

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_156313

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

ASPHALT ROAD
TO
CONCRETE PARADISE

By
V. S. MUDVEDKAR.

**THE BOMBAY BOOK DEPOT,
BOOKSELLERS & PUBLISHERS,
GIRGAON, BOMBAY.**

PREFACE

The title of the book will probably furnish half the excuse for adding the present drop to the ocean of literature of the kind. The other half is that the same, though not lightly used in a fit of rhetoric, facetiæ, or fantasy, may not be too literally or uncharitably interpreted. In other words, such mighty problems as prevention of wars, demolition of human misery, or the apparently intractable problem of communal wrangles in the land, that have been discussed herein, along with others, have not actually been solved – and, evidently, had they been so, the writer would have by now sat, surveying the grand view with celestial pleasure and pride, on the pinnacle of fame and fortune – known to the world as a Nobel Prize winner – without being reduced to the necessity of proclaiming his solutions over again; because the present book is nothing but a re-production – revised, enlarged, abridged – of articles mostly published in the press. What has been done herein is that the broad line, along which alone the final solution of these and other similar* disturbing problems is possible, has been indicated – if not demonstrated – by reference to concrete instances, wherever possible, from burning topics of the day. And it is believed that a wider, deeper, calmer knowledge of these principles and arguments will induce more rational and successful efforts being made, in the near future, by abler writers and passionate benefactors, for the solution of these ever-recurring, un-ending, baffling, shaming problems.

2. How far even this presumption is correct, it is for the readers to judge and for the time to prove. That it is not totally incorrect or absolutely unreasonable, is however guaranteed by the fact that the articles were not only approved by journalists of repute, but some of them were also highly applauded by them – in their cruder, coarser, or rougher form – and a few others perhaps confounded them. And in cases of controversy – with my fellow readers of papers or with the editors of papers – my contention will invariably be found to have prevailed and closed the controversy.

3. Some portions of the articles will be found overlapping one another. They had to be so, as each article had to be made self-contained in the first instance for individual publication in the papers; and I found it impossible, without impairing the sense or emphasis of the articles, to avoid the duplication even in the present re-compilation, for which I beg apology of the readers.

CONTENTS

(Arranged in alphabetical order)

I - Communal	<i>Page</i>
1 - Are Communal Quarrels Incurable ?	7
2 - How to Maintain Lasting Peace	9
3 - Whither Governors - Driving or Drifting ? (Controversy with an Editor)	12
II - Criminal	
4 - Crimes Horrible and Heinous - Their Cause and Cure	25
5 - Gangsterdom at Matunga	30
III - Economical	
6 - Budget - Bread - Behaviour	32
7 - Unemployment or Destitution ?	37
IV - International or Universal	
8 - A Way to Avoid Wars	42
9 - Dramatising Dream	47
10 - Root of the Trouble and Rooting It Out - or Problem of the World in a Nutshell	51
V - Matrimonial	
11 - Modern Marriages	70
12 - Sex-Equality	75
VI - National	
13 - Congress and Success	79
14 - Jinnah vs. Savarkar	84
15 - Khare Episode in a Nutshell	88
16 - Routine Bombardment ? (Letter to an Editor)	94

VII - Social				<i>Pag</i>
17 - Untouchability - Part I	..	..	..	97
18 - Do. - Part II	..	..	..	99
VIII - Terrorizational				
19 - "Cowardly and Contemptible"	..		..	101
20 - Terrorism and Constitutional Theory			..	103
IX - Theological				
21 - Euclid's Disproof of God	..	..	..	105
22 - Religion and Administration	..	..	..	106
X - Miscellaneous				
23 - Improving One or Spoiling Both ?	..		..	109
24 - Meat-Eating (Controversy with a reader of a paper)	..	..	..	112
25 - Organization and Individualism	..		..	119
26 - Survival of the Fittest	..	..	..	122

1 - Are Communal Quarrels Incurable ?

(This article was published – or disposed of – by three papers in three different forms, a comparison of which would probably be found interesting.)

Only three, small, simple, clear, fundamental points are involved in this ancient, nation-wide, apparently intractable, utterly disgraceful nonsense, called communal quarrels or riots between Hindus and Muslims. Namely :-

- (1) These troubles do not accidentally or unexpectedly fall from the heaven. They come, almost with the announcement and appointment of state functions – at fixed places, on fixed days, at fixed hours – the chief if not the sole of such occasions being music before Mosques.
- (2) Government is strong enough, and rational enough – as it should be – to put down these troubles, when they actually arise, with the help of Section 144, the Police batons, or the Military bayonets, as may be found necessary for the occasion. And
- (3) The quarrelling, fighting, murdering communities have no resource left to them, but to bow in the end to the arbitrary orders of Government –

whether those orders be right or wrong, just or unjust ; whether they be in conformity with, or in direct contravention of, the provisions in the Sheriat or the Shastras ; whether they allay or offend more the fancy, sensibility, or sentimentality, of the Hindus or the Muslims.

2. If so, is it not far better, more sensible, more honourable, for both the communities, instead of continually quarrelling like cats and dogs, and brutally killing and wounding their brothers and getting killed and wounded in turn, to obtain the far juster and fairer decision of their dispute, by a court of justice or a tribune of rational and honourable gentlemen, and abide by such decision ?

3. If, on the other hand, the communities concerned be too dull, stupid or rude to understand this simple thing, why should not the intelligent, benevolent, boastful, responsible Government, instead of leaving the question in an indefinite or ambiguous state, and perpetually dealing with it, year after year and day after day, after the fair – i.e., after much property has been destroyed, after many lives are lost, after an amount of suffering is brought – with the curfew, the grapeshot, the bayonet, the machine-gun, the aeroplane – itself get the matter decided, once for all, by a proper authority – the Federal Court, the Privy Council, a Royal Commission, or a social tribunal – and make both the communities submit quietly, if sullenly, to such decision ?

4. How does not the Government – which is the tutor, monitor, and protector of the people – realize the simple thing that the present beastly state of affairs is as much a disgrace – if not greater – on its own name and capacity of administration, as on the citizenship and civilization of the people ?

2 – How to Maintain Lasting Peace

(This is the last of a series of articles written during the Bombay Riots in 1936, all of which were rejected by the press, except this last one which was published by two papers in different forms – a comparison of which would also be found interesting.)

If the prevailing peace – following an orgy of bloodshed, brutality, shamelessness and nonsense called the communal riot – is to be permanent, the root of the trouble must be removed is clear. But there seems to be considerable misapprehension or confusion as to the real or primary cause of the trouble. Many think that the hooligan was the cause, some think it was the Muslim fanaticism, some the Hindu obstinacy, some the Mandap, some the Mosque, some the music, some the Maruti. But none appears to suspect that the root of the whole trouble was the Government's "impartial" attitude or policy – strange as it may look !

2. Government should act impartially no doubt – they are supposed to act impartially. But why should

impartiality be emphasized, proclaimed, or paraded? That naturally means Government sometimes do act partially or unfairly, but on a particular occasion they are going to act impartially; or, they have got their own special or peculiar notion or meaning – different from that of the common people – of the term “impartiality”, with regard to the particular occasion or problem!

3. Secondly, when Government had to act impartially – as they always have to – why not so act promptly and openly – in a grave emergency? Why force or threaten the contending parties to come to terms or settle their quarrels among themselves? Why use threats like “Come to terms at once, or.....!”, and confound more the already confounded parties? If the quarrelling and collaring parties could themselves compose their quarrel, whence the occasion for the origin of the quarrel, or the necessity of a third party to settle a deadly quarrel – or to rule the people? Why this vagueness of impartiality and delay in acting impartially? Why not tell the contending parties firmly, clearly, unequivocally, immediately – *when the cause and nature of the quarrel was fully known* – that one was right and the other was wrong, and Government would support the right and suppress the wrong? Why not do on the 15th or 13th what was done on the 20th or 24th?

4. This vagueness of impartiality and delay in acting impartially, led to the riot. The Hindus thought, since their claim was just, Government would support them.

The Muslims thought, because the hooligan was at their back, Government would support them – for the sake of public peace. Thus the Hindus stuck to their guns and the Muslims to their own – and Government also to its own, *viz.*, blustering inaction or “impartiality” – and the crash came about!

5. Now the riot has gone and peace has come ; but is it permanent peace ? Permanent peace, like the permanent cure of a disease, is impossible, unless the root of the trouble is taken out and burnt down. And, if the above diagnosis of the trouble be correct, there can hardly be any difficulty as to the remedy. Government should make it clear, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that :-

- (1) They are not going to tolerate for a moment, fanaticism, superstition, religious sentiment or the like – of the Hindu, or the Muslim, or the Christian, of any one in short – to interfere with the laws of the land, rights of the people, or orders of Government.
- (2) Any one having a grievance, should seek redress peacefully, through the Government or the Court of Law. And
- (3) Defiant and violent mobs of hooligans and ruffians will not be treated leniently as during the riot ; *i.e.*, they will not be asked to disperse or to behave, or arrested and marched to the Police Station or the Magisterial Court, but will be shot down at sight.

6. An earnest, emphatic, indignant, unequivocal proclamation to this effect – flashed across the land by beat of drums and blow of bugles – will put out the communal, fanatical, or nonsensical fire once and for ever ; and preserve the public peace, not only against the 1,000 and odd hooligans, ruffians, and rascals, arrested and imprisoned – who can then safely be released if there be no other objection – but against any possible number that could be imported from elsewhere or even from hell.

7. When the clean policy of Government is clearly known, all right-minded and responsible people, of all classes and races, will gladly come forward to help and assist Government ; and what appears to be an enormous and onerous task of Government, would be a matter for ease, pride, pleasure. The structure of society rests on the rocks of reason, right, peace, happiness, and not on the opposite of these.

3 - Whither Governors - Driving or Drifting ? (*Controversy with an Editor.*)

(i)

The communal quarrels, culminating in enormous suffering and loss of life and property, at the time of Bakri-Id, Dussera, Holi, Moharrum – apart from the innumerable stray incidents of almost daily occurrence – have become an annual feature of the land – like the round of seasons, rains, crops. It is unnecessary to point out or emphasize the fact that they are a sheer absurdity, a

deliberate and most heinous form of crime imaginable – brutality in the name of religion – and a darker and deeper stigma on the name of Government than on that of the people – because the Government exists for doing what the people are unable to do or do not do. If the people could or would always do what they should do, there would be no need or justification for the very name or existence of Government.

2. These troubles are of course ultimately put down with a strong hand – with the help of Section 144, the Police and the Military. The contending parties are at last compelled to submit to Law and Order ; that is to say, to subordinate their religious practices to the discipline or regulation of Law and Order. The majesty of Law and Order is thus invariably upheld – made to prevail, as it must, over religious practices as over wicked crimes, when such practices are found to be harmful to the society as a whole. But all this appears to have been done, in the case of communal quarrels, after the fact; *i.e.*, after the mischief has been done – after shops are looted, houses burnt, lives lost, and suffering is brought.

3. Although these perpetual, disgraceful, diabolical devilries are called Hindu-Muslim quarrels, they are in essence a quarrel between a clear civil or legal right on the one hand, and mad fanaticism on the other. The religious or sentimental argument or element, being common to both the parties, can easily be brushed aside, in the search for a solution of the problem. It should also be brushed

aside, because it has to give way to Law and Order, in the common interest ; has so given way in the past ; has been giving way all these years – although after the accomplishment of the mischief. If, then, religion – rather fanaticism – has to bow to Law and Order, as it has to, even in the end, the problem resolves itself into a simple question of simple common sense. It should be made to bow to Law and Order before it does the mischief, instead of making it do so after the mischief is done.

4. Is the present law strong enough to put down these troubles only after they arise and accomplish their measure of mischief, but is too weak to prevent them from doing the mischief? If so, is it impossible for the Government – which has abolished the practice of “Suttee” by law ; has sanctified sacrilegious marriages by law ; has crushed terrorism and mass movement under the heel of the law ; acquires and confiscates the private property of the people by the aid of the law ; imprisons the people without a trial and hangs them with a mock trial as a matter of law ; certifies bills and promulgates ordinances in defiance of the prayers and protests of the people in the name of the law ; commandeers men, money and materials in the teeth of the opposition of the people as a matter of law – is it impossible for such an almost Almighty Government to amend the existing law or enact a new law, for effectively dealing with this particular form of senseless, shameless, enormous, infernal, recurring, rascality ?

5. How is it that what could be done, even under the existing law, after the mischief has been done, could not be done for preventing the mischief – which does not fall from the heaven, but comes, almost with the steadiness and fearlessness of military march – with bands playing, bugles blowing, flags flying – in due course, in due form, at the appointed time, at the appointed place? Why does the Government go abegging and pacifying the obdurate and infuriate mobs – and their abettors and instigators – instead of firing volleys on them? Does it not know the simple thing that arguments and entreaties are for men and not for beasts – are for the council hall or drawing room, not for the battle-field or lonely jungle; or that a crime does not cease to be a crime – if it is not aggravated – by being committed in the name or with the sanction of religion? Or, does it consider the lives of the roughs and scamps – or idiots and fanatics – as more sacred than those of the innocents and law-abiders?

•

(ii)

Your note in the “R” of April 9, contrasting my method with that of Mahatma Gandhi for dealing with the question of communal riots, is rather misleading – which, I hope, you will set right, in view of the importance of the subject. I am not newly asking the Government to turn hooligan for suppressing hooliganism. It is already so – in the sense you have used the term hooligan. Its

very nature is such : the very idea of Government is like that ; all Governments are like that. Otherwise, what is the purpose or propriety of the physical force it commands – the Police, the Military, the muskets, the machine-guns ? And, unless it is so, it won't be Government : not fit to govern. It may be excellent as a lecturer, as a saint, a hermit, a vedantist ; but as Government, it will be an utter, pitiful, disgraceful failure. Nay, it cannot simply exist for a day – never existed in the past for a day – without the support of physical force. Whether, however, Government always uses its force – or power, or authority – properly, is a different matter, and I have not raised that point on the present occasion. Government also is after all a human institution. It may be erring at times ; it may be doing wrong at times. But the use of its force for the suppression of hooliganism – as for the suppression of any other form of crime – as the last remedy of course, can't be wrong, nay, would be perfectly right. That is the simple point of my argument.

2. Mahatma Gandhi is making a fetish of his theory of non-violence. He wants at once to make the world perfect, in which not a single individual – including himself – is perfect. His object is certainly laudable, but it is utterly impracticable. His remedy of non-violence for each and every form of violence or other crimes, is not less absurd than the magic pill of the mountebank, which is to cure all the 200 and odd ills of the human system,

in all climes, at all their stages. Perfect non-violence, like geometrical theorems, is impossible in this world – at any rate at the present stage of the world. Surgical operation is a form of violence; but can it therefore be bad or wrong? Poisons are harmful, but they are indispensable in pharmaceuticals. Similarly, one cannot simply afford to be non-violent with a tiger in the jungle, a high-way robber, or a mid-night burglar. If you do so, it would both be cowardly and suicidal. Violence, like the use or abuse of food or poison, is thus good or bad, according to the motive behind it or the purpose for which it is used. There can therefore be no doubt or dispute regarding its justification for the prevention or suppression of crime – whether it is hooliganism, fanaticism, or rascalism. It cannot be entirely eschewed from practical life, any more than the use of bread, butter, water, fire, air. Mahatmaji is stated to be a man who is always open to correction, and a constant learner of new things. If so, here is a new and wholesome lesson for him to learn.

(iii)

With reference to your remark on my letter on the above subject published in the “ R ” of April 23, I beg to point out that I do not think that I have shifted my position in the letter in question; rather, that position would appear not to have been clearly apprehended by you. Instead, however, of explaining the whole thing

anew, I reproduce below the substance of my views on the subject, published in the "B.S." and "B.S." – but unnoticed or ignored by Government – on the occasion of the last riots in 1936, which will make the matter perfectly clear :—

“ Now the riot has gone and peace has come ; but is it permanent peace ? Permanent peace, like the permanent cure of a disease, is impossible, unless the root of the trouble is taken out and burnt down. And, if the diagnosis (made in the earlier part of the article) of the trouble be correct, there can hardly be any difficulty as to the remedy. Government should make it clear, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that :—

- (1) They are not going to tolerate for a moment, fanaticism, superstition, religious sentiment or the like – of the Hindu, or the Muslim, or the Christian, of any one in short – to interfere with the laws of the land, rights of the people, or orders of Government.
- (2) Any one having a grievance, should seek redress peacefully, through the Government or the Court of Law. And
- (3) Defiant and violent mobs of hooligans and ruffians will not be treated leniently as during the riot ; that is to say, they will not be asked to disperse or to behave, or arrested and marched to the Police Station or the Magisterial Court, but will be shot down at sight.

