

# HARIJAN

(FOUNDED BY MAHATMA GANDHI)

Editor: MAGANBHAI P. DESAI

VOL. XVII. No. 4

AHMEDABAD — SATURDAY, MARCH 28, 1953

TWO ANNAS

## PROHIBITION PROGRAMME

(By Gandhiji)

Let me summarize what should, in my opinion, be the comprehensive programme (under prohibition) :

1. A drink drug map showing the locality of liquor and opium shops in each province.

2. Closing them as liquor shops on the expiry of the licences.

3. Immediate earmarking of liquor revenue, whilst it is still being received, exclusively for the purposes of prohibition.

4. Conversion, wherever possible, of the liquor shops into refreshment and recreation rooms in the hope that the original visitors will continue to use them, liquor contractors being themselves persuaded to conduct them if they will.

5. Employment of the existing excise staff for detection of illicit distillation and drinking.

6. Appeal to the educational institutions to devote a part of the time of teachers and students to temperance work.

7. Appeal to the women to organize visits to the persons given to the drink and opium habits.

8. Negotiation with the neighbouring States to undertake simultaneous prohibition.

9. Engaging the voluntary or, if necessary, paid assistance of the medical profession for suggesting non-alcoholic drinks and other substitutes for intoxicants and methods of weaning the addicts from their habit.

10. Revival of the activities of temperance associations in support of the campaign against drink.

11. Requiring employers of labour to open and maintain under first class management refreshment, recreation and educational rooms for the use of their employees.

12. Toddy tappers to be used for drawing sweet toddy for sale, as such, or conversion into *gur*.

*Harijan*, 28-8-'37

## WHY PROHIBITION

By Bharatan Kumarappa

Pages vii + 43 Price As. 12 Postage etc. As. 4

NAVAJIVAN PUBLISHING HOUSE

Post Box 105, AHMEDABAD

## OUR SOCIAL PURPOSE

[The other day at Delhi, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, while inaugurating the annual session of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry spoke about allowing the private sector of our industry certain measure of freedom of action "according to the way it knows how to function". He also spoke about the general overall need of controlled economy in our country.

We know how modern trade and industry functions in a capitalistic society today. It is therefore a little difficult to follow exactly what the Prime Minister meant to suggest when he said that a certain measure of freedom of action should be allowed to private enterprise. That allowance must surely square itself with the general social purpose to subserve which is the chief concern of all of us including those working in trade and industry. The Prime Minister beautifully described that purpose and that was the main theme, we might say, of his inaugural address. The pertinent part of that portion of his address is culled below from the report of *The Hindustan Times*, March 9, 1953.

17-3-53

— M. P. J

"Our social purpose," said Mr Nehru, "is to raise the level of our people — the whole and not of any particular section or group of the community — and to bring about a progressive measure of equality, or rather to lessen the inequalities that exist. A Welfare State means the partnership of the people in that State, and a partner means a person who shares the benefits and obligations of that State. If he does not get the benefits, he is not a partner. If he has only obligations he rightly resents them. A person who is unemployed, let us say, has no sense of partnership. He is out of it and he is socially, as an individual, a danger to the State, quite apart from the humanitarian aspects of the matter. Therefore, if we aim at a Welfare State — as we do — we must always keep that in mind and judge our policies from that point of view.

## Unemployment

"Perhaps the most important aspect of that point of view is this question of unemployment being eliminated completely. It is not an easy matter in this huge country, but difficult or easy, one has to face that question. We are going in that direction, and indeed all our planning is meant for that. But we have to think all the time how to hasten that progress, because if we do not, it comes in our way and prevents us from progressing at all.

"We want greater production of wealth in this country. We are not going to get wealth

pouring in from other countries. In fact, we do not want that to happen. I have no objection to external aid but we have to stand on our own feet and depend on our own brains and our own labour and not on other people's labour. If we have to go ahead, we have to produce wealth with all our resources, including manpower. Now as an algebraic formula, you put down: 'Here is our unemployed manpower which should be given work. Work leads to greater production. So why cannot we put an end to unemployment and have more production?' This seems simple, but it is not quite so simple.

#### National Effort

"In this matter, of course, the 19th century way of looking at things, *laissez-faire* and all that, is considered out of date. If we have a social purpose in view and we want to advance to it, we have to co-ordinate and direct as far as possible all the national effort to that end. So we have a kind of planned economy which essentially is a controlled economy. By controlled economy I mean more effective controls, not a multitude of controls all over the place."

