

Working Title

Joy. M. Monteiro

Introduction

MORAL instruction has been a hallmark of social living for as long as one can remember. By moral instruction, we mean any set of tools that one is given to generate a preference ordering for use in daily life. It takes various forms – fables, religious texts and discourse, social norms and even threats. There is always an asymmetry between the giver and taker of moral instruction – parent and child, teacher and student, godman and devotee, rich and poor, and nowadays, West and East (or vice versa, depending on context). The implicit assumption is that one is in a superior position for some reason and this gives one both reason and authority to ask others to change their preference ordering. Moral instruction can have significant political consequences as well, – witness the issues surrounding proselytization and production of people who consider themselves warriors in a holy war – and this sometimes calls into question the legitimacy of influencing someone who is in an inherently asymmetric relationship with oneself.

One can legitimize or delegitimize moral instruction from various perspectives – some would emphasize complete freedom for the individual in arranging the world around for themselves, others would point out that certain modes of life have better aggregate outcomes, some others would use it as the choice tool for perpetuation of some social contract, and others would dismiss it as a tool of the powerful to keep the rest under check. In this essay, however, we would like to dwell upon a statement of Tagore regarding what should be the moral basis for action and see whether this viewpoint yields more insight as to how one handles asymmetric relationships. To this end, we will explore some incidents and statements from the vast literature on Gandhi and see whether one can understand how he handled the many situations in which he was in a position of immense power.

Continuity and Rupture

During the famous Tagore-Gandhi debates regarding the latter's use of the charkha as a means for the emancipation of the masses, Tagore considers this means to the end (which was swaraj) to be missing the point of the problem, which was to rouse the people from their inertia and their tendency to cling to great personalities and symbols instead of awakening themselves. He strongly objects to calling something one's own unless one has taken pains in its creation, rather than obtaining it as a gift or hand-me-down from a superior. Thus, he says that one can call the country one's own only if we have put our heart and soul in its creation. In this context, he says:

The Rishi has said: "The son is dear, not because we desire a son, but because we desire to realise our own soul in him". It is the same for the country. It is dear to us, because it is the expression of our own soul. When we realise this, it will become impossible for us to allow our service of our country to wait on the pleasure of others.[?]

While the above statement is made in the context of national/social service, it is worth dwelling on the 'statement of the Rishi' that Tagore mentions. Shorn of theoretical abstractions, if we think of moral instruction as something that happens at an interpersonal level between say a mother and her child, it is motivated

by the mother's understanding of how the world works and the behavior she has come to value during her engagement with the world. She sees a necessity of giving her child a 'head start' that she might not have had and tries to maintain a continuity from her life to her child's, i.e, she tries to 'realise her own soul in her child', the word 'soul' simply being interpreted as a worldview and a preferred ordering of behavior. Similarly, staying in a particular socio-cultural milieu cultivates in the person a certain 'spirit of the age'. Though the mechanisms for such moulding of the individual by the collective may not be clear, it is hardly debatable that it is composed to a large extent by interpersonal interactions of the above type – even the laws of the land have to be communicated to the individual.

This particular formulation of an answer to 'why moral instruction?' is sensitive to outcomes without a need for problematic aggregation, respects historicity without degenerating into determinism and replaces power struggles with love and concern. It understands the effects of the society on the individual but also respects her discretion. It is prone to the obvious danger of being overly paternalistic, and we hope to ensure that this is addressed properly in the course of this essay. It also misses the role and responsibilities of the other person (or more generally the other entity) in the relationship, which we also hope to address.

One can always argue that moral instruction is simply a method to manipulate individuals for one's own gain. While there no doubt that this is possible, moulding a person in a manner that one knows to be wrong is not something we will address here. We believe that for the most part, this is not the case. The jihadist actually believes in the truth of his war, the coloniser truly believes he is helping helping the colonised, the World Bank economist truly believes that she is making a positive difference in the lives of the impoverished. The main challenge to these people on the ground, requiring to make decisions at that particular moment (and not analyse it from all angles and write an essay), is the limited perspective and information they have access to. This is why hell can be reached even by good intentions. Without trying to address the epistemic issues of decision making under uncertainty, we take it for granted that the 'moraliser' has no ulterior motive while addressing the 'moralisee'.