An earnest, emphatic, indignant, unequivocal proclamation to this effect – flashed across the land by beat of drums and blow of bugles – will put out the communal, fanatical, or nonsensical fire once and for ever; and preserve the public peace, not only against the 1,000 and odd hooligans, ruffians, and rascals, arrested and imprisoned – who can then safely be released, if there be no other objection – but against any possible number that could be imported from elsewhere, or even from hell.”

2. Now, kindly consider, Sir, whether I have here advocated the use of force or violence as the last or first remedy; or whether the remedy here suggested in any way differs from the one that is now being advocated. And, be also pleased to consider whether it is a mere chimerical or puerile remedy, or a thoroughly reasonable, perfectly practicable, absolutely justifiable, and sufficiently effective one.

3. Of course, by the use of this method, in the first one or two instances, a larger number of deaths and a greater amount of suffering may ensue – if the hooligans choose to treat lightly, according to their usual wont, the earnestness of Government’s action or intention. But it will obviate a lot of subsequent periodical trouble, bother, and suffering. In other words, in the phraseology of modern advertisement, it will be found to be far more economical in the long run.

4. There is, of course, the other aspect of the problem, *viz.*, educating and improving the condition of the hooligans, so as to make them think and feel, peaceful and honourable occupation as much more pleasurable and profitable, than that of engaging in the risk of being stabbed by their own brethren of the opposite camp, or of being shot down by the police bullets or pierced through by the military bayonets. But, until that is done, they should be made to feel that it is far safer and better to drink and gamble with cards or coins, or pick the pockets of passers-by, or lie naked on the footpaths of roads, than to engage in the pastime of stabbing unwary pedestrians, or to incur the risk of defying Government orders.

5. The present treatment of hooligans, namely, threatening and frightening them with empty rifles and revolvers, and then arresting a few of them, for being imprisoned and soon released – thus enabling them, within a few months' time, to be back again at their old trade afresh – is a huge farce, a costly joke. Imprisonment to such ruffians is respite – if not reward – rather than punishment. And, if punishment is at all to be given, it ought to be such as to be effective. Leniency in punishment and parsimony in reward are imbecile virtues and futile policies.

6. The idea of deportation of hooligans is another shift, and not at all a remedy. Is it supposed that it is enough if Bombay is made safe at the cost of Poona,

Satara, or Sholapur ? Have those places no problems of their own ? 'Is the climate of those places particularly congenial to the health or temperament of the hooligans ? Why should those places entertain or maintain the ruffians whom Bombay has driven out ? Or, is it supposed that the hooligans of Bombay will be metamorphosed into thorough gentlemen, by the touch of the air of the upcountry ?

7. To put the whole problem in a nutshell, amenable criminals should be helped and reformed, and incorrigible ones permanently confined if possible, or hanged if otherwise. But it is not necessary to anticipate such an extreme contingency at all. The mere enactment – and emphasized announcement, by beat of drums and blow of bugles – of a stringent law on the lines contemplated above, will at once improve the situation 99 per cent, and its literal enforcement in the remaining one case, would be nothing very serious, as compared with the heinousness of the crime or obdurate character of the criminal. In fine, Government action should be so stern as to make criminals tremble at the very thought of it, and at the same time so straight that no reasonable person would take the least exception to it.

8. Neither is there any need to consider the existence of such a law on the Statute Book as a matter of disgrace to the body politic. That would be like considering hospitals and dispensaries as matters of disgrace to the health of the public. There is nothing disgraceful in

either of the cases. One's efforts may quite honourably and consistently continue to make the dark laws and the black buildings a dead-letter and a desolate house – which are meant to be availed of only in extreme, exceptional, or inevitable cases or circumstances.

(iv)

Although you have decided not to pursue the subject any further, I hope you will not be so unkind as summarily to consign this letter to the W.P.B. without casting a glance over it. You might perhaps then be inclined, in the interest of the public weal, to reconsider your decision.

2. The reason for my pursuing the subject with so much pertinacity – or importunity – is that the trouble has neither been eradicated, nor is it confined to any one place. It cannot be stated when or where it may flare up again, or with what disastrous result. It is accordingly my wish, with your kind permission, to make my humble contribution towards the solution of this knotty nasty problem.

3. To cut the matter short, my contention is that hooliganism is a form of terrorism – and a baser and meaner form because, whereas the terrorists aimed at the lives of those whom they believed to be offenders, the hooligans aim at those whom they know to be innocent.

I do not know whether a precise definition of a terrorist was ever given, or whether terrorism was considered a public or private problem, or whether it was solved along the well-known lines of settling private disputes or otherwise. But this much I can definitely state, without the least fear of being challenged of the truth of that statement, that there was once – not very long ago – such a thing in the land as terrorism, and it has since been wiped out of existence. And I want to suggest that hooliganism should also be similarly suppressed – by sterner measures if necessary in view of its viler character – notwithstanding the regrettable want of a correct or precise definition of the term hooligan.

4. Of course, this method of dealing with hooliganism may not be quite just or perfect – apart from the question whether it was so in respect of terrorism. But there is no sense in complaining about the imperfection of a measure, in the absence of a better alternative. And secondly, it is vain to expect mathematical accuracy or perfection in moral or social matters, like the one under consideration. In such cases the question always is one of degree or comparison. The point to be decided in the case under consideration is accordingly not the ideal perfection of ideal means of dealing with hooliganism, but whether the existence of hooliganism is a lesser or greater evil, than its suppression by available and humanly devisable means. In other words, is the restraint, confinement or chastisement of the hooligans – who are little better than beasts –

a greater injustice or atrocity, than the knife stabs, passing from back to chest, of innocent pedestrians, ranging from old women to tender children – the loss and waste caused by loots and arsons apart – or *vice versa*? That is the simple point to be decided in this case; and I fail to understand how can there be any room for difference of opinion in this.

5. Your compassion or anxiety for the safety of the hooligans, at the cost of the innocents – like that of the theorists in the Assembly who raised a variety of objections to the Goonda Bill – is probably due to your not having personally visited the storm centres or the treating hospitals during the riots, or having otherwise had no occasion to observe what a hooligan is like or what hooliganism means.

6. Lastly, if one be unable to do anything more than use the grandma's remedy of vociferating imprecations and condemnations, and twisting and breaking one's fingers in consternation, for dealing with such a gross shameful abuse at home, then one should rather hang one's head in shame and keep mum, than go on, day and night, tirelessly talking, twittering, or blustering about such things as Independence, International Peace, League of Nations, Germany's Arms, Russia's Plans, Fellowship of Faiths, Brotherhood of Man, etc., etc.

4 - Crimes Horrible and Heinous -

Their Cause and Cure

On the 1st of October of the year of grace 1938, in the metropolis of Bombay – the citadel of the Province – on the royal Gokhale Road at Dadar, at the cool and bright hour of 9-30 in the morning, as I was taking my meals, I heard the heart-rending screams of a victim. I left the meals and rushed to the window. A Pathan was holding the hands of another Pathan who was rolling on the ground, and a third was dealing blows on him with a cudgel, on the other side of the road. A crowd had gathered round the scene at some distance. It was also frightened and was crying for help. None could dare go near the assaulters. They were doing their business in a most composed and systematic manner, as if they were pounding rice or kneading floor in their kitchen. Out of some 15 or 20 blows not a single one was given on the head. It appeared that the assailants wanted not to kill their victim outright, but to torture him to slow death and establish their bravado in the locality. After finishing their ghastly business they slowly and lordly walked away to their rooms nearby, as if nothing unusual had happened ! The crowd followed them from a distance, crying “ catch them ”, “ catch them ”.

2. I washed my hands, put on my clothes, hired a taxi, went to the Police Station, and gave the information. The Police came and commenced their work.

3. I was quite nervous and uneasy the whole day. As it was first day of the month, I could not but go to office for pay. But I could not put my mind in my work. I could not find interest in papers. The horrible scene was continuously haunting me.

4. When I returned home in the evening, I was told I was called at the Police Station. As I was not well in mind and body, I thought I might go in the morning. In a short time the Sub-Inspector came to my house and asked me why I did not turn up. I told him the reason. He said that it was only a case of simple assault, the victim had got only one bone broken and a few contusions on the body, and as the accused were to be bailed out, my evidence was immediately required. I was stunned to hear his description of the offence and his idea of bailing out the demons ! I went with him to the Police Station and gave my evidence. I was shown the accused persons. I could not identify them. My sight is not sharp, and I had seen them from a distance in a disturbed state of mind.

5. After about two months and a half I was summoned by the Court. I gave the evidence that I had given before the Police. I was relieved that day, but the case was postponed.

6. The result of the case, which was announced after about a dozen adjournments and the lapse of about six months, was that the monsters were rewarded for their bravery – nay, compensated for their trouble – nay, punished for their offence – with rigorous imprisonment of two months each !

7. I understand that, apart from the crowd that had gathered near the scene of offence and the residents round about, being unable to interfere with the criminals during the commission of the crime, no respectable witness of the locality could be found who was willing to come forward to give evidence even in the Court of Law against the accused Pathans – except the “Chasmavala Master”, as I was known by the Pathans, who also gave the sort of incomplete and effectless evidence, and for which he had to rue the day he was prompted to do even that.

8. This, in short, is the history of a case, not untypical, in respect of heinousness and horribleness, of cases occurring almost every day, almost everywhere, with almost similar result. The daily stabbing affrays on the slightest provocations; the “All over a few annas”, “All over a few chillies” cases; the communal riots so recklessly committed, so easily stirred up, so commonly cropping up; the mischievous pranks and the arrogant and defiant acts and attitudes of *mavalies*, in public places, in the presence of respectable persons – the exceptional cases of defying and dishonouring the very judges, in the very courts of justice, in the presence of the public and the police, apart – all these are instances of different degrees, of the same wilful and defiant category of crimes.

9. Now, what is the cause of this pitiable and shameful state of things, which is equally disgraceful to the public and the Government? Is there no remedy for it? The

cause is evidently the vapid law, framed by recluses, day-dreamers, or mere theorists, rather than by sensible men of this world ; based on primitive notions of jurisprudence centuries old – when the problem of crime had not developed, as at present, into a regular science and art, when perhaps the very terms of “ mavali ” and “ crook ” were unknown ; applying to desperadoes rules and principles suited for the chastisement of obstinate children or stupid women ; and conceived as if more with the intention of exhibiting the acuteness of intellect and softness of heart of the law-giver, than with the object of preventing crimes. And secondly, the meticulous manner of administering such fastidious laws. In other words, the dilatory and almost impracticable rules of procedure ; the lenient punishments prescribed by the law ; and the more lenient punishments generally awarded and often waived by the courts – with more reference to the technicality of the law and the apprehension of erring on the side of severity, than to the nature of the crime, or the class, character, or constitution of the criminal – are at the root of the existence and continuance, notwithstanding the police precautions and the magisterial checks, of crimes of the different daring kinds. Otherwise we would not have had the professional class of “ jail birds ”, goondas, dadas, regularly and fearlessly coming before the Courts, with an ever increasing tail of “ previous convictions ”, and with perfect unconcern about the present consequences. Imprisonment to such ruffians is manifestly respite if not reward. In fine, the effect of the present law and the

manner of its administration, far from its being a check on crimes or a terror to the criminals, has only been a matter of routine or belly-filling employment to the Police, the Magistracy, and the legal profession. The public have to look, in their daily business or behaviour, more to the mercy of the goonda than to the efficacy of the law !

10. The remedy is simple and obvious. If the extra-legal laws, so ruthlessly and successfully employed for the suppression of political terrorism, be not available or suitable for the suppression of this far more heinous form of perpetual social terrorism, similar more suitable laws should be immediately forged and used, until the ordinary law is amended in due course and made absolutely deterrent in effect and utterly summary in operation. And this should not be difficult of effecting, since all classes of people – except, of course, a few extremely nervous, punctilious, foolish, selfish, bigotted or wicked persons – will be deeply interested in it, and will heartily welcome it. Especially the punishment, in addition to its being thoroughly deterrent so far as the particular criminal is concerned, should also be publicly and ceremoniously administered, so as to make would-be criminals think, not twice but hundred times, before they act. The effect of the present method of dealing punishment, such as it might be, is considerably lost on would-be criminals, for the reason of its being “ Out of sight, out of mind ”.

11. But the really important or curious thing about the remedy here recommended is that, 'the very enactment – and emphasized announcement by beat of drums and blow of bugles – of a stringent law on the lines suggested, will instantly improve the situation more than 50 per cent ; and its literal enforcement, in the first one or two instances, 99 per cent.

5 - Gangsterdom at Matunga

I fail to understand the complaint of the Police regarding want of co-operation on the part of the public. What kind of co-operation do the Police expect from the public, and what use are they going to make of it ? Is it supposed that the public like the gangster raj, and therefore they do not offer co-operation to the Police ?

2. Supposing the people come forward “ openly ” to help the Police in catching the *mavalies* and sending them to jail, are the Police going to guarantee the subsequent safety of the public, who thus help them in their task ?

3. And, what is going to be the result of all this risky affair on the part of the public, if they openly help the Police in catching the *mavalies* ? The *mavalies* will at the most be sent to jail for a couple of months – to rest and be refreshed ! They will soon be back, with redoubled vigour, to their old trade, and to take vengeance on those

who dared to help the Police against them. That is why the public are afraid to help the Police openly, and that is how the *mavali* raj spreads and flourishes. Do the Police not know this simple fact ?

4. Unless the Law is so amended as to make it a terror to the miscreants, *mavalism* is not going to abate, much less to vanish.

5. When the Law itself is so lame, it is no use blaming the public, or even the Police, both of whom are equally helpless. The blame lies entirely with the Law, and the Government – which is the maker, breaker, and unmaker of Law.

6. If the people do not come forward, in their own vital interest, to help the Police, it is for the Government to enquire and find out the cause of this strange behaviour on the part of the public, and set the matter right. Merely blaming the public for want of co-operation is not the way of solving the problem. Even a child or grandma can do that.

6 - Budget - Bread - Behaviour

I believe the object of the institution of Government is to establish peace and prosperity in the land, and the annual Budgets are one of the important means aimed to bring about this effect. But in point of fact the Budgets appear to have been prepared according to the principles of book-keeping, rather than with a view to meet the crying needs of the day. That is to say, it appears to have been considered as a successful Budget if the Receipts and Expenditure sides are made to agree – without a deficit balance. Of course, several laudable items of expenditure are included in it, such as, removal of illiteracy, prohibition of drink, reduction of debt, construction of roads, etc., etc. But the chief item, which is the root of the major portion of misery, crimes, quarrels and disgrace in the land, and the source of peace, progress, and happiness, namely, sufficiency of food for the people (including other necessities of life, as clothes, shelter, leisure, etc.) appears to have been totally ignored or overlooked. It does not appear to have been sufficiently realised that, without the solution of this fundamental problem of bread, all other reforms are bound to be simply imaginary or transitory, if not an utter mockery ; that making men healthy and virtuous while keeping them starving and toiling, is a feat at once impossible and absurd – unachievable by the gods above, much less by mortals like us ; and that giving them food to eat first and then to expect them to be straight, honest, peaceful, would be sensible and justifiable, and to make them so would be extremely easy and immensely fruitful.

2. It does not appear to have been contemplated at all in the annual Budgets to tackle the problem of bread along the only effective lines, which may briefly be stated as under :—

- (1) The number of souls in the land at the beginning of the year.
- (2) Approximate increase during the year.
- (3) Quantity of food that can be made available.
- (4) Method of equalising the quantity of food with the number of people — by augmenting the amount of one if possible, or by arresting the growth of the other if necessary.
- (5) Fixing the ratio between the available quantity of food and the available amount of gold in the land ; that is to say, fixing the prices of food stuffs and other necessities.
- (6) And the method of distributing the amount of money among the people, with a view to insure a minimum amount of respectable wage — as that of a common soldier of the present day, for example — for a maximum amount of reasonable labour — say of 6 or 7 hours a day or 40 hours a week.

