a people; stated Manjappa. This spirit is the 'Kriyasakti' or 'Activism'. If a people like the Indians, who devoted all their energies to the attainment of knowledge during the previous centuries of their history; how would they suddenly become action-minded? Manjappa believes that a people's original aptitudes and inclinations can never be obliterated. So the propensity of the Indian mind towards knowledge has remained, while the urge for action has been added to it only in recent years. It is because, Manjappa opines, the Indian mind, with a pronounced ability for acquiring knowledge, was brought under the influence of western literature and western education with their emphasis on action, and thus acquired the patriotic spirit also. He further says, the inter-action of the two—knowledge and action—is sure to impart to Indian patriotism the elevation and clarity which comes from true knowledge. 86

Badabhai Naoroji, opined in his presidential speech to the second session of the Indian National Congress in 1886 that English education had brought the Indian mind out of the darkness of ignorance into the light of knowledge and helped them to realise that the ruler exists for the ruled and not vice versa.\(^7\) Naoroji further said in his speech on "The Cause and Cure of Famine" in 1901 that Indians were grateful to the British Government for the English education that was given to them, since that education was responsible for forging unity among people speaking so many different languages, for understanding each other, and for the growth of the awarness of a common-national purpose.\(^8\) Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya expressed his views in the same way, in the Banaras Hindu University on 1-11-1920; "though Indians were subjected to great wrongs by the British, they had undoubtedly benefitted from a study of the great English literature which had infused into them ideas of freedom and Swarajya. He continued that,
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in spite of some obvious drawbacks in the English education as imparted in India, Indians had to be grateful to the British for the Education Act of 1854, for that education was largely responsible for many Indians making efforts towards the country's progress.\textsuperscript{89}

A question may be raised at this juncture, as to how this education, which roused feelings of nationalism among Indians, spread all over the country; for nationalistic ideas gripped the Indian mind from its inception. The rule of the East India Company was selfish and commercial in its aims and outlook, and in many ways was reprehensible. They did not want India to proceed in the path of progress. Raja Ram Mohan Roy went to England in 1837 to represent the grievances of Indians to the British Parliament. He was the first Indian to carry to England such a complaint against British rule. The Company's administration was also not liked by British leaders like Lord Macaulay and the Marquis of Lansdowne. They believed the wisest policy for the British Government would be to impart western education to the Indians and enable them to rule their country.
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themselves. They brought this question before the Parliament for discussion in 1833 and an Act was passed enabling educated Indians to hold high offices. Thanks to the efforts of Englishmen like Lord Macaulay and David Hare and of Indians like Raja Ram Mohan Roy, on the seventh of May 1835 an Act was passed in the Parliament to give Indians western education through the medium of English and also another Education Act came into existence in 1854 with the efforts of Sir Charles Wood. As a result, Universities were established at Calcutta (1857), Bombay and Madras (1858), and later at Lahore (1882), and Allahabad (1887). During the sixty years from 1857 to 1918 the number of students increased ninefold, and about sixty-thousand graduates came out of the Universities. Many of these young men have devoted their energies and their learning to the service of the mother-land. It is due to their striving and sacrifice that the light of patriotism could be kindled all over the country.

As a result of this some patriots like Prasanna Kumara Tagore established the British Indian Association in 1851, which is the first forum of
nationalist opinion. Then two years later, Dadabhai Naoroji established the **Bombay Presidency Association** for the discussion of political problems. Again in 1877 the political Association of Calcutta sent Babu Surendranath Bannerjee to tour all over north India for delivering lectures in order to bring about political awakening. He was the first among such speakers. By his amazing powers of oratory he roused large masses of people to an awareness of their condition. All over the country, associations like the *Sarvajanika Sabha* of Poona and the *Mahajana Sabha* of Madras were established for the discussion of the country's political questions. The Political Association of Calcutta called a **National Conference** which consisted of all educated men of Bengal in December 1883. In December 1884 most of the country's leaders like Dadabhai Naoroji and Surendranath Bannerjee who had come to Madras for a Theosophical conference not only endorsed the resolutions of the Calcutta National Conference but also examined a proposal of holding a **National Conference**. A great friend of India, A.O. Hume, who was Secretary to the Government of India, saw the alacrity with which Indians absorbed the learning of the west, and how eager they had become to work for the betterment of their condition. Realising that this
was the time to help them in their onward march, he
gave up his service under government and directed all
his energies to his new work. With the help of patriotic
Indians like Dadabhai Naoroji, he established the
Indian National Congress. Thus A.O. Hume was regarded
by the people as the Father of the Indian National
Congress, and Naoroji as their political Rishi or the
inspiring spirit. The first session of the Indian
National Congress was held in Bombay on the 28th of
December 1885 with Umesh Chandra Bannarjee as
President and 72 representatives from all parts of
India attended this session. Manjappa considers this
as the first representative political body for the
whole country; and the inspiring spirit behind it was
the patriotism aroused in the hearts of Indians by
western education. He further said, for the first
time in the country's history, Indians from all parts,
whatever their creed, combined in an organized body
to demand political reforms from the Government; an
occasion worthy of being inscribed in letters of gold.

