India 1945-52

Licence No. 71 of 26th June 1926] [Reg. M. 6066. Reg. T. 50

"Though man a thinking being is defined,
Few use the great prerogative of mind:

"How few think justly of the thinking few!
How many never think who 'think' they do!

The Indian Thinker

A FORTNIGHTLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE
CAUSE OF UNIVERSAL WELFARE

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
N. SUBRAMBANYA AIYAR, M.A., M.B. & C.M.

TRIVANDRUM, S. INDIA.
15th APRIL 1945

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Surrender of Vital Safeguards	1
The Late President Roosevelt	2
This Nonsense Must Stop	3
The Colour War and The Way Out	5
The Anatomy of Industry	6
The Woman Problem	7
Anthropology (I)	9
Should not the Philosophy of Life be Represented at San Francisco?	11
Book-Reviews	12

THE

INDIAN THINKER

VOL. XIII } TRIVANDRUM, S. INDIA, 15TH APRIL 1945. { NO. 8

SURRENDER OF VITAL SAFEGUARDS

Is That the Function of a Righteous Government?

We are glad that the Central Assembly has passed without a division a resolution asking that early action be taken for the repeal of sections 111 to 121 of the Government of India Act of 1935. Under these sections it is not competent to any Indian Legislative Assembly to discriminate against Britishers or foreign nationals in the matter of commercial and business matters, the right of acquisition of property, the holding of public offices, occupation, trade, profession and so on. Mr. C. P. Lawson of the European group speaking on the resolution, said that although he was confident of the goodwill of the members of the House, the Britisher in the light of recent evidences of racial bias, has naturally felt that he needed protection. It is unfortunate that the European member did not recognise that the only moral right of the British Government to exist in India is to protect the interests of the *natives* of the country against all outsiders, British and non-British. The function of Government in every civilized society is to afford that protection. To say that the function of Government includes the protection of the interests of those who want to compete against the native people in their own homes is to repudiate governmental function. It is nothing less. We wish to know if Mr. Lawson's viewpoint is shared by the entire European community in India. If that is so and if that is accepted by the Government in power, Indians have no right to treat India as their country or to sacrifice their blood and treasures for her, just as any other people naturally do or are legitimately expected to do in defence of their own. On this point clarity and insistence are essential. Of

course, it is not meant that any discrimination would be or should be carried on from any motive of racial antipathy. But to plead that in an age of competition no power of protection should be reserved for the benefit of the natives of a country is to say what can on no account be justified.

In this connection, it has to be stated that but for the leader of the European group, who made an unhappy reference to the methods by which British Industries succeeded in establishing themselves in India, there would have been no opportunity for the Indian Members to expose these facts. Mr. Isaac Sait of the Moslem League criticized a previous speaker, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, for having referred to the promise of Dominion Status with so much eclat and said that neither the Congress nor the Moslem League were prepared to even consider it,—implying that nothing short of Complete Independence will satisfy them. Referring to Mr. Benthall's speech at the Round Table Conference where he had spoken of "rights which we (Britishers) have legitimately won by years of industry," Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari (Nationalist) said that Hitler also felt that Czechos*that* lovakia and Poland belonged to him by right. He also recalled the "disgraceful story of how Clive took half a million sterling by cheating a poor man, Uma Chand and that this was the kind of integrity upon which British Industry in this country had been built. It is not possible to refer even briefly to what the other speakers said in support of the resolution in question. But it must be stated that the entire proceedings have a momentous importance deserving of a copy being specially docketed and preserved, not only to the office of the Government of India, but in Whitehall and Downing Street as well.

THE LATE PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

A most important figure in the arena of world-politics has disappeared. Our sincerest condolences are now with Mrs. Roosevelt. That a person dies suddenly does not appeal to us as anything surprising. Numerous forces must have been acting on a person before the final crash. Only we do not appreciate them. But all the same, the unexpected demise of the great American figure has upset the World's international calculations. But the question is whether death has come to stay? Is there no way out? If so, all the ambitious programmes that man projects can only make the thinker laugh.