3. Undue importance appears to have been attached to minor or secondary matters in the Budgets. For example, too much importance and attention is paid to the subject of illiteracy — as if a knowledge of A B C would fill the

bellies and cover the bodies of the nude starvers ; as if there is not already such a thing as unemployment, starvation, suicide and slow death among the literates or educated of the day ; as if there are no rude, dull, dishonest, mean-minded or ill-tempered people among the educated ; as if the daily news in the press is not almost entirely made up of the quarrels, crimes, recriminations and intrigues of the educated ; as if crookedness, ambiguousness, faithlessness, are not synonyms for politics, which is the business of the educated ; as if the greater part of misery in the world has not been brought about – and is not being kept up – by religions and wars, which are the works of any but the intelligent and educated ; as if, in short, history is anything but a shameful record of crimes, cruelties, wickedness and baseness of the ambitious and educated !

4. Of course, illiteracy is not good, but is far less urgent than bread, and still less than the improvement of behaviour of the Budget-makers or rulers themselves – or the leaders. They should set an example by their own straight, honest, elevated behaviour, demonstrating the fruit of their education. The attempt of infusing education among the illiterates, under the present conditions of upheaval and scramble for petty party politics, would appear to resemble the pitiful, laughable, futile and self-contradictory attempt of bringing about temperance by reading lectures to the people on temperance, under the influence and punctuated by frequent draughts of liquor.

5. Same with the question of prohibition also. The drink habit – if it really be so bad as is made out by the prohibitionists – has at least the merit of being an old, immemorial, universal one ; and the addicts are habituated to it, and the people are accustomed to putting up with it. There is, again, a better, more effective, and less irritating way of bringing about this reform. Habits are not born with men, nor acquired with any deep thought. They are generally acquired sportively, casually, carelessly, customarily. Only, when they are indulged in for a time – often against one's inclination, as in the company of friends or as a matter of etiquette – they begin to take root, look nice, and become more indispensable than food. As a glaring example of this, take the case of meat-eating. Vegetarians, far from envying meat-eaters, or feeling the necessity of eating meat or the inclination of trying its taste, actually get giddy and nauseous at its very sight and smell, and pity and despise those that eat such filth with so much zest. And the reason for this strange aversion is simply that they have not been accustomed to eating it. No man is born either a meat-eater or vegetarian, like tiger or deer. He is entirely made, at least in this respect. And the same rule applies to the case of addicts of the different drugs also.

6. If, accordingly, a bad habit is to be rooted out, the best way of doing it is to nip it in the bud. Those not yet addicted to it should be warned against its bad effects, the allurements should be made difficult or impossible of

obtaining – as in the case of fire-arms or passports – and their use highly criminal. Those already addicted and unable to give it up, should be given a permit, allowing them to continue their indulgence, in a gradually descending degree if possible, or without any such restriction if otherwise – leaving them to their fate. A habit, which has come down almost from the beginning of the world, and is prevailing over the entire world, may well be allowed to continue for a generation more or so, without any very serious danger to society. The objectional features, however, of excessive use of intoxicants, such as improper behaviour in public places or cruel treatment of family members, should be made more severely punishable by law, if they are not already adequately punishable.

7. In any case, the present sudden and forcible plan of prohibition – adversely affecting both the drinkers and the drink-traders – if not absolutely unjustifiable and partially and precariously effective, is at least far less urgent than unemployment or destitution, which is daily increasing and culminating in crimes, quarrels, suffering, misery and disgrace – assassination and suffocation of pride and honour, of the wretches and also of the onlookers, viz., the public and the Government – apart.

7 - Unemployment or Destitution ?

The problem of human poverty or mass wretchedness has been attacked, from time immemorial, in a variety of manners, by a variety of experts - economists, socialists, philanthropists, politicians. Yet its solution, far from coming any the nearer day by day, appears to be going farther and farther every day. Why should it be so ?

2. The reason appears to be that, instead of grappling with the essence of the problem, only the traditional, groping, scratching attempts have been continued to tackle it. What is it that is exactly wanted ? Work for the hands, or bread for the belly - including clothes and shelter for the body - of the masses ?

3. If it be work that is required for the unemployed, I think, I can provide - if any simpleton in the street be unable to provide - any amount of work, and of a variety of interest. Set them to dusting the houses and sweeping the streets ; to nursing the sick and tutoring the rude ; to constructing taller and brighter buildings, smoother and wider roads, stronger and grander bridges ; to replacing motor cars by aeroplanes and bullock-carts by motor ones. Or, if this kind of work be not enough or interesting to keep them engaged, make them empty the ocean by buckets and fill it again with well water !

4. And, if this could not be done without money, manufacture tough paper - or thin leather - cut it into convenient sizes, print them with attractive designs, and call them rupees and sovereigns !

5. If, on the other hand, it be bread – and its appurtenances, *viz.*, clothes and shelter – that is really needed, I fail to see how it is produced or provided by such means as primary and compulsory education, by closing the factory and turning the charkha, by the prohibition of drink or remission of revenue, by the manufacture of guns or acquisition of Independence.

6. It is true, the wealth of the land – or of the world for the matter of that – is too unevenly distributed – there being millionaires and billionaires on the one hand, and wretched beggars and literal starvers on the other. But, I suppose, a millionaire does not actually eat a million loaves of bread daily – nor wears a million shirts and coats over one another, nor occupies a million bungalows by his body – as against the beggar or starver, who perhaps does not even get a whole loaf, a complete coat, or a square foot of private space. If so, and if there be bread, clothes and houses in the land, in quantity to be sufficient for all, where do the extra houses, coats and loaves go? What becomes of them?

7. If, on the other hand, as is probably the case, the total quantity of the essential requisites – bread, clothing and shelter – in existence, be only so much as to be insufficient for all, how will remedies like spinning by hand, learning to read and write, abstaining from drink, or chatting about petty politics or sterile philosophy, make up that deficiency in the essential requisites? The

application of these remedies to the problem under solution, is something like a blind man trying to discover a new planet, or a kiteboy setting to construct a sea-plane.

8. The fact appears to be that there are not the essential requisites in the land, to be sufficient for all ; and no attempt is made to equalise the supply and demand in this respect. All effort is directed, mainly if not solely, at bringing about a more even or equitable distribution of the existing inadequate supply. But when the stuff itself is insufficient, how will its distribution, however ingenious, overcome the initial difficulty of inadequacy ? When there is none in the well, none is bound to come into the bucket.

9. Even supposing, therefore, that the total outturn of provisions in the land has definitely increased in recent years, over what it was fifty years ago – when there was no such thing as unemployment, and far less starvation and destitution than at present – the question still remains, how will an increase, say, of 20 per cent in bread, avail against an increase of 40 per cent in men ? Exactly the reverse should be the case to bring forth abundance.

10. To take a simple illustration. The local trains on the G.I.P. and the B.B.C.I., and the trams, taxies, buses, have all assuredly increased, in number, speed, size, during the last 25 years. But the net effect of all this improvement or increase, far from adding to the comfort

of the passengers, has on the whole been to aggravate their inconvenience. Notwithstanding this enormous all-round increase in accommodation, the trains, trams, buses, are all getting more and more congested day by day – as at country fairs.

11. Railway journey would certainly be beneficial – and even pleasurable – to one who has to travel, for example, once a year, in a bullock cart, on a rough road, from Poona to Bombay. But how will it benefit one who has to travel every day – like the driver or guard – 50 miles for going to office, and 500 miles for going to the market ? Want, continually – and extravagantly – in advance of achievement ! Creation of want first, and struggle – and quarrel – to provide for it next, has been the rule, has been the philosophy, of modern life – individual as well as collective. And exactly such appears to have been the case in the matter of food supply and free space. This rule, this philosophy, must stand reversed, if ease and abundance be required.

12. If such be really the case – which can easily be investigated and verified – the solution of the problem would considerably be simplified. Attempts should be made on the one hand to produce more requisites, and on the other to check the growth of population, until both are made equal to one another. Of course, this manner of adjustment may not be left unaided or unsupplemented by the present efforts at bringing about a more equitable or reasonable distribution of wealth, including

prevention – rather than prohibition – of drink, inculcation of thrift, eradication of illiteracy, implantation of true morality, reduction of high salaries, enhancement of low wages, etc., etc.

13. If similar be the state also in the more advanced and independent countries like Germany or Japan, where articles are produced on a scale to suffice not only for the country of production but for the entire world, the cause of misery there also would be found to be the same as here. Only, we are not in a position to do, whereas those people do not do, what ought to be done. All things are produced there, except the necessary ones – bread and land. If half the sense and resource that these people spend on the manufacture of arms or toys, is spent on the manufacture of food and room – *i.e.*, cultivation not only of land, but of sands and rocks, of snows and salt waters – by monster-tractors, super-dredgers, artificial rains – on the one hand, and control of population on the other, their misery would vanish overnight – like a bad dream.

8 - A Way to Avoid Wars

(This article was written and published about six months before the outbreak of the present war.)

The waging of wars in modern times may be compared, in many important respects, to the fights of mavalies, in respectable quarters, in the presence of respectable people. Not that the mavalies cannot be over-powered and kept under control by the people of the locality, but they do not do it, for a variety of reasons :-

- (1) Why should we interfere when we are not affected by their quarrel ?
- (2) My neighbour is affected, not I.
- (3) We may all be affected, but there is no danger of it today. When the morrow breaks we will see to it.
- (4) If we interfere, we may ourselves come into trouble. It is therefore great prudence - or practical politics - to keep aloof - until the trouble comes to us, and, of course, crushes us !

Practical way indeed, of self-preservation, though for a moment !

2. This stupid, selfish, blind, cowardly line of reasoning may become - or be pardoned in - the common people ; but it is pitiable and despicable in men called statesmen, administrators, philosophers, warriors.

3. The reasoning of the common people however, though wrong from the ethical or logical point of view, from the practical stand-point their conduct would be found to be perfectly correct. Because, if the fight of the mavalies spreads or lasts, there is the police to come and control it.

4. But such is not the case with wars. There is no police to control wars. If, therefore, a big war breaks out and spreads, — as it is bound to, sooner than later, under the present conditions of false economics and wrong notions of politics — even the cool, neutral, philosophical onlookers — or prudent, practical, tactical non-interventionists — are also bound to be entangled in it. It would accordingly be found, even from the lowest — or highest — “practical” point of self-preservation, that it is ultimately far safer and more profitable to make a vigorous, daring, desperate attempt in time, to nip the trouble in the bud, even at the risk of one’s all — and die heroically, to be venerated and admired, to the end of time, by friends and foes, on earth and in heaven — than to wait shivering for the day — or trying to put out of one’s mind the day — when one will be over-powered, dragged out, hissed at, hacked to pieces !

5. It is true, the aggressors in war — as in the case of common criminals — will be much more prepared and much more desperate than their targets, and therefore they may not be as easily susceptible of control as street bullies. They may also have some real-justifiable ground of

complaint, as want of bread and room for their increasing people, and it may not therefore be fair either, on the part of others – even if it be possible – instantly to combine and crush them, without caring to know their complaint or trying to set it right. They should therefore first be given distinctly to understand two simple things :–

- (1) The principle on which they now wage wars, even if it turns out successful or fruitful for a time, is bound to be suicidal to them in the long run – as surely as it is murderous and merciless to the victims at the moment, and brutal and barbarous in the eyes of all right-minded men.
- (2) And secondly, there is a way of solving their problem of want in a far better, safer, more honourable, more pleasurable manner, than that of slaughtering others and getting slaughtered in turn. •

6. Now, how the present principle of waging wars is going to be actually suicidal to the aggressors in the end – apart from the loss and suffering that would result during the operation of the war – is briefly like this. Suppose, for example, the Germans are enabled today to dominate the world and purge it of all elements non-German. But tomorrow, *i.e.*, a few centuries hence, when the world would again be full – now with people of only the purest German

blood – and the problem of bread would again be as acute, the Germans of America will wage a war against the Germans of Europe, the Germans of China against the Germans of Japan, the Germans of Russia against the Germans of Germany ! And, how brutal, ferocious, or heinous this war would be – due to the improvement or development in the methods and instruments of war – can be better imagined than described. And, what is the root and fruit of all this barbarity, shaming even the brutes and barbarians of the dark and dusky ages ? Refined purified Germans, taking pride in their culture, civilization, intelligence, assassinating and mutilating their brother Germans, for no valid or sensible reason as such, in a world of overflowing bounty !

7. As regards the other point of solving the problem of bread in a far better manner than by means of wars, it may be observed that the time has now arrived, in view of the development of fast communications and inventions of quick destruction and devastation of humanity and property – which facilities can easily be turned into means of preserving, elevating, enriching humanity – to consider the world as a large family, and tackle the problem of bread – and also of pride – along the lines of typical family lives of the day. And, as a matter of fact, the earth is so vast, nature is so bountiful, science so munificent, and the intelligence of man so fruitful, that, with the help of the present amount of resources that is now being employed for the destruction and devastation

of humanity and property, the present population of the world can, not only be fed – and clothed and sheltered – but the present standard of living of the different sections can even be considerably raised. And, if the daily progress of science and the cunning of man be hereafter found to be unequal to meet the needs of the daily increasing amount of population, it would at least surely be found to be equal to the task of regulating the growth of population, so as to keep it within the limits of the available outturn of provisions and space, by means far less painful, far less shameful, far less horrible, and far more honourable, than that of bombs, guns, gas.

8. It is thus in the interest of all that the ancient foolish notion of empire – the welfare of *our* people, the security of *our* children ; the whiteness of *our* skin, the redness of *our* blood ; the bravery of *our* soldiers, the skill of *our* generals ; the progress of *our* science, the fertility of *our* brains ; the superiority of *our* race, the supremacy of *our* land ; the splendour of *our* name, the grandeur of *our* fame ; as against that of all the rest of the world, be given up, by every one – aggressors and defendants, neutrals and belligerents, perpetrators and instigators ; and the bread and room problem – indeed the butter and sugar problem also – of the world as a whole, be made a family affair, and its solution sought along the well-known lines of typical family lives of the day.

9. But it is also true that no one today is so pure, honest, or straight, as to command the confidence of the world – to deserve the honour of the typical family “Baba” or “Papa” of the world. But it is time for some one, to open his eyes, see the danger, come forward and take the lead – in the common interest and the human name ; avow his honest intention hereafter and prove it by action – by consenting to be bound by rules, penalties, and sanctions. I think the British Government, whatever its past history or even present behaviour, is better fitted than any other power to take this lead, with, of course, the help of India and America, France and Russia – indeed with the help of all the willing powers of the world.

9 – Dramatising Dream

Along with the advance of time, man's intelligence also is undoubtedly advancing. But this advance in intelligence, far from helping to solve or simplify the problems of life – *i.e.*, making life lighter, brighter, sweeter, grander – appears to be making it only harder, darker, more complicate, more burdensome, more bothersome. With science at his command, capable of building structures kissing the sky, and roads and rails girdling the earth ; of making vehicles having the speed and smoothness of wind – and flying like birds and diving like fish ; of turning dark nights into bright noons, and sandy deserts and marshy lands into corn fields and fruit and flower gardens ; in a word, of literally turning this unhappy

earth into a veritable heaven, man is trying to degrade it, not into a waste or forest, but into a veritable hell ! Look at the dastardly wars and the constant war clouds hovering over head ; and the more dastardly manner treaties are made, evaded, broken, blown up. Why should it be so ?

2. The reason appears to be that, all the progress man has made – and is making – and the intelligence he is spending, is all along the ancient road, and only in the traditional field. He is not daring – or caring – to think calmly, deeply, originally or independently, to find out the ultimate cause and devise a final cure, for the great, chronic, contagious Disease. In other words, he has not yet learnt to take a sufficiently comprehensive view of the problem that faces him. Questions of world-wide concern, are discussed by statesmen of international standing, along the same narrow lines on which housewives dispose of their daily bazaar problems ; grandmas compose their kiddies' quarrels ; illiterate litigants try to settle their party disputes in toddy shops ; or country pleaders argue their clients' cases in subordinate courts. That is to say, present disposal, immediate profit, technical rules, physical force, saving of face, one's juster cause and higher status as against the other's unjust cause and lower status – such are the guiding principles of statesmen and administrators, warriors and philosophers, sages and seers – as of the common people ! In other words, one talks of *his* country and party, another of *his* master and empire, a third of *his* religion and culture, a fourth of *his*

right and document, a fifth of *his* position and prestige ; as if there is no such thing in the world as the “ other ” or “ other’s ” ! No one cares or considers about the interest or happiness of others as of his own, much less of humanity as a whole. No wonder if this contracted, short-sighted, selfish, foolish, mean, arrogant, ignorant, egoistic way of discussion gets its due reward in due course – dissatisfaction, disquietude, heart-burning, rankling, intrigue, conflict, quarrel, war !

