CHAPTER VII

ENDS AND MEANS.
ENDS AND MEANS.

The Extremists Methods for Achieving Swaraj.

Tilak held that it was not by its aims, but by its methods that his party had earned the name 'Extremists,' because according to him its purpose was the same as that of the Moderates; it did not aim at abolishing the British rule completely, but with obtaining a large share of power for the people in the administration of the country.

With regard to their aims, the extremists were, divided into the following three categories. The first were against the British rule through and through and sought the development of their country inspite of the British. The second class comprised those who believed that the continuance of the British rule was compatible with their natural progress, and that this should prepare themselves for expelling the British from the country. The third class of the extremists was of the opinion that the British must be made to clear out of India at once, no matter what happened to their country.¹

¹ The Indian World, (Calcutta), March-April 1907, pp.350-55.
They were further divided on the basis of their methods into three classes: (1) the revolutionaries; (2) those who sympathised with and secretly helped revolutionaries but did not admit it for fear of the law; and (3) visionaries, impatient of foreign domination, but opposed to violent methods.2

The last group were those who were either opposed to violent methods, or at least were not themselves involved with violent activities. They played a dominant role in the moulding of the political thinking of the Indian people. Their fundamental assumptions were: (1) to conduct a political campaign in the hope that petitions and prayers to the British public would redress India's grievances was unrealistic; (2) these grievances were not just confined to the Indianisation of civil services, the reduction of the military expenditure and such specific legislation as the arms act and the executive measures as the partition of Bengal; they centred round the broader questions of Indians getting a larger share in the administration of the country and putting an end to Britain's exploitation of India; (3) the political agitation for the redress of these grievances should be conducted with a view to fulfilling

the nationalist aspirations of the people. They advocated that popular enthusiasm should be aroused for the cause of Swaraj. Their technique of agitation was based on the following ideas: (a) Faith in India's past glory. Invocations were to be made to the earlier periods of Indian history and to national heroes like Shivaji (Tilak); (b) an appeal was made to the religious instincts of the people: The country was to be represented as a goddess and functions such as the Durga Puja (worship of a Hindu goddess) were to instil among their countrymen enthusiasm for political agitation. (B.C. Pal and Aurobindo Ghosh); (c) Reorganisation of education on national lines; (d) on the economic plane, the boycott of British and other foreign goods and the promotion of 'Swadeshi' (indigenous) goods. (e) In the political sphere non-co-operation with the British Government in India and, if necessary, passive resistance to it; (f) They laid increasing emphasis not only on Indian traditions, but on the development of Indian languages and making extensive use of them for conducting political agitation with the aim of enlisting the support of the general masses for the national movement.

The problem of ends and means of Swaraj occupied Lajpat Rai from the very beginning of his political career. 'Agitation,' he declared was only a means of mobilising the
public opinion. But the politician must have a creed; he should spot out grave social injustice, seek its remedy and continue pressing for it till he achieved the end. He should not look for immediate results, but invoking his duty should go on undismayed right through to his goal. He should have religious fervour for his work.

Lajpat Rai, however, contended that it was the duty of the politicians to generate such forces in the country as would strengthen the people. They should try to bring up the masses to the level of people elsewhere in intelligence, in culture, in calibre, in capacity for self-sacrifice and subordination to high ideals. They should learn self-help and self-reliance and be always prepared to take risk and make sacrifices for the highest goal of Swaraj. This task could not be performed by speeches and resolutions. It required that they must be prepared to undergo great sacrifices. Lajpat Rai, therefore, pleaded for the emergence of a sense of social responsibility which he found apparently lacking even among the so called leaders who were expected to be the torchbearers of the ignorant masses. He held that among other things this was due to India's political degradation under centuries of
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alien rule. He maintained that 'unless Indians were firmly determined to win their rights at any cost, they won't be heard with respect.' He observed in 1907 that the government was not prepared to concede reforms, the Congress asked for, because they knew that the demands were not backed by any compelling force. 'We should agitate,' he declared, 'not in the hope of getting any immediate result, but even when nothing comes of it. Then alone we can give incontestable proof of our earnestness for political privileges.'

