

The Ninth Rule of the ethics of means and ends is that any effective means is automatically judged by the opposition as being unethical. Saul Alinsky, Rules for Radicals: A Practical Primer for Realistic Radicals (), p. 35 The first sign of corruption in a society that is still alive is that the.

Oksana Akulova Means and Ends in the Philosophy of Gandhi Akulova Oxana 10HPPH04 Since times immemorial most of the people have initially been concerned with the goals to achieve and then pragmatically considered means available to them. In other words end mattered first, means were chosen according to their compatibility with desired ends. In modern era it became possible for each individual to be used as a means for another to achieve his ends without undue coercion and to his own distinct advantage. In utilitarian ethics spread in modern Europe the end to achieve has intrinsic value in itself. Kant in his deontological ethics stresses that the utility has nothing to do with an action which is morally right. It is right only if it is done in the sake of duty. So, to the most schools of thought it is common to accept a sharp dichotomy between means and ends. Distinctions have been repeatedly made between immediate and ultimate, short-term and long-term, diverse and common, individual and social, essential and desirable ends, as also attainable and utopian goals. Discussion about means has not ignored questions about their moral implications and propriety, or about the extent of their theoretical and contingent compatibility with desired ends or widely shared values. But despite all these reservations, the dangerous dogma that the end entirely justifies the means is merely an extreme version of the commonly uncriticized belief that moral considerations cannot be applied to the means except in relation to ends, or that the latter have a moral priority. Gandhi seems to stand almost alone among social and political thinkers in his firm rejection of the rigid dichotomy between ends and means and in his extreme moral preoccupation with the means to the extent that they, rather than the ends, provide the standard of reference. What is the relation between means and ends according to Gandhi? How does Gandhi show the workings of their relation? Why was Gandhi so much preoccupied with the importance of means and ends and their relation? As it was mentioned above Gandhi did not make a rigid difference between means and ends. Indeed, the Creator has given us control and that too very limited over means, none over the end. Realization of the goal is in exact proportion to that of the means. The idea of the limit of our free will is also conceivable in the statement b. It is the most important time because it is the only time when we have any power. The most necessary man is he with whom you are, for no man knows whether he will ever have dealings with any one else: It is interesting to note that in the case of untouchables Gandhi did not accept the law of karma, i. So to say they were excluded from Hindu society on the ground of their low birth and treated worse than criminals and even beasts. The explanation of this I will give in the second part of the paper which deals with Truth, Ahimsa and non-duality. The last statement gives a practical recommendation that we must be primarily or even wholly concerned with the immediate adoption as what we regard as morally worthy means. As we can see all definitions of means and ends are very organic and flow one from another. Metaphysical truths and practical applications do not conflict. However, one may have an impression that for Gandhi end does not have intrinsic value in itself and seems to be very vague and obscure notion for it totally depends on means employed. He was convinced that a concentration upon task at hand must be combined with a degree of detachment, a freedom from anxiety about future consequences. The end we do not know. They must know the full definition of swaraj, i. But while the cause has to be just and clear as well as the means, it is even more important to recognize that impure means must result in impure end, that we cannot attain to any truth through untruthful means, that we cannot secure freedom from tyrannical acts, or socialism through enmity and coercion, or enduring peace through war. This view explicitly rejects the doctrine that the end justifies the means and asserts that a moral means is almost an end in itself because virtue is its own reward. For Gandhi it is not the case that utilitarian ethics and the belief that the end justifies means can lead to a welfare of people. Technical external to men means may bring about only one-sided development, i. While trying to understand the relation between means and ends, professed by Gandhi, we should keep in mind a much more large and deep picture behind it. This picture consists of three principles which saturate all philosophy of Gandhi,