3. One must understand the simple thing that, if one has his country, his people, his children, the other too similarly has his own country, his people, his children ; if one takes pride in his empire, the other feels ashamed of his bondage and enraged at his treatment – and will therefore try to break away from the empire and subvert it if possible ; if one’s religion and culture be dear to one, the other’s religion and culture are equally dear to him ; if one has his rights and documents, it is possible that they might have been acquired by force, deceit, threat, or chance ; if one has his position and prestige, the other may not be as mean as he is supposed, in one’s own meanness or arrogance, to be.

4. History of the world – ancient, modern, current – is replete with proofs of this contention, if it is not entirely made up of it. In view, however, of the fact that the earth is vast enough and science and nature are capable enough, to arrange for a far better accommodation and maintenance of all, than by means of wars, it should not

at all be difficult to arrest the tradition and turn the tide of history – to bring down upon this terrestrial earth the ideal paradise in the skies – and make the heavenly gods and goddesses shower scents and flowers, singing celestial songs and dancing celestial dance ! One has simply got to be straight and honest, sympathetic and fearless. He should break off the old shackles of childish notions of superiority of race or blood – which was one at the source and will again be one in the end – in the bowels of the earth ! He should cast off the stupid rules of religions – which were made by men like us, and the effect of which has only been to create strifes and lead to bloodshed. He should give up mad notions of prestige, weak impulses of sentiment, wrong ideas of victory – just as he does in his behaviour with his children, friends, or beloveds. One must learn to stand stiff and high – like the sun and moon – walk straight, do right, admit and set right wrong, decide on merits, stick to principles, mind the essential – as a matter of course, without fuss, without farce, without thinking, without consciousness – like the breath of lungs or beat of pulse – without caring to count the cost or measure the fruit.

5. If a few robust, fearless, obstinate persons determine to combine and act on these principles – determine to revive, revise, improve, enlarge, reform, refine – on these lines – the defunct or disused League of Nations, the day-dream and forlorn hope of centuries would stand materialised and dramatised overnight !

10 - Root of the Trouble and Rooting it Out or Problem of the World in a Nutshell

(This article was published by one journal, publication was promised by one, was under consideration for over six months by one, was blessed by some, was regretted by some, was rejected by some.)

(i) - Introductory

It was probably Macaulay who said that the sign of deterioration was not deformity but misplaced beauty.

Sign of Demoralization. Similarly the sign of demoralization is not the fall of the low - who are too low to

fall - thefts by beggars, fights by roughs, quarrels among fools, or abuses amongst the vulgar ; but similar deeds - though under different names or in different fields - by the high-placed, the respected, the emulated, the venerated - by writers, litterateurs, leaders, rulers, soldiers - vulgar recrimination under the name of discussion ; duplicity and trickery under the name of politics ; art and intrigue under the name of diplomacy ; circumlocution, equivocation, procrastination, under the name of statesmanship ; silly obstinacy under the name of prestige ; large-scale robbery under the name of empire ; large-scale barbarity under the name of war !

2. History of the world - ancient, modern, current - which is the history of savage wars and shameful intrigues, is nothing but a huge chronicle of the degeneration and demoralization of the

Fatality, Imbecility, or Bravery ?

leaders of men. And the pity of it is that the position, far from improving by the bitter

experience of 2000 years, is on the way to greater deterioration day by day! Look at the international wars abroad and the civil wars at home, over the entire world. Starving the poor, cheating the simple, frightening the weak, bending before the strong, has been the politics of the day at the one end; and at the other, deadly wars without declaration and dirty wars with acclamation; official neutrality in the face of open instigation and abetment; isolation in the prospect of general conflagration; mutual petty pacts of trade and commerce in the midst of universal rain of death and hunger! Oh God! Is this the fatalists' struggle of vindicating the doctrine of fatality, by translating it into action? Or, is it the effect of incorrigible human imbecility, or of the stupid notion of bravery? Can there be deeper degradation and demoralization of the ideal, intellectual, philosophical, vaunting, prating, Man? Is there no hope of recovery from this disgraceful state?

3. Or take the simpler instance of love of one's country. This is a 'stale notion of love, centuries old.

**Stale Notion of
Patriotism.**

Why its praise and parade in the year of grace 1941, by people who have seen the disastrous war of 1914-18, are engaged in the more devastating war of 1939-?, and are in daily apprehension of a perpetual, ghastly, beastly war? Why the praise, song, shout, brawl, about national freedom and patriotism, like tender school-children under the guidance of country school-teachers, by scientists and

statesmen, by prophets and philosophers, by jurists and journalists, by senators and premiers, by Hitlers and Stalins, by Churchills and Roosevelts, by Francos and Mussolinis, by Shaws and Wells, by Mahatmas and Sardars, by Natarajans and Hornimans? Why not freedom of the world and happiness of the human race instead?

4. The time has certainly now arrived, in view of the development of fast communications and the inventions of quick destruction and devastation of humanity and property – which facilities can easily be turned into means of preserving, elevating, enriching humanity – to consider the world as a large family, and tackle the problem of bread – and also of pride – along the lines of typical family lives of the day.

5. Of course, there have always been – and there will necessarily be – differences, of opinion, taste, whim, among the different members of every family – between brothers, sisters, father and son, husband and wife. But are the differences ever allowed to reach the limit of strangling each other, starving each other, hacking each other – except, of course, in very rare cases of absolutely rude, incompetent, or idiotic management of family affairs? And, what is the secret of the happiness of normal family lives? The head, who has the responsibility of managing the family, has no

interest of "his," different from that of the family – no axe of his to grind, no bread of his to butter. His interest – and his pride – is centred in the successful and beautiful management of the family, and taking celestial pleasure in the success.

6. Why should not the world be similarly managed, in an age in which one can travel round the world in a week, in which one nation can almost raze to the ground another nation in a week?

Impossible ?

And, as a matter of fact, the earth is so vast, nature is so bountiful, science so munificent, and the intelligence of man so fruitful, that, with the help of the present amount of resources that is now being employed for the destruction and devastation of humanity and property, the present population of the world can, not only be fed – and clothed and sheltered – but the present standard of living of the different sections can even be considerably raised. And, if the daily progress of science and the cunning of man be hereafter found to be unequal to meet the needs of the daily increasing amount of population, it would at least surely be found to be equal to the task of regulating the growth of population, so as to keep it within the limits of the available outturn of provisions and space, by means far less painful, far less shameful, far less horrible, and far more honourable, than that of bombs, guns, gas.

7. Further, I do not think the people of the different countries of the world are essentially different from one another, any more than the different sections of the different peoples or the different members of different families are. That is to say, I do not think that the people of one country are humans, of another are brutes, of a third are devils, of a fourth are angels. Similarly, the different political or territorial units and their respective systems or theories striving for the welfare of their peoples, such as imperialism, nationalism, capitalism, proletarianism, socialism, Marxism, Gandhism, are so many different branches of the same tree, the roots of which have been worm-eaten if not have become absolutely rotten. If some of the systems as imperialism and nationalism, capitalism and proletarianism are clearly, avowedly, and antagonistically sectarian, others like socialism, communism, Marxism, or Gandhism, are not sufficiently comprehensive – all-loving or all-embracing. And that is the root of the constant clash and continuous strife in the world – as in the land.

8. Nor is there any fundamental difference between the essence of international wars and the essence of political party quarrels in the land – between Congress, Liberals, Democrats, Labourites, Muslim-Leaguers, Mahasabhaitees. As in the international so in the national field also, the leaders are quarrelling

**Similarity of
Peoples and
Systems.**

**Similarity of
Wars and
Quarrels.**

and fighting for something more theoretical, sentimental, or ceremonial, than for the essential or substantial matter, for which they profess, proclaim, and perhaps believe to be fighting, *viz.*, the well-being of the people. An explanation of the one trouble would thus appear to be sufficient to furnish an explanation of the other.

9. There has not been the least improvement in the condition of the people of the land, notwithstanding the several changes in the political system, from the Mogul to the Mahratta, from the Native to the British, from the British to the Congress. The beggars are begging, the thieves are stealing, the poor are crying, the rich are enjoying, the farmer is toiling and starving with a loin-cloth round his waist and a broken plough in his hand, and the worker is sweating and striking for a belly-full of meal a day, today as in the days of yore. Nay, a clear change has been brought about the other way ! To the ancient miseries and crimes of begging and robbing have been added new miseries of educated young men wandering, wasting, and dying for want of work, and young girls pining, withering, and drowning for want of marriage ; and new crimes as mavalism, mass disobedience, passive resistance. Not only has there been no improvement in the condition of the people, but no serious attempt has been made to find out the cause and uproot the evil. All the fight – and thought – has been – and is being – for power, fame, freedom, culture, religion – for the power,

in short, of the silly old mother-in-law of saying "no" to the beggar, who had come for alms and whom the daughter-in-law had turned away saying no! One fails to understand the worth or beauty of freedom and culture in juxtaposition of crime and misery.

10. Nor is there any reason to believe that this state of things will suddenly or surely improve, even if we get tomorrow the highly coveted political prize of Dominion Status or Independence, for the attainment of which – and to prevent the attainment of which – the leaders of the different parties are spending and wasting all their precious resources, moral, mental, material. Otherwise, wherefore the absence of happiness and contentment in countries, and peace and friendship between countries, that are already enjoying Dominion Status or Independence? Wherefore the frequent occurrence and recurrence of wars, and the constant and continuous hanging of war clouds, in Europe and the far East?

11. It is thus clear that the whole world has been thinking wrong and treading astray – muddling and bungling through to a precarious existence. All the systems or theories of the different countries or parties, have been based on isolated and insulated notions of interest, and prompted and guided rather by pride, ignorance and selfishness, than by wide sympathy, deep thought, or mutual regard. They are at best, local, superficial,

**Gloomy
pect.**

Pros-

**Muddling and
Bungling.**

ephemeral remedies, affording temporary relief, but not reaching the root of the trouble or comprehending the entire constitution of the world. They are thus unrelated, if not antagonistic, to one another, and to the common well-being of man; and therefore, however, highly praised or advertised by the progenitors and propagators of the respective faiths, are scorned and rejected by the sponsors of the other cults.

12. In the circumstances, the only way out of the impasse is to liquidate all the current political and territorial units and social and economical
The Only Way. “isms” in the world, and consolidate them into a common, universal system, the broad principles of which and the brief method of putting which into action, may be summarised as under.

(ii) - Fundamental Principles

13. It is impossible to effect an equal or absolutely just distribution of wealth or pleasures in the world among the peoples of the world, much less among the individuals of the world. Nor is it
Distribution of Wealth. either fair or desirable to try to do so by means of force or violence. That will only add to the chaos and wretchedness that already exists. The present abnormally uneven distribution can, however, certainly be rendered much more equitable with little injustice. But the continuance of a certain degree of unevenness is as

natural and inevitable as the hills and valleys, and trees and shrubs of nature, so long as the qualities of ability, intelligence, skill and valour of man continue to be uneven, as they are bound to, as long as Nature continues to be Nature – as long as the sun continues to shine and the sea to be salt.

14. It is manifestly foolish to call oneself – one's religion, culture, colour, custom, anything in short, of self – superior to others. If this were the test of superiority, any fool, rogue or rascal can call himself superior ! True superiority does not therefore consist in beating one's breast and shouting oneself to be superior, but in being so called and admired by *others*. Boasters of superiority should at least understand this simple thing.

15. The world is so mutable that what appears as good today may turn out wretched tomorrow, and what appears as bad to one may appear best to another, and *vice versa*. For example, look at the divorces of love marriages and the happy lives of child marriages ; the practices of meat-eating and wine-drinking ; or the intrigues and treasons as against the devotions and disciplines in politics. The human race is far more precarious in the development of its constitution and character than the animal and vegetable kingdoms, on account of its special qualities of meditation, communication, discussion, and the highly

excitable passion, in extremely varying degrees, without apparent cause. The law of sow wheat and grow wheat, sow gram and grow gram, does not apply to the human field – where wheat often produces gram, pomegranate produces plantain, thistle gives birth to jasmine, and *vice versa*. Otherwise, we would not have had Buddha, Vyasa, Christ, Shakespeare, Napoleon, Lokamanya, Mahatma, Sandow, Newton, Raman – not a single one of the epoch-makers of the world ; or, we would have had a regular dynasty of them.

16. It would similarly be found that there are many cultured men – as also beautiful women – among the Jews as among the Germans, among the
Only Way of Improvement. Indians as among the Americans, among the Muslims as among the Brahmins, among the peasants as among the princes, among the atheists as among the divines and priests. So also, there would always be rogues and rascals, dwarfs and brutes, actual and potential, in all classes and races, high and low, black and white, of East and West. In the circumstances, the only way to improve oneself – and improve the world – is to find out, appreciate, encourage, enjoy, whatever is really good and great, grand and noble, sublime and beautiful – without reference to where it is or how it came – without caring or enquiring whether the lotus grows in mud or in milk, whether the diamond is found in the mine or on the mountain.

17. If history has any important lesson to teach to mankind, it is the futility and harmfulness of fighting through blind egoism – whatever is mine is good, and everything yours is bad. This is the secret of the origin and expansion of the strife in the world – of the dismal course the history of the world has taken and is taking to date.

18. This state of things, however, may have been excusable centuries ago, when the different nations lived in different worlds as it were, and were in the habit of thinking in the manner of the proverbial frog in the pond. But today, when the entire world has almost been brought within the ambit of a family – physically, ethically, intellectually – the present gross and hideous sort of partiality and cruelty between man and man is absolutely unjustifiable, extremely contemptible, utterly inexcusable, and enormously harmful to all in the end.

19. The notion of protecting, consolidating and expanding one's race by means of war, again, is as wrong and impossible in principle, as it is stupid and impracticable in practice. The campaign of war may prosper for a time, but it is bound to lead to self-suffering and self-destruction of the aggressor in the long run, as surely as it is murderous and merciless to the victim at the moment. Suppose, for example, the Germans are enabled today to dominate the world and

purge it of all elements non-German. But tomorrow, *i.e.*, a few centuries hence, when the world would again be full – now with people of only the purest German blood – and the problem of bread would again be as acute, the Germans of America will wage a war against the Germans of Europe, the Germans of China against the Germans of Japan, the Germans of Russia against Germans of Germany ! And, how brutal, ferocious or heinous this war would be – due to the improvement or development in the methods and instruments of war – can better be imagined than described. And, what is the root and fruit of all this barbarity, shaming even the brutes and barbarians of the dark and dusky ages ? Refined purified Germans, taking pride in their culture, civilization, intelligence, assassinating and mutilating their brother Germans, for no valid or sensible reason as such, in a world of over-flowing bounty !

20. But this is an extreme supposition. Neither the Germans, nor the Russians, nor the Japanese, nor a 'combination of them, would be able to dominate the world and purge it of all non-German-Russian-Japanese element, peacefully divide the world among themselves, and live a happy life for ever. Even supposing they succeed, by dexterous intrigue and enormous bloodshed, of other people as well as of their own men, in this impossible monstrosity of dividing the world between a few powerful nations, their principle of grab, pride of blood,

**Result of Coali-
tion of Crooks.**

and habit of bloodshed – their very philosophy in short, of the highwayman and the slaughterhouse – would rather accelerate than put off the day of their own perdition. The competition for grab and grapple would then commence between these surviving blind, arrogant, ignorant, intoxicated, infuriated nations, with the help of up-to-date instruments and inventions of slaughter. And the dim distant centuries of self-suffering and self-effacement would thus soon dwindle into near and clear decades, and quickly disappear into simple years and present days – as in the case of the present war. And this process of destruction, devastation, and devilization, will go on repeating, at shorter intervals, with sharper instruments, until perhaps the inanimate engines of destruction refuse to destroy, in utter shame and grief, unknown to the civilized, sentient, boastful, philosophical man !

