

Readings for Workshop with Anthony Parel

Gandhi On Wealth, Poverty, and the Quest for Happiness

208. SPEECH BY GANDHI AT MUIR COLLEGE ECONOMIC SOCIETY, ALLAHABAD

December 22, 1916

‘Does economic progress clash with real progress?’

When I accepted Mr. Kapildeva Malaviya’s invitation to speak to you upon the subject of this evening, I was painfully conscious of my limitations. You are an economic society. You have chosen distinguished specialists for the subjects included in your syllabus for this year and the next. I seem to be the only speaker ill-fitted for the task set before him. Frankly and truly, I know very little of economics, as you naturally understand them. Only the other day, sitting at an evening meal, a civilian friend deluged me with a series of questions on my crankisms. As he proceeded in his cross-examination, I being a willing victim, he found no difficulty in discovering my gross ignorance of the matters. I appeared to him to be handling with a cocksureness worthy only of a man who knows not that he knows not. To his horror and even indignation, I suppose, he found that I had not even read books on economics by such well-known authorities as Mill, Marshall, Adam Smith and a host of such other authors. In despair, he ended by advising me to read these works before experimenting in matters economic at the expense of the public. He little knew that I was a sinner past redemption.

My experiments continue at the expense of trusting friends. For, there come to us moments in life when about some things we need no proof from without. A little voice within us tells us, “You are on the right track, move neither to your left nor right, but keep to the straight and narrow way.” With such help we march forward slowly indeed, but surely and steadily. That is my position. It may be satisfactory enough for me, but it can in no way answer the requirements of a society such as yours. Still it was no use my struggling against Mr. Kapildeva Malaviya. I knew that he was intent upon having me to engage your attention for one of your evenings. Perhaps you will treat my intrusion as a welcome diversion from the trodden path. An occasional fast after a series of sumptuous feasts is often a necessity. And as with the body, so, I imagine, is the case with the reason. And if your reason this evening is found fasting instead of feasting, I am sure it will enjoy with the greater avidity the feast that Rao Bahadur Pandit Chandrika Prasad has in store for you for the 12th of January.

Before I take you to the field of my experiences and experiments, it is perhaps best to have a mutual understanding about the title of this evening’s address: *Does economic progress clash with real progress?* By economic progress, I take it, we mean material advancement without limit and by real progress we mean moral progress, which again is the same thing as progress of the permanent element in us. The subject may therefore be stated thus: “Does not moral progress increase in the same proportion as material progress?”

I know that this is a wider proposition than the one before us. But I venture to think that we always mean the larger one even when we lay down the smaller. For we know enough of science to realise that there is no such thing as perfect rest or repose in this visible universe of ours. If therefore material progress does not clash with moral progress, it must necessarily advance the latter. Nor can we be satisfied with the clumsy way in which sometimes those who cannot defend the larger proposition put their case. They seem to be obsessed with the concrete case of thirty millions of India stated by the late Sir William Wilson Hunter to be living on one meal a day. They say that before we can think or talk of their moral welfare, we must satisfy their daily wants. With these, they say, material progress spells moral progress. And then is taken a sudden jump: what is true of thirty millions is true of the universe. They forget that hard cases make bad law. I need hardly say to you how ludicrously absurd this deduction would be. No one has ever suggested that grinding pauperism can lead to anything else than moral degradation. Every human being has a right to live and therefore to find the wherewithal to feed himself and where necessary to clothe and house himself. But, for this very simple performance, we need no assistance from economists or their laws.

“Take no thought for the morrow” [*St. Matthew*, VI, 34] is an injunction which finds an echo in almost all the religious scriptures of the world. In well-ordered society, the securing of one’s livelihood should be and is found to be the easiest thing in the world. Indeed, the test of orderliness in a country is not the number of millionaires it owns, but the absence of starvation among its masses. The only statement that has to be examined is whether it can be laid down as a law of universal application that material advancement means moral progress.