One of the reasons why he wanted the "Swadeshi spirit", said Mr Nehru, was that he did not believe in any individual or group or nation going soft. "We have a tendency to go soft, 'we', meaning those who can afford to go soft. I am not talking about the millions of our people who have no chance of going soft.

"It is a good thing for our own selves, apart from the nation, to lead less soft lives, have a little more austerity in our lives and a little less vulgar display, which is really most displeasing whether it is on some special functions, weddings and so on. I do not understand why our tastes have gone down so much. Encourage art and so many things in India which are deserving. Why encourage vulgarity? Display of money without art is vulgarity."

"The Swadeshi spirit meant self-reliance, having faith in ourselves and our country and working for it," he said.

#### WHAT IS A WELFARE STATE?

[As the reader knows, Sir George Schuster, former Finance Member of the Government of India during the British administration, came here a few weeks ago. In the course of his short stay in India, he spoke two or three times on problems confronting us today. A friend drew my attention to these speeches, and chiefly to the one he gave in Bombay. In that address he tried to answer three queries—Where do we stand? Where do we want to go? Can we help each other on the road? (The two meant were India and Great Britain).]

In India we also have begun to speak in the name of the Welfare State as the goal of our journey. The word *Sarvodaya* seems to find less favour in Government circles and with our Planners. But that is just by the way. What is essential is to know what exactly is a Welfare State. Are we clear about what is meant thereby?

The idea and the slogan seem to have been born in Socialist England. Like many other things, we seem to be copying it and there is all fear that the shibboleth might begin to hinder clear thinking. The essence of the idea lies in collecting from the people as much as a State

can by way of taxes and to distribute the same through State organized social services of various sorts. It becomes in practice a kind of collectivist welfare work organized by the government of the State and administered through an expert bureaucracy. This idea of a paternalistic State can be compared to our joint family system; and it must be noted that its administration involves much red-tape and dangers of corruption etc.

Again such a method of working for the collective welfare of the people may probably be more suitable and helpful in an industrialized society as has evolved in some western countries. We are essentially an agricultural society. As we often remind to ourselves, India dwells in its lakhs of villages. I think, it was Shri J. P. Narain who noted this important distinction when he said at the Rangoon Socialist Conference that Socialism in India and Asia was required to work for an agricultural society, and might have therefore to take a different way from that in the Industrialized West. The question needs serious thought on our part.

Sir George Schuster touched the question of the Welfare State in his Bombay address. Though he did not directly discuss it from the above-mentioned stand-point, he touched it in a way and warned his hearers about one thing, viz. that the ideal of a Welfare State is not an economic proposition concerning our material welfare, but is a human ideal. The portion of his speech dealing with this is reproduced below from its report in *The Hindu* of 17-1-53.

12-3-53

—M. P.]

Where do we want to go? We have both set out to fulfil the conception of a "Welfare State". But I believe we both need to guard against danger of a wrong conception of welfare.

I want to give you my own ideas. I believe that the true meaning is best brought out by considering the contrast between "Welfare States" and "Power States". The Power State thinks in terms of greatness and power of the State; the Welfare State in terms of the welfare or happiness of its individual citizens. The danger today is that 'welfare' should be interpreted merely in terms of material welfare—that it should be regarded as a static condition which can have no reality unless a certain material standard is reached. Of course, certain minimum standards are necessary, and a great effort is now needed (especially in India) to improve material standards. But the essential spirit of a Welfare State can start to work even in a very poor country; and that essential spirit may be destroyed in a very rich one. According to my conception, a poor country in which every individual citizen is consciously and freely playing a worthy part in a collaborative effort to improve material conditions for the community, is much more truly a "Welfare State" than a rich country in which high standards of material benefits are distributed to all by a government acting as a beneficent providence. (We in Britain have certainly erred on the side of the second interpretation; but I think we are beginning now to move away from that error).

I want specially to stress the importance of this dynamic conception of the Welfare State, and to emphasize the dangers inherent in what I have called the static conception of mere material welfare.

The dangers are indeed of two kinds. The first is obvious and practical. If we start by laying down standards of material welfare, which — although they may be quite reasonable — may nevertheless involve an expenditure which is more than what a country is — at that stage — actually earning, then we may at the very outset bring our countries to economic ruin. Attempts to build a structure of social benefits before the economic foundations are soundly laid can bring nothing but disaster.