21. War-mongers should further understand the simple thing that the effects of war linger and fester in the breasts of the vanquished, and form the basis and causes for the preparation and perpetration of fresh wars – and thus the chain of wars goes on lengthening without limit – as it has lengthened to date. The determination – or desire – of the contending parties to “ win ” the present war – *i.e.* to beat and humiliate the other party – is thus, far from being a sign of leading to any kind of enduring peace, is only an omen of perpetuating more ghastly wars. If

peace be really intended, if it really be meant to avoid a recurrence of a second Versailles, pride must be set aside and an earnest attempt must be made to evolve a reasonable formula for peace, *before* either of the parties gets a crushing defeat. And secondly, partners of today in unjust and selfish wars – as all wars generally are – like those in theft or gambling, will be enemies tomorrow, on the division of the spoil, when their wants or their strength is increased. All pacts and treaties, however plausible, ingenious, or expedient at the moment, unless they are strictly just and fair, are bound, like the agreements of gamblers or robbers, to revive disputes and lead to wars – as has actually happened in the case of the present war.

22. Another misconception of the degenerate politicians and soldiers of the day is that they consider high-handedness, recklessness and arrogance – though ultimately followed by surrender and supplication – to be the highest forms of heroism – as intrigue, cunning, equivocation and verbosity to be the highest forms of wisdom or statesmanship. They undoubtedly are so regarded by the low, and they do dazzle the rude, frighten the weak, and prosper for a time. But in fact they are no better than mavalism or street hooliganism, and as such, they are eventually bound to collapse. That is how several great empires in the past, founded on similar foolish and short-sighted notions – as Roman, Spanish,

Napoleonic ; and several great despots inspired by similar petty and arrogant ambitions – as Attila, Alexander, Tamerlane ; have mixed with the dust till now, to be pitied and hissed by subsequent generations, rather than be contemplated with pride and admiration for them and hope and light for the future. That is how the late war of 1914 – 18 fared and ended ; and that is how the present war of 1939 – ? promises to fare and end.

23. There are many other ways and fields for showing one's bravery – or digesting one's arrogance – instead of doing human butchery and other devilish savagery. Drive out disease, ignorance and wretchedness from the world ; replace thatched huts by concrete structures, and concrete structures by marble palaces ; turn deserts into lakes and bogs into gardens ; make cars without wheels and planes without wings ; reduce working hours from 8 to 4, from 4 to 0 ; make rivers flow with milk and lakes stagnate with honey ; yoke tigers and lions to carts, and dragons and unicorns to coaches ; control storms and bolts, and regulate eruptions and earthquakes ; invade the moon and raid the mars ; make the clouds rain to order, and the sun emit moonshine ; make the moon be full every night, and the stars twinkle by day !

**Wide Scope for
Bravery.**

(iii) - Outline of Action

24. In the circumstances, the only way to preserve permanent peace and ensure steady progress in one's country or of one's people is to consider the world as a vast country or family and the different nations as members of that family, and to help towards the maintenance of the joint peace and prosperity of the world. Notions like "I" and "you", "mine" and "yours", should go; and slogans like "India for Indians", "England for English", must cease. "The earth for all" should take their place. It would then be as easy and pleasurable to solve the problem of bread - and also of butter and sugar - of the different countries, as the head of a family living in the country-house surrounded by gardens and fields, solves his daily petty problems of his kitchen, hall, stable, yard.

25. Of course, in order to work out the details and chalk out the plans of putting into action such a huge programme of universal happiness and progress, the establishment of an equally huge and competent institution is apparently essential. For which, the defunct, inert, or powerless and ill-conceived League of Nations - with, however, the vast array of its experts and enthusiasts - may be revived, radically reformed, re-modelled, re-constituted, re-juvenated - and re-named if necessary as the Universal Congress of Men - so as to enable it to

take up this vaster yet easier, more fruitful, more practicable, more abiding, more exhilarating work – corresponding almost to that of the noble head of a noble family – in right earnest. It should however clearly be realized that the object of this Congress is not, as was or turned out to be that of the late League, to protect and exploit the weak and defeat and castrate the strong, but to protect both strong and weak from the wicked, to protect the human race, to guard the human name, to raise the human fame.

26. The business of this Congress would thus broadly be to conduct the government of the world, on the lines of a model Government of a country, or the **Government of the World.** model conduct of a model family. It will have to proceed along the following lines for this purpose :—

- (1) It will owe no allegiance or loyalty to any particular nation or country, the entire world being its nation or country.
- (2) It will profess no religion, all religions being equal in its view.
- (3) It will give no quarter in its Code of conduct to such slogans or catch-words as empire, independence, democracy, self-determination, etc., etc., or to abstract theories as socialism, communism, Marxism, Gandhism.

- (4) It will see that the different countries together produce the requirements of life – according to their respective natural facilities and aptitudes for same – in quantity sufficient for the world.
- (5) It will regulate the exchange of these commodities, according to the requirements of the different countries ; and establish a common currency for the facility of the exchange.
- (6) It will see that the different countries regulate the growth of their respective populations, according to a prescribed uniform rate – if necessary and as may be decided upon by the Congress from time to time. And
- (7) It will see that the internal administrations of the different countries are carried on or guided by the following principles, with suitable local alterations as may be found necessary, but not incompatible with the spirit of these fundamental principles. . Namely :—
 - (a) Free ingress and egress of any people into and out of any country.
 - (b) One rule for all, in matters material or civil, without distinction of caste, creed, colour, birth, or sex. The distinction to be only on account of such things as ability, honesty, intelligence, skill, valour – fitness, in short, for the particular post or purpose.

- (c) Preference to civil rights over religious, superstitious, or sentimental.
- (d) Questions like religion, culture, marriage, etc., to be the private concern of individuals – like eating, shaving, smoking, walking.
- (e) Maintenance of a minimum standard of life – approximating to that of a common soldier of the present day – for a maximum amount of labour, say of 6 or 7 hours a day or 40 hours a week.
- (f) Establishment of asylums or infirmaries for the treatment and maintenance of the invalid and the disabled.
- (g) Enactment of absolutely deterrent and summary laws for the prevention of crimes of all sorts, from the spitting or throwing of dust and waste from upper stories, and including mob or mass offences or actions, begging, idleness, wastages, and “accidents” like the daily accidents of motor vehicles. And
- (h) Full scope or freedom to bring about any improvement or revolution, by peaceful methods of logic and reason.

27. This, in brief – and in rough – is the only way to peace, progress, happiness ; universal, local, individual, perpetual – the only way of ushering **Laugh or Weep.** in the real and lasting New Order or Millennium. There seems to be no other way. It is however to be seen whether our leaders – Hitlers and Stalins, Churchills and Roosevelts, Mussolinis and De-Valeras, Gandhis and Nehrus, Sardars and Savarkars, Jinnahs and Sikandars, Rajajis and Malaviyas, Boses and Roys – would even now wake up, stand up, see sense, shake off their cramped notions and ancient doctrines, and act as men, of advanced times, of the age of science and intelligence, reason and logic ; or all will continue to drift, struggle, shriek, weep and sink, like ship-wrecked women and children, as heretofore.

11 – Modern Marriages

I haven't got statistics regarding adult marriages or widow re-marriages of the day. But I understand that more than 50 per cent of such marriages turn out unhappy – if not utter failures. The reason appears to be that, in the first place, the couple generally becomes a misfit as in the case of ready-made clothes. It is difficult for developed and hardened characters – habits, tastes, ideas, opinions – to get quickly or quietly fused and blended, as in the case of dried and burnt pieces of bricks or tiles to form a tough pot, as with soft sticky mud. And secondly,

the intellectual way of fusing is considerably blocked by the parties not furnishing to each other correct or complete information – that vitally matters and is likely to ooze out – and sometimes even definitely false information is furnished, in the hope of easily digesting the deception, with the result that the explosion – or subsequent disclosure – of such suppressed facts, naturally leads to embitterment, develops into resentment, and finally culminates in the break-down of the marriage bond – in the majority of cases.

2. The parties to a marriage should understand the simple thing that marriage is not a sport or temporary shift, but a question of life ; and the companionship of life will not stand or last on the slippery sands of tricks – apart from such tricks being unfair, especially in so close a relation as that of husband and wife. Rather, frank admission of one's defects, mutual sympathy therefor, and honest assurances of goodwill towards each other, would make married life much more happy and enduring.

3. I should however like to make a few suggestions in the matter as under :–

- (1) In the first place, it is desirable to contract such marriages under the law – and through a respectable Society – instead of their being solemnized according to the rites of religion. This, however, should not be construed to mean that either the parties to the marriage, or the

Society that brings about such marriages, stand for divorce, any more than the founders of hospitals stand for the spread of diseases. And in distinct clarification of this point, a clause to the following effect should be added in the entrance form :-

“Although I am contracting the marriage under the secular Law, it shall be my pride, pleasure, duty and ambition to be a faithful and model spouse, and render the provision in the Act relating to divorce a dead letter.”

- (2) Secondly, in the form of application, to the usual entries regarding age, income, issues, etc., a few more entries should be added regarding the health and habits of the parties, similar to those in the proposal form of Insurance Companies ; and medical examination of the parties – physical and sexological – should also be introduced.
- (3) Thirdly, one more entry of a general character as “Any other information likely to affect the love or relation of married life”, should be added in the admission form. And the ‘information under this head, which the parties consider should be made a condition of contract, *e.g.*, the question of provision for the wife and her issues, may be put down in black and white ; and what they

think should remain confidential, *e.g.*, the question of taking part in public activities or of free love, may be discussed by them orally for their own satisfaction.

- (4) Fourthly, the parties should be given distinctly to understand the fundamental principle of the success of such marriages, at such advanced stages, *viz.*, that the spirit of the phrase "Forgive and forget the past and act aright in the future", should pervade the entire course of their lives – should permeate every movement of their limbs, every breath of their lungs – should be their constant motto, their mutual view-point of each other. And this should be made one of the clauses in the form, for the specific information and constant recollection of the parties.
- (5) Lastly, the form of application or admission should be divided into two distinct and separate parts :—

I – Legal Conditions.

II – Moral Obligations.

The first part should be drawn up in the form of a regular legal document, as in the case of the proposal forms of Insurance Companies; so that, in the last unavoidable event of breach of marriage, or disturbance of the marriage bond – sufficient to secure a legal divorce, or insufficient

or inexpedient to secure such a divorce – it should give right, not only to the parties to the marriage to sue each other, for having cheated them ; but also to the Society that brought about the marriage to sue the offending party, for having injured its utility as a benevolent public institution and brought its name into disrepute, by furnishing to it false information – or concealing from it material information – as the case may be. And the second part should include matters similar to those referred to at the end of clauses (1) and (3), and in clause (4) above. And this part should be the private property of the parties only – which they may make use of as they like, but with which the Society will in no way be concerned.

4. The introduction of these few improvements may, perhaps, at the beginning, lead to some diminution in the number of formal, nominal, technical, or brittle marriages ; but, I hope, it will ultimately have the effect of gradually augmenting the number of real, robust, happy, healthy, successful, blissful, beautiful marriages.

12 - Sex-Equality

That women should have the same liberty of sex as men, sounds quite plausible ; and the opposite party's cry that such liberty will destroy the happiness of home life, will demolish the beauty of social life, appears equally justifiable. The history of the human race, however :-

- (1) The lives of the greatest men and women, in history and mythology.
- (2) The institution of prostitution - over the entire world, almost from the beginning of time.
- (3) Crimes like kidnapping of girls and commission of rapes.
- (4) The daily street incidents of men being eager to have a look at women ; whereas women, far from similarly being eager to look at men, taking this attitude of men as an insult if not a crime.
- (5) The state of celibacy on the part of man - notwithstanding the natural limitation on his appetite and the easy unnatural means available for appeasing it - being generally considered as a higher feat of self-restraint than on the part of woman - with her greater capacity in this respect and fewer means of appeasing it.
- (6) The bad custom of old men marrying young girls and the phenomenon observable in this respect in the lower animals, apart.

All these things would appear to go to prove conclusively that man is by nature far more passionate and fond of variety in sex than woman.

2. Woman is by nature an incarnation of the softer qualities of weakness, lightness, neurosis, dependence, patience, superstition, sanctity, ceremony, timidity, delicacy, modesty, beauty, sympathy. Ordinarily, she would take pleasure and pride in being the devoted wife of a man superior to herself – strong and brave, intelligent and rich, passionate and generous – rather than handsome, gentle, chaste. She might perhaps, in a fit of rivalry with man, demand equality in respect of beard or moustache, rather than in respect of sex. It would also be illogical to suppose that woman, who is weaker or milder than man in all the qualities of human nature – exceptions of course excepted – is stronger or equally strong with man in respect of sex impulse alone.

3. This is not, however, to say that women should never dream of that kind of liberty or fondness for variety, while men should go on wallowing in lewdness without let or hindrance, but that, in the majority of cases, woman does not, as a natural urge, require that liberty; while on the other hand, slight or stealthy transgress on the part of man in this respect is pardonable. In other words, this is merely an explanation of a natural phenomenon – improveable and abusable, by man as by woman – which to extremists on either side appears inexplicable. If a section of the women of today – rather a section of men

on their behalf – be bawling about that liberty, as a natural right with men, it would appear to be due to the following three causes :-

- (1) Plausibility of the phrase “equality”.
- (2) Incompatibility of the match – or unsuitability of the male partner.
- (3) Exceptional cases among women – who may perhaps be more passionate than the most passionate man.

4. I do not know whether anywhere in the world the principle of sex-equality has actually been given a full and fair trial, and how it has succeeded. But from the tales of divorces in the advanced western countries – unions of free love, marriages by trial, separations for experiment, etc., etc., and the re-actions produced in countries where a trial to this principle appears to have been given, as in Russia – it appears that, however happy those people might in other respects be, in the matter of what is known as the happiness of “home life” – one of the highest if not the highest pleasure of life – their condition, of both men and women, is extremely pitiable.

5. As for the incompatible matches, their examination – physical and sexological – and if possible even psychological and temperamental – of both the parties before marriage, thus determining their suitability to each other in this respect, as by means of negotiation in other respects – would appear to overcome this difficulty to a large extent.

6. As for the remaining class of exceptions, really standing in need of sex-liberty – which would be very small if the above precautions are taken before binding the parties by marriage – they are entitled to have that liberty. But then there should be no humbug about it – no hypocrisy in it. They should not be ashamed of being known as prostitutes – real or born prostitutes, prostitutes by nature or choice, as against the professional prostitutes of today, most of whom are probably prostitutes against their will, by force of circumstances; and no special shame or civil disability should attach to the term “prostitute” – as to the profession of prostitution. And if possible they may even be given a better, more appropriate or pleasing name – as free, generous, private, or advanced beloveds or “My Dear”s or Darlings. They may openly do the profession of prostitution – for pleasure, profit, or philanthropy; or, if they want to be both wives as well as prostitutes or concubines, they should openly declare their creed accordingly and marry men of similar creed – if they find them, as they should, if their male partisans or “Samajaswasthists” be sincere in their intentions as they are loud in their professions. Only, they should not deceive the lay public – by concealing their real creed, marrying men of the traditional or common creed, and then divulging and acting up to their own special creed. In other words, they should not envy or aspire to the position of normal wives, of the majority of men – to whom their wives are the queens of homes, “Karbhārins” or “Grihalaxmis”, the goddesses of man

on earth – the last resort of peace and consolation – of the labouring, wandering, sweating, struggling, battling, consuming life of the erring, yielding, impetuous, adventurous, outdoor-duty man.

13 – Congress and Success

(This article was considered by one eminent Editor as worthy of being brought to the personal notice of Mahatma Gandhi or Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, was simply published in a corner of the paper by one, and was rejected by some.)

There are men who wonder how duffers fail or weaklings fall. I hope I will be pardoned if I inquire why the intelligent fail and the strong fall.

2. I doubt whether there are men abler or otherwise worthier than the leaders of the Congress – that are at present leading it, or have led it in the past. Yet, how is it that the Congress is not succeeding better than its meaner rivals as the Muslim League or the Mahasabha ?

3. The reason appears to be that the Congress too, like other average organizations, has not got out of the rut of traditional notions of political behaviour – or historical superstition. However loudly it may boast – or protest – it hasn't got the courage of its conviction – the courage of speaking truth, doing right, and walking straight

- at any cost. Otherwise, it would be difficult to explain - to take a single simple example - its attitude towards the Muslims as against the Hindus.