In the beginning, Muslims of India wrongly
thought that the Congress was an organization through
which the Hindus were trying to advance their own
interests. For the first Congress session was attended by only one Muslim, Mr. R. Sayani. As they also became enlightened through western education they attended the future Congress sessions in large numbers and ultimately became an essential part of the Congress body. As education spread among Indians, stated Manjappa, the spirit of patriotism gripped them more intensely.

Thus, Manjappa opined, the sacrifices made by many educated patriotic leaders during the last sixty years have helped to rouse the spirit of patriotism among the common people to a great extent. Again the Congress as a national body established local branches at provincial, district and taluka levels and enabled Indians of all grades not only to understand the Congress aims and ideology, but also to participate actively in the work of their fulfilment. Manjappa further states, through English and vernacular newspapers like the Hindu, Kesari, Jnanaprakash, Amrit Bazar Patrika, learned leaders of the country enabled all sections of people to acquire a patriotic outlook. 90
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At a time when the Indians, keenly aware of their conditions of humiliation and impelled by the surge of patriotism, were trying to induce the Government to change its policy of exploitation and suppression, the very able but stubbornly imperialist Lord Curzon came to India as Viceroy. He saw the wave of patriotism and national unity that had swept over the whole of Bengal, imperilling British imperial interests. The only way to suppress it was by dividing Bengal by incorporating some eastern and northern parts in the province of Assam. This proposal had already been mooted by provincial governors in 1891 and 1896, but had been kept in abeyance by a friend of India Sir Henry Cotton who later became Governor of Assam. Curzon revived the question of dividing Bengal in order to wipe out Bengal's opposition to British rule. On the 3rd of December 1903 he passed an order incorporating the Bengal districts of Chittagong, Dacca and Mymensing into the province of Assam.91

This anti-Indian measure of Lord Curzon roused the patriotic spirit of Indians into a fury.
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Between December 1903 and October 1905 alone about two thousand mass meetings were held in Bengal to condemn the policy of Lord Curzon. Partition of Bengal became an all-India question. Meetings were held all over the country to condemn the policy of the Viceroy; people of all faiths and creeds united and spoke in a single voice. About seventy thousand people of East Bengal signed a mammoth petition expressing their discontent against the partition and sent it to the Secretary of State for India.92

A few questions may be raised at this juncture. What was behind all this outburst of discontent and opposition? Why did the people of other provinces also participate in it? Not a single precedent was there in the whole history of India for such a united protest. Even when foreigners invaded and established their rule in the country, and even when provinces like Karnataka and Maharashtra were torn up and given away to the neighbouring states, was there a protest? while now the transfer of a few districts of Bengal to Assam roused such an outburst of fury all over India? Manjappa opined that it was due to the love and
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devotion to the mother-land which had gripped the hearts of the people. 93

Though there was popular protest, country-wide and insistent, it went unheeded by the Government. Government of India approved of Curzon's measure on 16th October 1905. But the Indians did not lose heart; for patriotism is a mighty force generating invincible strength and spirit of sacrifice. 16th October, 1905 became a day of mourning for the people of Bengal; lakhs of people bathed in the holy Ganges, went in procession singing patriotic songs, and held protest meetings in which they voiced their feelings in no uncertain terms. At the same time they boycotted British goods. Manjappa said, this wave of patriotic protest spread over the whole country. "For the first time Indians realised the truth of the ancient statement that one's mother and mother-land are more precious than even heaven". 94

Manjappa further noted, popular dissatisfaction could have been assuaged if the Government had
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taken prompt remedial measures. But the Government would not learn anything. They tried to suppress popular discontent by force, and only made the people more determined to resist. Dadabhai Naoroji who was the President of the Congress session of 1906 declared in his address that self-government was the only solvent of the evils from which the country suffered and the people should be united and make determined efforts to win it. Government also understood that popular discontent, born of intense patriotism, would continue and grow in strength unless they adopted positive measures to meet the popular demand. The mild and prayerful attitude of the Congress leaders so far towards the Government did not seem adequate and proper to the new and youthful leaders who now came to the fore and exhibited a more agressive attitude. The new group of 'extremist' patriots was led by Tilak, Lajpat Rai and B.C. Pal. Those who believed in a milder and more liberal attitude came to be called Moderates, in contrast to these Extremists.