The second danger goes deeper. If we concentrate only on material welfare, if all our actions are governed by purely materialistic conceptions, then, however successful we may be, we may destroy all that gives true meaning and purpose to human life — individual liberty, human affections and the appreciation of spiritual values.

When I talk like this, I clearly get into the realm of ideas which cannot be adequately covered by easy and commonplace general phrases such as I have used. But I believe you will understand what I mean. And then I think you will agree with me that on this matter your people and mine have fundamentally the same outlook. We both think that the objective of Government should be conceived in terms of welfare of the individual citizens rather than of the power and greatness of the State. We both feel that true "welfare" means something much more than mere material possessions.

But we live in a hard material world and we must face hard practical realities. However much our ideals and purposes may be influenced by the conception that "man cannot live by bread alone", we have to recognize that he cannot live without it. And here I am brought back to what I said in answering my first question. For both of us, as I then said, the fact is that this elementary material task of earning our daily bread has become of supreme and dominating importance.

You have a population which is increasing at the rate of  $4\frac{1}{2}$  millions a year. You have no room to employ more people in agriculture and yet you are not today producing enough food to feed your existing population. If you cannot provide fruitful employment in industry for the working class of the  $4\frac{1}{2}$  millions that are added every year and produce the food on which they can live, then India must come to disaster. That would be true even if there were no threat of Communism in the world.

We in Britain, have a comparable problem. We have to support 50 million people in our small island. We cannot live on our present basis unless we can maintain a vast flow of exports to pay for our essential imports and owing to our war losses our exports need to be 75 per cent greater in volume than pre-war.

So for both of us, our bare living is at stake; for both of us the problem of improving our material production must so dominate all our activities as to set the pattern of our culture and our society.

What does this mean? If I look below the surface, if I try to think in terms of true welfare, then I see two fundamental questions arising from the conditions of our two countries.

The first is, how can we concentrate all our energies on our material tasks without becoming so obsessed with them that we neglect higher values — spiritual values?

The second is, how can we ensure the co-ordination of the whole national effort, which is necessary, if we are to make the best of our resources without creating rigid, over-centralized control which will destroy individual enterprise and initiative?

How to answer these two questions? First, and above all there is a need for a complete change of outlook especially for a new outlook on productive work. This must be seen not as a mere sordid money-making business. People must see in productive work, including manual work opportunities for personal achievement and public service, just as honourable as can be found in any other activity. Our countries need the best qualities of intelligence, education and character to go into this work. And they need it for a double purpose — first, for the sake of the efficiency of the work, and secondly — and this in a way even more important — so as to ensure that the work is handled in a way which affords the basis for a worthy human life.

### PROFIT v. PURCHASING POWER

(By M. P. T. Acharya)

If it is true, as pointed out by me (see 'Abolition of Profit Economy', p. 434, *Harijan*, 21-2-53) that even with the abolition of profit, (with interest, rent, profit and taxes maintained it will be more impossible) production and consumption cannot be adjusted except without money or exchange i.e. without wages and prices, then all the schemes that are made or tried by all on these old bases are useless even to discuss or countenance, *to talk of them is to neglect vital issues and to experiment with them is only to make matters worse, to practise vivisection upon the people.* They are all the same foredoomed to failure.

Every investment is "transferring resources of consumption to manufacture" which again must earn i.e. take away from consumption. Whether it is done by private people, or Government, the result is reduced consumption even if done in the name of employment and raising the standard of living of the people. There can be

no improvement that way but only impoverishment. What is the use of manufacture if purchasing power is taken away? *The manufactures cannot be sold to an impoverished people.* Hence they must look out for foreign markets, although ostensibly made for the good of people at home. If it is not humbug, it is want of thinking. One cannot enrich people by reducing the purchasing power of the people by grandiose plans but can only and will only make matters worse.

Let us know where we are going.  
Bombay, 26-2-53

## HARIJAN

March 28

1953

### REGENERATION OF COTTAGE INDUSTRIES

(By Maganbhai P. Desai)

Shri J. D. Khandhadia, Bombay, sends me a long communication on the subject of 'Regeneration of Cottage Industry (handloom cloth) in India.' It is dated 2nd March, 1953. I reproduce it below:

"I have read your editorial and various other articles in the last issue, all anxiously touching and discussing the above subject in its various aspects.

I have also been keenly following the development of the suggestion of Shri C. Rajagopalachari, Chief Minister of Madras, (for stopping mill production of *dhotis* and *saris* with a view to rehabilitate the cottage products) followed by the announcement of the Union Minister the Hon. Shri Krishnamachari, of curtailing 40 per cent of mill products culminating in a spurt in mill-made products' prices by about 25 per cent to 40 per cent. Apparently, these higher prices will go to the pockets of stockists and mills as extra profits without rendering any appreciable or visible service to the cottage industry for reasons described by me hereunder.