He also warned the government that if the right of meetings, the right of petition and the right of constitutional agitation was taken away, there would be nothing left for the people of this country to be loyal to the British Government. Having been advocate of 'Swadeshi' from the beginning of his public career, Lajpat Rai held 'Swadeshi' and boycott as constitutional and legitimate weapons.
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In the wake of the countrywide agitation against the Bengal partition, the firebrands in the Congress challenged the moderate leaders for the mild interpretation of the terms 'swadeshi' and 'boycott.' To the extremists, 'swadeshi' was not merely an economic principle, but a tenet of revolution against imperialism. Extremist anger was further roused when even the Government talked of 'swadeshi' with its own interpretation of the doctrine. In March 1906, Lord Minto made reference to 'swadeshi' in his speech in the Council. To those who were earnestly endeavouring to develop home industries for the people of India in an open market he held out a promise of support. But 'swadeshi' could not be so elastic as to accommodate even the Viceroy of India as a supporter. Minto's declaration was followed immediately by a wide outcry. Bal Gangadhar Tilak was on the 'war-path.' The Deccan and the Punjab leaders united to challenge the Viceroy. Lajpat Rai said: 'For us -- a subject race -- there was no path but that of struggle.' He identified the philosophy of struggle with that of 'swadeshi.'

He visualised Swadeshi and Boycott as the religion of new India: the manifestation of self-sacrificing

---
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patriotism, the means of moulding a self-reliant Indian nation, and the spearhead of India's national struggle against the British rule. Discarding the moderates' sermons of unswerving loyalty, he asserted that it was folly to interpret India's status of political subservience as a school for political apprenticeship. "How can a subject race governed by another be patriotic towards its rulers?" asked Lajpat Rai. He condemned Indians who celebrated the Empire Day as "hypocrites who dragged Indian patriotism into the mire," and bitterly denounced Indians who hankered after British honorary titles.

Defining the creed of 'swadeshi,' Lajpat Rai said, 'I regard it as the salvation of my country.' The 'swadeshi' movement ought to make us self-respecting, self-reliant, self-supporting and last but not least, manly. The 'swadeshi' movement ought to teach the Indians how to

14. Lajpat Rai, "Indian Patriotism Towards The Empire," The Indian Review (Madras), January 1907, p. 52.
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organize their capital, their resources, their labour, their energies and their talents for their greatest good, irrespective of creed, colour or caste. It ought to unite them, their religious and denominational differences notwithstanding. 'Swadeshi' ought to be the common religion of the United India.\(^7\)

Thus, 'Swadeshi' was, according to Lajpat Rai, a weapon forged by the people to achieve the industrial and general economic regeneration and advancement of India. Its implementation demanded great sacrifices especially from the middle classes who were the largest consumers of foreign goods.

The Boycott movement conceived and organised by the militant nationalists was openly and aggressively anti-British. It had a comprehensive programme and included not only the exclusion of British goods, but also such items as the renunciation of titles and government posts and the boycott of councils and schools. The protagonists of the Boycott movement used it as a weapon to compel the government to rescind the Partition of Bengal and stop repression.

Lajpat Rai explained the significance of the Boycott

\(^7\) The Indian Review (Madras), Vol. VII (1906), pp.333-36.
movement that the prestige of the Government was the main thing and the boycott struck at its root. The Boycott was primarily meant as a means to rouse among the people a militant determination to win Swaraj.

Considering the method of arguments and appeals futile, Lajpat Rai emphasised the programmes of action such as the Boycott in which the mass of the people could participate and the pressure of which could be felt by the British ruling nation. Regarding the efficacy of the Boycott of British goods, Lajpat Rai said "The logic of losing business is more likely to impress VISHVAMITRA than any argument based on the ethics of justice."19

In retrospect Lajpat Rai affirmed that 'Swadeshi and boycott in Bengal raised the people to a consciousness of their power.'20 But this was not enough. There must be men who could find time to study political literature, and work for the political education of the masses.21 Nevertheless he declared that he 'believed in righteous struggle; it was righteousness that exalted a nation.'
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Naturally he felt sorry that in 1907, the party of extremists occasionally used extravagant language which could not be justified by the then existing conditions in the country. Without taking sides he chided both the moderates and the extremists and advised them to close up their ranks and forge a united front against the common enemy. He emphasized that old leaders did, what they could when perhaps nothing else could be done. Recourse to expediency was not ruled out and nor were the petitions and prayers to the government for all times. But he asked 'the Moderates' not to hold up the extremists to the ridicule of the Anglo-Indian press and forbear from criticising them in such a way as might enable the government to launch prosecutions against some of them.22 To the extremists he appealed not to shut their ears ' to the voice of political experience and maintain discipline in public life.'23

