

HARIJAN

(FOUNDED BY MAHATMA GANDHI)
Editor: MAGANBHAI P. DESAI

Vol. XVIII. No. 46

AHMEDABAD — SATURDAY, JANUARY 15, 1955

TWO ANNAS

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION WE NEED

(By Jawaharlal Nehru)

[Being from an address he gave to the Congress Parliamentary Party on December 22, 1954.]

"If we look at the world today with all these conflicts and danger of wars, you will see that this is perhaps an inevitable development of the growth of the Industrial Revolution which started 150 years ago. As it has grown it has produced problems. Those problems would have been produced much earlier but for the fact that the industrialized countries of the West had the whole of Asia and Africa to play about and to profit by it. So, they rose in prosperity without any internal conflicts. But gradually those conflicts came. They came to conflict with each other — which resulted in the German war, and the other wars. The internal conflicts of the Industrial Revolution, as it functions under the capitalist structure, come up more and more. The East and Africa get industrialized and it is difficult to see logically how this can go on as it is under the capitalist structure.

"There must, therefore, be some other structure. Apart from that, this tremendous process of industrialization has brought enormous changes in human beings. You see this most of all in America. You will probably see them as much in Russia. Quite apart from Capitalism, and Communism, both Russia and America are the two countries which worship the machine, although their policies may be different. America is the most highly industrialized country and therefore the most wealthy one. Russia also aims at that and is going pretty fast in that direction. Other countries of Europe, however, industrialized they might be, are behind them in a sense.

"But all this industrial civilization has created terrific problems in society and in the individual. Of course, the final picture of that problem is the Atom Bomb and the Hydrogen Bomb — the result of the Industrial Revolution. It is important that in any industrial policy that we may have we should keep in view, call it if you like the moral factor — I would prefer to call it the cultural aspect — which includes morality in a broad sense. A man must remain a man, not

become a machine even though he might have much money. He must have human qualities, human growth and all that which the machine is gradually putting an end to.

"I am all for the machine, but I am not afraid of the machine. I am pointing out that unless you balance this growth, the machine might as well kill the man through the Atom Bomb or something else. Now, do you realize what the present position is in regard to the Hydrogen Bomb? It is difficult to say, of course, but very eminent scientists, physicists and Nobel Prize winners, are of opinion that even the five or six Hydrogen Bomb experiments that have occurred have affected the atmosphere of the world for the worse; and if another five or six experiments are made, they may affect so badly as to gradually and slowly, kill life in the world. May be, it takes 5 or 10 years for a person to die off, but he will gradually wither away. This is merely if the experiments go on. But if a war occurs and 10 to 20 Hydrogen Bombs are dropped, it is a terrific prospect. All your other ideas — Socialism, Communism, Capitalism, Gandhism — become rather out of place. When this is the thing that faces one, one cannot do anything about it, not much any way. But the only thing one can do is to build up one's own country, build it up as strong as possible and build it up also on some strong basis of character and discipline."

(From *Hindu*, January 4, 1955)

By Mahatma Gandhi

TOWARDS NON-VIOLENT SOCIALISM

Pages xii+164 Price Rs. 2-0-0 Postage etc. As. 14

By Richard B. Gregg

WHICH WAY LIES HOPE?

Pages vi+82 Price Re 1-4 Postage etc. As. 5

By K. G. Mashruwala

GANDHI AND MARX

With an Introduction by Shri Vinoba

Pages viii+112 Price Re. 1-8-0 Postage etc. As. 5

NAVAJIVAN PUBLISHING HOUSE

P.O. NAVAJIVAN, AHMEDABAD - 14

VINOBA GETS HIS SHARE

(By Suresh Ramabhai)

In the second week of October last, Vinoba and his party were at a small village in the Kosi area. Of about 2,000 acres of land in that village, about three-fourth belonged to two families, the rest with others. Donations amounting to sixty acres were offered on behalf of the two rich houses.

In keeping with Vinoba's behest, the gift-deed was returned. In the evening after the prayer, four young men from these two families approached Vinoba. While one of them was a graduate, another was a vakil, the third was a leading Congress worker and the fourth had Praja-Socialist leanings. They gave a written memorandum (?) to Vinoba regretting the insult (?) shown to their village by returning their gifts. Some Bhoodan workers were also present.