In my humble opinion, masses in India are governed more by price factor because of their low purchasing power rather than by any sentiment, whereas classes are governed by firstly taste, choice and lastly sentiment. If this economic reason is conceded as the fundamental basis of the whole problem, the same can only be solved by some 'economic-cum-legal' jugglery or manipulation which our past British Masters perpetrated with success in killing 'Indian Cottage Industry' and in replacing the same with Lancashire Mill Cloth, without announcing "40 per cent or 100 per cent cut in handloom product"! With a similar policy adopted by Government of India since about 1937, by protective duties on foreign sugar, they succeeded in consolidating Indian Sugar Industry and making foreign sugar extinct from India, without banning its imports. This shows that there is a precedent for my plan suggested hereunder, based on that 'jugglery or manipulation' but without doing any harm to the mills except subtle and slow.

If the people's Governments of ours at the Centre and States and the Congress including the Wardha Group, really mean and are sincere to regenerate and revitalize the Handloom Cloth Cottage Industry in India in a way to restore its pre-British self-sufficiency for the happiness of the mute millions of India represented by Mahatma Gandhi, the only way to bring it about is to reverse the British process of ousting the handloom cloth systematically as evident from historical

records, by adopting similar "jugglery" (but in the reverse gear), as under:

1. The present position is that mill products prices are about 25 per cent to 40 per cent lower than handloom products, (though the latest spurt in prices might have placed both the products on par, but even at par values, human tendency is to prefer mill-cloth for its fineness in finish, packing, easy availability and wide choice, etc.).

2. The said price-position shall have to be reversed by "economic-cum-legal" actions, and not merely by propaganda, appealing to sentiment, or half-hearted Government measures of "bans by percentages on productions" etc.

3. For that matter I suggest:

A. Excise duties to be levied on mill-made *dhotis* and *saris*, of course medium variety useful to rural areas, and the collection of these duties to be given back as "subsidy" to the handloom-made *dhotis* and *saris*, in such a way that automatically the costs of production to the mills and the handlooms for identical varieties would be brought about at 2 to 1 respectively. This means that selling prices for handloom *dhotis* and *saris* will, out of sheer force of economic necessity, be about 50 per cent lower than those of the mill products, which will be a great attraction to masses generally looking to cheap goods.

B. The duty will be treated as an "Unemployment Tax" on people with higher purchasing power and governed by personal taste and choice rather than by sentiments for national good. Or in Government language, it may be treated as a "protective duty" to give protection to cottage industry.

C. The mill production of these varieties might be gradually adversely affected because there is no room for price adjustment in competition, but then nobody will mind a slow downward process spread over 50 years. Alternatively, the mills may switch over to production of finer varieties on which too proportionate excise duty should be levied to maintain a wide margin of prices from handloom goods.

D. There will also be some profiteering by the stockists and handloom weavers because of wide margin in the prices, but then one should not mind little more profits and prosperity of the dealers in rural areas and the handloom weavers at the cost of classes with higher purchasing power and preferring mill cloth.

I hope and trust, my aforesaid plan will have due consideration at all the relative quarters."

Surely, the suggestion of Shri Khandhadia deserves all consideration at the hands of those who care for peace and happiness, plenty and prosperity in our country. In my article "Price and Sentiment" that appeared in the previous issue, I have touched this aspect of the question raised by the correspondent. I quite agree with him where he says that Government in our country has 'to reverse the British process' of establishing their industries which they adopted in the last century, but in the reverse gear. It is for our big industrialists and economists to find out how to graduate this process in the interest of all including themselves. For it must be remembered that the State policy is to see that both large-scale as well as small-scale industries are dovetailed into one pattern of a happy all-India economy. I invite students of industry and economics to study the suggestion reproduced above for whatever worth it may have for us.

12-3-53

## THE TWO VOICES

(By Maganbhai P. Desai)

The meeting of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry that met at New Delhi is over. From the report of its proceedings we learn that :

"As regards rehabilitation of industries, Mr Kasturbhai urged that the Government should at least provide a guarantee to industrialists to enable them to go ahead with renovation and modernization of industrial undertakings." (*The Times of India*, 9-3-53).