THIS NONSENSE MUST STOP

A Leader of the People must be different

Both the sheep and the shepherd must learn more sense. And we are not afraid of saying it even at the probable cost of much chagrin on the part of some of our readers. What is the meaning of Gandhiji making prayer to 'God' as part of a public, even political, programme? If he believes that the World *i.e.*, the Totality of all that exists, is inanimate, and owes all its animateness to a Being *outside* the world—which is itself a contradiction in terms—he is welcome to so believe as many have done before and still do. But to advertise his God-belief and to stage his God-prayers in season and out of season as part of his political saint-craft must cease.

While chiding a poor emotional crowd that rushed to the great Indian Leader the other day at Bombay, 'one whom many regard as even a superman, Gandhiji said: "I am a believer in God. Every Religion proclaims that man is not man if he praises not his Maker. It is a matter of shame that when we come here to offer prayers to God, there are shouts and disturbances. Had I known about it, I would not have come here for prayers. Some person told me that the people of Bombay will derive no benefit from the prayers. They will throw a few rupees at my face and go away".

All this is pathetic reading, but pointless at the same time. Does Gandhiji, as a thinking individual, mean to say that the world has an Almighty Maker and that He should be *praised* for what the world is experiencing today? If he wants people to believe in the benefit of his prayers, why not he be praying all the time and do nothing more? Why then Kasturba Memorial Fund? Why the Harijan Uplift Movement? Why issue statements, and appeals against the execution of Chimur and Ashti prisoners? Is it not an insult to his Maker to beg at a lesser's gate when the chief,—why the sole—source of power is ready to give all in response to prayer? In fact, why prayer at all? Is it not at best a superfluous reminder to Him who is supposed to know all and therefore to know also *when* to give, *what* to give and *whether* to give at all?

All this vapid twaddle must stop, especially on the part of a great leader of men, speaking and acting in this

Age of Reason, India lost her freedom, not through want of petition to God as a salvage agent, but through not recognizing with sufficient clarity that God is not an *Extra Cosmic Agent*, but the Cosmos itself in its perfect state, and should therefore be made the *goal* of all our actions and not an object for knee-crooking and word-lisping. And if God *is* the Cosmic Goal and if the essence of that Cosmos is Order through Responsible Mutual Functioning, that order must be established from the home and village upwards, till the whole world is embraced. When that is done, not only will India get Swaraj, but the entire human race will live in peace, which it will not do through any other devise, hold as many San Francisco Conferences or as many prayer meetings as you may.

We hope that India, hereafter at least, may through her great Leader, give a more manly lead to the world, and make Religion a respect-compelling power, and not a mere sentimental sobstuff.

To repeat, it is only when God is conceived of as the goal *condition* of the world—from which it fell and to which it must re-ascend—and not as a goal-conferring *agent*, and it is only when religion is presented as the rational code of belief and conduct needed for that re-ascent, that the more the education the more will be the believers in religion and in God. Else, it must be, ast he Canadian clergyman, the Rt. Rev. R. J. Denison, lamentingly wrote in the Toronto "*Globe*" under the title "The Empty Pews", the other day. He said; "We have seen people (Indian Aboriginees) kneeling in a groove of trees on a rainy evening with their faces covered with mosquitoes, listening patiently to the story of the Cross as against a modern up-to-date town which voted to postpone the evening service for one hour so that the congregation might not be denied the privilege of listening to Charlie Mc Carthy!

HOW RELIGIOUS!

Sailor Harris of Waco, Texas, U.S., has his entire back tattoed with Bible quotations.

COMMENSURATE!

Up to a Century ago in Europe, numerous peasants slept with their feet instead of their head on the pillow, in the belief that the feet did the harder work and, therefore, were more entitled to comfort.