Now let us take a few illustrations. Rome suffered a moral fall when it attained high material affluence. So did Egypt and so perhaps most countries of which we have any historic record. The descendants, kinsmen of the royal and divine Krishna, too, fell when they were rolling in riches. We do not deny to the Rockefellers and the Carnegies possession of an ordinary measure of morality but we gladly judge them indulgently. I mean that we do not even expect them to satisfy the highest standard of morality. With them material gain has not necessarily meant moral gain. In South Africa, where I had the privilege of associating with thousands of our countrymen on most intimate terms, I observed almost invariably that the greater the possession of riches, the greater was their moral turpitude. Our rich men, to say the least, did not advance the moral struggle of passive resistance as did the poor. The rich men’s sense of self-respect was not so much injured as that of the poorest. If I were not afraid of treading on dangerous ground, I would even come nearer home and show you that possession of riches has been a hindrance to real growth. I venture to think that the scriptures of the world are far safer and sounder treatises on laws of economics than many of the modern text-books.

The question we are asking ourselves this evening is not a new one. It was addressed to Jesus two thousand years ago. *St. Mark* [Ch. X, *verses* 17-31] has vividly described the scene. Jesus is in his solemn mood; he is earnest. He talks of eternity. He knows the world about him. He is himself the greatest economist of his time. He succeeded in economising time and space—he transcended them. It is to him at his best that one comes running, kneels down, and asks: “Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?” And Jesus said unto him: “Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God. Thou knowest the commandments. Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Defraud not, Honour thy father and mother.” And he answered and said unto him: “Master, all these have I observed from my youth.” Then Jesus beholding him, loved him and said unto him: “One thing thou lackest. Go thy way, sell whatever thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven—come take up the cross and follow me.” And he was sad at that saying and went away grieved—for he had great possessions. And Jesus looked round about and said unto his disciples: “How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God.” And the disciples were astonished at his words. But Jesus answereth again and saith unto them: “Children, how hard it is for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God. It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God !”

Here you have an eternal rule of life stated in the noblest words the English language is capable of producing. But the disciples nodded unbelief as we do even to this day. To him they said as we say today: “But look how the law fails in practice. If we sell all and have nothing, we shall have nothing to eat. We must have money or we cannot even be reasonably moral.” So they state their case thus. “And they were astonished out of measure saying among themselves: ‘Who then can be saved?’” And Jesus looking upon them saith: “With men it is impossible but not with God, for with God all things are possible.” Then Peter began to say unto him: “Lo, we have left all, and have followed thee.” And Jesus answered and said: “Verily I say unto you there is no man that has left house or brethren or sisters; or father or mother, or wife or children or lands for my sake and the Gospels, but he shall receive one hundred fold, now in this time houses and brethren and sisters and mothers and children and lands with persecutions and in the world to come eternal life. But many that are first shall be last and the last first.” You have here the result or reward, if you prefer the term, of following the law.

I have not taken the trouble of copying similar passages from the other non Hindu scriptures and I will not insult you by quoting in support of the law stated by Jesus passages from the writings and sayings of our own sages, passages even stronger if possible than the Biblical extracts I have drawn your attention to. Perhaps the strongest of all the testimonies in favour of the affirmative answer to the question before us are the lives of the greatest teachers of the world. Jesus, Mahomed, Buddha, Nanak, Kabir, Chaitanya, Shankara, Dayanand, Ramakrishna were men who exercised an immense influence over and moulded the character of thousands of men. The world is the richer for their having lived in it. And they were all men who deliberately embraced poverty as their lot.

