[E.]

800—17-12-02.

Educational (1904) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 285

DATED 9-5-04

INDEXED

[Despatch Abstract.]

Endorsing para V(3) of C. Petition rules on a petition from M. Rly. T.R. Venkatarama aiyar, late Sub Asstt. Inspector of Schools, Tindivanam range, praying for the grant of a pension.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

[E]
500—10-2-04.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

CURRENT FILE.

CONTENTS.

From	Number.	Date.	Pages.
The Private Secretary	150	25-4-04	1-19

[P. T. O. FOR PUT UP PAPERS.

PAPERS PUT UP WITH CURRENT No. 804

Papers of the department to which the current belongs.

Number.	Date.	Original (=O) or spare copy (=S. C.).	Remarks. (In this column such of the papers as have been removed for copying, printing, &c., should be marked with a cross.)	Initials of Referencer with date in token of return to Reference department.
114	19-2-04	original		
	C Petition	rules		

Papers of other departments.

Department.	Number.	Date.	Original (=O) or spare copy (=S. C.).	Despatcher to note the return of the papers to the departments concerned.

1,000—30-11-00.

Educational (1904) Department.

CURRENT No. 804

From

[Name] L. M. Wynch Esquire I.C.S.

[Designation] Private Secretary to H.E. the Governor

[Station] Ootacamund.

No. 150

Dated 25th April 1904

Enclosures 2

Received 190 .

Registered 3-5- 1904.

SUBJECT.

Transfers a petition dated 19th April 1904 from T. R. Venkatarama aiyar, late Sub assistant Inspector of Schools, Tindivanam Range, praying for the grant of a pension.

By order

L. M. Wynch

Pr. Private Secretary.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.No. 1142 Ed misc 19-2-04	

FURTHER PAPERS.

To

The Secretary to Government,

Educational Department.

Sir,

19th April 1904.

To

His Excellency

LORD AMPTHILL, G. C. I. E.,

Governor of Fort Saint George,

MADRAS.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,

THE most deplorable and critical petition of T. R. Venkatarama Aiyar, a dismissed Sub-Assistant Inspector of Schools, who was drawing Rs. 125 a month, most humbly and respectfully prays for a kind review of the Proceedings of the Madras Government No. 114, dated 19th February 1904, rejecting his appeal against the order of dismissal passed upon him by the late Director of Public Instruction, in the light of the undermentioned circumstances in his favour. He hopes from your Excellency's humanity and the well known benevolence of your Excellency's disposition to partake of that Royal nature to spare and forgive which brings happiness upon the oppressed and the distressed.

2. The petitioner served your Excellency's Government as Sub-Assistant Inspector of Schools Tindivanam and elsewhere faithfully and honestly and he counts a service of about 23 years. At the request of some native gentlemen of Tindivanam, most of whom are pleaders, he helped them in working up the old school of Audinarayana Aiyah, which is now known by the name of "*Victoria Native Primary School*." He simply taught the teachers of the school the method of imparting sound instruction so as to awaken the real interest of the pupils and never took an active part in the management.

3. Your Excellency's petitioner has now to express in brief the fact of the present American Missionary as manager of the Mission Lower Secondary and Primary Schools in Tindivanam having succeeded in bringing the late Mr. G. H. Stuart to Tindivanam and got him preside over the meeting on the occasion of the prize distribution on the 9th March 1903. His honour lived with the Missionary, visited all the four Mission Primary Schools in Tindivanam but did not visit the Victoria Native Primary School notwithstanding the humble request of the managing members. It is this very Missionary who applied to the same Director of Public Instruction for a building grant of the old District Munsiff's Court-house in Tindivanam. The petitioner was personally directed to recommend the application which was immediately done on the personal and written modified requisition of the manager. The unusual expression of his Honour's Countenance and the

manner the poor subordinate petitioner was then received made him think that some unusual steps to undo him would be taken in spite to him and the Missionary.

4. Mr. Singaravelu Mudaliar, Assistant Inspector of Schools, the next superior of your Excellency's petitioner, took exceedingly undue advantage of his honour Mr. Stuart's displeasure towards the petitioner and found an occasion to work out the ruin of the subordinate for the preconceived spite. His inimical attitude towards the petitioner prior to the complaints will best be seen by a perusal of copies of his D/O letter dated 22nd March 1903 and the reply hereto submitted. On three pseudonymous petitions containing charges of the most trumpery description and got up by the malevolence of the petitioner's own subordinates who were all reported against in the strict discharge of petitioner's duty and on the statements taken behind his back without notice of the enquiry, the Assistant Inspector of Schools somehow penned a lengthy report, which, if perused, will be a sufficient proof of his vindictive spirit.