Lajpat Rai supported the policy of passive resistance. He said:

"Personally, I am a believer in the efficacy of prayer, as an instrument of religious discipline .......prayers to the ruling nations may be useful
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to you in proving uselessness of appealing to the higher sense of men, in matters political."  

Lajpat Rai, however, believed that the people had to be educated in a school of politics and initiated into a religion of true patriotism and for this the adoption of the political method of passive resistance was perfectly legitimate, constitutional and justifiable. He ruled out any recourse to violence on the ground of expediency. According to him, to think of physical force in the then existing conditions and circumstances was folly. For this reason, he did not join the Indian revolutionaries. But short of physical force or violence, Lajpat Rai was prepared to use any method against the British rulers including "civil disobedience." Criticising the method of the Congress, Lajpat Rai accused it of having created the false impression that it could gain political reforms by merely passing resolutions and delivering speeches, misleading Indians to place unjustified faith in the efficacy of constitutional agitation and failing to impress upon them the need for great sacrifices for the achievement of political freedom. He wrote, "The first axiom
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which every Indian politician ought to take to heart is that no nation is worthy of any political status if it cannot distinguish between begging for rights and claiming them." He condemned the Congress as an institution of beggars who pleaded for charity from the Government instead of realising that "Sovereignty rests with the people, the state exists for them and rules in their name."  

He made it clear that no nation deserves to be free which could not win its freedom and was not prepared to fight for it, if necessary. In his opinion, freedom won, principally by outside help was liable to be easily lost. Lajpat Rai emphasised that eternal vigilance was the price of liberty. To him, the capacity to fight for freedom was as much a moral and a spiritual asset as it was a physical and a scientific one.

Lajpat Rai spoke in unmistakable terms about the evils of a foreign rule and enjoined upon the people to overthrow it. Foreign rule was under any circumstances a curse; a chaos, a disorder and mutual slaughter -- anything was preferable to that. When once a foreign rule was

established it could not be overthrown by hysteria, melodrama or sentiment.

In his opinion the ideal of Swaraj would elude the people if they were not prepared to pay the price in terms of blood and human sacrifice. He declared "Our struggle for freedom must be carried on in India... the tree of the nation calls for blood, world history was written in letters of blood. Let us crown our national movement with martyrdom." 31

Lajpat Rai believed that British Rule in India was based on weak and insecure foundations. He asserted that Englishmen were a handful among a people of 300 millions and they could not keep India under control if Indians did not willingly acquiesce in British Rule. He categorically stated that Indians could be free as soon as they refused to co-operate with the British rulers in the work of carrying on the administration of the country.

Lajpat Rai stressed the need to arouse the political

31. 'Punjab Native Newspaper Report.' Paisa Akbar, December 12 and 13, 1905. (This speech was cited by the Government of the Punjab in support of its decision to deport Lajpat Rai in 1907).
consciousness of the working classes. He wanted the wage earning classes to realize that their destiny and bread was in their own hands and not in the hands of those handful of people who overlorded them.  \[32\]

He emphasised that India's release from political slavery necessitated her going through a "hell of unrest." In 1914, unlike any other Indian leader, he asserted that Indians should not support England in the war as mercenaries. \[33\]

In 1919 when he found both the extremists and the moderates united in demanding self-government, he emphasised that all should be 'absolutely frank and truthful in thought and opinion and expression of both, but moderate in the application or enforcement of that truth' in the interest of orderly progress. \[34\] In his "Call to Young India," he condemned revolutionaries because he noted that revolutionaries had taught the people lying and duplicity besides assassination, robbery, dacoity. \[35\] It was short-sightedness to try to bring about revolution by assassination,

\[32\] India Home Proceedings, Political, 7590, July, 1907.