Vinoba began, "At the outset I must tell you that my work is not to discredit anyone but to raise everybody's prestige. I do not want to run down anybody's honour or reputation. I am interested only in revoking love and cementing hearts."

"We too want the same," the vakil put in, "but I am constrained to add that our *danapatra* was refused. I know cases where offers short of one-sixth have been accepted."

"Vakil Sahab, it is no court of law where you must argue against the adversary. This is a company of the faithful who give vent to their true feelings, who are anxious to wash off all stains on their heart. I can quote numberless instances when people have offered far more than one-sixth as also of those who have forsaken their all. Why should you imitate only low-pulling cases?"

"My only submission is that our offer may please be accepted. More shall follow later."

"I would urge upon you to grasp my point. I want you to take me in your house as a member on behalf of the *Daridranarayan*. If you are five brothers I should be considered as the sixth and given the share, if three then the fourth, if seven then the eighth, and if you are alone then I must get the half. I do not count children, for they grace every house. Mine is a religious demand."

The vakil grew silent and seemed to be thinking something. But the graduate ejaculated, "Baba! We can't meet our own needs. Besides, there is the ever sharp sword of the Government hanging over-head."

Supporting him the vakil added, "They are going to fix ceilings. Who could then offer land in gift?"

"I know it very well," answered Vinoba, "and I also know that all your talents are employed in the task of sabotaging the proposed legislation. When I was in Telangana, the Government there was thinking of land enactments. It went on thinking. Meanwhile the landlords transferred their lands in the names of their

various relatives. At long last the Act has now come allowing some 100 or 125 acres. Now this is as good as not done. In your Bihar too, joint families are being disintegrated. Within 2 years, or by the time they pass any Act, all land would go to the family-members. And that Act would be rendered futile."

"Do you mean to say that this legislation is in vain?"

"You know it far more than myself," said Vinoba with a laugh. He continued, "I am afraid you did not appreciate the secret of my demand. I want to abolish the very ownership of land. To claim landownership is heresy. It is against the will of God. I go from village to village to spread this message. As air, water, sky and light cannot be owned by anybody, so also land. Land would go only to the tiller, even as a book goes only to the reader. True that some of you will not be able to work on the field yourself. But, I give you time. Not much, but four or five years. During this period, you must prepare your children so that they may labour in the company of the children of the landless. But would you please tell me the reason of keeping any land when you can support yourself by legal practice?"

The vakil tried to evade the issue, "People have not yet quite understood."

And the Congressman joined him, "Even if we agree to part with land, the elders of the house do not. They have earned it by the sweat of their brow. How can they give it up now?"

"I would not go into the question how land has been acquired by you people. I need not rake up the past. It would help neither you nor me. But I would like to know your duty as Congressman. Your State Congress passed a resolution for 32 lakhs of acres and also repeated it in a subsequent meeting. Do you feel that you must fulfil that resolution?"

"There are ever so many resolutions," interrupted the socialist young man.

"I see!" spoke Vinoba in astonishment. "But it were you of the Praja-Socialist Party who told me that I had taken up your work. Does it mean that you have abandoned it after my taking it up? You are a very strange lot. Your leader, Jayaprakash Narayan appealed for it. But you are such queer followers as have forsaken their own leader after giving him a push!" The whole assembly convulsed with laughter.

"Baba, this is not surprising at all," confessed the graduate, the youngest, "for your demand strikes first at one's own self."

"You are right," exclaimed Vinoba. "Had it not been required to offer one's own share, both the Congressmen and the Praja-Socialists would have accepted the resolutions of their parties. This is the difference between my work and that of others."

The vakil seemed to be in a hurry to wind up the case, "All right! You agree to our present offer. We shall complete one-sixth quota shortly."

"When you are willing to offer one-sixth, the earlier the better. Who knows when I would be able to come to your village again or see you?"

"For that matter, there is so much land lying idle. And we do not even know how much it is."

"Why don't you give me all that? It is waste for you, but I can make use of it. My demand is: Give me all the uncultivable land with you and out of the cultivable land I want my rightful share as a brother."

"Baba, what can you do with that uncultivable land?" asked the Congressman. "It is of no use — it is either river or sand or barren."

"Please give me first. All is grist that comes to my mill. I will show you what I can do with it."

"We won't be able to keep it with us under the proposed enactment."