The extremist group in the Congress, more dynamic and aggressive than the Moderates, now adopted their own policy. Theirs was the philosophy of aggressive action and defence of national self-respect. They told the people that they must win Swaraj through the boycott of foreign goods, use of Swadeshi (indigenous) articles, and national education. Tilak declared that nothing short of complete Swaraj was acceptable to his party. Thus Manjappa concluded that the patriotism of the Tilak group was of the Rājas type while that of the Moderates was Sātvic in character.

Manjappa stated if the Government had revoked the Bengal partition earlier, this Rājas patriotism would not have spread among the people. Even Rash Behari Ghosh expressed the view that Curzon was responsible for the rise of the radical group within the Congress. Government was obdurate even in the face of intensive agitation of the extremists, and adopted repressive measures. Nine patriotic leaders of Bengal including Lajpat Rai, Ajit Singh and Aswinikumar Dutt were deported without even the semblance of a trial. This roused the fury of the
people. Many a misguided youth took up revolutionary activities, killing Englishmen in the belief that it would help the country. To Manjappa, this was the Tāmasic type of patriotism, justifying violence and killing in the cause of the country. However, Manjappa opined, the majority of patriots followed the Rājasic mode of patriotic service by fearlessly criticizing the Government in newspapers and from the platform. Many of these had been sent to prison. On the 22nd of July 1908 Tilak was tried and sentenced to imprisonment for six years. Thus, Manjappa rightly remarked, within half a century after the introduction of western education in India, patriotism of all the three types could be seen in India— the Sātvic, Rājasic and Tāmasic. He also stated that most of the patriots were Sātvic, while the Rājasic were small in number; and the Tāmasic group was infinitesimal in comparison. 97

To assuage Indian discontent born of patriotism the 'Morley—Minto Reforms' were introduced in 1909. The partition of Bengal was repealed in 1911. Thus Indians had won the battle.

The result was that the number of Sātvic patriots swelled, that of Rājasa patriots dwindled, while the Tāmasic class almost disappeared. In such a situation, the First World War began in 1914. Tilak was released from jail. At this juncture, the outstanding guide and leader of Sātvic patriots, Gokhale, passed away. There was none to carry on the work with his energy and zeal. At the same time, Turkey joined the enemy camp in the war and the British became the enemy of the Indian Muslims. In such a situation, Tilak began to advocate Rājasa patriotism for Indians; and he was also able to win over the Congress in 1916 to his viewpoint.

Manjappa noted, Indians of all classes and creeds, moderates and extremists, Hindus and Muslims, had now come together to demand political reforms for the country. The result was, the British Government announced on the 20th of August 1917 that their policy was to grant self-government to India by gradual stages. 98
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Manjappa noted with sorrow that, though the war ended in 1918, self Government was not granted to Indians. On the other hand, the British Government imposed the 'Rowlatt Act' which gave ample powers to the Government of India to suppress all patriotic efforts of Indians for their country's advancement. The result was with one voice, as in the days of Bengal partition, Indians demanded the repeal of the Rowlatt Act through meetings all over the country and in newspapers. But again the Government was callous and obdurate; and this brought to the fore a new type of patriotism among Indians.

At this juncture, Gandhiji appeared on the scene, with his Satyagraha weapon. He called upon all Indians to observe hartal on the 6th of April 1919 as a protest against the Rowlatt Act. The result was, thousands of protest meetings were held, and people expressed their feeling in a Sātvic manner. But the then Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, Sir Michael O'Dwyer, however, did not like even this peaceful protest. He ordered that Mahatma Gandhi should not enter the Punjab. This had a tremendous affect upon the country. Some misguided people, roused to fury,
burnt and looted some Government property and killed two British officers. Though this was condemned by people all over India, General Dyer ordered the perpetration of retaliatory acts, more inhuman than those of the people. When people had gathered for a meeting at Jallianwallaha Bagh, General Dyer went there with a body of soldiers and opened fire on the peaceful and unarmed mob. About a thousand people were killed.