namely, non-duality, Truth and Ahimsa. Gandhi was advaitin and supported non-dual reality. He saw everything from the stand point of oneness which is shared by us all. The second, for Gandhi the underlying principle of every department of life were Truth and Ahimsa. Ahimsa is the means and Truth is the end. These are convertible terms for Gandhi. The practice of Ahimsa inevitably leads to Truth and practice of himsa can never lead to Truth. This convertibility of means and ends brings us to the thought that our religious and ethical ideals not only inform the ends we aim at but also the means we employ to reach them. Why ahimsa is so much related to truth? To understand this we have to look back at the first point I mentioned, i. He makes no distinction between Self or Atman and Truth or God. Self-realization is truth-realization or realization of God. The self within man is at one with the essence of reality, which is Truth or God. Here lies the explanation why Gandhi did not support the law of Karma in the case on scheduled caste. The inseparable relation between means and ends work under the guidance of these three principles above which are universal and non-fallible. There can be no compromise with Truth and non-violence. The difficulty in choosing the appropriate means arises because people differ in their understanding of Truth and Non-violence. To which extent should we follow these principles? Gandhi says that until we are bound in empirical existence the absolute truth as well as the absolute ahimsa are not possible. Yet, the ideal of perfect love still informs the spirit in which we live directing our thoughts and actions. Why did Gandhi pay so much attention to the priority of means over the end? Metha it is because he made a distinction between the objective of life and the objectives of living. With some justification we might call simplicity of life and non-violence to be the objectives of living and the realization of self is the objective of life. Living is the process through which life manifests itself. Our thoughts, words and actions are the different ways in which our span of life on this earth manifests itself. The objectives NB plural of living and the objective single as objective of life is only one to realize oneself of life are found mixed up in all ordinary works of Mahatma Gandhi. When we compare the objectives of living and the objective of life, the former appear as means to the attainment of the latter. It is through the various objectives of living that we can attempt to reach final end or the objective of life. Gandhi kept the objective of life in his mind and was mostly talking about objectives of living, which ultimately should lead us to the objective of life. As is your living so is your life. Life is a subtle, fundamental and more permanent force. Living is more concrete, more superficial and transient. Life is infra-sensorial while living is super- sensorial. Living arises when life comes in contact with the material world. Living is the manifestation of life in terms of words and deeds. The same we can say about means and end, means are manifestation of end in terms of words and deeds. Objectives of living are meant to sub-serve the objective of life. Simple living helps us to have the vision of simplicity. Bullock-cart economy that Gandhi favoured was meant to remove all complications from at least one mode of living. When our mode of living is simple, our thoughts also become simple. Ultimately we shall have to depend on sun to give us the needed energy. Why did he want decentralization of production? Why did he want that the rich should hold their wealth in trust for the poor? Why did he express himself against sophisticated machinery? Why did he preach non-violence? Gandhi had the ultimate objective of living and of life in his mind and that is why he said and did what appeared to some as nonsensical. The objective of life is the realization of the self. Our inner-self is our soul, it is the same thing as God. This is the end of life. It is only in the light of this objective, concludes J.

Chapter 2 : The ends and the means | Seth's Blog

Ends and Means. What are your goals in life, what is it that you care about? When people are asked what they value, answers will include things like happiness, freedom, fairness, friendship, biodiversity, truth, pizza, equality, medicine, loyalty, and many other things.

If it is a means, then what end is it a means to? If it is an end, what are its inherent benefits in and of itself, apart from those of any other end? They become so focused on the details of their favored system that they lose sight of them; and yet they are critical and must be answered if we are to avoid grave, even civilization-threatening mistakes. This is especially important when we consider that Whigism “ which is the root of modern democracy ” suffers from a persistent inability to distinguish between means and ends. One may see evidence of this in many of its failures. For example, its confusion over whether technology, hard work, and money represent a means or an end it all too consistently operates as if they are the latter rather than the former , has resulted in much of the aesthetic, cultural, and spiritual ugliness of Modernity. We have wrecked our families, let our children be raised by strangers or by the television set if we have any at all , destroyed femininity in all its comfort and glory, become atomized and deracinated to the point that we hardly know our neighbors, work soul-crushing jobs as cogs in gigantic corporate machines, and, worst of all, are miserable “ is this an end that anyone could desire? Why has it happened, then? Because we have gotten so lost in the pursuit of something that we have forgotten what we were pursuing in the first place. Thus, if someone wanted to convince me to support a system that they claimed was a means, they would then have to convince me that it would reliably produce the promised ends. And if they wanted to convince me to support a certain end, they would then have to convince me that this end had inherent benefits. Whoever wished to do either or both of these things would have to present evidence that squared with the reality that I observe in the world; any evidence that visibly does not match observable reality must be dismissed as false. That is because reality “ not our hopes, plans, wishes, dreams, or pet theories “ is final. Let us start by considering a test case: Is it a means, or is it an end? If it is a means, what are the ends, and do our observations of the world around us indicate that it is actually producing those ends? If it is an end, then what are its inherent benefits, and do our observations of the world around us indicate that those benefits are actually accruing? Does what we observe in reality around us square with what we were promised by those who supported increased diversity, without any appreciable amount of unintended bad consequences? My own observation of reality tells me this: I see no end to which increased diversity is acting as an effective means except for increasing the power of leftist political parties who want the guaranteed votes provided by the importation of millions of dirt-poor immigrants, and the profits of businessmen who want the cheap labor of illegal scabs. Since I do not support these ends, I must reject diversity as a means to anything beneficial. As for diversity as an end with inherent benefits, I say this: If diversity was working as advertised, with no serious bad side effects, then I would have no objection to it. But it visibly is not: In short, as they say on eBay: Now, let us apply this concept to another idea; one that is even more unquestioningly held to in the modern world: Mencius Moldbug described the situation a few years ago: For one thing, you disagree with basically everyone in your society. For another, your thoughts undermine the theory of legitimacy on which your government is founded. For a third, acknowledging your beliefs, let alone evangelizing them, is not exactly an effective way to make friends or influence people. And for a fourth, your original reason for believing in it was that when you were very small, grownups told you that it existed and was good. Americans especially are fanatically “ often hysterically “ attached to democracy, entirely for sentimental reasons. And Americans get very upset indeed if you question these beliefs. Here, for example, is a quote from usually-rational author John C. Wright, taken from a debate in which he participated: The answer already given there is that I am a member of the sovereign ruling in America, hence the same rank as a king. This is simply delusional. Here is a question for Mr. When the sovereign and here I mean the real sovereign; not some figurehead who may ceremonially hold that title makes his will known, that is the law. I know that Mr. Wright styles himself a conservative. Has the history of the past couple of centuries been a tale of conservatives like Mr. Wright getting their way on matters of