4. It boasts to be the one non-communal national organization in the land. But in fact it is only a little more national - or a little less communal - than the avowed communal organizations as the Muslim League or the Mahasabha. Its national character may be said to be more observable in its name - in the use of the epithet "National" against its name, as against the epithets of "Hindu" or "Muslim", used by the League or the Mahasabha - than in its action. Otherwise, wherefore the open partiality to the Muslims? Why the favouritism - or concession - to the Muslims, at the cost, however slight, in its view, of the Hindus - knowing it to be unfair, and admitting it to be so? Wherefore the cowardly, unmanly, or womanly policy of "Neither accept nor reject", towards such a distinctly, definitely, deliberately, disgracefully unjust and base measure as the Communal Award?

5. The idea of the mundane, mercenary, petty-policed, short-sighted, low-minded British Government, is to give the Muslims 99 out of the 100 balls in the basket, and one to the Hindus; the Congress wants to give 98 to the Muslims and 2 to the Hindus; while the Muslims want all the 100 balls to themselves! This, in short - or in substance - is the policy of the Government and the trick of the Congress; and this the difference between the

Muslim League and the National Congress, between Mahomed Ali Jinnah and Mahatma Gandhi.

6. Of course, even with this slight difference to its credit, the Congress will naturally succeed – and has actually succeeded – slightly better than its less discreet rivals in the field. But the question is, is its success equal to its ambition – or exclamation, or protestation? Its ambition is not merely to capture the Councils and strut as Ministers; or to build a road here and dig a tank there; or give a pie to the beggar or add a pie to the wage of the worker. Its ambition is to attain national independence and bring about international peace! Is it ever possible, with its clear policy of partiality or imbecile expediency – trying to please the fastidious, argue with the unreasonable, appease the insatiable, and bowing before the blusterer – to go anywhere near about those high goals? A sparrow might fly higher than the butterfly, but is it not presumptuous and ridiculous for it to aspire to the flight of the falcon?

7. The net ultimate effect of the policy of expediency is about the same as that of the proverbial policy of treachery, only with this difference that, whereas the traitor got his reward quickly, the policy of expediency goes on lingering, struggling, begging, crying; inflaming the greed of the greedy, enhancing the rage of the injured, postponing the hopes of the credulous; being cursed by the helpless, hated by the clamorous, hammered by the vigorous; lamented by few, suspected by all, respected by none.

8. There are men in the Congress who talk heroics – who dub all sorts of injustices, imbecilities, or simplicities, with the name of generosity, and call it philosophy ! If the Muslims want 10 seats, give them 15 they say. Learn to be generous, and base politics on sacrifice ! Sublime sentiments indeed ! But all this philosophy or generosity appears to have been reserved or restricted only for the benefit of the Muslims. If the Muslims are to be given 15 seats when they want 10, why not similarly let the English have what they are having or would like to have, and be contented, satisfied and pleased, with whatever is left or may remain ? Why this struggle at all for Dominion Status or Independence ? This would rather be a hard philosophy even for these brave people to digest.

9. These generous folks do not seem to know wherewith to eat generosity. They do not know the simple thing that generosity comes after justice and not before it ; and it is a virtue to be used in favour of one at the cost of self, and not at the cost of others or third persons. It is no generosity but simple justice, in a judge, to order compensation to the aggrieved complainant by the defendant ; but if that compensation be not forthcoming or be inadequate, making up the deficiency from the judge's pocket would be real generosity. To show generosity to the Muslims at the cost of the Hindus, is the Congress a purely Hindu organization, as alleged by the Muslim League ? If not, what right has it to show generosity to the Muslims, at the cost of the third persons, the Hindus ? This is not generosity but naked partiality, if not atrocity.

10. The Congress stands, like the Government, in the position of a judge or arbitrator, and its function is simply to deal strict and severe justice, leaving the parties to show generosity to each other – if they want. It is thus for the Mahasabha to show generosity to the Muslims, and for the Muslim League to show it similarly to the Hindus – if they please. The Congress has neither choice nor voice in the matter of showing generosity, either to the Muslims or to the Hindus – unless, of course, it has got something exclusively of its own, in respect of which it is at full liberty to be generous, lavish, or foolish – if not otherwise objectionable.

11. The ambition of the Congress is not unpardonable – nor is it altogether impossible. Only, it must learn to be thoroughly stern and straight in its behaviour or policy – absolutely fearless of obstacles and careless of small gains – so as not only to deserve the confidence, but to extort admiration and veneration, of one and all, of friends and foes, on earth and in heaven – except, of course, of the inherently or irretrievably base or wicked. Its principle should be the one small simple thing, of doing right and walking straight. And this, as a matter of course – without the least fuss, without any hard thinking, without minding the consequence, without caring to count the cost or measure the fruit – without, in short, being reduced to the miserable plight of having to put forth absurd and unconvincing defences of one's actions – and their endless explanations, interpretations, elucidations,

implications, amplifications, clarifications – and unabashed repetitions in different words or altered phrases, followed again by their own explanations and interpretations without end, sense, or weariness – and calling it high politics or dexterous diplomatics, as if the leaders of the Congress – and also rulers of the land – are too ignorant of using or understanding clear and simple language, or as if politics and diplomatics cannot be conducted in unambiguous language and in a straightforward manner – as if, in short, language is meant for these people for concealing their thoughts and misleading others, rather than for expressing thoughts and clearing doubts !

12. When the Congress will acquire the grit of acting in absolutely straight and fearless manner, only then, and then only, can it have any claim to aspire to higher goals, than provincial Ministerships, under the Government of India Act, of nineteen hundred and thirty-five A.D.

14 – Jinnah vs. Savarkar

Responsible people – and more responsible journals – with the air of strict impartiality, roundly denounce these two leaders as mere and pure communalists, place them on the same level with each other, and finish with their case ; as if there is nothing further to be said about them, or there is no difference whatever between them, or the difference is too slight or too recondite to much

bother about. This sort of judgment, about men or movements that agitate the entire land, and are likely to plunge it into utter confusion or chaos if not into sanguinary conflict, resembles the crude opinion of boys, boors, or grandmas, rather than the logical and helpful judgment of jurists or judicial courts. In every quarrel, fight or dispute, there is bound to be in the contention of both the parties, a mixture of some right and some wrong. And it is neither wisdom nor even simple sense to give the easiest of judgments that both are wrong – or both are right – which is no judgment at all. If such easy judgments were to prevail in the Courts of Law – which are the foundation of stable society – the very propriety of the Courts, conceived with the intelligence and experience of centuries, and maintained at a huge expense of the public, would be gone in a moment ; and their existence would not only be useless but positively mischievous. Because, under such a state, disputes, quarrels, crimes, fights, will all instantly multiply, with the sanction – or without the hindrance – of the Courts ; and in the deluge that will follow, both the litigant parties, the restraining Courts, the innocent observers, will all be murderously and mercilessly washed away !

2. Both* these famous men, along with their famous parties, may indeed be equally wrong, in many a detail or immaterial non-essential of their contentions. But it is not enough to point to the gross, patent, common-place defects of their programmes, call them

communalists, say both are wrong, and leave them there. That would only amount to giving them a licence, to continue their stupid fight or dispute, with its natural dire consequences.

3. The fact is that, in no dispute fight or contest, can both the parties ever be equally wrong. If both be *equally* wrong, there would be no point of *difference* between them – no real ground at all for dispute. The very essence of a dispute or quarrel is inequality of claims. This inequality may be gross in one case, fine in another, simply imaginary in a third, purposely simulated in a fourth ; but it cannot but exist in every case of dispute, in some form or other, in some degree or other. And it is the part of the impartial and intelligent tribunal to find out and nail down this net, final, residual, essential, aggressing, or aggravating part – or atom – of the blame in the matter – the tiny seed that grows into the banyan, the tiny spark that leads to the conflagration.

4. Now, what are the complaints or charges of the respective parties against each other? Barrister Savarkar's charges against the Muslims may be summed up as under :–

- (1) The Muslims are the real communalists and disturbers of the peace and prosperity of the land. And is this false? What is the meaning of the slogan “Muslim first and Muslim last”? Is this not the creed of the Muslim league? Is it a sign of nationalism?

- (2) Are separate electorates, weightages, reservation of seats, the criterions of nationalism ? And whose are these demands ?
- (3) Is the Communal Award a very just, fair, impartial, equitable, or honourable award ? Why accept and enthuse over such a distinctly unjust, extremely partial, utterly disgraceful decision ?
- (4) How are the Muslim atrocities on the Frontier and in Sind, confined against the Hindus, if there be nothing communal about them ?
- (5) What is the amount of Muslim sacrifice in the Civil Disobedience or Terrorist movements, undertaken for the liberation of the land ?
- (6) Is the Muslim demand for Pakistan, or their threat of following the example of Sudeten Germans, founded on pure principles of nationalism ?
- (7) What is the Muslim idea of a " Nation " or " Nationalism " ? Who were the ancestors of the land, and who form the majority at present ? Is the attempt of driving the host out of his home - or demanding a partition of his home - nationalism ?

5. And now, what are the charges of the Muslims against the Hindus ? Vande Mataram, the Tricolour-flag, the Hindi script, the " Mandir " sound !!! Can there

be meaner, tamer, tepider, more puerile, more ridiculous, more provoking, more exasperating charges than these, as compared with the above ?

6. If the arbiters entrusted with the decision of this Hindu-Muslim dispute, be devoid of the fine intellect required for sifting fine shades of evidence, or for understanding abstruse points of arguments, should at least keep their god-given eyes open, to see what even the blind can perceive.

15 - Khare Episode in a Nutshell .

Statements and counter-statements in connection with the unfortunate C. P. incident are still pouring in ; nor is there any sign of their coming to an end in the near future. And the reason is obvious. A physical impossibility is being attempted to be effected - a grave and manifest injustice is being attempted to be justified: a real mountain of earth and rocks is being attempted to be actually lifted, by real super Sandows of flesh and bone.

2. The most unedifying part of the controversy is that oral statements and implied understandings are declared by opposite parties to be naked lies and shameless falsehoods. Apart from such reciprocal recriminations being unbecoming the persons so high-placed and so highly respected and honoured by the public, they are also bad as precedents to the lay public and the promising youths.

3. It is unnecessary to repeat here things already stated and repeated during the course of the controversy ; and it is futile and foolish to try to give an unanswerable decision on the strength of facts or statements challenged alternately by opposite parties and damned as lies. The only way to form a reasonably just estimate of such a case in such circumstances is, on the analogy of a straw indicating the direction of the wind, to stick to points or facts, however small or trivial in appearance, which are self-evident truths or have been proved beyond doubt, and to draw, on the basis of such facts, only a logical conclusion as regards the rest.

4. The main charge against the Doctor – which was also the immediate cause of his abrupt disastrous downfall – was one of indiscipline. The Doctor has given in his “Defence” a full and smashing answer to this charge. It is however necessary, for our present purpose, specifically to note the following points in this connection :—

- (1) The conduct of the three colleagues of the ex-Premier who refused to obey the lawful order of their immediate lawful superior, in the matter of their resignation, was a clear and definite act of indiscipline on their part – as any schoolboy, any junior clerk in any decent office, any boy-scout or girl-guide, or any raw recruit in the police or military force can tell.

- (2) The conduct of the member of the High Command who secretly supported and encouraged them in their rebellious and unconstitutional act, was both wrong and bad, as any man of simple sense – the proverbial man in the street – can see.
- (3) And the conduct of the High Command in raising, on the hot ruins of the victim, the very same delinquents to positions of power, fame, and fortune – as if to reward them for their bullyish acts of insubordination – far from being just or right, was not even decent, becoming men of honour.

The Doctor's act of indiscipline or insubordination, such as it was, thus sinks into insignificance, when compared with these revolting acts, rivalling with one another in meanness, wickedness, impudence !

5. Further, the refusal of the High Command to grant the Doctor's demand for an enquiry into his case by an outside tribunal, for the simple, solid, jurisprudential reason that an accuser, however honourable, cannot be an impartial judge, is a clear admission of weakness of its cause. And, unfortunately, the accusers in the case have not turned out to be honourable as they were expected to be. Even the Mahatma, the virtual leader of the accusers, who had justly earned his enviable title of world-wide fame, has not hesitated in this disgraceful affair, to lower

himself to the level of unscrupulous common court litigants. His statement that he made only a few minor corrections in the draft of the Premier's resignation – which corrections in fact covered about three-fourth of the draft, and completely changed the original outline and import of the draft – if put into geometrical form, would read like this – More than a half means less than a quarter ! A grossly false and manifestly absurd statement. And his struggle to get back the corrected original draft from the Doctor, was pathetic beyond expression or imagination.

6. It is unreasonable, illogical, unhuman, to suppose that, when the Incarnation of Truth himself has made such a palpable and demonstrable statement of falsehood, his faithful servants, devout disciples, enthusiastic worshippers, or lamb-like followers, would be more scrupulous, sensible, or manful, in making statements which have no proof and are challenged by the opposite party.

7. That the Premier should have consulted his superiors, viz., the High Command, in the matter of his resignation, as claimed by it, is perfectly evident. But where was the wrong, if he acted within his powers, in good faith, “in anticipation of sanction” as the official phrase goes ? And, it has not yet been proved – or insinuated – throughout the voluminous course of the controversy, either that the Premier's act was unconstitutional, or was unjust on the merits of the case. And the urgency of taking the step “in anticipation of sanction” was

apparently to give the refractory colleagues – who stood badly in need of it – a wholesome practical lesson in the very same essential quality of discipline, which the High Command so highly values, and which in fact is the very soul of efficient working of all collective affairs.

8. In short, when all the pros and cons of the case are taken into consideration the net or final blame in the matter would be found to fall definitely, and heavily, on the High Command.

9. Now, if the Congress has a higher ambition than that of the common run of similar petty institutions, past and present, if it really means to render real and lasting service, not to any party or section but to the entire nation, and through the nation to the world at large, as it often boasts ; and if for that purpose it wants to gain the unstinted – and unrestrained – confidence and support, of all right-minded men – in the Congress and out of it, at home and abroad, on earth and in heaven – without which it is impossible to achieve such a grand object – as peace at home and fellowship abroad – it should forthwith do the following among other things :—

- (1) It should understand that the achievement of such a huge task is no child's play. It is impossible to achieve it by such petty and crooked methods or expedients as it has adopted in the present case. All its acts, small or great – nay, its very intents, its familiar talks, even its dreams

-must be spontaneously guided or prompted by strict principles of justice, fairness, honour - must be defensible before, and admirable by, man, god, demon.

- (2) It should understand the simple thing that it is a human and not a divine institution, and that therefore it is also liable to err - and entitled to repent, and make amends - like all humans or human institutions.
- (3) It should have the boldness, frankness, sportsmanliness, of admitting its error and setting it right, when the same comes to its notice.
- (4) It should start by admitting - and thus harbingering the new era of frank actions and honest intentions - its error in the present case, the error of having fallen a prey to the crude and commonplace notion of prestige, and having thus spoiled or aggravated an easily rectifiable matter.
- (5) And rectify it now, preferably by summarily pardoning the Doctor and reinstating him, on the sound and noble principle of "Forgive and forget"; and thus prove its repentance of the past and its sincerity for the future.
- (6) Or, if it still honestly feels its action to be just and right, at least grant him his very modest and most reasonable request for an enquiry into his case by an outside tribunal, for the reason already stated in para 5 above.

10. Lastly, in the interest of efficient conduct of important public affairs, the Congress should hereafter follow the procedure of Government, *viz.*, making definite rules, and introducing the system of immediately confirming in writing, orders issued orally in emergencies.

16 - Routine Bombardment ?

(Letter to an Editor - Practically applicable, mutatis mutandis, to all journals of party politics.)

Your leading articles are generally so logical, so powerful, so convincing, so beautifully got up - in short so grand that I often become completely enamoured of them. But this state of almost celestial thrill turns out to be only momentary. When I finish perusal of the shivering articles, I begin to despond and wonder why they do not produce the same effect on those for whom they are meant, as they do on me - how they fail to produce the required effect. Why should it be so ? Why do they not hit those whom they try to strike so hard ? How does the marksman miss, not the bull's eye but the very target, at every round ? Have you ever thought about this strange ineffectiveness of such heavy and repeating bombardment of yours ?