\[33\] Lajpat Rai, "Congress Politics in 1914." The People. (Lahore), November 14, 1929.

\[34\] Lajpat Rai, A Call to Young India. (New York, 1917), pp. 310-311.
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murder, terrorism or dacoity. In a letter from New York dated 19th July, 1919, he declared that his mental attitude towards the work of revolutionaries in America had been one of contempt mixed with pity. In a letter to Mahatma Gandhi published in the Young India on 13th August, 1919, he went to the extent of saying that he was 'convinced of the futility of the attempts to bring about forcible revolution (in India).' Terrorism was not only futile but sinful also. It was useless and demoralising to threaten violence or try to use force against organised government forces.

Reorganising Education on National Lines.

Another method which found favour with the Extremist school in general and Lajpat Rai in particular was 'National Education.' In the course of the national movement the demand for national education took on certain irrational and
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sectarian forms and expressed itself in a desire to return to a glorious past.

Lajpat Rai did not accept this extreme view of going back to the past or rejecting the modern concepts altogether.

Lajpat Rai evolved his educational philosophy as a result of deep study of education in foreign countries. In foreign countries he devoted a substantial part of his time and energy to the study of educational questions always with a view to adapting them to the needs of India. Lajpat Rai delineated his educational philosophy in his book entitled the Problems of National Education, which he wrote during his enforced stay in the U.S.A. and published in 1920. Though a lawyer by profession, Lajpat Rai dedicated himself to the cause of education. He was convinced that he could best serve the country by imparting education which would be a blend of Eastern and Western ideals and the foundations of which should rest securely in the values enshrined in the Vedas and the superstructure of which should symbolise all that was dynamic and pragmatic in the western arts, sciences and technology. His incipient educational

thought, in an embryonic form in the D.A.V. laboratory, was crystallised by his "study of educational institutions, educational ideals and educational methods."

**Emasculating and Denationalising Education.**

While education was regarded as a great national asset in Europe and in America, Lajpat Rai was sore at the staggering illiteracy and ignorance of his people. He observed that a century and a quarter of the British rule had failed to educate more than five or six percent of the people of India, while Japan had been wholly educated within less than forty years. He asserted that the Education that the Indians were receiving was emasculating, denationalising and creating a gulf between the educated and the non-educated classes. It was meant more to enslave them than to free them. They were taught that everything Indian was barbaric and deserved contempt.

**Diagnosing the ills of the Indian society and**


42. Lajpat Rai, "Message to Young India," Presidential Address at the All India College Students Conference, Nagpur, December, 1920.

designing a frame work of national education, Lajpat Rai pointed to the law of organisation which ruled supreme in Europe and was the secret of her prosperity. Lajpat Rai said:

"In Europe, the prevalent notion about education was that it should make a man fit to meet his personal and national requirements, that while on the one hand it should develop private virtue in him, it should on the other, make him a true and honour loving citizen and lover of the country."\(^44\)

Lajpat Rai emphatically stated India's future would principally depend upon the amount and the sort of education its people received.\(^{45}\) At the same time he laid emphasis on the development of a national outlook.

**Genesis and Definitions.**

Although the genesis of national education may be traced to the birth of the nation states, the idea received constructive thinking and concrete shape after the Second World War, when the dominant aim in education was accepted as the development of a sense of loyalty to the nation and the national system was expected to reflect the working of national life. By instinct, national education often laid special emphasis on those parts of training which the national character particularly demanded. By instinct


\(^{45}\) Lajpat Rai, *The Man in His Own Words*, (Madras, 1907), pp. 150-51.
again, such a system shrank from laying stress on points concerning which bitter dissensions were likely to arise. He was all praise for D.A.V. movement in education, but he wanted unalloyed patriotism as the key note of national education and not denominational loyalties.

His programme of national education laid emphasis on:

(a) Bridging the gulf between the educated classes and the uneducated masses.
(b) Technical education in arts and industries.
(c) The teaching of Indian languages.
(d) A national discipline.
(e) The economic needs of the country as a whole.
(f) National consolidation and national independence.46

For further elucidation of the term "national education," Lajpat Rai got the cue from three pronouncements: one by Mrs. Annie Besant, the other by Mr. B. R. Tilak and the third by Rash Behari Ghosh. Of these the one by Mrs. Besant, expounded exclusively in Indian context, appealed to him as fairly complete and comprehensive. Mrs. Besant defined National education as one that:

(a) Must be controlled by Indians, shaped by Indians, carried on by Indians. It must hold Indian ideals.

of devotion, wisdom and morality and must be permeated by the Indian religious spirit rather than fed on the letter of the creeds.