policy? But if this is the case, then why has his rule been so ineffective in yielding him the results he wants and that I, as a traditionalist, want as well? Wright, allow me to quote that most reactionary of recent films and ask: Do you feel in charge? The difference between myself and Mr. Wright is that I have not one ounce of sentimentality in me towards government – not the one I live under, or any other. This allows me a bit of realism that eludes both Mr. Wright and in fairness to him most Americans. Allow me to explain the reality of the situation: There are approximately 230 million eligible voters in the United States the rest of the population being children, felons, or nonvoting aliens. If I then attempted to use it as a justification to stop by a meeting of the Board of Directors and start instructing Tim Cook on how to build iPhones, how do you think that would go? It just happens to be one in which you are issued a single share of voting stock when you turn 18. And, unlike any other corporation, you will never have the chance to acquire any more voting shares than that. You are not the sovereign; not even a little bit. Here we return to critically important point: If everybody is a king, then nobody is the king. And who ends up in charge then? Money men, slick talkers, flatterers, liars, clever sophists skilled in manipulating the crowd, and snake-oil salesmen with a heart-tugging story to tell and a tinhorn utopia to peddle. This is all the long way of saying: Hey rube, stop being sentimental about government. Stop believing in the inherent goodness of a system that commits incessant wickedness just because when you were very small, grownups told you that it was good. Then take the big step by asking yourselves: What actually is good? Presuming you are the sort of impeccably moral sort who wants what is good and how could any of my readers be otherwise? Pretty much as they do now, or would there be a whole lot that was different? Finally – and most importantly – we reach this: Why should you not support whatever system is likely to deliver the ends you want? Why should you not prefer the good to the bad, and wish to see what is good done instead of what is bad? Is this not both more logical and more moral than a sentimental attachment to a system that consistently delivers foolishness, wickedness, and unsustainability? If this were true, we would never do anything that was a means to an end, which means that we would do virtually nothing that we ever do our lives. My earlier condemnation of the rat race of consumerist capitalism aside, I must eat, and so I have a job. Unless you are working for the sheer joy of it, then your job is a means, the ends of which is paying your bills. Do you drive a car? Unless you are doing so for recreation, then it is a means, the ends of which involve getting where you want to go. Robbing banks will pay your bills just as a job will, and hijacking an airplane will get you where you want to go, but there are specific moral reasons why these ends justify some means but not others. So yes, in fact, except for a few edge cases, the ends we pursue generally do justify the means we use to achieve them. And it is here that we circle back to the question we started with: Is our current form of government a means, or is it an end? What sense would it being an end make? How would it be rational to have a certain form of government just for the sake of having that sort of government? Other than for reasons of sentimentality, it makes none; we must dismiss this as an acceptable conclusion for rational and moral people to come to. So then, we must see it as a means. I too had been told by grownups since I was very small that democracy was good; but it was when I could not figure out any answers that squared with what the grownups had told me to these questions that I began to turn against democracy. I became unsentimental about government, and came to the conclusion that I value ends above means and product above process. And unlike Moldbug, my conversion to Christianity only strengthened and confirmed these beliefs. The Gospel of Matthew teaches us that our Savior said: Do people pick grapes from thornbushes, or figs from thistles? Likewise, every good tree bears good fruit, but a bad tree bears bad fruit. A good tree cannot bear bad fruit, and a bad tree cannot bear good fruit. Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire. So what are you going to believe: In the end, people like Mr. Wright talk themselves into the idea that democracy produces good results for the same reason that someone who bought an Edsel would try to talk himself into the belief that he bought a top-of-the-line car: This misses the point entirely. I want decent, sustainable laws, and I want them consistently and predictably. I will support whatever form of government provides that to me. Of course I do not expect absolute perfection from any system derived by man; that has nothing to do with the realities of this world.

Chapter 3 : Between GAFCON and General Convention: Means and Ends of Catholic Truth – Covenant

The second is a rule of tactics which states-Keep the pressure on, with different tactics and actions, and utilize all events of the period for your racedaydvl.com are being bombarded by different protests across the nation and they are using every issue they can think of to start a new social movement.