"And yet you do not part with it!"

In a slow voice, the vakil murmured, "Its compensation....."

Vinoba heard it and uttered loudly, "Here you are! It is now that you have opened your heart. Your eye is on the compensation money. This is what makes you stick on to that. I would rather ask you to donate me all compensation that you may get. Many have done like that."

"They must have been rich men," put in the Congressman. "We are not so well off. Nor the elders will permit us."

"Well, I won't say that. But I am sure that offering your uncultivable land you lose little."

Silence followed. The four talked for a while in whispers. Then one of them in a feeble voice said, "Baba, we four are willing to offer the one-sixth of our share."

Vinoba laughed and inquired, "What is your *ganit* or measure? Is it that of the Patna University or that of Bihar?" This amazed everybody: What does it mean? One of them said, "May we know the two measures?"

"Some time ago I met a pleader with a diploma of the Patna University," said Vinoba. "He offered me one acre of land with the remark: 'It is more than one-sixth.' I asked him to clarify. He explained, 'We have one hundred acres in our family. We are four brothers and our father is alive. So I get twenty acres out of this 100. Now I have three sons. They three and myself make four. Consequently my own share is divided into four. And only five acres fall to my lot. Obviously, one acre is more than one-sixth of the same!' This is the Patna *ganit*."

All burst into peals of laughter. Vinoba continued, "So one-sixth of 100 acres is one acre. So kindly let me know which *ganit* you follow."

The young graduate was very inquisitive, "Baba, tell us also the *ganit* of the Bihar University."

The Congressman silenced him. "What more do you want to hear from Baba? Give him what you want to give."

"We four offer," said the vakil, "one-sixth of the land due to us and our children. All of us will donate separately."

Humorously, Vinoba stated, "I wanted at least one-sixth of the whole family. But you have followed the Bihar University *ganit*. Now, what about my share of the land with other members of the two families?"

"For that our fathers and uncles would meet," replied the Congressman. "All members of the families would sit and then decide what to do. Presently we have dispensed with one-sixth of our individual shares."

"As you please," remarked Vinoba. "I hope that you will prevail upon your elders and successfully persuade them to part with at least one-sixth of the family holdings. But what you give me now is, I am sure, all cultivable land."

This stirred the Socialist: "Now that we have accepted you as a brother, we give you as your right. And when one gets a right, he must share both good and bad stuff."

Vinoba nodded in assent and said, "So I become your family member now. But I plead for justice. Won't you like your brother to stand on his feet like you? Naturally he must be made to share, besides land, all other things too. I am your weakest and youngest brother. Whence I have an extraordinary claim."

They all blushed at these words. The Congressman seemed to be struck aghast. He grinned: "Baba, you are continuously attaching more and more."

"Is there anything unfair in what I ask? Would you dare make merry, while your own brother be in a wretched condition? At any rate, I would expect you to get broken all fallen land you give me."

All the four conceded this demand.

More than an hour passed. It was past eight. Vinoba turned to the workers who wanted to consult him on some points. And the four brothers took his leave.

Correction

In *Harijan* of December 11, 1954 (XVIII, 41), on page 332, column 2, line 15 for *few* please read *open*.

By Vinoba Bhave

BHOODAN YAJNA

[Land-Gifts Mission]

Pages viii + 134 Price Re. 1-8-0 Postage etc. As.3

By K. G. Mashruwala

A VISION OF FUTURE INDIA

Pages v + 69 Price Re. 1-0-0 Postage etc. As. 4

NAVAJIVAN PUBLISHING HOUSE

P. O. NAVAJIVAN, AHMEDABAD-14

HARIJAN

Jan. 15

1955

HISTORICAL ROLE OF THE CONGRESS

(By Maganbhai P. Desai)

We learn from the Press that there is a proposal before the Avadi Congress Session to change the aim and object of the Congress. It is reported that the move is to put in the term 'Socialist Society' in place of 'Co-operative Commonwealth'. Not having the text of the suggested amendment with me, I say this from its press reports available so far. They now say that the Steering Committee has rejected the move on the obvious plea that what obtains at present as the aim and object or the creed of the Congress includes the idea of Socialism; however, if at all anything needs be done in that behalf, it might better be covered by the forthcoming Congress resolution on the new economic policy.