THE COLOUR WAR AND THE WAY OUT

In the Cape Town Assembly, Dr. Malan, Leader of the opposition, said that at San Francisco, Field Marshal Smuts should press for an end of the policy of "open door" to Aslatic immigration. As a writer in "*The Social Welfare*" put it, "With victory over their European rival now assured—with the aid of blacks, brown and white alike—they (the Whites in South Africa) are trying hard to tackle, what is to them a greater menace, the menace of the Non-Whites—the Negroes, the Indians, the Coloureds".

This colour war is an old one. It is perhaps the expression of a natural feeling. But what is the way out? White men cannot make up their mind to live as parts of one nation with the non-whites, not even with such of them as have had their intellectual and general cultural status raised to their own It is equally certain that the Coloureds—who have lived so long in the country with the Whites wherever the latter are trespassers—will not take the situation lying down. The next war, if it be not the war between the Big Three, will be the war of the Coloured against the Colourless. The feeling of resentment is intense, and in spite of their present unorganised condition they are numerically larger than their pigmentless brethren. The present war has taught them that they can as well fight *against* them as with them. The path of wisdom for the Whites, who are all nominally at least Christians today, is therefore not to forget that beneath the epithelium all humanity is alike and that it will not be an offence in the eyes of God or man to recognise that fact. Mixing up of races through marriage is not what is recommended. But certainly it is not impossible to arrange for interdependent unity through a suitable distribution of social functioning—A certain amount of re-adjustments will be part of the plan. We hope that the need for the planning and its broad details will be discussed and agreed on at the forth-coming San Francisco Meeting. If this and other similar questions are not to be taken up, what *will* be taken up will evidently be how the bigger fish can easily swallow the smaller ones and yet be at peace with in themselves.

THE ANATOMY OF INDUSTRY

It is wonderful how statistics carefully collected and skilfully interpreted can tell the real condition of a people's economic freedom. If the labourer, working in his home or field, owning the means of production, whatever it might be, and exchanging his products with those of others similarly placed with the help of a social conscience, which alone is true civilization, represents the maximum economic freedom, a state of society where, according to the Census of British Production, there are 118 representative commodities—a sufficient number to reveal the wide-spread nature of monopolist production—each of which was in 1935, either wholly or in effect, the monopoly of one or two firms, must certainly be the reverse of it. Mr. Leak, the Chief Statistician of the Board of Trade, has in his report presented to the Royal Statistical Society revealed these facts. According to him, the following articles are under the monopoly of one or two firms. They are listed below as they will be of interest to our readers.

"Mustard and lump sugar; sewing cotton and sewing machines, vacuum flasks, gramophones, cash registers, hair clippers, and umbrella frames; optical spectacle, and plain sheet window glass; clocks and lighting and starting sets for motor cars; radio transmitters; cycle lamps, flash lamp, bulbs, time-switches, and carbon electrodes; type-setting and boot and shoe machinery; tinned sheets, stainless-steel ingots, tin foil, unwrought nickel, and tungsten; celluloid; cellulose acetate, borax, carbide, acetylene, caustic soda, methyl alcohol, nitric acid, and pensecetin."

Mr. Leak's report goes on to say that there are other commodities 70 per cent of which are in the hands of three large producing firms.

"They include crude zinc (100 per cent); gramophone records, photographic plates and films, screws for wood, safety matches, motor-vehicle ball bearings, rice starch, and manufactured fuel (95-99 per cent); laundry blue, cocoa and chocolate powders, and barbed wire (92-94 per cent); motor spirit, cigarettes, powder and dry soap, inlaid linoleum, electric vacuum cleaners, and radio valves (85-88 per cent); margarine automatic and semi-automatic lathes, welded tubes, and primary batteries (79-80 per cent); cement (76 per cent); and newsprint (70 per cent)."

How this massive centralization is going to change over, if at any future time, the philosophy of industrialism should take a different turn, one cannot speculate now. But the task will have to be undertaken, however Herculean, if decentralized industrialism gets accepted, as it one day must be, as alone conducive to economic freedom in unanxious associated life.