Continuity, as imagined here, can be at atleast three levels: at the level of the individual, at the level of the society and finally at the level of the civilisation itself. Depending on a person's historical and philosophical acuity and tastes, he can engage with it at all or only one of these levels. Thus, questions of moral continuity can span a large number of scales in space and time.

Rupture here should not be seen as the opposite pole of continuity, but simply as the other face of the same coin. It naturally enters the scene when we focus on how the other in the relationship responds to calls of continuity. Breaking away from received wisdom can happen for a lot of reasons, not all equally valid. However, staying as we are in a society that evolves (however slowly) into different configurations, a creative response to the demands of now may involve breaking from tradition, no matter how hard one tries to stay within it.

However, we can question the notion of 'change for change's sake', embodied in (say) the 'creative destruction' of the entrepreneur in Schumpeter's view of capitalism. Historically, periods of great change have also been periods of great deprivation and misery to people who have had absolutely nothing to do with the causes of the change itself. It is therefore not surprising that such people (who are normally called the 'masses' in the vocabulary of the more dynamic groups in a society) have resisted change and preferred continuity, which is synonymous with security in this context.

The problem of continuity versus rupture becomes all the more important in a globalising world, where the strong disruptive influence of emerging global institutions like the World Bank and problems like climate change and ecological degradation demand both a healthy understanding of our civilisational past and impartial evaluation of a global future. At a societal level, mass migrations from rural to urban areas and the emergence of nuclear families has led to fantastic formulations of a idyllic past due to the inability to deal with an uncertain present. The tremendous release of energy that modernisation has brought forth, especially from the previously depressed sections of society, has immense social and ecological implications, which are normally overlooked due to some notion of political correctness and a sense of guilt. At a personal level, the large diversity of life and lifestyle choices that are available to one in this day and age is both bewildering and overpowering, making it extremely difficult to let the winds of other lands blow through our house without getting blown off one's feet.

Thus, one can see that a healthy and respectful tension between continuity and rupture is essential at all the three levels described above. One extreme may inhibit all change, the other may discard all wisdom gathered over generations. If we view the process of moral instruction as one that is an effort to preserve continuity, then the question of the ethics of moral instruction is transformed into the question of the ethics of continuity and rupture, and this theme is what will be explored in the rest of the essay. Specifically, continuity at the levels of geography or space (our social and natural surroundings) and memory or time (our traditions) take up all of this essay.

M. K. Gandhi

Going through the enormous literature that has been generated both by Gandhi himself and students of Gandhi, one gets a sense of where and how he desired continuity and change. His personal life was bombarded by change, indulging as he did in his continual experiments with Truth – from his encounters with untouchables near his house as a child till his brahmacharya experiments late in his life, he seemed to defy tradition and question the prevailing social norms. It was a long journey of self-purification, which is best described in his own words:

But the path of self-purification is hard and steep. To attain to perfect purity one has to become absolutely passion-free in thought, speech and action; to rise above the opposing currents of love and hatred, attachment and repulsion. I know that I have not in me as yet the triple purity . . . (which) is why the world's praise fails to move me, indeed it very often stings me.¹

Contrast this with his ideas for social engineering which emphasised continuity over change. Be it in the spheres of Hindu-Muslim, Untouchable-caste Hindu relationships or his choice of tools and trades that were to represent his village reconstruction work, he emphasised continuity, focusing on the Indianness of all groups regardless of their other identities and the familiarity of the villager with certain implements and skills which he sought to revive. He emphasised the requirement of an amicable relationship with the colonisers, asking only for a rejection of their ideas.

At a civilisational level, he sought to break any integration of the Indian economy with the British one, especially since he saw the British economy as the symptom of a diseased civilisational ideal. This stance found its expression in his leadership of the Civil Disobedience movement during the early 1920's. He urged his constructive workers to look to traditional practices for inspiration for their technological innovations, which he viewed as being non-violent in their formulation.