The Steering Committee deserves to be congratulated for this wise decision; because, if the suggestion is accepted, it would be a grave mistake on the part of the Congress. The change would mean delimiting the wider and more comprehensive ideal of world peace and Co-operative Commonwealth and resorting to a narrow and ambiguous creed. This might also lead to an undesirable situation of some important groups like the constructive workers getting out of the great organization to which they still look up for their political leadership. Or, it would land us into a fruitless attempt of interpreting the new term Socialism as equal to and meaning Sarvodaya, as can be seen from a recent article of Shri S. N. Agarwal (*vide*, "Socialism and Sarvodaya" reproduced in this issue elsewhere). All admit that we in India have and desire to go differently from West. We should better therefore have our own unambiguous term for it, and that from our own language. The word 'Sarvodaya' is the fittest here. The Congress may well have it, if it desires to change the creed at all.

India expects to have a social order which assures world peace and is classless, casteless, and for the good of all 'unto this last'. Such an order cannot but afford to see that its economy is for world peace. One of the main objections against Socialism as it goes today is that, howsoever it wishes it, it does not tend to peaceful international relations. The Socialist idea had its birth from 19th century European Capitalism; its aim has been to remove its defects. But it accepts the main fundamentals of Capitalism, which are born of the economic and political history of Europe during the last one century and a half or two. Socialism does not radically improve upon them.

It accepts centralist and urbanizing technology and science, as a result of which we have had Imperialism of the last century and modern world trade exploiting the weaker or backward races and nations. The main difference between the two is that while Capitalism allows private profit and property, Socialism aims to nationalize it. It is therefore that the latter is sometimes called by some as State Capitalism.

Capitalism has brought in its wake a type of civilization which is also acceptable to Socialism. It only adds that the benefit of that must be secured to all, to which end it posits the idea of a 'Welfare State' and attempts to have enough money for it from the people and from other lands also through competitive trade and commerce etc.

To implement this aim, whether the dictatorial or one-party way of Russia is adopted or the so-called democratic way of majority rule and its planning (which means controls and regimenting regulations) is adopted, both result in a 'managerial' State or a rule of experts, say a highly powerful bureaucracy. This is detrimental to individual freedom and interferes with man's free and independent growth. Such a State can hardly eliminate war and exploitation from the world.

Free India is not for imitating such an order of the West. Learning from the history of the West, it wishes to forge a new way. Surely it will avail of the best in Western science and philosophy; but it will be its task to improve upon them and make them conducive to world peace and Sarvodaya i.e. the good of all peoples. The Congress stands for this ideal. To realize it in India is its historical role. Future knows how far it will fulfil it. It should at least not forget that it is greater than its parliamentary party. Through its work in India, the Congress should aim to establish world-peace and Sarvodaya.

10-1-'55

(From the original in Gujarati)

By Mahatma Gandhi

SARVODAYA

(The Welfare of All)

Pages xii+200 Price Rs. 2-8-0 Postage etc. As. 13

UNTO THIS LAST

A Paraphrase

Pages vi+64 Price As. 6 Postage etc. As. 2

By Gopinath Dhavan

THE POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY OF
MAHATMA GANDHI

Pages viii+407 Price Rs. 6-0-0 Postage etc. Re. 1-4

NAVAJIVAN PUBLISHING HOUSE
P.O. NAVAJIVAN, AHMEDABAD-14

SOCIALISM AND SARVODAYA

(By S. N. Agarwal)

It was, perhaps, for the first time that the economic policy of India was discussed at length in the Parliament. Shri C. D. Deshmukh, who initiated the debate, made it quite clear that "the central objective of our economic policy from now on must be to create full employment conditions, within a reasonable period, say, ten years from now." This is by no means an over-ambitious goal. "In achieving this," said the Finance Minister, "there is ample scope for expansion both in the public and private sector."

According to the calculation of Shri Deshmukh, some 24 million jobs would have to be created if our objective were full employment, and the total investment would have to be of the order of Rs 1,000 crores a year. Considering the numbers involved, while the development of major industries must continue in national interest, the Finance Minister thought that it was necessary "to foster the development of small-scale and village industries with greater opportunities for employment and more and more chances of improving the resources of the population."

Intervening in the debate, the Prime Minister reaffirmed his policy of bringing about a "casteless and classless society" through the "peaceful and co-operative method". It was also made clear that India's approach to Socialism was not a doctrinaire approach but a practical way of achieving the basic objectives of full employment, more production and economic justice.