It is not clear what guarantee is being sought from Government. But one thing is clear therefrom that even mechanized industries also are not self-reliant and have to depend upon Government assurances, help, protection etc. for their existence. So it would not be true to say that small-scale industries cannot stand on their own legs. Rather, they have been all along struggling to stand on their own legs and it is the large-scale industries that have all along depended upon, and have amply got help and protection from, Government. It is now high time that the same kind of treatment is at least meted out to small-scale industries as well by Government.

Shri V. T. Krishnamachari, Vice-President, Planning Commission, in the course of his address to the Federation, "emphasized that all sectors of industry should work in a co-ordinated manner and asked for suggestions from the Federation regarding the development of cottage industries to relieve unemployment." (*The Times of India*, 9-3-53).

This was a very happy thing pronounced at the Federation. We do not learn what the Federation replied to this by way of suggestions for the development of cottage industries. However it is a matter of common knowledge that our small-scale industries have to compete with large-scale mechanized industries in mills and factories. The small-scale industries generally produce things of common household use like cloth, oil, food etc. It is here that the question of competition arises and nation-wide problem of unemployment is born. If a co-ordinated manner of work for all sectors of our industry in homes and factories is to be found out, we must realize sooner than later that ultimately cloth, food, shelter etc. should be left to be organized on small-scale decentralized manner through our village industries and accordingly a plan of reorganizing all sectors of industry in such a co-ordinated manner must be thought out to be completed during the course of a reasonable number of years. It is upto the Federation to reorganize and plan their private sector in terms of such a general requirement of our people. And it is upto the Planning Commission also to see that a clear picture of such a line of reorganization emerges as we proceed further in implementing the First Five Year Plan, so that the second one that is expected to follow might proceed on this clear way of our economic regeneration.

17-3-53

## THE WAY OF KARMAYOGA IN EDUCATION

[The following is taken from the Publishers' Note to a new book, *The Educational Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi* by Dr. M. S. Patel, published by the Navajivan Karyalaya, Ahmedabad, Price Rs 5-8-0, pp. XV + 288.]

Though not a teacher by profession Gandhiji all his life had been a teacher of man, irrespective of class or creed, caste or colour, sex or race. It was from that larger aspect of his personality that he was required to touch all sides of man's life on earth, — its progress and development. Therefore he dealt with the problem of education and developed it not merely for the mural limits of a school but also for other and wider fields of various human activities. His view of education, therefore, was to evolve the whole man in us, whom God has created in His own image. Hence education, according to him, encompassed the entire vista of man's life on earth, from conception to cremation if not before or beyond it. Such a view of education was born of a philosophy that holds that education is indivisible; therefore it does not agree to compartmentalize man's life and its problems as individual apart from social, biological apart from ethical, physiological apart from metaphysical or spiritual. All these contradictory-looking aspects of our being dovetailed themselves in his view as one whole which man surely is and should undoubtedly be so considered; and his peculiar genius as the great teacher of men gave us also a similarly whole technique for the realization of such an entity.

Very often Gandhiji described himself as one who had not really discovered any new thing but had only translated or re-defined the hoary truths for the modern age and has chiefly tried to apply them to the group-life of man in society. These truths were well known as guiding our individual life, but more often than not they were ignored or, if at all, observed only in their breach when it came to the questions of collective or group-life of the individual. So was it in the case of Satyagraha, his greatest discovery as the moral equivalent of war. A technique was devised by him whereby Truth and Non-violence were to be operative in group-life as well.

This peculiarity of Gandhiji's genius is apparent in his educational discovery of Basic Education as well. To put it in the terminology of the Gita, he only showed us the way of Karmayoga in education. The principle of life and creation, according to the Gita, is tersely laid down in its following two verses :

"From food springs all life, from rain is born food : from ५१ — sacrifice comes rain, and sacrifice is the result of Karma — action."

"Know that action springs from Brahma and Brahma from the Imperishable; hence the all-pervading Brahma is ever firm-founded on sacrifice." (Chap. 3 — 14, 15).

From this principle the Gita derives the eternal law of life which is *yajna* and enjoins

the following law of man's education and advancement :

"Together with दान — sacrifice did the Lord of beings create, of old, mankind, declaring, by this shall ye increase (evolve and progress) ; may this be to you the giver of all your desires."

"With this may you cherish the gods and may the gods cherish you ; thus cherishing one another may you attain the highest good." (Chap. 3—10, 11).