(b) Must live in an atmosphere of proud and glorious patriotism and this atmosphere must be kept sweet, fresh and bracing by the study of Indian literature, Indian history, Indian triumphs in science, in art, in politics, in war, in colonisation, in manufactures, in trade, in commerce.

(c) Must not be separated from the home. The present opposition between the home and the school must cease. The teachers in school and college must work in harmony with the teachers in the home (parents).

(d) Must meet the national temperament at every point and develop the national character. India is not to become a lesser - nor even a greater - England, but evolve into a mightier India. British ideals are good for Britain while India's ideals are good for India. We do not want echoes nor monotonies; we want a choral melody of nations, mirroring the varied qualities of Nature and God.

Mrs. Annie Besant's rhetoric was the main inspiration behind Lajpat Rai's sharper focus on education. Since education was the fundamental problem for the nation, Lajpat Rai would not tolerate loose and confused ideas regarding the aims and methods of education. Realising that education was an instrument of national welfare and on its progress and expansion depended intelligent citizenry, he wanted the colour, the shape and the scent of Indian education to be deeply embedded in its cultural traditions, but he desired that it should, at the same time, reflect India's hopes for the future. In order to create such a system of education,

47. Ibid., pp. 331-38.
eclecticism and cross-fertilization of ideas were imperative.

While, by and large, Lajpat Rai endorsed what Mrs. Annie Besant had said, but he did not wish to reject "the sciences and the philosophy of western scientists and philosophers, because they happened to be non-Indians" because "no country on the face of the globe could under modern conditions, live an isolated and self-contained life."

Thus he formulated his concept of national education within the framework of national postulates and modern needs and based its scope and content on the following general principles:

1. National education was necessary for national safety. Universal popular education must be provided by the State. Any attempt to provide for national education by private agencies and private funds was futile.

2. Duty of a state did not end with elementary education. The economic and industrial efficiency of the nation depended upon technical and industrial education and that also must be provided by the state. Nor could the state ignore the necessity of higher education.

3. State should make a provision for the general health and physical well-being of the child as a part of national education.

4. State should realise its duty to bring up and to educate the child to become a prudent citizen.
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5. At no time could private efforts to further education be dispensed with. These should be directed towards filling up the gaps. 49

**Eclecticism**

Lajpat Rai was keen that his system of education must reflect the ethos of the Indian people whom it was meant to serve. He should see that a sense of unity was not only desirable, it was essential in the interest of a reascent nation. But equally important it was to have a harmonious variety for a pluralistic nation like India. Staunchly opposed to aping the westerners, Lajpat Rai contended, "we donot want to be English or German or American or Japanese. We want to be Indi, but modern, uptodate, progressive Indians." 50 He wanted the synthesis of the best and the finest in the East and the West. In order to keep the Indians abreast of the latest knowledge and technology, he wanted every Indian to know compulsorily one European language, have European tools in his hands and handle easily European mechanical appliances.

Lajpat Rai, therefore, arranged prioritywise India's


educational needs as: more schools and more teachers, vocational schools including schools for instruction in commerce and foreign languages, technological institutions, continuation schools and lastly more high schools and more universities. The true education was to raise the nation's intelligence and skill, it was to improve its physique and develop its earning capacity.