I should not have laboured my point as I have done, if I did not believe that, in so far as we have made the modern materialistic craze our goal, in so far are we going downhill in the path of progress. I hold that economic progress in the sense I have put it is antagonistic to real progress. Hence the ancient ideal has been the limitation of activities promoting wealth. This does not put an end to all material ambition. We should still have, as we have always had, in our midst people who make the pursuit of wealth their aim in life. But we have always recognised that it is a fall from the ideal. It is a beautiful thing to know that the wealthiest among us have often felt that to have remained voluntarily poor would have been a higher state for them. That you cannot serve God and Mammon is an economic truth of the highest value. We have to make our choice. Western nations today are groaning under the heel of the monster-god of materialism. Their moral growth has become stunted. They measure their progress in £.s. d. American wealth has become the standard. She [*sic*] is the envy of the other nations. I have heard many of our countrymen say that we will gain American wealth but avoid its methods. I venture to suggest that such an attempt if it were made is foredoomed to failure.

We cannot be ‘wise, temperate and furious’[“Who can be wise, amazed, temperate and furious,/ Loyal and neutral, in a moment? No man.”—*Macbeth*, II, iii.] in a moment. I would have our leaders to teach us to be morally supreme in the world. This land of ours was once, we are told, the abode of the gods. It is not possible to conceive gods inhabiting a land which is made hideous by the smoke and the din of null chimneys and factories and whose roadways are traversed by rushing engines dragging numerous cars crowded with men mostly who know not what they are after, who are often absent-minded, and whose tempers do not improve by being uncomfortably packed like sardines in boxes and finding themselves in the midst of utter strangers who would oust them if they could and whom they would in their turn oust similarly. I refer to these things because they are held to be symbolical of material progress. But they add not an atom to our happiness. This is what Wallace, the great scientist, has said as his deliberate Judgement.

In the earliest records which have come down to us from the past, we find ample indications that general ethical considerations and conceptions, the accepted standard of morality, and the conduct resulting from these were in no degree inferior to those which prevail to-day.

In a series of chapters, he then proceeds to examine the position of the English nation under the advance in wealth it has made. He says:

This rapid growth of wealth and increase of our power over nature put too great a strain upon our crude civilization, on our superficial Christianity, and it was accompanied by various forms of social immorality almost as amazing and unprecedented.

He then shows how factories have risen on the corpses of men, women and children, how as the country has rapidly advanced in riches, it has gone down in morality. He shows this by dealing with insanitation, life-destroying trades, adulteration, bribery and gambling. He shows how, with the advance of wealth, justice has become immoral, deaths from alcoholism and suicide have increased. the average of premature births and congenital defects has increased, and prostitution has become an institution. He concludes his examination by these pregnant remarks:

The proceedings of the divorce courts show other aspects of the result of wealth and leisure, while a friend who had been good deal in London society assured me that both in country houses and in London various

kinds of orgies were occasionally to be met with which would hardly have been surpassed in the period of the most dissolute emperors. Of war, too, I need say nothing. It has always been more or less chronic since the rise of the Roman Empire; but there is now undoubtedly a disinclination for war among all civilized peoples. Yet the vast burden of armaments, taken together with the most pious declarations in favour of peace, must be held to show an almost total absence of morality as a guiding principle among the governing classes.

Under the British aegis, we have learnt much, but it is my firm belief that there is little to gain from Britain in intrinsic morality, that if we are not careful, we shall introduce all the vices that she has been a prey to, owing to the disease of materialism. We can profit by that connection only if we keep our civilization, and our morals, straight, i.e., if instead of boasting of the glorious past, we express the ancient moral glory in our own lives and let our lives bear witness to our past. Then we shall benefit her and ourselves. If we copy her because she provides us with rulers, both they and we shall suffer degradation. We need not be afraid of ideals or of reducing them to practice even to the uttermost. Ours will only then be a truly spiritual nation when we shall show more truth than gold, greater fearlessness than pomp of power and wealth, greater charity than love of self. If we will but clean town houses, our palaces and temples of the attributes of wealth and show in them the attributes of morality, we can offer battle to any combinations of hostile forces without having to carry the burden of a heavy militia. Let us seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness and the irrevocable promise is that everything will be added with us. These are real economics. May you and I treasure them and enforce them in our daily life.