Such barbarous and malevolent retaliatory acts of the Government shocked the whole of India. Everyone felt that it was a national calamity; and patriotism flared up in every Indian heart. At the same time, British Government had already gone back on the promises made to the Muslims over the question of the Khilafat; and added to it there was the inhumanity of General Dyer. Patriotic India lost its faith in British sense of justice and fairplay. At this critical situation, Tilak passed away on 1st August 1920. Fortunately for the country, Gandhiji took up the national leadership and trained the people in Sātvic patriotism.
Gandhiji advised Indians to adopt the method of non-cooperation, which formed a part of his political creed of Satyagraha. All titles and rewards bestowed by the Government should be renounced; offices like that of Bench Magistrates should be given up; students should keep away from Government schools, Vakils should return their Sanads to Government courts, and no Indian should contest the election to the new assemblies constituted according to the 'Montague — Chelmsford! Reforms; every Indian should wear home-spun Swadeshi cloth only. Gandhiji toured all over India in 1920 explaining to the people the principles and methods of his Satyagraha and brought about a tremendous awakening.99 Even special session of Congress held at Calcutta accepted his proposals.

According to Manjappa, Gandhiji's principles and plan of non-cooperation reached every nook and corner of the country in the space of four months; and in the annual Congress session held at Nagpur, fifteen thousand delegates and about 10 lakhs of visitors gave their approval to his Sātvic principles and methods; though it demanded courage and sacrifice of the highest

sort. The result was, that no Indian could co-operate with the Government. This was the cry all over the land.

To sum up: (1) The political agitation and struggle during the past 70 years have been carried on in the interests of the whole country; (2) In times of trouble or calamity in one part of the country, the people of other parts have run to their help; (3) Whatever might be their race, religion or creed, all those who fought for political reforms in India became friends. Manjappa further states that the spur for all the agitation for political reforms leading to the country's freedom came, as we have seen, from the feeling of patriotism aroused in the people of India by the western education given to Indians under the British rule. So interests of one's own Dharma became ultimately less important than the interests of the mother-land to Indians.¹⁰⁰

6. PROMOTION OF PATRIOTISM:

It is discussed in the foregoing as to how our country had to suffer from dangers, troubles and

tribulations for over seven centuries. Now a question arises as to the means to eradicate these evils that had brought the country to this deplorable condition. As it is rightly stated by Manjappa, if only we were able to prevent the conquest of our country by foreigners, there would not have been this situation of political, economic and cultural decadence. In his 'Appeal to the Americans on behalf of India' the great patriot-saint Swami Rama Thirtha emphasised that India, which was once the mother of all knowledge and attainments in the world of the spirit, was now reduced to a state of prostration. Thus according to Manjappa it should be the primary concern, the first duty, and a sacred duty, of every son of the hallowed soil to free his mother-land from the ailments which have emasculated her. They should be inspired by Sv'itic patriotism; they should carefully think of their duty as Indians in this hour of crisis; and they should make a united endeavour to revive the strength and glory of their country.

Disinterested, patriotic service of the mother-country for six decades had made Dadhabhai Naoroji keenly aware of the ills to which the people

were exposed. Thus he rightly pointed out in his presidential speech at the Congress session of 1906 that Indians should try to promote a planned and coordinated advancement of the country in the political, social and economic fields, as otherwise progress would be defective and unsound. 102 Manjappa explained as to how Indians should proceed with their duty, and what ultimately helps promotion of patriotism.

As it is rightly stressed by Charles James Fox, "freedom can never be safeguarded without political power. But the unfortunate thing is that we drifted down the path of decadence from the day we lost that power". 103 Thus Manjappa opines; if we have to live again as a great nation we must recover it.

He then examines how the British, who are ruling us, were using their power and whether they were giving us any other power.