Any change that he asked for was not revolutionary in character, but slow, almost unconscious. Speaking about caste, for example he says:

The most effective, quickest, and the *most unobtrusive* way to destroy caste is for reformers to begin with themselves . . . The reform will not come by reviling the orthodox. The change will be *gradual and imperceptible*².(emphasis added)

Change that happens, must be of such a kind as to improve one's moral status. When he speaks about proselytization, for example, he says:

What is the use of moving from one compartment to another, if it does not mean a moral rise? What is the meaning of my trying to convert to the service of God (for that must be the implication of Shuddi or Tabligh) when those in my fold are every day denying God in their actions?³

Again, when speaking to laborers, he speaks of the unfortunate relationship between capital and labor in Europe:

¹M. K. Gandhi, An Autobiography, pg. 464

²Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi (CWG henceforth), Vol 68, pg. 152

³M. K. Gandhi, India of My Dreams (IOMD henceforth), pg. 259

Should the labourers obtain an increment in their wages by violence, even if that be possible? . . . Look at Europe. . . The labourer does not trust the capitalist and the capitalist has no faith in the labourer. Both have a sort of vigour and strength but even the bulls have it. They fight to the bitter end. *All motion is not progress*⁴.(emphasis added)

Thus, we see in Gandhi's thinking, change was welcome, only as an entailment of a moral rise.

The tension between continuity and rupture as seen here requires moral judgement by both the parties involved in the relationship. I think that what has been proven to be good for me (over time due to experience, say), will be good for everyone, and therefore I will use my position of authority to realise this in others. On the other hand, the person at the receiving end of this also makes a judgement as to whether the proposed change will result in a moral rise for himself or the group, which enables him to welcome or resist the change. In other words, one should prefer to be stationary than to run around in circles. The notion of a moral 'rise' suggests a directionality to the evolution of morals, a notion of a purpose for human life is therefore necessary. Gandhi had a very strong sense of purpose, both for himself (self-realisation) and for India (swaraj). Therefore, all moral evaluations that he made were necessarily in reference to these ultimate ends.

Akeel Bilgrami argues⁵ that Gandhi's philosophy breaks the historical link between moral judgement and criticism, and says that the ideal satyagrahi had only the possibility of being an exemplar to his fellowmen. This obviously has a lot of implications for the modes of moral instruction that is available to a satyagrahi. Whatever the theoretical possibilities that one can read off Gandhian literature, Gandhi himself never backed away from commenting on or implementing things that he strongly felt about. Not only was his body the site for experimenting, his whole family had to go along with his ideas, whether they liked it or not. He deplored the sanitary conditions of the Indian in various fora. He supported the decision (indeed, he was party to it) of Gujarat Vidyapith to not recognize schools which excluded untouchables⁶. Gandhi never saw a distinction between religion and politics – he argued that any such distinction draws from wrong ideas of religion and/or politics. He considered the ultimate goal of religion as identification with all beings in this world, and this to him naturally led to protest atrocities against them. His religion lead him to action, and was therefore someone who shaped history rather than being shaped by it. All in all, whatever may have been interpreted about the disjunction between judgement and criticism, he definitely did not follow it consistently, if at all. Thus, one can assume for the rest of this essay that Gandhi did actively try to 'realise his soul' in a new India that he was helping to form all his life.

Geography

All animals are strongly shaped by the surroundings in which they spend most of their life – their kin, society, the climate and available resources influence their language, worldview, clothing, food, architecture, modes of celebration and mourning among other things. Humans are extremely flexible in their adaptations to such surroundings, whereas collective norms and climate change at much slower rates. The whole program of society and civilisation building rests upon this particular separation in time scales. Imagine a world where the climate changed on a daily basis. Every day would bring new challenges to just find something to eat, forget about shelter and protection. If today you are in a tropical forest, the next day in a desert following which you are swimming with the fish, it is very unlikely that even the more complex forms of life could emerge in such a scenario, forget about ideas of civilisation. Similarly in a society, if robbery was illegal one day and encouraged the next or the side of the road on which to drive changed randomly, it is unlikely that stable groups of individuals could form. It is only when the persistent pressure to survive from day to day ceases that human mental capacity truly comes into its own.

Thus, it is not surprising that most of what has been called 'high culture' only derived from individuals who had somehow escaped from this eat to survive – survive to eat cycle either due to political power and

⁴IOMD, pg. 39

⁵Ed. Raghuramaraju, Debating Gandhi, Gandhi's Integrity: The philosophy behind the politics

⁶Rajmohan Gandhi, The Good Boatman, pg. 227

patronage or institutional asceticism (e.g. gurukulas, monasteries). Most of humanity has not broken from this cycle and their rituals, traditions and culture are therefore somewhat condescendingly called 'popular culture' as opposed to the 'classical culture'. This dichotomy has made it difficult for people from either side of the divide to identify with the other and made it easy to caricature, criticise and antagonise them. How is one then to emphasise continuity given this big divide?