Man achieves all his good by action. It should therefore be productive of the goods that sustain life. It has therefore to be a co-operative effort of mutual aid and respect for others. And it is through such action, which is sacrifice, that man educates and frees himself of bondage. This is the law of man's education through life. It is his real education for freedom. Applied to a child's education, it says that the child also learns through doing and associating himself with action which is integrally related to the life of the society. Such action, if divorced of life-needs, will render its doer either a parasite or a pest to human society ; it will jeopardize the health of the community. As the Gita says (Chap. 3-12), it will land us in sin and bondage. It will thus mean mal-education for a child. Thus only can education be for life or for a democratic society or for real freedom of all. That is the type of education for Sarvodaya. Gandhiji's view of education was thus a derivative from his general philosophy of life which was Karma Yoga. The craft that is to be the medium of education was to be done intelligently and with the full understanding of its know-how. Then only can it be Karma Yoga, i.e. synthesis of action and knowledge. It is such a synthetic method of teaching which, Gandhiji said, was the true and natural way of a child's education. It is therefore bound to be the best way also. Shri Patel, in his book, has tried to describe this in terms of modern pedagogy and philosophy.

### MACHINE AND DEHUMANIZATION

[This is a further instalment of Rene Fullop-Miller's speech, the previous instalments of which appeared in the issues of 14-3-53 and 21-3-53. —Ed.]

Aside from the various scientific and philosophical factors which contributed to the trend of dehumanization, there is of course the development of real machines which played a decisive role. Dehumanization would have never attained its present heights had it not been for a thorough industrialization of life.

Originally the machine was invented to ease man's burden, to increase man's goods, to give him more leisure to develop his higher faculties and to enrich his life. But the undeniable blessings of the machine are balanced by equally undeniable curses. The very nature of the machine demanded and achieved a change in the concept of man. The machine induced an ever-increasing skill of specialization, and of necessity labour became more mechanized and impersonal. Mechanized production mutilated the working man,

cancelled out his body, and conscripted only his hand. Thus the harmonious interplay of forces in the whole man was reduced to a fragment of man's body.

In this way the machine, which was conceived as a willing slave of man, became a demanding master. It is like an irony of fate that the machine, which was to serve man, also made man its servant. Man's unique personality lost all significance ; what counted was his use-value in industry.

This depersonalization was of course not only confined to the factory worker who produced the goods, but also to the portion of the population that consumed the goods. Just as the worker, so did the consumer become an impersonal factor in calculation. Consumers took on more and more the aspect of a mass, abstractly considered, divorced from individual taste and life. Production was geared to typical averages which were established statistically, that is, by reducing men to numbers.

The same applies to other activities which are tailored to fit the depersonalized fiction called average man, whose specific human features are conscientiously blotted out and whose standards are lowered to sub-sea level. This fiction of the average man is the target of political campaigns, advertising campaigns, charity drives, TV and radio programmes, magazine serials, and movie productions.

And in all aspects of production, exchange and consumption, there is obvious the dominion of capital, which consists entirely of abstractions, balances, shares, bonds and obligations ; of capital which has no natural ties with the individual but is guided by rising and falling figures upon the stock exchange.

Another trend that leads to dehumanization is the attempt to organize all facets of public life. Instead of shaping institutions according to man's needs, man has to adjust his needs to the requirements of existing institutions. This accounts for the appalling lack of humaneness in many of our charity organizations.

At the opening of our century the founder of Taylorism, F. W. Taylor, declared : "Formerly personality came first ; but in the future, organization and system will come first." His prediction came true. People have come to be so dependent on organizations that they have lost the capacity to organize their own thoughts and lives.

The dehumanizing effect of mechanization is also reflected in our psychological response to the machine. Overwhelmed by the amazing productivity of the machine, man has come to regard it no longer as a tool but as sort of a higher being, a modern idol to be worshipped.

Henry Adams realized clearly how entirely the machine had changed man's place in the

universe. In his book *The Education of Henry Adams*, we read: "To Adams the dynamo became a symbol of infinity. As he grew accustomed to the great gallery of machines, he began to feel the forty-foot dynamos as a moral force, much as the early Christians felt the cross. Before the end one began to pray to it."

And Gustava Courbet, the great French painter, reflected the same trend of thought when he said in one of his catalogues that machine shops, railway stations, mines and factories are really the saints and miracles of the nineteenth century.

In view of this deification of the machine, man no longer tried to be the image of God but rather to make himself into an image of the new machine idol. He thus began to apply mechanical laws to all his human activities.