Britain built the largest empire in the world, sprawling over the continents of Asia, Europe, America, Africa and Australia. She controlled 55 colonial colonies.
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possessions, large and small, 8 of them, like Canada and Newfoundland, were independent, who had their own legislatures, and guided by the British Government in matters like war and foreign policy. Thus they were self-governing colonies for all practical purposes. On the other hand the remaining 47 colonies like India, Ceylon, were governed according to the dictates of the British Government, neglecting popular opinion. Thus they were described as Dependencies or Crown colonies. Our country being a dependency, Manjappa described how and in what respect popular will came to prevail over autocratic dictation. 104

After the Government of England took over the rule of India from the East India Company, Manjappa says, the Indian Council Act of 1861 was passed, by which the Governor-General was given power to select 6 to 12 advisers to help him in matters of administration. The Indians declared, through the National Congress, that this concession to popular opinion was not acceptable. Then another Act was passed in 1892 wherein also the opinion of the members selected by

the Government prevailed, and there was no provision for obtaining the wishes of the people. As it is said by Manjappa, agitation for adequate popular representation therefore continued and the result was that, in the Act of 1909, popular representation through election in the Central and Provincial Councils was provided for. But in the Central Assembly members selected by the Government had a preponderance and the views of the elected popular minority were totally ineffective. So popular protest continued. The Government brought into force an act introducing some further reforms in 1921. Thereby education, public health and agriculture came into the hands of Indian ministers. The Councils were enlarged and scope was given for the entry of a large number of elected representatives. But the bureaucratic framework continued, and this was a far cry from the self-government enjoyed by colonies like Canada. Thus Manjappa declared, "India's freedom is a farce until its legislative bodies are constituted like those of the self-governing colonies, and her progress remains a dream till then. We must make untiring efforts to achieve for our country the status of a
self-governing dominion; then only the Swaraj of our conception will come into being.\textsuperscript{105}

Further he opined, all the political parties of India want such a Swaraj. But the non-Brahmin group, which confined its activities only to social reform, was not in favour of Swaraj. Its fear was that, under Swaraj, the Brahmins would monopolize political power and keep the non-Brahmins in a state of degradation. In this connection Manjappa cites the example of Muslims who were also saying the same thing, that Hindus would make use of any political reform to their advantage. But Sir Syed opined that the Hindus and the Muslims were the two eyes of India, and if one of them is hurt tears come out of the other also. In the same way the non-Brahmins should also realise, said Manjappa, that what hurts the country would hurt them also. In his presidential address to the 22nd session of the National Congress, Dadabhai Naoroji gave the clarion call that no Indian may hope for progress until we have Swaraj, that we should all stand united for winning it and that all of us were
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like people sailing in a ship. He concluded with that famous statement: "United we will stand; divided, we will fall". Thus Manjappa requested all mon-Brahmins to keep Dadabhai's admonition in mind.

He further stated, both the political groups, the Moderates and the Congress Satyagrahis, want Swaraj. But they differ in the approach to and the method of obtaining it; while the former is satisfied with the dribblets of self-government obtained by humble petitions, the latter would develop moral force and use it against the Government until they win Swaraj. Their patriotism is Sātvic, but they belong to different stages of that patriotism. The first stage is that of the moderates and the second and higher stage is that of the Satyagrahis. Thus Manjappa thought that in the fight for Swaraj the moderates should make the first attempt, failing which the other group should take up the struggle. Otherwise the people will have recourse to the Rājasa and Tāmasa methods that might cause untold misery and suffering to the country and to themselves, or make them live a life of dishonour and degradation under

the iron heel of a despotic regime. He was of the opinion that a study of our history under British rule would make it clear that the Tāmasa and Rājasā methods of fight would not yield good results. Thus he opined that the Congress should adopt the Sātvic course.

Let no Indian forget this, says Manjappa; our mother-land taught the world long centuries ago that life's fulfilment consists in practising charity, tolerance and love, and in eschewing violence in any form; in other words, living a Sātvic life. It is a disgrace to our hallowed cultural tradition if we abandon this Sātvic path and adopt Rājasic or Tāmasic ways. Perhaps a divine purpose lies hidden behind the unarmed, helpless condition to which our country is reduced; it may be that, under a divine dispensation, we should become instruments for teaching mankind the way of non-violence, righteousness, and of love. Our troubles, our sufferings, and our sacrifice may well be a means of proving to the world that soul-force is mightier than any physical force. A time will surely come, said Manjappa, when India will conquer the hearts of mankind with the redeeming weapon of love.
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2. Some people believe that political freedom is the solvent of all the evils of a country, and when once this freedom is achieved, the progress of the country is assured. But Manjappa rejected this view. He argued, political freedom is only a means to progress. If progress had been the direct result of political freedom, many politically free countries should have achieved progress. But it is not so. He said, the freedom of every individual in society is as important as political freedom. The Progress of any country is possible only when these two co-exist. As J.S. Mill rightly points out in his essay on Liberty that social freedom is much more important than political freedom; for, when political freedom is absent it is the person's body that suffers from the use of force or from punishment, while his soul also suffers from the restrictions imposed on his freedom by society. He maintains that mankind benefits more by allowing the individual's freedom of belief, word and action in society than by imposing any restrictions on him. 108