THE WOMAN PROBLEM

Assuming that man once lived isolated from other men and even women, except for chance matings, as in the case of animals, the first step in the progress towards associated life was taken when men and women were thrown together within a particular area and man joined woman consciously and purposely to form a family—man finding food for both and woman keeping house for both.

The next step evidently was when the families so constituted, instead of each supplying its own wants, however few, agreed to live under a division of labour, each family or group of families undertaking to work in one particular labour, and exchanging it with the labours of other families. When this labour division got fixed, the associated life became to that extent a stable life maintained from generation to generation. And as long as the mating of man with woman was only for leaving a progeny behind, and not for the mere satisfaction of lust, there was no question of over-population. With a boy and a girl for each family and with a supply of all their needs of life ensured through established division of labour and responsible exchange of the products of the various labours, marriage became an institution of automatic ease, in mutual benefit. There was no problem of career for man, or woman, and no possibility of mutual competition or conflict. They lived as inseparable complements—man doing his responsible function to society (or *Dharma*) direct, woman doing it *through* man.

It is when through the disruption of society marriage has ceased to be an institution of dignity and use for woman that she naturally considers it a penalty to have to depend on man for her physical wants and a privilege to fight for them herself and against man if need be. The abolition of this so-called penalty and the conferment of this so-called privilege now go to constitute the emancipation of woman!! although this so called economic independence of woman, which the animals enjoy, would place the human female unequipped with instinct at a lower level than they.

That all this is an abnormality will be clear when we have traced the ascent of man from his isolated or savage state to the ideal responsibly interdependent life which alone is real progress and real freedom—in fact, all that makes for the exhibition of the higher qualities for which humanity claims credit as against the rest of the animal kingdom.

In this connection, the following interesting lines from Arabella

Kenealy's book "*Feminism and Sex Extinction*" written immediately after the last war will be found useful—especially when another war is nearing its end, threatening to present to the world greater problems than before.

"Feminism, the extremist—and of late years the predominant cult of the woman's Movement, is Masculinism.

It makes for such training and development in woman, of male characteristics, as shall equip her to compete with the male in every department of life; academic; athletic, professional, political, industrial; and it neither recognises nor admits in her natural aptitudes differing from those of men, and fitting her, accordingly, for different functions in these. It rejects all concessions to her womanhood; even to her mother function. It repudiates all privileges for her. Boldly it demands a fair field only and no favour; equal rights, political and social, identical education and training, identical economic opportunities and avocations, an identical morale, personal and public.

In '*Woman and Labour*' Miss Olive Schreiner sums in a line the Feminist objective: "*We take all labour for our province.*" And this is the text of the Feminist creed, the elimination of sex-differences and the abolition of sex-distinctions in every department of life and activity.

Feminists anticipate the militant faction with zest, fierce economic encounters between the sexes now that, war ended, our men, having fought their own and woman's battle in the trenches, are returning to reclaim their places in the world of work. Secure in that possession which is "nine-tenths of the law" and armed with their new powers of enfranchisement, it is further anticipated that the usurpers will be able triumphantly to stem the masculine reflux, and to retain on all hands their new industrial footing.

By showing that, contrary to Feminist doctrine, the division of labour into two sexes, so to speak, is as natural and is as indispensable to human progress as is the division of life into two sexes, the purpose of this is to dissuade women from exploiting a world's misfortunes for their own immediate profit, and to reconcile them, in their profounder and more vital interests and in those of the race, to surrender freely all the essentially masculine employments into which mischance has cast them.

Human evolution and progress have resulted absolutely from an opposite end, in inherence and development, of the two sexes, as regards life and characteristics, aptitude and avocation. The progressive differentiations and specializations of vital processes and living forms, whereby human character and faculty have been increasingly advanced to higher powers, reach their most admirable culmination in the complex division of humanity into two genders: each of which is enabled, by way of such complex specialisation, to promote, intensify and to dignify its own allotted order of qualities. To oppose and frustrate this natural dispensation, whereby human development is achieved by the two sexes travelling along diametrically opposite lines of ascent, is to nullify all that civilisation has secured, and to transform the impulse of Progress into one of Decadence.