2. The cause appears to be that your arguments - anecdotes, aphorisms, sarcasms, parallels, contrasts, and the manner of marshalling them all - though quite brilliant,

almost blinding, are one-sided, like those of a counsel in a court of law – thoroughly Gandhian and entirely Congressite – though, of course – or perhaps – perfectly sincere, unlike those of the briefed barrister; and they therefore produce the same effect on your opponents, and inured readers, as those of the barrister on the stern judges. It appears that you consider the Mahatma to be actually a Mahatma – a real Superman or the Deity in flesh and bone; and the Congress a really superhuman or divine institution, equally incapable, with the heavenly Mahatma, of making mistakes or of being biased. But it seems that both are human of this earth, and like all things human, are liable to err – and entitled to repent, and make amends. Perfect individuals, much less institutions, have not yet been born; nor, unfortunately, is there any prospect of their being born in the near future.

3. Have you ever tried to find out – if not to root out – the causes of :-

- (1) The downfalls of Nariman, Khare, Bose, Roy, Singh.
- (2) The split between the rightists, leftists, and middlists in the Congress.
- (3) The vehement opposition to Congress and Gandhi, of so many outside or independent groups – individuals as well as institutions. And

- (4) The secret - or object - of the technical detachment and practical attachment of the Mahatma to the Congress - at the risk of provoking grave suspicions, scathing criticisms, and universal derision and denunciation ?

4. Instead of blindly praising the Congress, devoutly if not superstitiously worshipping the Mahatma, and futilely trying to make out a case for the Congress, as it is, if you will try to reform the Congress - find out the cause of the deep discontent in, and the vehement revolt against, the Congress Raj and the Congress King, and a way of setting the matter right - I think you will be rendering a far higher and nobler service to the Congress, to the Mahatma, to the nation, and to the world at large, than you are now doing.

5. Of course, after all this is a squalid mundane world, and there might still remain some sort and some amount of discontent and opposition. But if the Congress be sound and soft at heart, clear and level in head, and just and straight in behaviour, all trivial amounts of fastidious discontent or wanton opposition, can easily be crushed - if they could not safely be ignored. At any rate, the fear or anxiety of having daily to encounter enormous and unmanageable amount of opposition or unsatisfiable mass of discontent as at present - in other words, the necessity of having to put forth - and having to waste all one's energy and intelligence in putting forth - absurd and unconvincing defences of one's actions -

and their endless explanations, interpretations, elucidations, implications, amplifications, clarifications – and unabashed repetitions in different words or altered phrases, followed again by their own explanations and interpretations without end, sense, or weariness – and calling it high politics or delicate diplomatics, as if the leaders of the Congress – and also rulers of the land – are too ignorant of using or understanding clear and simple language, or as if politics and diplomatics cannot be conducted in unambiguous language and in a straightforward manner – as if, in short, language is meant for concealing one's thoughts and misleading others, rather than for expressing thoughts and clearing doubts – such a pitiable plight, at least, need not then even be dreamed.

17 – Untouchability – Part I.

The present feverishness of the untouchables' grievance regarding the barring of temple gates against them, is like a chronic patient's complaint to be cured in a day. That the grievance is genuine, there is not the least doubt: nor is there any doubt that it ought to be redressed, as early as possible. But their satyagraha, *i.e.*, insistence that it should be redressed now and here, is both impossible and unreasonable. Impossible because it is an old grievance of centuries, and therefore requiring for its solution patient thought and changing experiments; and unreasonable because the attainment of the object by the method of satyagraha, inflicts a fresh grievance on another class – the orthodox class.

2. The orthodox people may be highly sentimental or exceedingly superstitious. But they too are after all men, like the sceptics or heretics, or the sensitive untouchables themselves. Sentimentality and superstition may be unreasonable or unjustifiable feelings, from the point of philosophy or high morality. But the pain which the injury of those feelings produces, is psychologically real, and as a matter of fact considerable. Nor can those feelings be said to be more unreasonable or less excusable than the keen sensitiveness of the untouchables themselves.

3. Temple-satyagraha, therefore, is not the proper way of getting the grievance redressed. It is a method of getting redress for one by inflicting a grievance on another – and in an intenser form, because of that other's being unused to it – a clear aggravated case of starving Peter for feeding Paul.

4. The true remedy lies in the education of the untouchables, and wide-spread cultivation of sympathy for the feeling of pain – be the sufferer untouchable or embraceable, a fool or knave, man or stone. And this is the office of the social reformer, standing far above the level of the untouchables' interested or misguided leaders, or the simple or hypocritical orthodox priests. And he has already been performing it. The definite wane of untouchability that we see today all around us, is the result, not of the untouchables' importunity to enter a temple at Nasik or Gurveyur, but of the silent and sedulous

teaching of the grim reformer. His mission was begun long before temple-satyagraha was known or practised, and will go on, until the goal is reached, unhampered or undaunted by the untouchables' satyagraha or the touchables' hattagraha.

5. Will the sincere well-wishers of society at large ponder over this aspect of the problem, and learn and teach the obvious lesson, to all concerned? Will the injured untouchables try to find a pretty good measure of consolation in the free mingling with the fast growing crowd of rationalistic laymen, outside the compound wall of temples, mosques, and churches? Will the orthodox people also, in their turn, try to learn to be more rationalistic and sympathetic, according to the spirit of all true religions, on earth or in heaven?

18 - Untouchability - Part II.

The untouchables, instead of wasting their energies and resources in quarrelling, fighting, praying, or crying, over such things as admission into the orthodox temples, should concentrate their efforts on improving their material condition and moral calibre; and their sympathisers should help them in this direction - give them bread to eat and education to develop character. That will automatically, surely, though rather slowly - without wounding the feelings of others, without exciting one's own tempers - bring about the essence of the desired

result, if not actual entry, into the superstitious precincts. And this kind of consummation is actually happening around us – in cities, among the educated classes.

2. Obtruding oneself on others – by force, or piteous prayers – against their will, is clearly confessing one's own inferiority, and therefore a justification for the other party to thrust him back, to kick him out. In law it is a crime – trespass, assault. And law is nothing but codified common sense, for the common good. *

3. Steps should be taken by reformers, leaders, legislators, lay sympathisers, to remove the visible or recognizable marks of untouchability or inferiority, such as the specification of caste, creed, parentage, in public concerns of the common good – for entrance into service of the fatherland, for example. And on the other hand, the untouchables should be taught to feel – “ Why should I be so anxious to go to the prohibited temple to worship God ? God is in my house : He is in my heart. Let me first improve my social habits, let me reform my mode of living. I can then erect – or help to erect – in course of time, far grander temples, where the highest touchables, from the farthest corners of the world, would be proud to come, if not to worship God, to see the grandeur of God – the Grandeur Incarnate of education, patience, perseverance”. Such should be the spirit of the untouchables – and such the aim of their sympathisers – if they really want to be real touchables, not only among the Brahmins of the land, but also among the worthies of the world.

19 - "Cowardly and Contemptible"

I am very much grieved to read your remark regarding the recent Punjab outrage. That it was "a rash act of a wretched boy who could not even shoot straight" appears to me an almost adequate and appropriate comment. How you consider it as a "cowardly" and "contemptible" outrage I fail to understand. Do you mean that it was more cowardly and contemptible than Ordinances and lathi charges? Or, do you consider Ordinances and lathi charges as very brave and commendable deeds?

2. How the choice of time and place, again, makes the outrage more than ordinarily outrageous, is another puzzle to me. Is the Azad Maidan and fine winter morning a very proper time and place for lathi charges - on non-violent unarmed crowds? Is the height of Simla and the eve of Christmas a very appropriate time and place for the issue of strangling Ordinances?

3. That it was "a mad act of a misguided youth" I readily admit. That it is against the Congress creed is true. That it may more hamper than help the purpose it aims to accomplish is possible. But can it therefore be "C.C."? Suppose, for the sake of argument - which God forbid - Satyagraha fails. What next? Of course, even terrorism may fail. But then, is it not something, far better, infinitely more honourable, boldly to face and answer arrogance, than silently and sheepishly surrender

to Ordinances, lathi charges, bayonet thrusts, rifle shots, bombing from planes, torture in jails ?

4. Please mistake me not. I do not defend violence merely as violence. I only object to your calling terrorising the tyrant as cowardly and contemptible. Is not surgical operation a form of violence ? Is not the killing of germs by phenile a form of violence ? Are they on that account entirely to be eschewed ? And what is Satyagraha ? It is only a protest, a form of argument or reasoning. And as such, it may avail against reasonable beings. But how will it avail against midnight robbers or tigers in the jungle ?

5. I too share your abhorrence of the crime. But I look – and I believe the country, why, the whole world, will look with me – with more abhorrence on the cause of the crime than on the crime itself.

6. Lastly, who is responsible for the outbreak of these “cowardly and contemptible” outrages ? The Congress – which has adopted non-violence as its creed, and is daily getting hundreds of heads broken, and sending hundreds of people to jail, without so much as a protest ? Or the Mahatma – who is an Incarnation of Non-violence, and is now confined in a cage ? Or the Tyrant or Despot – call it what you will – irresponsible Government, Ordinance, Certification, exploitation, humiliation ?

20 - Terrorism and Constitutional Theory

Everything that Sir Laurie Hammond says in the London "Times" regarding terrorism - in India and Palestine - is perfectly correct, except the very first proposition from which all his further deductions quite logically follow. Far from the lives of a few Magistrates and Judges being more important than constitutional theory, constitutional theory - like any other important theory as social, legal, religious, scientific - is infinitely more important than the lives of all the Magistrates and Judges in the land put together ; because on sound theory of constitution depends the safety and prosperity of the land, in which the Magistrates and Judges also live, and have to live, along with millions and billions of other people. Bad theories - constitutional, economical, international, or philosophical - are the direct cause of crimes, quarrels, wars or terrorisms - all of which are merely editions of such very theories - amplified, intensified, diversified, glorified, fructified, or materialised.

2. Terrorism - like wars or crimes - is certainly bad, but not for the reason put forth by Sir Hammond, *viz.*, because it aims at the lives of Magistrates and Judges - whose lives may be more valuable than other lives according to Sir Hammond - but because, in the first place, it is not a sound or reasoned conduct or policy, leading ultimately to success and general happiness, but only a form of reckless and senseless despotism on a small scale, leading to and ending in chaos and misery ; and secondly

because, far from helping to achieve its noble purpose, it only spoils the promising lives of its noble sponsors – who are young, educated, respectable, intelligent, ambitious, adventurous, impetuous – in short are the flower of the population – are the light and pride of the nation – but only misguided.

3. If terrorism – as also other crimes or wars – all brothers and sisters of one another – are to be stopped, appreciably if not entirely, sound, clear theories – of constitution, socialism, internationalism – have in the first instance got to be fearlessly propounded, to be subsequently as fearlessly and rigidly followed. In the absence of sound definite theories, correct public action is impossible, and incorrect actions are bound to lead to undesirable results and disastrous effects.

4. This unsoundness – iniquity, stupidity, or absurdity – of the theories in the different spheres of life is at the root of all strifes, quarrels, wars, or unrest in the world – of social crimes, of communal wrangles, of international bickerings. Theories are the root of the tree of action or conduct. Unless the roots are sound, the tree will not sustain – much less grow, bloom, blossom. Hence the importance of theories – constitutional or otherwise – far more than the lives of the theorists, whether they be Magistrates, Judges, or Hammonds.

21 - Euclid's Disproof of God

If the great geometrician had been living today and he was asked whether he believed or disbelieved in God and why, he would probably have demonstrated his disbelief in God as under :-

2. The common conception of God is - and that is the only sensible, useful, practical conception - that he is :-

- (1) Omnipotent
- (2) Omniscient
- (3) Omnibenevolent.

Any other conception must be rejected as foolish, useless, academic or pedantic.

3. It must be admitted that there is misery and wretchedness in the world - disease, crime, cruelty - plague, famine, war.

4. The existence of misery in the world is thus an axiom, the truth of which is self-evident and cannot be disputed. If, then, God does not see the misery or has no knowledge of it, he is not Omniscient. If he cannot remedy it, he is not Omnipotent. If he does not want to interfere with it - wants to be, in the current war phraseology, a non-interventionist - he is not Omnibenevolent. There is therefore no God - who is, and ought to be, Omnipotent, Omniscient, Omnibenevolent - *Q.E.D.*

22 - Religion and Administration

Whatever the object - and it must have been a good one, though perhaps prompted by simplicity of understanding - of the founders of the different religions of the world, there is not the least doubt that the net effect of the several religions has been to create strife between the different groups and increase misery all round. Apart from the historical quarrels and wars between Jews and Gentiles, Catholics and Protestants, Hindus and Muslims, Shaivas and Vaishnavas; the present-day persecution of Jews as such in Christian lands; the misery of the discarded Hindu wife in this Aryan land; the murderous Hindu-Muslim quarrels over such paltry things as music before mosques - the wastage of time and intelligence spent on prayers and performance of rites, and in the futile attempt of proving the unprovable or knowing the unknowable, which time and intelligence could be turned to far better purposes, apart - are live instances, of the antipathy between religions or the stupidity of religions, of which any sane man ought to be ashamed. The lengthy, learned, contradictory, unmeaning, confounding, misleading defences of the different religions, frequently put forth by priests and pundits, kazies and moulvies, pastors and prelates, knaves and simpletons, only go to show the enormity of intelligence and labour wasted in the futile attempt of proving pain to be pleasure, falsehood to be truth, fancy to be reality, misery happiness, and shame honour.

2. The cause of the present deplorable state of affairs is the slavish or bigotted mentality of considering religion – notwithstanding its absurdities, stupidities, and inconsistencies, some of which are patent to the naked eye or simple sense, and others stand exposed or exploded by science and logic – as having fallen from the heaven, which heaven, again, is supposed to be a real and tangible place like this earth, though far grandeur and immensely blissful – and as helping to take one to such heaven, pardoning all one's sins and crimes – and therefore admitting of no change or improvement, or even discussion about its correctness, truthfulness, or usefulness. This kind of view may be pardonable in babies, boobies, or grandmas ; but it is pitiable and reprehensible in public men of the twentieth century, versed in the severities of science and logic, and acquainted with the atrocities of crusades and communal strifes, and yet professing the high ideal of serving and elevating humanity as a whole.

3. As a matter of fact, all religions are systems of rules, framed by men like ourselves, having two legs, two arms, two eyes, one nose, no horns, nor tails ; but not having our experience, and perhaps even our logic – men, who had not seen – except perhaps in fits of poetic frenzy – aeroplanes and machine-guns, submarines and destroyers ; had not even heard the names of air raids, poison gas, x-rays, electrons ; nor had dreamt of dastardly schemes as Pakistan or Nazistan. It is unthinkable that our forefathers, who were, and could not but be, backward to us

in every kind of knowledge, were perfect, to the exclusion of the very idea of improvement or discussion about it, in this highly controversial and extremely harmful subject alone. Even granting, therefore, that those rules had distinctly been beneficial to the state of society for which they were designed, or of the time at which they were framed, it is sheer absurdity and stupidity to hold that they must similarly be beneficial to us – and to our posterity to the end of time – notwithstanding their gross, patent, evil effects, of every day occurrence.

4. If, therefore, it be impossible – or otherwise inexpedient – to demolish religion – *of the prevailing type* – altogether, it is at least high time that those priding themselves to be philosophical administrators – or practical philosophers – who are responsible for the material welfare of the entire people under their charge, gather sense and spirit enough to declare religion to be the private concern of individuals – like eating, shaving, smoking, walking; and restrict themselves, in their public capacity, to making general laws and rules, conducing to temporal peace and mundane progress, of the society as a whole.

23 - Improving One or Spoiling Both ?

A strange notion regarding the essence of happiness appears to be prevailing in the world – at any rate in this our land of different classes and races of people, of a variety of vegetation and climatic conditions, of world-famous mountains and rivers, forests and deserts, elephants and tigers, cities and hamlets, nawabs and mendicants, ascetics and epicures, agnostics and theocratics – which is thus an epitome of the world. It does not appear to have been clearly realized that a cat will not be more happy by being transformed into a dog, or a dog by being transformed into a cat.

2. Of course, either or both the cat and the dog may happen to be unhappy, and there may be scope enough for making them both more happy. They may be in need of more or better kind of food, better shelter, protection from disease and danger. And the provision of these things will certainly make them both more happy.