To Manjappa, social slavery is more terrible than the political one; and he said, a true patriot must do his best to eradicate it. Even Dadabhai Naoroji also warned his countrymen in the same manner that they must work for the simultaneous social and political advancement of the country if there should be real progress. 109

Manjappa further said, the social problems were confined only to Hindus, for they form an overwhelmingly large majority, and improvement in their condition helps the country's progress to the maximum.

Among the social groups of the world, said Manjappa, Hindu society is singularly unique. Like the Muslim and Christian societies, it is not bound by rigid rules and restrictions; that variety is its characteristic feature can be seen in the existence of three to four thousand castes in it. Many rules of conduct and behaviour, sometimes contradictory to each other, derive their authority and justification from the same Hindu scriptures, like Vedas, Agamas,

Sastras and puranas; which were the sole authority for all these castes. On other matters of social conduct also, such as untouchability, early marriage, foreign travel, social rights of women, the most divergent and contradictory views find their support in the Vedas, or in the comprehensive concept of Hindu Dharma.

He argued, the decadence that had crept into Hindu society was due to two chief causes: (i) The social reforms that were introduced as time went on were not accepted or adopted by all sections of society, with the result that Hindu society became a conglomeration of people in different stages of social development — with practices like animal sacrifice and Ahimsa existing side by side. (ii) Ancient authority for some social changes was created by the incorporation of spurious writings by unscrupulous people.¹¹⁰

Thus he concludes, absence of uniform rules and conventions of conduct in Hindu society has given scope for restraint and coercion in the name of Dharma.

There cannot be any real social freedom until a comprehensive, homogeneous and uniform set of rules for social conduct comes into existence. So he says, in the existing situation, a real social revolution is imperative; political freedom is meaningless if it is not accompanied by social freedom also. It is the duty of social leaders of all denominations to persuade people to come together and evolve a new set of rules of guidance in social conduct and behaviour. He further said, we need, not only a political Swaraj, but a social Swaraj too.

For achieving this social Swaraj, he suggested the following reforms: (i) The four Varnas or castes, based on the accident of birth, must disappear, because caste is responsible for all social evils. (ii) Untouchability in any form must disappear completely. (iii) The innumerable sub-castes must be made to disappear; and this will facilitate intermarriage among the main castes. (iv) Conversion to Hinduism from any other religion must be made easy. (v) Taboos on foreign travel, adult marriage and widow-remarriage must be allowed. (vi) Women should have full social freedom in all matters. (vii) Child marriage should be regarded as
a crime on society. (viii) *Ahimsa* being a fundamental principle of the Hindu Dharma, animal killing for any cause must stop, forthwith. 111

To Manjappa social reform is more complicated and more difficult than political reform. Thus he said, this should be carried on with care, patience and circumspection, and in gradual stages. Those who take up this work must carry the people with them, not only through precept but also by example. This is according to him, the true patriotic social service.

3. After considering the patriot's duty in the political and social fields, now we turn to the industrial and economic field. Karl Marx maintained that the political, social and religious conditions of a people depend upon their economic condition. In other words, a people's economic condition influence their political social and cultural outlook. Manjappa on similar principle, proceeds to examine, how the matters stood in economic matters under the British regime.
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Lord Lawrence wrote in 1866 that innumerable people in India were suffering owing to a lack of the barest necessities of life. The reason was, as Dadabhai Naoroji wrote, the British were carrying away from India every year as much wealth as Mahmud of Ghazani did in all his 18 expeditions.112 Manjappa says, our inconceivable destitution is due to this drain from our country; India's life-blood is being sucked away by the leech of British imperialism. Thus Curzon was right when he said that the sun of the British Empire would set on the day England lost India.113

To Manjappa, it was a sheer folly to expect this Government to do something to eradicate this poverty. Sir H.J.S. Cotton declared in 1885 that while the Indian people were clamouring for food, the British Government was trying to satisfy them with constitutional reforms.114