5. The petitioner's full explanation was not taken by either of the two officers, no necessary papers were given him even when repeatedly requested, no opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses, no permission to appear by a pleader were given the petitioner and he was not asked to enter upon his defence as enjoined by the rules prescribed by Government. The repeated cravings of the petitioner that the Assistant Inspector of schools was highly prepossessed and prejudiced were not at all attended to. The authors of the pseudonymous petitions on which the report of the Assistant Inspector of Schools hinged, were purposely avoided being traced out and the superior officers did not care or even attempt to find out whether there really existed persons bearing the names subscribed in the pseudonymous petitions.

6. It can further be explained that the statements alluded to in the Assistant Inspector's report were not taken in an open enquiry and in the presence of the petitioner affected by them. The makers of these statements are mostly persons drawing very low salary and in the good grace of the Assistant Inspector of Schools. If the charges were true, there would have been complaints long before the date of Mr. Stuart's visit to the Tindivanam Mission Schools or as soon as the alleged subject matter of the charges were said to have been committed and not after a sufficiently long interval and immediately after the visit of the late Director of Public Instruction. The subordinates who made the statements were influenced by the promise of promotion or confirmation as also the immediate superior who was since confirmed in this division.

7. The Assistant Inspector of Schools, who originally enquired into the matter, as well as the late Director of Public Instruction found nothing which could not be believed against the petitioner though both have by official record expressed their real appreciation of the work of the petitioner. The late Mr. G. H. Stuart stayed here for two days and a half and every day he spent more than four hours with the Assistant Inspector of Schools in private but gave the petitioner no opportunity to explain his case. Neither of the two officers cared or attempted

to find out that through no fault of the petitioner, coloured circumstances in the shape of charges have been brought about and that coincidences of circumstances have been fabricated most effectually to effect the ruin of the petitioner. The utter disregard of the rules and procedure prescribed for an enquiry into matters like the dismissal of a public servant with long service rightly calls forth the correction of your individual Excellency.

8. The first charge against the petitioner is, as alleged, that he employed one Vaithinatha Aiyar as temporary clerk in his office with a single clerk and drew pay for him for 19 days as such, while he was employed as a teacher in the Victoria Native Primary School, Tindivanam.

The second charge is, as alleged, that the petitioner examined and passed grants for a school in Nagar knowing that it had been closed. Your Excellency's petitioner is quite innocent of the above charges, as his appeal will show and his simple innocence can be explained only in this way;

"In order to effect the ruin of a poor servant, his box is opened with a false key and a quantity of goods taken from his master deposited in it." There has been only one sided representation all through from the immediate superior.

9. Your Excellency's humble petitioner has had the happiness of serving His Royal Highness' Government loyally for about 23 years and now in his 48th year of mature age is turned adrift with no ostensible means of support and even without being heard by any officer. He has been inevitably driven to the length of expressing that the superior officers in the Department have placed a blind reliance upon the dictum *"facts cannot lie"* which has played a mischievous effect in the administration of justice in the case of the petitioner. That facts can awfully and cruelly lie is illustrated above by the case of the servant. The ruined petitioner most respectfully prays for a personal interview to represent some more of his grievances. His address is 8 Eswaran Covil Street, Tindivanam.

As your Excellency with the prerogative of Royal mercy is the only asylum for relief to persons in the petitioner's ruined circumstances, he looks up with great anxiety and prays that your Excellency may be graciously pleased to order at least a monthly pension for the petitioner's family support and thereby render justice to the petitioner's simple innocence.

The petitioner begs leave to subscribe.

May it please your Excellency,
Your Excellency's most obedient and
humble servant,

V. R. Venkatarama Aiyar

19th April, 1904.

Late Sub-Assistant Inspector of Schools,
Tindivanam Range.

6

SUBJECT.

Submitting Review, appealing to the Prerogative of mercy, and humbly explaining the Petitioner's simple innocence of the two unfounded charges based on Pseudonymous petitions with devout prayer for a personal interview to represent the facts on the side of the Petitioner in as much as the Proceedings against him are onesided and as such, in the interest of Justice, necessarily call forth Your Excellency's kind notice and consideration.