In order to ensure full employment to the people of India, it is estimated that the rate of investment should be 10 per cent of the annual national income. It should be understood, however, that economic planning in under-developed countries cannot depend on monetary resources only. The main problem is to organize and utilize the idle man-power of the nation. It is from this point of view that increasing attention will have to be paid to the development of small-scale and village industries.

The Finance Minister was on uncertain ground when he stated in the Parliament that additional jobs for providing fuller employment "must obviously be created in the non-agricultural sector." If 12 million new jobs are to be found in the country by the end of the Second Five Year Plan, it would be impossible to do so in the urban areas alone. We have no doubt in our minds that additional employment on a large scale will have to be found in the direction of agro-industries like hand-pounding of rice, oil-pressing through village ghanis, hand-spinning and weaving of cotton, silk and wool, leather-making, animal husbandry, manufacture of gur, khandasari etc.

There is already enough congestion in our cities and the process of depopulation of our villages is almost continuous. If we attempt to pro-

vide work to idle people in the urban areas through small-scale industries, there is bound to be greater congestion in the cities and a number of additional problems social, economic and moral, will crop up. The best solution of the basic problem of fuller employment is, therefore, to provide work to the peasant or the artisan at his very door, in the form of village and cottage industries.

This plan could be achieved only if the State decides to avoid unhealthy competition between the large-scale and small-scale industries by reserving the fields of production for the small industries. For example, we see no reason why all edible oils should not be reserved for the village ghani. Hand-pounding of rice which has been providing gainful employment to several lakhs of our workers could be encouraged by banning the use of rice-hullers, more specially in the countryside. In regard to leather manufacture, factories should not be permitted to prepare certain varieties of *deshi* footwear like chappals and sandals. It is only through such reservation or demarcation of spheres that the State could hope to afford greater employment facilities to millions of our people who are either totally unemployed or are partially employed for only a few months in the year. There is no other way out.

In trying to establish a socialistic pattern of economy in India it would be futile to regard nationalization of industries as the panacea for all evils. It is, of course, essential that basic or mother industries like iron and steel, coal, power, and heavy machinery ought to be State-owned and State-managed. But no attempt need to be made to nationalize other existing industries which manufacture consumer goods like cloth, sugar, oil, etc. Instead, all these large-scale consumption goods industries should be progressively decentralized in the form of Co-operatives. In short, the kind of Socialism that we desire to establish in this country would be very different from the Socialism of those countries where population is sparse and capital is plenty. In a country like ours, where population is dense and capital is scarce, a socialist economy must be in the nature of a decentralized economy. In India, Socialism can only mean *Sarvodaya*.

There is one more point which Mahatma Gandhi used to emphasize repeatedly. *Sarvodaya* economy should not be based merely on the production and accumulation of more wealth and material articles. We must always bear in mind that man does not live by bread alone. Along with the fulfilment of our material needs, we must try to raise our cultural and moral standards as well. That is why Gandhiji laid stress on the concept of "standard of life" rather than on the "standard of living." "I wholeheartedly detest," said Gandhiji, "this mad desire to destroy distance and time, to increase animal appetites and go to the ends of the earth in search of their satisfaction." "By going on increasing

the volume or pitch of sound," wrote Gurudev Tagore, "we can get nothing but a shriek." Kautilya, the distinguished Indian economist and thinker of the fourth century B.C., observed in his *Arthashastra*: "Whoever is of reverse character, whoever has not his organs of sense under his control, will soon perish, though possessed of the whole earth bounded by the four quarters." That is why our Vice-President Dr. Radhakrishnan has described the Indian way of life as "Ethical Socialism".

Such a pure type of Socialism can be established in India only through the Gandhian technique of decentralized economy and "composite" democracy in the form of self-dependent and self-governing village communities or Panchayats. A bold decentralization of political and economic power would go long in enabling us to establish a kind of social and economic order which could serve as a model to other countries of the world. A highly centralized State with a centralized economic system tends to become authoritarian or totalitarian with all the resultant evils. India must avoid such a regimented and over-centralized type of economy. Moreover, true Socialism could be established only if there is a visible and real change in the attitude of the individuals who compose the society. "Socialism begins," said Gandhiji, "with the first convert." "If there is one such, you can add zeroes to the one and the first zero will account for ten and every addition will account for ten times the previous number." If, however, the beginner is a zero, multiplicity of zeroes will also produce zero value." When individuals change, the society also changes. In order to bring about a Sarvodaya Society, therefore, all of us must "turn the searchlight inwards" and begin by reforming ourselves. There can be no short-cuts to true Socialism. It is not merely an economic doctrine but also a way of life.