Manjappa thus declared that our deplorable economic condition cannot change for the better until

there is a revolutionary change in our industry and commerce. He said, cotton industry is the foremost and most vital of the industries. Human comfort depends primarily on clothing. In fact, social scientists measure the civilization of a people by the advance they have made in the cloth industry. At the same time he advised to boycott foreign cloth (specially from Britain). Because he said, our textile industry can never come into its own otherwise, nor can our poverty disappear. He called upon every Indian to prefer Swadeshi cloth to foreign cloth however crude and costly the former may be; every Indian should feel that wearing foreign cloth and selling it are acts of treason to the mother-land. He further exhorted, we should wear Swadeshi clothes even if we have to pay more, because it will help thousands of families of Indian weavers. Thus he concluded, it is only when Swadeshi goods are manufactured, and used by all people, that our industries can revive, and our wealth can remain with us. At the same time he declared, textile industry should develop only with the help of the Charaka and handlooms. He felt that patriotic service consists only in wearing Swadeshi cloth, thereby helping the growth of this industry.
4. If, in this way, patriotic Indians should think of striving for the political, social and economic advancement of their country, eradication of the prevailing illiteracy and ignorance is the initial step. To Manjappa, ignorance is the root of all evil; there can be no progress until education is widespread among the masses. He said, let us not forget that 95 percent of our countrymen are illiterate, and hence, are incapable of thinking of new things. Everyone should strive for removing this darkness; there is no more meritorious national service than this. He requested, let the rich give their wealth, and the educated their learning, for this service. He further argued, mere literacy cannot make a people educated. To Manjappa, education which will not conduce to self-reliance and comfortable living among the people does not deserve to be called by that name. So he said, let us not remain content with the existing system of education which makes us fit only for subordination and servitude. He advised, on the other hand, that thousands of our youth should go to the advanced countries of the west to receive education in industrial technology; and on their return they must help to augment the national wealth. The work
of educating the people is the responsibility of the educated few. Swami Vivekananda rightly said, "the Indian who is educated at the expense of his ignorant countrymen and who fails to return the debt he owes to them by doing his best for their education is a traitor."

5. About the mental attitude necessary for national service Dadabhai Naoroji declared in his presidential speech to the Congress session of 1893, "every Indian should keep in mind that he is, first and foremost, a son of the mother-land, and that he has duties to perform towards his countrymen; whether he is a Hindu, Christian, Muslim or Parsi, he is an Indian, a son of the sacred soil of Hindustana."

Manjappa, thus opined, it is the sacred duty of every Indian to strive for the political, social, economic and cultural advancement of his countrymen in such a frame of mind. Whatever might be our religious profession, all of us are Indians, and we
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share equally the joys and sorrows of our country. He further said, such differences have already brought us to this deplorable condition. At least from now onwards let us forget our differences and work for the welfare of our mother-land. He warned that an individual or a social group standing in the way of national service with a view to its own advancement is as heinous a sin as perfidy to one’s own mother. Apart from this aspect of patriotism, at least from humanitarian considerations, he said, it is the duty of every Indian to improve the condition of his less fortunate countrymen. He also called upon the people to shake off their inertia and to strive for the improvement of the lot of our countrymen; if we do not, disaster is sure to overwhelm us.

It is necessary to refer to the three essentials of patriotism advocated by Swami Vivekananda at this juncture in order to appreciate Manjappa’s views on the subject.

"What is the intellect or reason? If it goes a few steps and there it stops. But through the
heart comes inspiration. Love opens the most impossible gates, love is the gate to all the secrets of the universe. Feel, therefore, my would-be reformers, my would-be patriots! Do you feel that millions and millions of the descendants of gods and sages have become next-door neighbours to brutes? Do you feel that millions are striving today, and millions have been starving for ages? Do you feel that ignorance has come over the land as a dark cloud? Does it make you restless? Does it make you sleepless? Has it gone into your blood, coursing through your veins, becoming consonant with your heart beats? Has it made you almost mad? Are you seized with that one idea of the misery of ruin, and have you forgotten all about your name, your fame, your wives, your children, your property, even your own bodies? Have you done that? That is the first step to become a patriot, the very first step. I did not go to America, as most of you know, for the Parliament of Religions, but this demon of a feeling was within me and within my soul. I travelled twelve years all over India, finding no way to work for my countrymen, and that is why I went to America. Most of you know that, who knew me then. Who cared about this Parliament
of Religions? Here was my own flesh and blood sinking every day, and who cared for them? This was my first step".