An interesting discussion followed in the course of which several students put questions to the lecturer:

Prof. Jevons said . . . It was necessary for economists to exist. It was not their business to lay down what the end should be. That was the business of philosophers. . . .

Prof. Gidwani, president of the society, thanked the lecturer for his address. . . .

Prof. Higginbottom said that there was no economic problem which could be separated from the moral problem.

Mr. Gandhi in the course of his remarks referred to Mr. Jevons' remark about the need for economist and said that it was said that dirt was matter misplaced. So also when an economist was misplaced, he was hurtful. He certainly thought that the economist had a place in the economy of nature when he occupied the humble sphere for which he was created. If an economist did not investigate the laws of God and show them how to distribute wealth so that there might not be poverty, he was a most unwelcome intrusion on the Indian soil. He would also suggest for the reflection of their economic students and professors that what might be good for England and America need not necessarily be good for India. He thought that most of the economic laws which were consistent with moral laws were of universal application, but there might be in their restricted application some distinction and difference. So he would utter the note of warning that Indian conditions being in some respects so essentially different from the English and American conditions, it was necessary to bring to bear on the matters that presented themselves to the economists a fresh mind. If they did so, both Indians and the economists would derive benefit. Mr. Higginbottom, he said, was studying the real economics that were so necessary for India and reducing his studies inch by inch to practice and that was the safest guide to follow, whether they were students or professors. Referring to a question by a student, he said that a man should not hoard money for selfish ends, but if he wished to hoard money as a trustee for the millions of India, he would say that he might have as much riches as he could. Ordinarily, economists prescribed laws for the rich people. It was against those economists that he would always cry out. As regards another question, whether factories should not be replaced by cottage industries, Mr. Gandhi spoke approvingly of the suggestion but said that the economists should first of all examine with patience their indigenous institutions. If they were rotten, they must be wiped but and if there were remedies which could be suggested for their betterment, they should improve them.

As regards intercourse with other nations, he said that he did not think that they necessarily advanced one little bit in their moral growth by bringing their masses with others into physical contact and pointed to Indians in South Africa as an instance. The rapid locomotion such as steamers, trains and others dislocated so many of their ideals and created a great deal of mischief.

As regards the question what was the minimum and the maximum wealth a man should have—he would answer in the words of Jesus, Ramkrishna and others who said 'none'. The Hon. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya in his concluding remarks offered a cordial vote of thanks to Mr. Gandhi for his excellent address. The ideals which Mr. Gandhi put before them, he said, were so high that he did not expect that all of them would be prepared to subscribe to all of them. But he was sure they would agree with the main object he put before them, namely, that they should go for the welfare of man as the test of all economic questions with which they dealt. . . .

The Leader, 25-12-1916. Source: <http://www.gandhiserve.org/cwmg/VOL015.PDF> pp. 272-280

179. MY LOIN-CLOTH

[October 2, 1921]

All the alterations I have made in my course of life have been effected by momentous occasions; and they have been made after such a deep deliberation that I have hardly had to regret them. And I did them, as I could not help doing them. Such a radical alteration—in my dress,—I effected in Madura. I had first thought of it in Barisal. When, on behalf of the famine-stricken at Khulna, I was twitted that I was burning cloth utterly regardless of the fact that they were dying of hunger and nakedness, I felt that I should content myself with a mere loincloth and send on my shirt and dhoti to Dr. Roy, for the Khulna people. But I restrained my emotion. It was tinged with egotism. I knew that the taunt was groundless. The Khulna people were being helped, and only a single zemindar could have sent all the relief necessary. I needed therefore nothing to do there.

The next occasion came when my friend Maulana Mahomed Ali was arrested before my very eyes. I went and addressed a meeting soon after his arrest. I thought of dispensing with my cap and shirt that moment, but then I restrained myself fearing that I might create a scene.