3. But, instead of doing this, if we were to try to develop the cat into a dog and the dog into a cat, and make the cat hunt hares and the dog catch mice, the result is bound to be deplorable – both will miserably fail. Nor will we have any ground to complain that both are inefficient. We have made them so. We have attempted an impossible and foolish task. We have assigned improper or unnatural duties to two different

kinds of animals – of absolutely different natural constitutions and capabilities. Their failure was perfectly natural, and inevitable. The fault was ours, not theirs.

4. Almost similar absurd notions regarding betterment of the backward classes and of the weaker sex – or fairer or finer sex – actually prevail in the land ; and attempts are being made to improve their lot along these very lines – by means of special or preferential treatment, such as reservation of seats, posts, scholarships, charities; facilities – without reference, nay, with deliberate inverse reference, to the merits or deserts of the classes or individuals concerned. Instead of trying to realize and remove the peculiar difficulties in the way of the different classes, groups, or individuals, and helping them in the special requirements of their natural or suitable callings, attempts are being made to make a writer of a barber, a scholar of a sweeper, a tailor of a joiner, a lecturer of a labourer, a doctor of a mother – teaching stitching and typing to the blind and begging and robbing to the strong – etc., etc., and, as a corollary, *vice versa*. And the effect of this manner of making improvement is that the clerk is unable to handle the pen, the barber is unable to wield the razor, the fitter is unable to lift the hammer, the professor is unable to teach, the doctor is unable to cure, the wife is unable to breed, the mother is unable to bring up. And we thus have inefficient or bad clerks, bad cooks, bad wives, bad teachers, bad doctors, bad soldiers, bad

sweepers – all rivalling with one another in bad and worse. And then we wonder how our people are degenerating ! There is nothing to wonder. We are doing it.

5. It is wrong to suppose that the calling of the dog is a higher or nobler profession than that of the cat, or *vice versa*. Both are appropriate and indispensable, and equally useful and honourable in the Great Drama – conducing to the common benefit of all. And secondly, it is futile and foolish to try to make the cat a better dog, or the dog a better cat. A cat alone can be made a better cat, and a dog alone a better dog. The pith of the famous proverb गुणः पूजा स्थानं गुणेषु न च लिंगं न च वयः (*i.e.*, merit in the meritorious, and not their age or gender, is matter for appreciation and encouragement) is this very thing ; and the all-round improvement of a race or nation – and automatically of the world as a whole also – depends upon this very principle. Such high ideals – rather common sense questions – as “Dignity of Labour”, “Importance of Duty”, “Claim of Merit”, etc., are sung and taught in schools, but are not practised in life. That is the trouble of it.

24 - Meat-Eating

(Controversy with a reader of a paper.)

(i)

The substance of Mr. M.'s long laboured letter that appeared in the "C" of yesterday appears to be that, apart from the practice of meat-eating being quite justifiable on moral and religious grounds, and supported by the highest authorities, in history and mythology, its chief merit is that it makes one physically stronger, and therefore abler to defend himself against his enemies. Now, I think, it is unnecessary for me to attack the moral or religious justification of meat-eating, or the mythological or historical authorities quoted in support of it. I believe this aspect of the question has been, and is being, otherwise assailed, and the fallacy thereof daily exploded. I will therefore content myself on the present occasion, with only answering Mr. M.'s main contention, in support of which he has apparently ransacked history and mythology.

2. Granting therefore - not admitting - that meat-eating does make one physically stronger, how will it, pray, make one abler to defend himself against another meat-eater, if all were to take to meat-eating? A tiger may be a hero before a hare; but how will it fare before another tiger, stronger than itself? Or, will there be no such thing as stronger and weaker among men, when all will take to meat-eating under the advice of Mr. M.?

3. Mr. M.'s theory, therefore, even if sound in one part, *viz.*, that meat-eating makes one physically stronger – and stouter, more aggressive, more materialistic, etc., etc., as enumerated by him – is absolutely incorrect in the other more important respect, *viz.*, that it makes one abler to defend himself against his enemies.

4. If all men were to take to meat-eating as recommended by Mr. M., and if meat-eating should produce the estimable qualities of anger, avarice, passion, aggressiveness, etc., etc., as it probably does, as avowed by Mr. M., what may happen is that, it will teach men the art – and also the science – of how to “kill”, not merely goats, cows, fowl, fish, as at present, but men, women, tender boys and blooming girls as well – to meet the increasing demand for meat – or to appease the passions of anger, avarice, aggressiveness! At any rate, it has no tendency whatsoever to teach men the A B C of the art of how to “live” – the fond hope and sweet dream of Mr. M.

(ii)

My friend Mr. M. is confounding arguments, statements, hypotheses. I never took exception to the improving of one's body, although my purpose in such improvement be different from my friend's. I believe sound body – not necessarily strong body – is necessary for sound mind, and both are necessary to make life worth living or enjoying.

2. As for the tigers in the jungle living in peace and amity, they are so doing, not because they are strong, but firstly because they have not yet degraded to the level of the thinking, calculating, arguing, intriguing, inordinately selfish, extremely ferocious, exceedingly omnivorous man – because they have not yet developed the qualities of anger, avarice, aggressiveness, blood-thirstiness – the concomitants of meat-eating – to the degree man has done. And secondly because, they are not now living in a world of tigers alone, but of tigers and hares. When they will be the inhabitants of the purely tiger-world – where the hares will necessarily be non-existent – what alternative will they have but to tear one another ?

3. Mr. M. appears to consider strength as a very valuable asset, if not also a peculiar virtue. Strength in itself is neither virtue nor a qualification. It is valuable as compared with weakness. In a world of tigers *and* hares, the tigers will undoubtedly benefit by their strength. But in a world of tigers alone – the world our friend is hankering for – or of hares alone for the matter of that – it is immaterial whether the tigers or the hares are strong or weak, so long as they are sound. And the body of the herb-eating tiny hare, of the nimble deer, of the handsome and strenuous ox, of the elegant and enduring horse, of the enormous and stoutest elephant, is, I believe, as sound as that of the meat-eating tiger or panther.

4. The question of morality appears to our friend to be rather a high problem, beyond the reach of common people to understand. It is in fact only a question of a little clear thinking. Taking the life of another – killing harmless, innocent, beautiful animals – hare, deer, lambs, cows, singing birds and dancing fish – not to burn one's belly, but to pamper one's body – if this be not sheer cruelty, *i.e.*, arrant immorality, what else can it be please? What argument will man advance if a similar fate should befall him?

5. Now, as regards the merit of the tigers in the jungle living in peace and amity, what special merit or profit is there in being a tiger and living in peace and amity, which is not to be had by being a hare, or a horse, and living in peace and amity – granting tigers will live in peace and amity? But tigers will not live in peace and amity, unless there are hares to eat in abundance. Whereas hares can well afford to live in peace and amity without the help of tigers. Which, then, is the better and surer way of securing peace and amity on earth? Obviously by converting meat-eaters into vegetarians, and not by turning vegetarians into meat-eaters – Q.E.D.

(iii)

I would not have thought it worth while to write again on the subject after my last letter, but for my name having been specifically mentioned by my friend. I hope, however, that this will be my last letter on the subject – at least for some time to come.

2. Mr. M. is quite innocent of arguments, but extraordinarily capable of contradictions and declamation. He is harping on his theme from his own point of view, like a drowning man struggling at a straw. Since he could not appreciate my arguments, I now propose to see if he can at least understand his own contradictions.

3. In his very first article he maintained that meat-eating produces the heroic qualities of anger, avarice, passion, aggressiveness, etc.; and recommended meat-eating on this very account. He now turns round and complains “All your correspondents fear that meat-eating makes us ferocious, but in fact it does not”. Now, what essential difference is there between anger, avarice, passion and aggressiveness combined and ferociousness? “Whom am I to believe”, may I now ask, Mr. M. of July 2, or M. of July 23?

4. He is tirelessly quoting religion and the authors of religions as authorities in favour of meat-eating. But he forgets that the present day vegetarians also are followers of those very religions, but who have given up meat-eating as an improvement in religion, after consideration of that question from the higher stand-points of true religion and real morality.

5. "The God-man of Dakshinেশ্বর used to eat meat given to him in the name of the Goddess", says Mr. M. If so, it was evidently for the purification of the soul. But our friend wants it for the glorification of the body.

6. The contrast introduced by Mr. M. between the cat kept on milk-diet and the dog kept on meat-diet, is totally fallacious. Neither is cat as completely a milk-drinking animal, nor dog a meat-eating one, as horse is grass-eating or the tiger is flesh-eating.

7. "Generalizations drawn on the basis of individual comparisons are faulty". Quite so. But Dr. Daji's contrast between horse and tiger was not a contrast based on individual qualities. It was a contrast between the genus of horses as a class and the genus of tigers as a class. Our friend has yet to learn what individual and collective comparisons are.

8. He asks his adversaries to be intelligent truth-seekers. But his own mode of discussing the problem lacks alike intelligence and the spirit of truth-seeking. Another inveterate meat-eater - or advocate of meat-eating - with a touch of intelligence and a spark of the spirit of truth-seeking, would perhaps by now have been glad and proud to avow his conviction of the benevolence of vegetarianism, and his consequent total conversion to it - or at least would have admitted his total inability to defend the practice of meat-eating.

9. Our friend's notion about civilization and culture, like his notion about morality and life's duty, appears to be rather quaint. Installation of slaughter-houses at every corner ; street hawking of reeking limbs of animals ; flesh-eating, dram-drinking, nude-dancing, brawling, quarrelling, fighting – or their modern improved, refined, elevated, deified equivalents of armament, dis-armament, re-armament, aerial bombardment, under-sea blowing up, devastating wars, more devastating peace treaties, living in constant fear and suspicion of one another – afraid of talking, afraid of acting, afraid of keeping silent ! Oh God ! If this be civilization and culture, what would barbarism be like ?

(iv)

. Mr. K. (in the "C" of July 28) has undoubtedly sprung some real surprises and made a few pleasant revelations, but has committed one fatal fundamental error. He has taken rather a low view of human life. Self-preservation somehow – by some means fair or foul, high or low, noble or ignoble, estimable or detestable – appears to be his motto of man. Those creatures whom we scornfully denounce as "lower" animals, have been living in this very fashion. If man also were to live like them, where will be the difference between the proud man and the lower animal ?

2. The spirit of vegetarianism is different. It is the living of a life raised far above the level of beasts. It is not a living somehow – by taking the life of others or eating dirt. It is living a clean and correct life – standing or falling – straight, direct, erect. Vegetarians do not live to eat ; they eat to live.

3. Another mistake our friend has committed is that he has considered the effect of meat-eating only on the body of man, but has failed or forgotten to consider its effect on the brain. And in these days of scientific inventions and intellectual discussions and negotiations, the brain is likely to play a far more important and effective part than the body. If our friend would carry on his very useful and interesting investigation and observation into this branch of the subject also, I am afraid, he will perhaps himself be much more surprised at the result than he has surprised his readers on the present occasion.

25 - Organization and Individualism

People talk of organizing themselves in these days, to meet menaces of various types – imperialism, capitalism, hooliganism, high-handedness, intolerance. Of course, organization is not without its value, if not indispensable in its own way. But it appears that, in the attempt or anxiety to organize the people at large, one is apt to forget or neglect to form his own self, and make the people depend more on others than on their

own selves. Thus we often see the curious spectacle of degenerate individuals smarting under easily avertable grievances and attributing them to want of organization among the members.

2. As an organization will necessarily be composed of individuals, unless the individuals possess the requisite qualities, their organization is not likely to be of much practical use. An excellent example of this is furnished by the "Association" of clerks, although other large associations called peoples and nations afford far more important and interesting illustrations of this principle. I do not know if any association of clerks has ever achieved – or can ever achieve – anything which could not as well have been achieved by the clerks praying or crying individually.

3. There are certain grievances, or wrongs – material, moral, ideal – which may not appeal to an organization in the same light or with the same severity as to the individual concerned; and there are the personal grievances of individuals, which no organization, however perfect or sympathetic, may care or be able to redress. The faculty to form and conduct an organization, again, apart from its being a dependent, delaying, desponding, precarious process, is a privileged gift of nature, which is not vouchsafed to every individual. But not to bear or suffer insufferable injustices or indignities, is the primary right and duty of every individual born, which he is expected somehow to safeguard.

4. I have read somewhere – an English story – of the farmers of a certain manor, complaining about the intolerable cruelties and atrocities of their lord, to which was asked the short, sharp, straight, unsophisticated query – “ Why do they not shoot him ? ”

5. Of course, shooting an oppressor may not always be possible, or reasonable, or advisable, or very agreeable. But, unless the members of an organization are imbued with that sort of spirit – are ready to follow their leader blindly, silently, vehemently, violently – their organization can do very little for them.

6. It would thus appear to be a matter of extreme importance that, if not prior to, at least simultaneously with, the formation of an organization, every member should try to form his own self, morally, mentally, physically, intellectually; and not be merely a sleeping partner or defaulting subscriber, contenting himself with the idea that the “ Association ” will do everything for him. It will not do anything for him, if he considers it as something different from himself, if not, as some people seem to imagine, as his paid servant. But assuredly it will do a lot for him if he identifies himself with it, and animates it with his own spirit. “ God helps those that help themselves ” is not an idle proverb but a practical truism.

26 - Survival of the Fittest

The real fact about the theory of "Survival of the Fittest" is exactly the opposite of the common conception prevailing about it. That conception is that, by the law of Nature, as evinced in the lower animal and vegetable kingdoms, the fittest survive; and it is but fair that similar state should also obtain in the human world. But what actually happens in the un-checked non-human world is, not that necessarily the fittest survive, but whatever survives is called the fittest.

2. What is the test of fitness in the uncontrolled non-human world, from the point of survival? Strength and ferocity. Left to themselves, the stronger or more ferocious an animal or plant, the better it survives the weak, the mild, the graceful, the beautiful, the useful to man or animal.

3. It is unnecessary to point out or emphasize the incorrectness of this test of fitness, or its inapplicability to human beings. What, then, is the true test? The true test would appear to depend upon the correct answer to the question - "What is the purpose of life?" And that purpose, to my mind, appears to be to pass one's life as happily as possible, and try to make others also happy - if the conception of one's own happiness does not involve that of others - the pleasure of seeing others - men and women, boys and girls, beasts and birds - eating and drinking, dancing and singing, playing or praying -

making "majja" in short, according to each one's conception of majja, merry-making, or happiness.

4. The prime cause of the major portion of misery in the world today is undoubtedly insufficiency of food – and room – though this simple want may have been intensified or aggravated by the crass stupidity, ignorance, or arrogance of man; and "control" would certainly reduce this grievance to a large extent. But control should be popularised so as to make its rational adoption voluntary – though peremptory in exceptional cases or circumstances; and public institutions like hospitals should be adapted to suit the altered conditions and produce the required effect. But the adoption of such drastic measures as sterilization – of the poor, infirm, ignorant, simple, clownish, or careless – except, of course, in absolutely hopeless and useless cases of disease or derangement – in which case there should arise no question of discrimination on such ground as poverty and opulence, strength and weakness, straight-going or intriguing, conservative or progressive; and summary closing of free hospitals and other charitable institutions, would be totally wrong. That would result in more harm than good to the society as a whole. Because the law of "sow wheat and grow wheat, sow gram and grow gram", does not apply to the human field – where, wheat often produces gram, pomegranate produces plantain, thistle gives birth to jasmine, and *vice versa*. Otherwise, we would not have had Buddha, Vyasa, Christ, Shakespeare,

Napoleon, Lokamanya, Mahatma, Sandow, Newton, Raman - a President of a plough-boy, a Reuter of news-boy - not a single one of the epoch-makers of the world ; or, we would have had a regular dynasty of them. In other words, if the law of propagation of the vegetable or animal kingdom were applicable to human beings, there would not have been the immeasurable difference - marked by monuments of intelligence and benevolence, though often marred by acts of stupidity and cruelty - between Man and the 'Rest. We would not, in that case, have had such a thing at all as epoch-makers or epoch-making. We would only have had men and women - tall and short, lean and fat, black and white - merely coming to birth and going to death - like seasonal plants, worms or germs !

5. The undiluted or unqualified application of the theory deduced from the phenomenon of the wilderness to human beings, would thus be turning humans into wild beasts - of a more dangerous type - of a thinking, calculating, arguing, 'intriguing, enormously selfish, extremely ferocious kind ! Hence the necessity of great caution or circumspection in the use of remedies like sterilization in the case of human beings, and the summary closing of free hospitals, libraries, and other benevolent and beneficent public institutions.