Gandhi made an immense effort to identify with the poor of India and made extreme changes in his lifestyle to do so. This again derives from his idea of self-realisation which depended on identification with the 'meanest of creation' along with the 'triple purity' mentioned above. His call for civil disobedience, burning of foreign cloth, leaving English schools and colleges and voluntary spinning was a call to Indians to identify with the troubles of their fellow countrymen. He believed this identification to be an integral part of the swaraj that he envisioned. His immediate intention was to rectify what he saw as a glaring injustice, that of enforced idleness of millions in the country. He strongly believed in the dignity of labor (especially manual labor), and that every person had to earn her livelihood, and to that end creating a market for cloth that could be manufactured by individuals with limited means was a good means. Like he says:

The hungry millions ask for one poem – invigorating food. They cannot be given it. They must earn it. And they can earn only by the sweat of their brow⁷.

Tagore reacted to this call in a strongly negative manner, and it is useful to understand why. He was against nationalism and he saw in the Nation-State a system that would use people for its own ends of acquiring power. He also believed that it was India's unique purpose to set an example for the rest of the world in the manner in which it dealt with its problem of social amity in the presence of incredible diversity. With the world becoming closely integrated, he saw in India a microcosm of the world with many races interacting, and to him it was upto India to show that such a situation could be solved without having to invoke the idea of political nationalism, since it cannot apply to the world as a whole:

In finding the solution of our problem we shall have helped to solve the world problem as well. . . . And the moment is arriving when you also must find a basis for unity which is not political. If India can offer to the world her solution, it will be a contribution to humanity⁸.

Therefore, when he heard Gandhi's call, he perceived it to be a symptom of that same nationalism that he was against, which was dividing East from West in this case. Thus, he wanted to know what was the reason for rupturing the transcendental continuity of humanity that this movement entailed. Burning cloth when there are people without clothes (to whom it could be given), asking students to practice some kind of 'political asceticism' by leaving colleges, imputing moral undertones to what was basically a problem in economics, these were unacceptable to him.

Gandhi emphasised the moral gain to be made from such a rupture:

On the contrary, Non-cooperation is intended to pave the way to real, honorable and voluntary cooperation based on mutual respect and trust⁹.

My experience has proved to my satisfaction that literary training by itself adds not an inch to one's moral height . . . I am firmly of the opinion that the Government schools have unmanned us; rendered us helpless and Godless.¹⁰

I must refuse to insult the naked by giving them clothes they do not need, instead of giving them work which they sorely need. . . . I would give them a privileged position . . . and associate myself with them in work¹¹.

⁷Ed. Sabyasachi Bhattacharya, *The Mahatma and The Poet* (TMTP henceforth), pg. 91

⁸R. Tagore, *English Writings of Rabindranath Tagore, Nationalism in India*, pg. 453

⁹TMTP, pg. 65

¹⁰TMTP, pg. 66

¹¹TMTP, pg. 90

Thus, Non-cooperation would bring dignity and self-respect to Indians in their interactions with the West, schools are inculcating slave mentality in children, whereas a lack of schooling does not detract from one's moral personality, and instead of treating the poor as objects of pity, we must raise them to the status of equals. Therefore, in his eyes, this movement, though it temporarily ruptured the relations between the English and Indians, would go a long way in the moral reform of the Englishman, the middle class Indian and the poor Indian. The moral reform of the poor was not only by increasing their self-respect, but also by increasing their 'capabilities' (in the sense of Amartya Sen ^{12 13}) which would flow to other parts of their life unrelated to spinning. Thus, a problem which at first seemed to be purely economic in character, develops a moral tinge, showing the underlying moral basis of social problems, regardless of what language it is couched in. Thus, to Gandhi:

The truth is that the charkha is intended to realise the essential and living oneness of interest among India's myriads¹⁴.

However, there were other criticisms of Tagore that Gandhi took to heart. Tagore's complaints about over-enthusiastic 'satygrahis' harassing those who refused to take part in the disobedience movement was something he would have had in mind when he wrote the following as advice to students:

... On no account may they use coercion against dissentients or against the authorities ... They may not impose Vande Mataram or the National Flag on others. They may wear National Flag buttons on their own persons but not force others to do the same¹⁵.