Nature, marvellously prescient in all her processes, has provided that the sexes, by being constituted wholly different in body, brain and bent do not normally come into rivalry—and antagonism in the fulfilment of their respective life-roles. Their faculties and functions, being complementary and supplementary (and obviously best applied, therefore, in different departments of Life and Labour), men and women are naturally dependent upon one another in every human relation—a dispensation which engenders reciprocal trust, affection and comradeship.

Feminist doctrine and practice menace these most excellent provisions of Nature by thrusting personal rivalries, economic competition and general conflict of interests between the sexes."

But all this bewailing and beseeching can be of no avail unless at the sametime a call is made to hereditary social functioning as the only mark of civilization and the only key to prosperity with peace.

ANTHROPOLOGY

BY N. SUBRAMHANYA AIYAR

I

ITS DEFINITION AND SCOPE

What is Anthropology? As the term indicates, it is the science of man, of the human species known in biological language as *Homo sapiens*. If that is the definition of Anthropology, I wish to make a preliminary appeal to the readers to consider whether the function of Anthropology can be anything higher or other than making and keeping him as *Homo sapiens* or 'wise man'—i.e., not merely by way of contrast to *Homo Neanderthalensis*, but as the reverse of *Homo Stultus* (or the stupid man) or *Homo Stultissimus*,

(or man, the superfool), as Professor Richet, the Nobel Prize-man for Physiology, would suggest. Certainly, man *must* deserve to be called *Homo sapiens* in every sense of the term; but he *can* be that only in the measure in which he does his function in the world's economy.

Now, what is the function of the human species? Everything — by 'thing' being meant a form that can appeal to one or more of the five senses, viz., touch, sight, taste, hearing and smelling — has a function or quality attaching to it. And "Universe" is merely a term to denote the Totality of *all* things, in earth or heaven or in all the fourteen worlds spoken of in Scriptures, visible or invisible, coarse or tenuous, material or spiritual, animate or inanimate—man being but one of those "things." And just as, in respect of all *other* things in the Universe, having both form (or structure) and function (or quality), there are separate sciences that deal with the form on the one hand and with the function on the other, there must be a similar set of sciences with reference to man. While the sciences relating to form will deal with his origin, his growth, his development, the description of his component parts, including minute structure, and also the function of one part to another—in fact, of all that relates to him taken by himself and *without* reference to other things,—the science of function will treat of what that man has to do *with reference* to other things. Let us apply this, first to man as an individual and then to the species. We shall find that in regard to the individual man, there is the science of "Embryology", or the story of his origin, growth and development in the womb; there is his anatomy (including histology) which is a description of his organs, macroscopic and microscopic. There is also physiology and there is psychology, which deal with the functions of the various parts or organs one to another —physical and mental. Now, taking man as a *species*, we have Anthropogeny with its subsidiary science of Anthropometry, which discusses the question of his origin and explains the processes of that origin and growth, and which will correspond to the embryology of the individual man. There is then the formation and life-history of the various races or sub-species of the main species, *Homo*, and the description of their varied customs, manners, habits and beliefs, called Ethnology and Ethnography respectively, or "Anthropography", to use a more inclusive term. This will be the anatomy and histology of the human species. We have also national and international sociology

Should not the Philosophy of Life be represe

A Correspondent writes:—

Following up the Inter-Religious Convention, Bombay, on the 3rd day of whose proceedings Sir Radhakrishnan was to have presided, I am glad he has expressed himself in New Delhi at World Religious Confrence.

In his address to The World Religious Conference organised by The All-India Geetha Mission, New Delhi, Sir Radhakrishnan observed that 'Religion' has not been understood in its proper sense and that we have religion only to make us hate one another, but not to make us love one another. He added that the time had come for the world to realise that *Truth* and *Love* were the essence of all Religions.