The attempt to interpret human feelings and actions through mechanized metaphors started in previous centuries, but it attained dazzling heights during the highly mechanized machine age.

Every new technical discovery was applied to man. For instance, when the steam-engine was invented, man was immediately compared with a steam-engine which produces energy. At the time of the first electro-magnetic telegraphs, it was evident that man's nerves and brain worked exactly like a telegraph. The invention of the telephone caused Professor Ludwig Schleicht to prove scientifically that the brain is rather a telephone-switchboard, although, unfortunately, without a pleasant-voiced operator. The installation of electric alarm system in Parisian banks moved the great French neurologist Charcot to describe the human mind as sort of an alarm system. With the advent of the air-conditioning system it became clear that from a scientific point of view, you and I work somewhat along similar lines as an air-conditioning installation.

When we analyse all the various forms of dehumanization, we realize that all grow from the common roots of abstractions. Whether we deal with dehumanization in science, philosophy, sociology, economics, politics or what have you, everywhere the mania to see everything in abstractions or generalities has made us lose sight of the unique individual.

Kierkegaard realized the danger of abstractions when he wrote: "Abstract thinkers left man in the lurch, sacrificing him to abstract ideas. Abstract thinking abstracts from the concrete, and if this is the highest kind of thinking it follows that thinkers will walk proudly out of existence, leaving us with the worst burdens."

Unfortunately we happen to live in a time when abstractions have left the desks, studies and laboratories where they are hatched. They have made their way into life, politics, and history. The abstract word has become flesh, and the in-

dividual human being has suddenly become part of abstract principles. Man is not judged on his face value, but by the abstract category which he represents.

In our lifetime parts of the world were reconstructed in accordance with abstractions. Everything that did not fit into the abstract scheme had to be eradicated. The conceptual guillotine of living man by abstraction necessarily led in the end to the actual slaughter of millions of precious lives in the name of some principle that demanded human sacrifice upon the altar of abstraction.

I want to mention only a few examples of the devastating consequences of ideological abstractions. Some of you have suffered the consequences personally, and all of us have witnessed or read about them with horror. The abstract idea of the biological superiority of the Aryan race led to the brutal liquidation of millions of non-Aryans in Nazi Germany. Sir Francis Galton's eugenetic abstraction which postulated a normal average man was seized and distorted by Nazi biologists, who in the name of "biological utilitarianism" did away with hundreds of thousands of allegedly subnormal or abnormal victims.

Hegel's abstract ideas of the State led on the one hand to the deification of the State in Fascism and Nazism, and on the other hand to the omnipotence of the State in Soviet Russia. Marx's, Pareto's and Sorel's abstract fiction of "creative violence" again resulted in the establishment to totalitarian rule which brought suffering and death to millions.

## SCIENTIFIC ATTITUDE IN MEDICINE

To

The Editor of *Harijan*,

Sir,

What is the correct attitude which registered doctors taught at the Universities the European system of medicine should, for the public good, adopt towards medical practitioners of other systems of medicine, such as Nature Cure, Homoeopathy, Herbalism, Ayurveda, Unani etc? To this question an admirable and a true reply is given by Dr. Josiah Oldfield, Mahatma Gandhi's friend who recently died in London at the ripe old age of 89 years. Dr. Oldfield says:

"I have lately come in contact with a very interesting life of a physician who lived in the time of the early Georges. Dr. David Hartley was a Yorkshire man and an original thinker. In 1730 he was greatly interested in a popular stir which was raised at that time by the claims of Mrs Joannie Stephens. Stone was prevalent all through the time of Stuarts upto the time of Queen Victoria. Mrs Stephens said she could cure stone. Now, Dr. Hartley, instead of simply condemning her as a quack, said to himself, 'If this woman has any valuable knowledge, whether discovered by accident or how it matters not, my duty as a doctor is to heal my patients and if Mrs Stephens can help me, gladly I will learn from her.'

"This is the spirit which should imbue every physician always." (says Dr. Oldfield).

Such in truth should be the attitude of the orthodox medical profession to any one who claims to have made a discovery of the cure of a disease.

54, Wodehouse Road, SORABJI R. MISTRI  
Colaba, Bombay-5

### NOTES

#### Realizing God by Love

God is not a Power residing in the clouds. God is an unseen Power residing within us and nearer to us than finger-nails to the flesh. There are many powers lying hidden within us and we discover them by constant struggle. Even so may we find this Supreme Power if we make diligent search with the fixed determination to find Him. One such way is the way of Ahimsa. It is so very necessary because God is in every one of us and, therefore, we have to identify ourselves with every human being without exception. This is called cohesion or attraction in scientific language. In the popular language it is called love. It binds us to one another and to God. Ahimsa and love are one and the same thing.