The third occasion came during my Madras tour. People began to tell me that they had not enough khadi to start with and that if khadi was available, they had no money. “If the labourers burn their foreign clothing where are they to get khadi from?” That stuck into my heart. I felt there was truth in the argument. The plea for the poor overpowered me. I expressed grief to Maulana Azad Sobhani, Mr. Rajagopalachari, Doctor Rajan and others, and proposed that I should thenceforth go about with a loin cloth.

The Maulana realized my grief and entirely fell in with my idea. The other co-workers were uneasy. They felt that such radical change might make people uneasy, some might not understand it; some might take me to be a lunatic, and that all would find it difficult if not impossible, to copy my example. For four days I revolved these thoughts, and ruminated the arguments, I began telling people in my speeches: “If you don’t get khadi, you will do with mere loin-cloth but discard foreign clothing.” But I know that I was hesitating whilst I uttered those words. They lacked the necessary force, as long as I had my dhoti and my shirt on. The dearth of swadeshi in Madras, also continued to make me uneasy. The people seemed to be overflowing with love but it appeared to be all froth.

I again turned to my proposal, again discussed with friends. They had no new argument to advance and September was very nearly closing. What should I do to complete the boycott the close of September? That was what was for ever troubling me. Thus we reached Madura on the night of the 22nd. I decided that I should content myself with only a loin-cloth until at least the 31st of October. I addressed a meeting of the Madura weavers early next morning in loin-cloth.

Today is the third day. The Maulana has liked the idea so much that he has made as much alteration in his dress as the *Shariat* permits. Instead of the trousers, he puts on a *lungi*, and wears a shirt of which the sleeves do not reach beyond the elbow. Only at the time of the prayers, he wears a cap, as it is essential. The other co-workers are silently watching. The masses in Madras watch me with bewilderment. But if India calls me a lunatic, what then? If the co-workers do not copy my example, what then? Of course this is not meant to be copied by co-workers. It is meant simply to hearten the people, and to make my way clear. Unless I went about with a loin-cloth, how might I advise others to do likewise? What should I do where millions have to go naked? At any rate why not try the experiment for a month and a quarter? Why not satisfy myself that I left not a stone unturned? It is after all this thinking that I took this step.

I feel so very easy. For eight months in the year, you do not need a shirt here. And so far as Madras is concerned, it may be said that there is no cold season at all, and even the respectable class in Madras wears hardly anything more than a dhoti. The dress of the millions of agriculturists in India is really only

the loin-cloth, and nothing more. I have seen it with my own eyes wherever I have gone. I want the reader to measure from this the agony of my soul. I do not want either my co-workers or readers to adopt the loincloth. But I do wish that they should thoroughly realize the meaning of the boycott of foreign cloth and put forth their best effort to get it boycotted, and to get khadi manufactured. I do wish that they may understand that swadeshi means everything.

First published in Gujarati in *Navajivan*, 2-10-1921. Its translation in *The Hindu* was reproduced from the *Independent The Hindu*, 15-10-1921

Source: <http://www.gandhiserve.org/cwmg/VOL024.PDF> 179 My Loin Cloth, VOL. 24, pp. 349-351.

203. MY LOIN-CLOTH

In response to a letter from a Muslim brother, Gandhi wrote a letter.

Believing that other Muslim brethren, as also some Hindus, may have felt the same doubt as this friend, I venture to give a reply to the letter. I receive many letters about myself, but I do not discuss them in *Navajivan*, thinking that doing so will serve no useful purpose. But I feel it necessary to point out the any errors which this letter contains. The critic has correctly understood the reason for my wearing the loin-cloth. It cannot be laid aside except by securing swaraj. It will go when men and women of India secure swaraj and help me to discard it, or God may make me such an invalid that I could not do without more clothes.