In laying down the scope, content and norms for national education, Lajpat Rai pointed out that private efforts be directed to fill the gaps in national education. He wished that all research work in classical languages, in history and philosophy, in logic, and mental and moral sciences as well as social sciences might be left to them. He maintained that the state-maintained colleges and universities should mainly concern themselves with scientific education, scientific development and research and with the material development of the country. The nation was interested in everything that developed efficiency in the individual as well as in the classes and more so in leadership, but for the time-being, the above mentioned division of labour between the state and the private enterprise in education might be the best way of collaboration to economise India's resources.51 The

nationalism must be above the religious and sectarian influences. But at the same time he stressed the importance of modern knowledge and sciences in which the West was fairly advanced. He said:

"You cannot shut your eyes to the fact that science and knowledge have made wonderful progress during the past two hundred years. We shall be cutting our noses to spite our faces, if we deprive ourselves of that stock of knowledge which the moderns have accumulated to the benefit of the humanity at large." 52

With this perspective in hand, Lajpat Rai increasingly realised that without a strong educational infra-structure to generate political consciousness, emancipation from alien rule was not possible. His educational range was wide enough and he took within its purview all the fundamental aspects of education, viz., the concept and aims of education, the curriculum, the methods of teaching and the teacher's role.

Aims of Education.

The chief end of education, Lajpat Rai visualised was to evolve the "whole man." Education, according to him, encompassed the entire vista of man's life. Even sound thinking, to be useful for practical purposes of life, he
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nationalism must be above the religious and sectarian influences. But at the same time he stressed the importance of modern knowledge and sciences in which the West was fairly advanced. He said:

"You cannot shut your eyes to the fact that science and knowledge have made wonderful progress during the past two hundred years. We shall be cutting our noses to spite our faces, if we deprive ourselves of that stock of knowledge which the moderns have accumulated to the benefit of the humanity at large." 52

With this perspective in hand, Lajpat Rai increasingly realised that without a strong educational infrastructure to generate political consciousness, emancipation from alien rule was not possible. His educational range was wide enough and he took within its purview all the fundamental aspects of education, viz., the concept and aims of education, the curriculum, the methods of teaching, and the teacher's role.

**Aims of Education.**

The chief end of education, Lajpat Rai visualised was to evolve the "whole man." Education, according to him, encompassed the entire vista of man's life. Even sound thinking, to be useful for practical purposes of life, he
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emphasized, must be based on a full knowledge of the different phases of social life.

His aims of education were inspired by both the philosophical schools of 'Idealism' and 'Pragmatism.' He reflected idealism when he talked of the "capacity of the mind to transcend its environments and to rise above the limitations imposed on it." He was down-to-the earth Pragmatist when he laid down the 'social aim' of education, saying:

"Our boys and girls must not be brought up in hot-houses. They should be brought up in the midst of the society for which they are to be members." 53

Lajpat Rai, however, had very definite views on the place of co-education in educational system of the country. It was not a sound idea to make an anchorite, of a boy or a girl. Boys brought up in isolation, and the girls brought up in purdah, made very poor men and women. He held that ideas of morality and decency must also undergo change.54

John Dewey's idea of "Education as social function" is reflected in Lajpat Rai's remarks:

"Education is social function. Individual and society are interdependent, what is good for the

54. Ibid., pp. 331-38.
one implies the good of the other."

Lajpat Rai's conception of education was drawing out that is best in a man to the advantage of the community and of himself as a member of it. He wanted education to qualify the educated man to think and act for himself with a due sense of responsibility towards society. He agreed with Plato that education, spiritually conceived is "turning of the soul towards the light." Materially conceived, he agreed with Napoleon that it was "open career to talent."

**Realistic Curriculum.**

Education of the 'whole-man' and Education for 'Complete-living' became the sheet-anchor of Lajpat Rai's views on curriculum. He advocated a realistic curriculum, which should give "totality" of experience to the young thus helping them in the evolution of a balanced personality. His chief concern was preparation for life, including an intelligent understanding of the political machinery of the country. He wanted these subjects to be taught which met certain social demands.

Thus whereas the D.A.V. Society preached the gospel

"Back to the Vedas," Lajpat Rai strongly opposed an imposition of Sanskrit language in educational institutions.

"It is high time," Lajpat Rai wrote:

"For the nation to make up its mind that the study of Sanskrit, like other luxuries, is for the few and not the many. It may be studied for purpose of research and culture, but for the nation, by and large, the study of the modern foreign languages must be insisted upon." 56

He, however, advocated the teaching of National language, which was to be Hindustani. "The provincial vernaculars, "he said: "must be the medium of instruction in the primary schools," in addition to Hindustani.