"You may feel, then; but instead of spending your energies in frounthy talk, have you found any way out, any practical solution, some help instead of condemnation, some sweet words to soothe their miseries, to bring them out of this living death? Yet that is not all. Have you got the will to surmount mountain-high obstructions? If the whole world stands against you sword in hand, would you still dare to do what you think is right? If your wives and children are against you, if all your money goes, your name dies, your wealth vanishes, would you still stick to it? Would you still pursue it and go on steadily towards your own goal? As the great king Bharatrihari says — "Let the sages blame or let them praise; let the goddess of fortune come or let her go wherever she likes; let death come today, or let it come in hundreds of years; he indeed is the steady man who does not move one inch from the way of truth". Have you got that steadfastness? If you have these three things, each one of you will work
miracles". Manjappa, thus, requested, every Indian should acquire these three essential conditions of true patriotism and be able to help in the establishment of freedom, happiness and peace in the world!

To conclude, Manjappa was particularly conscious of a lack of patriotism among Indians. It is perhaps due to this awareness on his part that he chose to discuss the problem at good length in his book Bhāratiyara Deshabhakti, so that he could promote patriotic endeavour on the part of Indians which in turn would strengthen and contribute to the building up of a strong Indian nationalism.

Manjappa, as explained in the foregoing, has analysed in his book Bhāratiyara Deshabhakti the general principles of patriotism which generally move a people to patriotic endeavour. After examining the validity of the basic principles of patriotism, he has attempted to find out the causes for lack of patriotism among the Indians in the past. Manjappa

is of the opinion that Indians attached greater importance to religion rather than nation. Further, he has vividly shown how, on account of internal dissensions, they lost their freedom. The impact of the British Rule, Western ideas and institutions on Indian life has also been explained in this scientific work. The book, therefore, deserves to be read by all those who are interested in the cultural and political evolution of India and her future growth as a nation.

This is a rare writing of a very high order adorning Kannada literature, as it introduced Kannada speaking people for the first time to the modern western concepts, such as nationalism, liberty, socialism etc. As the father of nationalist literature in Kannada and a pioneer in the field of literature of thought, Manjappa occupies a distinct place and enjoys a high reputation as an ardent nationalist. Apart from the thought content, the way he presents his ideas in Kannada language is an eloquent testimony to his literary ability. One finds throughout the book a scientific and dispassionate attitude on the part of the author. That such a book should have been produced as early as 1921 in his series 'Rāśtra Jeevana Granthamale' is a matter of pride not only to
Kannadigas but to every Indian.

Manjappa's concept of patriotism included nationalism also. While he discussed the concept of patriotism, he also dealt with the concept of nationalism. At the outset Manjappa held, not merely as a political expedient but as a principle, that the national interest must prevail over any partial or fragmentary interest. He was a vigorous critic of all fissiparous tendencies that tended to weaken national unity. Basically, he recognised nationalism as a historical fact. This meant that each nation was the product of an evolving, historical process, and this process went on in accordance with its inner law, the 'Rashtriya Dharma'. A nation worth the name must evolve its own language and its specific ethos. But this does not mean that a nation should shut its windows against the world. But one should be selective in assimilating alien influences. Among the basic driving forces in India's national evolution, Manjappa considered two as most important. The first was the dominance of the religious motif in her national life. The second was the tendency towards synthesis, towards a peaceful process of absorption of foreign and hostile elements.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁸. Manjappa Hardekar, Ecchatta Hindusthāna, passim. 60-61.
Manjappa's nationalism was neither monistic nor chauvinistic. On the one hand, it did not require the repression of group life within, but it merely required that group life and individual life should not be pursued as ideals at the cost of national integration. On the other hand, his nationalism was not aggressive. It did not imply a narrow-minded love of one's own nation. Manjappa had the vision of a world state, though he did not work out its details or examine its practical implications. Manjappa was well aware that the ideal of nationalism was not indigenous to India, and that the problem of sustaining this imported ideal had to be tackled.

In all he did and said, he considered himself to be first and foremost a nationalist. The goal of his life was the comprehensive regeneration of India as a nation. His efforts to examine her past were meant to provide a basis for such regeneration. In a very real sense, every one of his activities, whatever its apparent form, may be related to this central purpose of nationalism (Rashtriya Dharma). Great indeed has been his contribution to the growth of the spirit of nationalism in Karnataka, a spirit which eventually triumphed, though Manjappa did not live to witness it.