7 6

Chidambaram, 22-3-03.

To

The Sub Assistant Inspector of Schools,

Tindivanam Range.

Sir,

Your D.O. of last month was duly received but owing to pressure of work I was not able to reply to you earlier. In my first communication I pointed out the objectionable nature of your recommendation to withhold part of Sivasamy Iyer's -- pay but you then recommended the withholding of the full pay. And my next communication was then sent to you in which I -- stated that you were biased against him: and you seem to think that I am not right in saying you are biased and you assure me that you are not. But your own letters bear testimony of not merely bias but illfeeling and animosity. You may show your two letters regarding the withholding (let alone other letters) to any person and see if he comes to any other conclusion than what I have arrived at. I am very much disappointed in your way of doing things ever since the anonymous complaint made against you was referred to you for remarks. You suspected Venkatarama Aiyar now at Vanur to have been the author of it. It is only a suspicion. Even supposing y o u had unmistakable proofs of his having been the author of it, is that a reason for your persistent persecution of the m a n in the way you have been doing in your numerous communications against him. If the facts stated in the anonymous petition against you be false, you should have cared a straw for it -- and to have thought no more of it than if it was never p r e-sented at all. But if there was any truth in it, it was -- just time to rectify the error if any and to have forgotten all about it. But instead of doing so, you have taken i t seriously to heart and not only that you have shown it in -- black and white in your official correspondence not in o n e

communication

communication but in many and not against one man whom y o u suspected but against several others who are some way connected with that man. Unable to bear the severity of your persecution, he resigned and washed his hands of all connection with the Board School but you are not satisfied with that. You have thought, so your correspondence clearly shows, that such a m a n should never breathe the same air as you do nor live in the same range if not in the same world. Your letters regarding that Venkataramier and others some way related to him for -- instance Varadappa Koundan who gave over his school to him - show that you would be too glad to flay them alive if ~~they~~ you could. Your correspondence regarding them will produce that impression upon any one who may see it. The feeling against that [illegible] was further extended to Sivasamy Iyer, Vanni Koundan, Sreenivasa Aiyengar and so on and I feel sorry to see that you are unable so totally to divest yourself of private feelings and look at public matters without prejudice. I see you bring personal feelings (which you should not entertain) to bear on official matters and your every letter regarding every one of these men bear testimony to it and speak -- volumes against you. I put all these matters plainly not with a view to offend you or vex you but by way of advising you and warning you of the serious risk you are running quite thoughtlessly, I fear, being carried away by strong feelings which ~~you~~ will do no credit to a public official. If a man wrongs you, you should not resent it much less wish to injure him and persecute him even in your private capacity but you have deemed fit to soil your official correspondence w i t h such deliberate persecution which bears recorded evidence against you. You seem to think that because you are entrusted with some power you are at liberty to use it against your subordinates in any way you please but I would advise you to read Mrs. Besant's warning given to the British nation in her memorable lecture delivered in London "Theosophy and Imperialism" of which an extract Mrs. Besant on "Imperialism"

has

has appeared in the Hindu of 14th February 1903. I am obliged to be plain with you in order that you may hereafter at least desist from such objectionable correspondence and let things go on in their natural course. Very often I found you going out of the way in a manner that no one in your position -- should do. You must be at peace with yourself and with any one in the world but you seem to have lost peace and ease ever since the anonymous petition against you was referred to you. I see before my mind's eye how you allowed yourself to be -- worried and chafed and fretted and with such a state of mind it is not possible to discharge the duties of your office with that unruffled a state of mind which is necessary for doing justice to them. What a great disappointment it is to me to see that you have not taken "Theosophy" to your aid. I see your correspondence is getting worse and worse without t h e least chance of improving. I feel very sorry for it. But I hope you will try to forget those men whose images, I fear, have been haunting you in your dreams also. I may tell you plainly never could I imagine how any official could put in official communications such feelings of hatred and animosity against his subordinates. Better leave them to themselves and not trouble yourself any longer about them at all events in your official correspondence. I have no time to write to you more nor do I think it necessary to write more. I wish and hope you will not take my advice amiss but try to follow it. I shall dispose of your official communications soon. This being the end of the year I am otherwise busy. I shall enquire into the Vidur irregularity soon. I shall see when I go to Vanur whether Venkatrama Iyer is deaf. I saw him the other day and found he was not deaf and wondered how you -- charged him with deafness. He was able to hear my low voice and reply to my queries.