Also, he could not deny the possibility that Tagore pointed out that people were blindly following his call, and sooner or later would get disillusioned. This did in fact happen, and the institution building that would keep Gandhian ideas alive after his death never happened.

The distinction between Gandhi and Tagore on this issue is the distinction between 'piecemeal engineering' and 'Utopian engineering' that Karl Popper makes in his 'Open Society and Its Enemies (V.1)'. Popper argues against working for the 'ultimate good' which he considers to be something that is not 'methodologically sound'. Rather, he says that it is preferable to fight against the 'greatest and most urgent evils of society', i.e, for a reduction in injustice versus an advancement toward perfect justice. The metaphor of the veena player used by Tagore sums up his position:

(I wish to learn the veena from a great master and) I then want a vina made. For this, of course are required all kinds of material and a different kind of science. If, finding me to be lacking ... (the master should say): "Never mind, my son do not go to the expense in workmanship and time which a vina will require. Take rather this simple string tightened across a piece of wood and practise on it. In a short time you will find it to be as good as a vina." Would that do? I am afraid not¹⁶.

Gandhi would probably reply that while taking your time to learn how to make a veena might increase your ability as a player, people without food simply cannot take their time to reform themselves in a holistic manner before their stomachs are filled. It is preferable to use spinning of cloth to solve this immediate problem than lose our fellowmen to hunger while we rebuild India from scratch. Swaraj was an ideal which was to be reached as a sum total of such interventions.

In the above debate, the fact that the object of the debate was never party to the debate makes it difficult to pick sides, since an onlooker who has very little familiarity with the life of the poor at that time has no way of judging which approach will be the one the poor themselves would prefer. However, it was not so in the other debate that happened between Ambedkar and Gandhi, over the issue of separate electorates for the Untouchables.

¹²Amartya Sen, Development as Freedom

¹³Anthony Parel, Gandhi's Philosophy and the Quest for Harmony

¹⁴TMT, pg. 124

¹⁵M. K. Gandhi, Constructive Programme: Its meaning and place

¹⁶TMT, pg. 80

Gandhi's response to this issue should be by now obvious – separate electorates implies creating a identity for the Untouchables distinct from the Hindu one, and this would constitute a huge social rupture. In some sense, it is a kind of proselytization, but this time to a more modern 'religion' expounded by Western political theorists called Nationalism. Ambedkar, having faced discrimination of the worst kind due to his status as an Untouchable, felt this rupture was precisely what was needed to gain any uplift of the Untouchables and had no hopes for any solution that kept them within the Hindu fold. To him, whole-heartedly embracing modernity was the only way out.

The results of this debate are well known – Gandhi went on a fast unto death which broke the resistance of Ambedkar, if only for political reasons and the separate electorates were never formed. As D. R. Nagaraj notes ¹⁷, the present day Dalit Movement traces its roots back to this historic moment. Strongly shaped by Ambedkar's ideas, it generally has very little sympathy for Gandhian ideas simply because they blame him for the loss in political power. They have a strong sense of identity distinct from the Hindu one, and embrace modern ideas and technology as the only hopes for their upliftment. The Dalit Movement has been remarkably successful in politically mobilising those formerly called Untouchables, and have converted this to a nationwide force, whose most famous product today is Mayawati in Uttar Pradesh.

This complete rupture that Ambedkar orchestrated has had somewhat counterintuitive results, which Nagaraj documents. For example, the Dalits in Karnataka protested strongly against including certain castes in the SC list, claiming that they were not part of the those who were historically humiliated and thus have no claim to retrospective justice. This parochialism, which may have been effective as a political tool, fails to identify the Dalit Movement with a larger class of second-class citizenry that has formed in India due to the technological revolutions of the past decades. The artisan, the farmer are victims of the modernity that the Dalit Movement embraces in principle and therefore there is no common meeting ground. Nagaraj goes on to lament the hatred for the village that he sees in Dalit activists which makes it impossible for them to visualise any alternate mode of living other than the one the West has to offer. Given that the Western mode of life is extremely harsh on the environment, which Gandhi correctly pointed out many times, the Dalit Movement cannot accept the alternative, which points to the rejuvenation of villages and Gandhian ideas.