But wh
universal
As for Tr
else than th
"Is the wo
and itself
mena that
indifferent
than the
Divided R
responsibili
third hypo

As for
reality un
can there h
the whole
organism,
and sexes

and general ethics, dealing with the relations between the various nations and races of mankind and between parts of the same nation. These will be the physiology, and hygiene of the human species. And lastly, we have history and political economy, which may be said to correspond to the clinical records and the emergency prescription-books of the human individual. But all these sciences, Anthropogeny, Anthropometry, Ethnology, Ethnography, Sociology, Ethics, His-

tory, etc.,
or form o
of them d
rest of the
primarily
now. If n
the brain o
has theref
that of t
organism:
Anthropolo
with that

BOOK REVIEWS

Through Pakistan to Freedom

By Jamil-Ud.Din Ahmad, B. A., (Hons.) M. A.

The Road to Peace and Pakistan

By Z. A. Suleri, Esq.

Both Published by Ashraf Publications, Kashmiri Bazaar, Lahore. Price Rs. 1/8 each.

Through Pakistan to Freedom

The author claims that "this little book is intended to provide some food for calm and serious thought both to those who believe in Pakistan as a creed and those who have so far set their face against it", though one fails to see any new points in favour of Pakistan brought to light in his book. The author affirms that the acceptance of Pakistan by Congress and other parties is the surest and quickest way to independence. But facts are otherwise. Disunion cannot bring freedom. It is unity alone—secured through economic interdependence—that can do it; and this is possible without either the Hindus or the Moslems having to give up their respective faiths. Only they must learn to keep religion apart from politics.

The Road to Peace and Pakistan

Condemning the creation of a world organisation of Big Powers for policing their respective zones of influence as only another League of Nations that would perpetuate the hold of 'haves' against the 'havenots', the author emphasises the need for economic inter-nationalism. He says: "in the economic sphere, we must have real internationalism. Being physically one, the world is now economically so interdependent that any attempt at division in this sphere will spell disaster. An international economic organisation must, therefore, be forthwith constituted. In the political sphere, we ought to outgrow petty nationalism."

'And to outgrow such petty nationalism', he adds, there must be a common purpose and a common ideology.' In fact, what is needed is a *universally* accepted ideology. And if the author had understood this and what his own findings really mean he would not have pleaded for Pakistan which, according to him, is the formation of an Islamic Federation based on Islamic ideology. He would have seen in it the very seeds of strife and slaughter.

---

indispensable mutual necessity, and, for that purpose, under responsible fixity of place and function'? What are the details of that organisation? And how is it to be implemented? It would have been well, if one or two philosophers of India had been invited to the San Francisco Conference, where momentous issues regarding humanity as a whole are going to be considered. *If there is no common philosophy of life, no concerted action is possible. And if there is no concerted action, how can the world live and progress as one unit?*

For Class Prin

CONSULT

The A. R. V. P

Statue Junction, Mai

TRIVANDRUM.

The Policeman at Home and The Soldier Abroad

The Necessary Evils of Unorganised Existence

If the body of people occupying a country, great or small—known as Nation lived an organised life i.e., a life of established interdependence under division of places and functions, as found among the organs of a living body, with the additional advantage that as thinking beings, they will be able to live that life under a sense of duty and mutual responsibility, *where is the need for policemen or policewomen for that matter?*

In the same way, if all the Nations of the World lived an interdependent life of the aforesaid type, *how can there be wars? And where will be the need for soldiers, he soldiers or she soldiers?*

By making the produce and products of the whole world easily available to all, both near and remote, under equitable terms, it would cordialize mankind and make it one impartible whole. In the place of crime, both between individuals and nations, there will then be commerce, true and righteous.

If, however, they will *not* do so, neither among themselves nor within themselves, you may have as much police and soldiery as you have men and women, but crimes and wars will only grow from more to more in frequency and intensity.

The World Welfare Mission

Printed and Published by S. Padmanabha Iyer at the A. R. V. Press, Main Road, Trivandrum.
Single Copy Annas Two. Annual Subscription Inland: Rupees Three, Foreign Six Shillings
Managing Editor, S. S. AIYAR.