(Adapted from A.I.C.C. *Economic Review*, January 1, 1955)

THE THIRD CAMP

The Eighth Triennial Conference of the War Resisters' International (W.R.I.) met in the Salle des Sociétés Savantes, Paris, from July 29 to August 2, under the chairmanship of Harold Bing.

The greater part of the time at the disposal of the Conference was devoted to the consideration of the policy of the Third Camp. The subject was introduced by A. J. Muste, Secretary Emeritus of the American Fellowship of Reconciliation; he was followed by Fenner Brockway, M.P. (Britain), who dealt with the colonial and economic aspects of the conception.

Treating the subject under the heading "Asia and the Third Camp" Horace Alexander (Britain and India) dealt with the threefold character of Gandhi's teachings: (i) Indian freedom; (ii) non-violence as a means to the achievement of freedom; and (iii) the development of self-help and self-sufficiency as the

means to stabilizing freedom and creating the conditions of peace.

Horace Alexander's description of Gandhi's work and teaching was supplemented by an address by J. C. Kumarappa (India).

The development of the policy of the Third Camp is an attempt to propound what have always been the positive implications of the pacifist conception, at the crucial historical period when only a positive expression of pacifist philosophy can save humanity.

For many of the W. R. I. Sections the Third Camp policy is a new idea, and the Paris Conference will represent the beginning of discussions rather than their culmination. The concluding comments in A. J. Muste's address provide a pointer to the kind of task those who are advocating the Third Camp are setting out to perform:

"This all means some special creative integration of the spiritual and political, of a new psychological orientation, a new concept of values and a new and creative way of making them rule in the social and political life of nations. It means, it seems to me, that we of the pacifist, the anti-militarist, the war-resister, the non-violent movements in the world, must somehow corporately be what Gandhiji was. He was on the one hand a saint, one to whom non-violence was in so deep a sense a way of life that he could say, he would still believe in non-violence even if it meant that India did not become independent; but who—precisely because of that—generated the spiritual dynamism which led the masses of India to follow him and made non-violence in at least one great situation an instrument of effective and profound political change.

"If in any other realm of life such a demonstration of a new method had been given, the scientists, the political and spiritual leaders would all be saying, 'Well, we must see whether this method will work in other situations, too.' In this situation we have gone through the terrible experience of two world wars and are faced with annihilation in a third; yet there is virtually no government outside India itself, no government in the rest of the world, which spends so much as a dollar, on exploring the possibilities of non-violence in an experimental and creative way in this situation. This, I say, my friends, is utterly unscientific and it is madness."*

[Will it not be a better thing to use the expression "Peace Area" or "Area of Peace" to connote the idea which is going at present by the name Third Camp, Third Force or Neutralism? While the two camps or blocs go on increasing the area of their armed camps and garrisons, and thus, may be unwittingly, extend the area of war, the policy India holds is to try for positive peace wherever causes for war or friction arise and thus to extend the area of positive peace there and then.

6-10-54

M. P. J.

*From the News Release, No. 67, 16-9-54 of the W. R. I. England.

CAPITAL AND UNEMPLOYMENT

(By M. P. T. Acharya)

I

Some unemployment creates more unemployment. One link lost in a chain becomes danger to other links. Not only because the unemployed who cannot earn money fall out of the line of consumers, but also because the reduction of production dislocates other productive activities, which necessitates throwing others out of employment. It is not easy to revive lost links afterwards.

Every productive unit keeps other productive units busy. So that if one unit fails and falls off, the other units have to reduce production or completely shut down their business and throw out their employees. There will be no further orders from other firms, unless new firms start and speculate. All business is hence speculation, gambling; for none knows what each one will do or will be able to do. It is all a chance if firms keep afloat. Even the oldest firms cannot guarantee their future. In fact, most of the biggest firms are based upon largest orders and run greater danger of losing them. They generally reduce the staff in order to save themselves from sinking. But that is also reduction of consumption and therefore of the markets.