When I started wearing the loin-cloth, I did fear that it would be labelled as indecent. But having regard to the direction which my life had taken, I thought it right to run the risk of being considered indecent in dress. I am always ready to do the utmost for my Muslim friends. My need of them is very great. I had even discussed the matter with a Muslim friend before effecting the change in my dress. He approved of my idea, and that gave me more courage. After an experience of three years, I do not at all regret the change I effected, but on the contrary feel daily happier with it. I wish to be in tune with the life of the poorest of the poor among Indians. I know that I can have a *darshan* of God in no other way. I want to see Him face to face. I have become impatient for the experience. I shall not be blessed with the vision until I have made myself the poorest of the poor. It is painful to me to eat or to dress as long as the poor do not have enough to eat or enough to cover their bodies with. Had God not created me weak I would have introduced more drastic changes in my life.

My critic can have no idea of the skeletons who stalk the country. To have it, he should repair to the remotest villages and live among the people there. The correspondent will not get, even in three or four hundred years, the dress which he desires for the people of the country. He should know that crores of people in India do not get even a loin-cloth to wear. They move about only with a *langoti*. There are crores who have not had even a look at a pair of sandals. They do not even feel the need for them. How can these poor people afford a long shirt with a collar? Who will give them a cap? If we would wear so many garments, we cannot clothe the poor. But it is our duty to dress them first and then dress ourselves, to feed them first and then feed ourselves. This critic thinks about clothes. Let me ask him, in all humility, when the poverty-stricken people of this country do not get enough even to eat, how can we talk of dress reform?

Now about decency. The term decency has more than one meaning. It does not mean the same thing everywhere. What is decent in the West may be indecent in the East. Some of the styles of dressing prevalent in the West have been considered indecent in the East. In America, I would certainly be jailed. Narayan Hemchandra was locked up in a prison for wearing a dhoti. My mother felt unhappy to

see us brothers wearing trousers. She thought we were not fully dressed in them. Innumerable Hindus do not look upon the loin-cloth as an indecent dress at all. The sadhus wear only a *langoti*, but are not, for that reason, looked upon as uncivilized. In my view, there is no indecency at all in being scantily dressed. Clothes are necessary only for the protection of the body.

From the point of view of this critic, the shame which is there in wearing too many clothes is not to be found in the loin-cloth of a mendicant like me. If we but think of man's body as it is, we shall see no reason at all to be attached to it. This bag of bones can bear being looked at only when dressed in all sorts and styles of clothing. I cite only one example to show that this view is correct. We have never heard of anyone having fallen in love with a corpse. The object of attachment is the indwelling soul. Why, then, give so much thought to the body? Why all this adornment?

Sisters come to bless me with their *darshan*, love me and give their blessings. There are both Hindus and Muslims among them. I am sure they do not come to look at my body at all. I have never felt that they ever watched it. This is but right. A man or a woman should never look at the body of his or her friend. If one happens to do so unwittingly, one should immediately take one's eyes off it. One is free to look at another's face only. A man of self-restraint like Lakshman had seen only Sita's toes, for he used to salute her feet. Hence, when sisters come to bless me, I never feel embarrassed in their presence because of my loin-cloth. I only pray for their goodwill. I need much help from them. I get some, but it is still too little.

When Hindu and Muslim sisters have adopted the spinning-wheel and come to look upon khadi as their adornment, I shall feel that I have got all I wanted. I shall then certainly please my correspondent by wearing a dhoti and a long shirt with a collar, for I believe that, when the women have fallen in love with khadi, swaraj will have been won. Meanwhile, the correspondent should be kind to me and to those like me who wear a loin-cloth and, even if he regards the loin-cloth as indecent, should look upon people who wear it as his brethren, overlooking their indecency.

Navajivan 27-7-1924,

Source: <http://www.gandhiserve.org/cwmg/VOL028.PDF> 203. *MY LOIN-CLOTH*, vol. 28, 22, 1924, pp. 369-71.