According to him:

"The subjects of study should include, besides the 3 R's, the teaching of patriotism, hygiene, drawing, geography of India, elementary geography of the world, history of India, elements of civics, music and modelling." 57

In his judgment, "working knowledge of English should be compulsory in the last three years of the middle school." He was not in favour of too many vernaculars to be adopted as medium of instruction. He deprecated the use of local dialects. He was in favour of using the same text book all over the country, of course in different media. He was in
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favour of drastic improvement in the art of teaching so that the load of the school curriculum should be light. He favoured teaching of modern sciences for those who pursued higher studies in agriculture, commerce and technology as well as for those who went for higher liberal education. For these he wanted English to be the medium of instructions.

He espoused the cause of teaching history to avoid the mistakes which nations had committed. To refuse the clear verdict of history, was to refuse to listen to its warnings and be guilty of unpardonable pugnacity.53

If Lajpat Rai had been asked to choose only two subjects for teaching, he would have voted for two separate teaching subjects, viz., "Patriotism" and "Nationalism." He cited copious references as to how "Patriotism" was taught in France, England and the United States. "The teaching of Patriotism in India" he averred, "must revolve round 'Love of India as a whole' and the 'love of the nation as a whole.'"59

Method of Teaching.

Lajpat Rai deplored the methods of teaching in India
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as it took "no cognizance of the individual boy or girl."

He said:

"The art of teaching is a kind of mechanical process aimed at filling the scholars' mind and body with so many facts and figures." 60

Lajpat Rai, therefore, wanted the teachers to realise that the real purpose of education was to help the child to become a thinking and an acting person. Cultivating the memory was a minor part of the life of a human being. Teaching should be directed toward the development of the faculty of thinking." 61

The Role of the Teacher.

If the "Whole-man" was the objective, the new push could be given not by the politician who could legislate, but by the teacher. He was pained to observe that in India, the function of a teacher ended when the school time was over.

Teacher and Taught Relations.

Lajpat Rai considered the ancient "Guru and Disciple"
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relations as having outlived its utility, and advised that it be replaced by the Western concept of teacher-taught relationship. He thought that the discipline enforced in the old 'Ashrams' was too strict, too mechanical, and too empirical, and impracticable. The ideal of the ancient system was to reproduce "Guru" in the person of the "Chela," whereas the ideal should be that the student should outgrow the teacher.62

Lajpat Rai was opposed to enforce discipline which became mechanical. He advocated that students should form habits and learn manners which would enable them to rise to the occasion in any emergency. He categorically stated:

"The future teachers and Gurus of India must learn to set aside the tone of command and authority to which they have hitherto been accustomed. The boys and girls are not clay in their hands to be moulded into patterns of their choice."63

Consequently, the slavish submission to authority must be done away with, in order to develop in them a free spirit, requisite for national progress. While Lajpat Rai laid down the 'ethics' of teachers to play their role effectively and significantly, equally solicitous was he about their economic wellbeing.64
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Thus the guiding principle of Socrates for the education of man was "Know thyself," and this was also the essential ingredient of Lajpat Rai's "wholeman." Aristotle's "Organon" enunciated "Education is a life process." Lajpat Rai propounded "Education for life." In the educational spectrum, both of them advocated the concept of "Education for body." Lajpat Rai was one with Quintillian in believing that "nature and nurture are both important in education."

"What knowledge is most worth?" is a question posed by Herbert Spencer and Lajpat Rai. John Dewey and Lajpat Rai introduced modern sociological tendency in education. If Gandhi considered "work-experience" as the sumnum bonum of curriculum, for Lajpat Rai it was "Patriotism."

To sum up: Lajpat Rai was an idealist as regards the aims of education, a realist as regards its curriculum, and a pragmatist as regards its methods. He wanted national education to bridge the gulf between the educated classes and masses, to inculcate among them the spirit of patriotism and national discipline. In addition to Swadeshi, Boycott and passive resistance, national education was an effective instrument of achieving national consolidation and national independence. In advocating these methods which leaders like Tilak, B.C. Pal and Aurobindo Ghosh, had included in their programme of militant nationalism
Lajpat Rai seemed nearer to them. *Whereas in his ideal but of Swaraj, Lajpat Rai was essentially a Moderate, in the realisation of that aim he adopted an extremist posture.*