So, has the 'moral rise' that Gandhi hoped any rupture would entail happened with the emergence of the Dalit Movement? Ambedkar himself lashed out at Dalits who tended to use the Movement to get jobs and then promptly forgot about it, and this behavior has led to strange new words being added to the 'reservation' vocabulary such as 'creamy layer in OBCs/SCs'. Mayawati's megalomaniacal antics in the name of Dalit pride do the movement no good either. The violence against the Dalit in the village has decreased, which is based on a mutual fear rather than any real understanding of the other. Gandhi's suggestion that this issue cannot be solved without the active participation of the caste Hindus has become more relevant now – the hope that caste would be dissolved with modernity has not borne fruit, with the caste system now integrating itself into the newer technological and economic hierarchies being formed. Thus, in its present form, the Dalit Movement is a potent political weapon, its significance in a program for swaraj – 'where the mind is without fear and the head is held high' – is debatable.

On the other hand, does the Gandhian formula of self-purification of the caste Hindus work? First, Gandhi conceived of the problem as a purely religious one, and asked the caste Hindus to accept the Untouchables back into the fold and asked the Untouchables to modify certain habits which would make them more acceptable socially. The Untouchable is conceived as one evoking pity and being the object of humiliation. The rest of the life-world of the Untouchable had no place in Gandhian arguments. His call for equality by the symbolic act of opening up temples can turned around, saying that the distinct culture, the Gods and Goddesses of the Dalits may no longer be able to survive. After all, as Tagore says¹⁸: "It was the prohibition for them to enter temples that has helped them in their purity of realisation.", speaking about a sect that had modes of worship that he greatly approved of. Therefore, trying to develop a continuity with mainstream Hinduism would imply a rupture with their own culture. Thus, by Gandhi's own standards, his solution was not likely to measure up.

Then what is likely to work? If one surveys the various experiments in social engineering in India that can be called successful (The Timbaktu Collective, Barefoot College, Ralegaon, SEWA, to name a few), it has

¹⁷D. R. Nagaraj, *The Flaming Feet*

¹⁸TMT, pg. 139

involved building bridges in two ways: Firstly, working in villages has required immersion in the life world of the village – its culture, society, politics and its epistemology¹⁹. Unless one has an understanding of what is knowledge and how one obtains it in a particular context, all evaluations of moral or material rise will turn out to be partial or meaningless. Which is why even though Bunker Roy or Uzamma speak English, few can grasp what they mean. Secondly, it may be necessary for a group of people to adjust to new surroundings, such as migrant labor in urban slums. Here, their understanding of the world is irrelevant and has to be replaced with a new conception, and those who live in cities can help in bridging this gap²⁰, understanding a money economy or nuclear families for instance. Living in a society that is changing rapidly, with fundamental changes in the relation between people and land, there is definitely scope for ‘mitigation and adaptation’ as well as eliminating the need for ‘mitigation and adaptation’.

Conclusion

It would not be too far from the truth to state that Memory is the bedrock on which civilisations are built: Memory both within our heads and without. It is interesting to see how everyday expressions and notions have such ancient and interesting roots. Especially in a country like ours, who you are is incomplete without the knowledge of where you come from. If, somehow, there is a rupture in this chain, it is imperative to fill it with other memories. Memories and traditions are of two kinds, those which are intimately tied to the material world around us, and those which are more abstract in nature. The more it is of the former type, the more ‘rooted’ a person finds herself to her native place. If the latter dominates, it is easy for someone to move constantly without feeling that she is far away from home. For example, it is the difference in the lifestyles of the farmer vis-a-vis the itinerant monk, in Bollywood vis-a-vis Carnatic music. One reflects changes in the society and culture more faithfully than the other. Abstract memories and traditions being slower to change and therefore longer lived, represent civilisational ideals more faithfully. However, material traditions are far more inventive simply because of their amenability to change.

Both these types of traditions play an important role in the ethical life of people. While canonical texts provide the general direction of moral growth, culture and tradition also stake a claim to authority in our moral lives²¹. In a world that is changing as rapidly as ours, the tension between fear of retrogressive change and fear of being ‘left behind’ is all the more palpable. In this context, a recognising and respecting sources of moral authority in our own lives as both something to base our lives on as well as use as a yardstick for measuring change is important. Following tradition is no excuse not to think, and thinking is no excuse to disrespect tradition.

¹⁹Shiv Visvanathan, Narendranath Memorial Lecture

²⁰see Ela Bhatt, *We are poor but so many*, for example

²¹Leela Prasad, *Ethics in Everyday Hindu Life*