Yours truly,

(Signed) M. Singaravelu,

Assistant Inspector of Schools.

P.S. My plain speaking may not be pleasing to you but I have felt it my duty to advise you in a demi-official --- correspondence in the hope that my advice will be taken well and followed.

(True Copy.)

T. R. Venkatarama Ayyar
Late. Sub Assistant Insprof Schools
Tiruvanam Range
19th April 1904

D/O

Tindivanam,

25-3-05

10

To

The Assistant Inspector of Schools

Arcot Division.

Beloved Brother,

Your kind D/O to hand. In one way, I am glad you have expressed yourself clearly, though I am equally surprised to find one of your nature, age, and service being carried away by the onesided untrue version of an interested party. I desire to answer your D/O in three aspects (1) as a Theosophist (2) as a brother officer of almost equal culture, Service and experience of the Subordinate Educational officers. (3) as a pure subordinate of yourself placing you in the position of the Head of the department.

Before I begin, I feel I should request you to b e good enough to dispossess yourself of any the slightest belief in the fictitious story of the alleged grudge, animosity etc. since the anonymous petition against me. If you cannot forget this wrong idea for the sake of argument and for the time being, I do not think you can follow. For my own part, I invoke the name of God and pray that I may be true in all that I write to you and expect to hear that you have found out the truth and thence a rational explanation for all the brutality you have attributed to me.

As a Theosophist, I have much to improve, I admit I have my karmic defects and I feel for them and try my best to set them right. The duties of a Public Servant who gets pay for a certain work has to be discharged in the proper way. When my powers are limited, I only extend my sympathy and - wishes for the safety of those men who misconduct themselves. Punishment (or better step at rectifying defects) is either retributive or preventive and in both ways punishment should not be misconstrued, In the inevitable law of Evolution -- Cause and Effect are certain. If as you allege in your D/O and that on the sole representation of Sivá Swami Aiyar and

and his party, I am led away by private feelings, I request you will harmonise the following :--

(1) I enjoy perfect rest and there is no image haunting me in dreams as you say. Because you are inclined strongly (biased) in favour of Sivaswami Aiyar etc. your mind has -- deceived you (I mean your Lower mind). If you strip yourself of that notion your minds eye will be true to you. I do not wish any harm to either Sivaswami Aiyar, Vannikoundan, --- VaradappaKoundan or Venkatarama Aiyar. I think they have all gone wrong and deserve to be set right and that for their good. I know I cannot drive out a man from my range or flay him alive (as you put it) but it is my principle that I should not acquire a bad karma in allowing the wicked to molest the good. I feel and act with the spirit of securing the advance of Primary Education. I am not at one with you in considering that I should let such flagrant cases of misconduct uncared for . If there be difference of opinion, is it right that I should be condemned? Want of maintaining discipline and consequent disaffection and negligence in work are, I believe, sins, sufficiently strong to retard the spiritual progress of an individual. Granting for the sake of argument that I am based against Sivaswami Aiyar and his men, is it just that you (who speak so much) should be equally biased in their favour and against me and not view matters dispassionately?

(2) On the night of the 23rd inst. Sivaswami Aiyar was with me in my bed room and speaking to me for about an hour. Had I private grudge, can I not say that he can see me during the day? Dear brother, you have not understood my nature and I am sorry I have to beat my own trumpet before you and beg to refer you to our respected Colonel Olcott who has taken a note of me so far back as 1888. I hope you will with your minds eye see to the restless work of Sivaswami Aiyar and his party in their search after Anantha Rao's ruin. I also -- desire to point out that I have returned good for evil done. Murugesa Mudali of Gudangal complained against me in writing

to

to the President. He is now doing well under me and has been recommended for promotion. The late first assistant to the Director of Public Instruction Mr.V.T.Seshadriachariar took it into his head to accord me peculiar treatment and I bore all that with patience. For about a week I was kept under observation as an impatient in Tanjore Hospital and that for the sake of giving me an extension of sick leave. His own nearest blood relations Rangachariar of Anantapuram School Tirumalachariar of Vettavalam school, Vedantachar of Komalam School may even now bear testimony as to my nature regarding grudge you speak of. I wish the time for me to retire from service will be near, so that I may not sin in being lax in maintaining discipline and that I may become a better Theosophist.