II

Since all business is based on the credit of labour to firms — if the firms have no use for the credit of labour, they automatically cut the ground from under themselves. After dismissing employees, they will have to dismiss themselves. But today is more important to them than tomorrow, because their economics are so narrow that they cannot do anything to keep the employees.

Firms think labour is enabled by capital to live. But in business both sink together; after labour sinks, the fate of labour is also the fate of the employers, although the latter may hold out for a time by "eating their own fat". Today, there is no more class-struggle and class-warfare, which is *capitalist concomitant*, possible or left.

Only when there are no more employees and no more employers possible that both can save themselves. Not before that.

III

All civilization is being run on the credit of labour given to capital. Even in Russia the labourer or employee is compelled to accept a certain fixed sum per week or per month and asked to deliver the goods to the employers. It is not that capital advances money to the labourers and employees, but it is labour which is given that is advanced to capital; for the labourer or employee is paid only at the end of the week or month. If the latter is advance of money by capital, it is because capital sells goods later and cannot sell earlier. But without labour capital cannot get any goods.

While the labourer's or employee's wages are fixed, the prices of goods delivered are not fixed.

Labour has no voice also in the fixation of prices. The employers can fix any price convenient to them. Naturally the difference between what is paid for labour and what is taken for the goods accumulated capital which is again used for further exploitation and profits. Whether that is done by private individuals or States makes no difference.

The State must necessarily be a non-producing organization. Its interests are necessarily with exploitation and profits. Even in Russia, it only *plans and enables* the organization of exploitation of State capital for profits, by hiring labour to produce goods and serve its own interests. As Gandhiji said, 'the State is a soulless machine.' Just as private capitalists cry about the horrors of communism, the Bolshevik partisans cry about the horrors of private capitalism. Both are right, but both conduct capitalism in the name of freedom or communism and democracy. The fact is that capitalism can only be abolished by the people taking over all things for their common benefit. If they do not want to take any responsibility for their own welfare, but want others to attend to them, others "who are experts" will only further enslave them. Too much dependence on experts will enslave all. We must simplify (decentralize) matters to make dependence on expert and managerialist unnecessary.

[This is an epitome of some thoughts that late Shri M. P. T. Acharya used to send to me as they came to him in his compulsory seclusion. This was lying with me since long. On reading it again, I feel that it can well bear publication even now.]

Along with it I had then added a note of my own as further idea in that connection. That is also given below:

Employment is not a mere function of funds and finance, i.e. capital, which is at best mere aid to labour. The right to work, as it is called, i.e., to be gainfully employed, is one of the fundamental rights of a citizen; it is his duty as well. The performance of this duty or the assertion of this right—whatever we may say, in a healthy and well-ordered economy, cannot wait on the pleasure of capital and be made dependent on it. Because that will mean dependence upon the capital-owner—only a small section of the people. This is humiliating and undemocratic.

And what is capital after all? It is rather the by-product of work and employment. It is surplus value monetized and appropriated by some as their own. Hence if capital is made the basis of employment, i.e. in a capitalist order, the labour-capital relationship is not composite, but becomes a duality, which becomes narrow and selfish and consequently of divided allegiance—not to the community, but each to itself and to the opponent's cost.

And this is not to be wondered at. Because the main object of capital is not securing full employment or production for use—not to establish a life-process of mutual aid in the social act of production for use—not a *yajna*, not an act of community service, to use the language of the Gita;—but rather it is a process on the lines of a competitive race of insatiable acquisitiveness and hoarding, the social and ethical meaning and significance of which is described by the Gita in the following terms:

इदमद्य स्या लब्धम् । इत्थं प्राप्ये मनोरथम् ॥

(This have I gained today; this aspiration shall I now attain.)

Again this is not a mere two-party duel; because in this unmatched combat there is the presiding duty over them, viz. the State which is not a disinterested party. The whole gamut of a capitalist order so created is all for profit, in which the presiding State also becomes interested, as it gets involved in that set-up for its own income and existence. The main object of production, viz., full employment of the whole people and just distribution of purchasing power among them so as to secure equitable distribution for the community, is thus rendered impossible of fulfilment. Therefore a just economy must be rather a social activity and should be labour-intensive than capital-controlled.