(From a private letter dated 1-6-42)

M. K. G.

#### Ibn Saud's Revival of Prohibition

This interesting item is taken from *Time of* December 22, 1952:

"Two of nature's most potent liquids, oil and alcohol, came hand in hand to the desert kingdom of Abdul Aziz Ibn Saud. In the early days of his reign, his subjects were as dry as the sands they lived on, for such is the law of the Koran. Then the infidels came to tap the oil and brought with them the other liquid. Soon the clink of glass against bottlenecks began to be heard in the new man-made oases of the Arabian desert.

"The oil brought Ibn Saud riches, but dearer to a Muslim heart than even riches are sons of whom the king has at least 35. In the homes and clubs of Westerners where women smiled unveiled amid the heady mixture of gin and vermouth, the young princes were always welcome guests. For the king's younger son it was easy to forget the Koran's teachings in the face of such delights. Several untoward incidents occurred. In one the British Vice-Consul was shot dead by a prince.

"Proud old King Ibn Saud was outraged. He ordered the arrest of his son and offered the widow the privilege of prescribing his death in any way she saw fit. She declined the offer and accepted \$70,000 in damages. Then the king cut his son's sentence to a jail term. The fault had not been so much the prince's as that of the foreigners who had taught him to drink. Later on the King issued a totalitarian edict, forbidding the importation of all intoxicating liquors into Saudi Arabia.....

"'Hang it all' said a worried official of Arabian-American Oil Company. 'A tough Oklahoma oil driller just is not going to be satisfied to work here for 6 days a week and have a bottle of Coco-Cola.' But neither was a tough son of the desert, as rich as Croesus, apt to be worried by such a situation when the welfare of his sons was at stake."

In India the welfare of 360 million children of the Father of the Nation is at stake. When is

the Congress Government in Delhi going to repay our debt to him by following in the footsteps of 'proud, old' Ibn Saud?

V. G. D.

### PROHIBITION — A WORLD MOVEMENT

Bombay, March 10.

Prof. W. A. Scharffenberg, Executive Secretary of the American Temperance Society, told Pressmen this afternoon that "thinking men and women everywhere have appreciated the noble efforts of your Government in not only taking the offensive in the launching of a new movement for world peace, but also in enunciating clear-cut policies on prohibition of liquor."

Addressing a Press Conference, Prof. Scharffenberg said: "India, with her deep religious convictions, rich, cultural and philosophical background, idealistic yet realistic outlook, and a generally accepted position regarding the manufacture, distribution, importation, sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages, is in a strategic position to set an example of total abstinence and national prohibition for the entire world to follow. The example of India may well set the pace for the entire world; for, such a move on the part of India will not only meet with the approval of all orthodox Hindus, but will also receive the support of the Muslim world, as well as the endorsement and moral support of those Christians who believe in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity."

Referring to the criticism that the enforcement of prohibition had affected to a great extent the income of the Government, Prof. Scharffenberg said: "The liquor interests would have us believe that the Government could not get along or exist without the revenue collected from the liquor traffic. Nothing is further from the truth. If the costs of arrests due to drunkenness, the costs of our courts, prisons, insane asylums, traffic accidents and crimes committed under the influence of liquor were computed, it would be found that the revenue collected from liquor would provide for only one-fourth of the actual cost." (*The Hindu*, Thursday, March 12, 1953).

[What a fine thing it would be if only our finance and excise ministers in the States and the Planning Commission realized the greatness and immensity of the noble task that the Constitution of India has entrusted to them by asking them to endeavour for Prohibition!]

17-3-53

— M. P. J

CONTENTS	PAGE
PROHIBITION PROGRAMME	25
OUR SOCIAL PURPOSE	25
WHAT IS A WELFARE STATE?	26
PROFIT v. PURCHASING POWER	27
REGENERATION OF COTTAGE INDUSTRIES	28
THE TWO VOICES	29
THE WAY OF KARMAYOGA IN EDUCATION	29
MACHINE AND DEHUMANIZATION	30
SCIENTIFIC ATTITUDE IN MEDICINE	31
PROHIBITION — A WORLD MOVEMENT	32
NOTES:	
REALIZING GOD BY LOVE	32
IBN SAUD'S REVIVAL OF PROHIBITION	32