When the Director of Public Instruction was present in Tindivanam and when he visited the schools in Cusbah, the supervisor you have posted for Tindivanam I am certain, - - avoided seeing him. I know very little about the Mission - Schools in Cusbah. You have had no opportunity to send me the notes on those schools. I thought it my duty to see the Director of Public Instruction and went to two schools with him and gave him some information he wanted about the same, I should consider that the Supervisor should have been ready to see the Director of Public Instruction even though he may not be wanted. Your Sivaswami Aiyar did the same with the Inspector of Schools in Villupuram. I hear Sivaswami Aiyar is openly declaring his proposition that the Sub Assistant Inspector of Schools need not be cared for and that on t h e strength of your strong support. He also quotes the cases of Streenivasa Aiyangar Varadappa Koundan and Venkatramaiyar as proofs. I say once more that Venkatarama Aiyar is short of hearing and nothing more. I am sorry you have gone so far as to believe all that may be said against me. If after the perusal of this part D/O you get yourself cool, I shall write you the other two aspects. I would not have written you, if you had not expressed yourself I hope you will consider this

letter

letter as though from a true friend intended more for your safe and sure progress. Please be a little less vehement in your letters.

Yours truly,

(Sd) T.R.Venkatara Aiyar

Sub Asst Inspr of Schools

Tindivanam Range.

(True Copy)

/Sd/ T. R. Venkatarama Aiyar

8/5/03

Sub Asst Inspr of Schools

Tindivanam Range.

Ime Copies

T. R. Venkatarama aiyer

Late. Sub Assistant Instr of Schools

Tindivanam Range

19th April 1904

[E. 2]

1,000—5-12-02.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

C. No. 804 From ~~the~~ Private Secretary No. 150 dated 25-4-1904.

SUBJECT.

Appeal from Venkatarama aiyar, late Sub-assistant Inspector of schools, for the grant of a pension.

Please see the notes and orders in G.O. no. 114 Educational, dated the 19th of February 1904, from which it will be seen that the petitioner's case was fully considered, the arguments pro and con were carefully weighed and the petition at last rejected. The Private Secretary now transfers a petition from the same petitioner, wherein he requests the grant of a monthly pension. No fresh facts have, it is submitted, been brought to light, which justify a reconsideration of his case ~~but the~~ except perhaps an attempt to vilify the late Mr. Stuart. In other respects ~~the other hand~~ the arguments now put forward are only a brief resumé of those contained in his petition of the 17th October last. Orders are solicited as to whether in these circumstances the petitioner may be informed that his request is inadmissible.

In G.O. no. 114 Edl (19.2.04) (P.P. 25-7-0)

5/5/4 Submitted that para: V (3) of the C petition rules may be endorsed on the petition.

Secy

5/5/4 A conspiracy of all his native superiors and subordinates was petitioner's theory of offence in the memorial dealt with in G.O. 114.

He now enlarges the conspiracy by including Mr Stuart and a missionary. The original theory of a conspiracy did not bear investigation. The more persons (and especially persons who could have no motive for spite) he includes in the conspiracy, the more preposterous becomes the theory.

HG 6.5.4

The petition may be received now

Para V (3) of the petition rules. There are no grounds for recommending that Mr Stuart should appear in person

HG
6.5.04

HG

Plan draft accordingly

HG
5.5.04

The draft placed below may issue.

HG 9.5.4

PJ
9/5/4

[E. 12]
1,200—7-10,05.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

READ AGAINST G.O., No. , dated 190 .

" " " " , " 190 .

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 804 , From the P.S. G , No. 150 , dated 25-4- 1904

" " , " " , " 190

" " , " " , " 190

ORDER No. 285 , dated 9-5- 1904.

mis

Draw Shimla despatch

despatch Shimla

9/5/4

Shimla 11/5/4

Para: V (3) of the C petition rules. HG 9.5.4

PJ
9/5/4

To the Petitioner PJO } Despd 11/5/4

When given for copying ——
When copied ——
When examined —— } 190 .
When signed ——

READ AGAIN G.O., No. , DATED
190 .

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.								
STATEMENT WITH DITTO.								
PAPER NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.								

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.