12-10-54

M. P. J

KNOWLEDGE, WISDOM AND MORALITY

(By Bertrand Russel)

Most people would agree that, although our age far surpasses all previous ages in knowledge, there has been no correlative increase in wisdom. But agreement ceases as soon as we attempt to define 'wisdom' and consider means of promoting it. I want to ask first what wisdom is, and then what can be done to teach it.

There are several factors that contribute to wisdom. Of these I should put first a sense of proportion: the capacity to take account of all the important factors in a problem and to attach to each its due weight. This has become more difficult than it used to be owing to the extent and complexity of the specialized knowledge required of various kinds of technicians. Suppose, for example, that you are engaged in research in scientific medicine. The work is difficult and is likely to absorb the whole of your intellectual energy. You have not time to consider the effect which your discoveries or inventions may have outside the field of medicine.

In such ways the pursuit of knowledge may become harmful, unless it is combined with wisdom; and wisdom in the sense of comprehensive vision is not necessarily present in specialists in the pursuit of knowledge.

Comprehensiveness alone, however, is not enough to constitute wisdom. There must be, also a certain awareness of the ends of human life. This may be illustrated by the study of history. Many eminent historians have done more harm than good because they viewed facts through the distorting medium of their own passions.

Perhaps one could stretch the comprehensiveness that constitutes wisdom to include not only intellect but also feeling. It is by no means uncommon to find men whose knowledge is wide but whose feelings are narrow. Such men lack what I am calling wisdom.

It is not only in public ways, but in private life equally, that wisdom is needed. It is needed in the choice of ends to be pursued and in emancipation from personal prejudice. Even an end which it would be noble to pursue if it were attainable may be pursued unwisely if it is inherently impossible of achievement. Many men in past ages devoted their lives to a search for the Philosopher's Stone and the Elixir of Life. No doubt if they could have found them, they would

have conferred great benefits upon mankind, but as it was their lives were wasted.

The essence of wisdom is emancipation, as far as possible, from the tyranny of the here and the now. We cannot help the egoism of our senses. Sight and sound and touch are bound up with our own bodies and cannot be made impersonal. Our emotions start similarly from ourselves. An infant feels hunger or discomfort, and is unaffected except by his own physical condition. Gradually, with the years, his horizon widens, and, in proportions as his thoughts and feelings become less personal and less concerned with his own physical states, he achieves growing wisdom. This is, of course, a matter of degree. No one can view the world with complete impartiality; and if anyone could, he would hardly be able to remain alive. But it is possible to make a continual approach towards impartiality: on the one hand, by knowing things somewhat remote in time or space; and on the other hand, by giving to such things their due weight in our feelings. It is this approach towards impartiality that constitutes growth in wisdom.

Can wisdom in this sense be taught? And, if it can, should the teaching of it be one of the aims of education? I should answer both these questions in the affirmative.

I have said that in some degree wisdom can be taught. I think that this teaching should have a larger intellectual element than has been customary in what has been thought of as moral instruction. The disastrous results of hatred and narrow-mindedness to those who feel them can be pointed out incidentally in the course of giving knowledge. I do not think that knowledge and morals ought to be too much separated. It is true that the kind of specialized knowledge which is required for various kinds of skill has little to do with wisdom. But it should be supplemented in education by wider surveys calculated to put it in its place in the total of human activities. Even the best technicians should also be good citizens; and when I say 'citizens', I mean citizens of the world and not of this or that sect or nation. With every increase of knowledge and skill, wisdom becomes more necessary, for every such increase augments our capacity for realizing our purposes, and therefore augments our capacity for evil, if our purposes are unwise. The world needs wisdom as it has never needed it before; and if knowledge continues to increase, the world will need wisdom in the future even more than it does now.

(Abridged from *The Listener*)

CONTENTS	PAGE
THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION	
WE NEED .. Jawaharlal Nehru	365
VINOBA GETS HIS SHARE .. Suresh Ramabhai	366
HISTORICAL ROLE OF THE CONGRESS .. Maganbhai P. Desai	368
SOCIALISM AND SARVODAYA .. S. N. Agarwal	369
THE THIRD CAMP ..	370
CAPITAL AND UNEMPLOYMENT .. M. P. T. Acharya	371
KNOWLEDGE, WISDOM AND MORALITY .. Bertrand Russel	372