Which things do we value for their own sake? Ends and Means What are your goals in life, what is it that you care about? When people are asked what they value, answers will include things like happiness, freedom, fairness, friendship, biodiversity, truth, pizza, equality, medicine, loyalty, and many other things. In theory, it may be that someone values all of these directly. However, for most of the examples it seems more probable that people would only value them indirectly, as a means to some other end. A common instance of it is when we think we care about something, while in fact what we truly i. This is the difference between means and ends, or between instrumental values and terminal values. Valuing x only instrumentally means that there are logically possible situations where an increase in x is, all else being equal, not something we care about. Thought experiments In order to figure out which values are terminal and which instrumental, we can design thought experiments to isolate any potential values. If someone cared terminally about medicine, it would always be important to her that there is medicine. However, imagine a world where no one ever gets sick, would medicine be important in this world? Probably not, so medicine is merely instrumentally valuable to us in this case: A more complicated example is biodiversity. Many people seem to want there to be many different species. Why do they want this? Maybe people only value it instrumentally, because biodiversity correlates with many other things one might find valuable: Biodiversity may often serve human interests. Biodiversity is usually important for the stability of ecosystems. Biodiversity is a source of scientific knowledge. Decreasing biodiversity could mean that more animals die than otherwise. The important question is whether biodiversity is valuable all else being equal, i. In order to properly imagine such a situation, we can design a thought experiment where the indirect effects of biodiversity do not apply as they might apply in more usual, real-life circumstances: Imagine a rare rodent species that is close to extinction. The animal serves no important role in the ecosystem. If it went extinct, the ecosystem would not be perturbed in any way. Further, the animal is completely boring: Finally, the situation happens to be such that if the animal does not go extinct, the amount of suffering and the number of deaths of sentient individuals remains the same. In such a scenario, would it be bad if that particular rodent species went extinct? As a final example, consider someone who claims that pain is not bad because it serves an important function: People with CIPA , a rare genetic disorder, are incapable of experiencing physical pain. While this may sound great at first, these people unfortunately have a significantly lower than average life expectancy because they often fail to notice when they are ill or injured. Still, it would of course be silly to conclude that just because pain sometimes serves an important function, we should therefore not try to make people pain-free. In that sense, pain is always bad, even if there are situations where it comes with useful side-effects. Tradeoffs Something important to keep in mind is that having more than one terminal value implies that there will have to be tradeoffs. In a decision-situation where two of our terminal values conflict with each other i. Imagine that I value both happiness and equality. Making society more equal usually also leads to increased overall happiness because of diminishing marginal utility. But this is not always the case. What would I do in a situation where equality could be increased greatly at the cost of making a few people unhappy? If I value equality to a significant extent, then there would be circumstances where I would trade happiness for equality. When we envision that there will have to be such tradeoffs, we may become pickier with declaring things to be our terminal values. For instance, most people consider knowledge to be a good thing in itself, but would they introduce significant suffering into a world where everyone is perfectly happy and would remain so indefinitely , if it was the only way to generate more knowledge? These are the questions we need to ask ourselves when thinking about our goals and values. In real-life situations, ends and means are often hard to separate. Sometimes particular means almost always correlate with particular ends. In some such cases, if the end is hard to measure directly, it could even be useful to focus primarily on the means as a heuristic. For instance, in order to make people

happier on average” which is something we might not immediately know how to measure directly” we could simply focus on trying to make society more egalitarian, a measure that will likely correlate significantly with our actual aim. The important point to keep in mind is that we should immediately abandon this endeavor if we ever discover that the correlation does not work in a specific case! Conclusion Because of habit forming and presumably also the way our values evolved, we are sometimes tempted to mistake instrumental values for terminal values. In order to properly distinguish instrumental values from terminal values, we can design thought experiments where common, real-life correlations are broken up while all the other factors remain constant. By distinguishing instrumental values from terminal ones, we gain clarity about our own goals and will therefore be able to form better plans to achieve them.

How you do something is more important than what you achieve if you say the means are more important than the ends. If you say something was a means to an end, it means it was what was necessary to do to achieve the goal.

By Christopher Wells 1. Christian theology has always been reticent to define too much, because wisdom seeks to inculcate humility and reserve so as to protect conscience, leave room for pastoral discretion and local discernment, and avoid circumscribing God. Indeed, regarding this last, precisely no one in the whole Western Christian tradition has imagined we can understand God, much less make him over in our "male, or for that matter, female" image. Advertisement I start here in order to place the humble ecclesiological labors of Episcopalians within a continuing stream of attempts to do the right thing over time in the context of relationships with God and with one another that, we hope, endure and mature. In this way Christian life together compounds our several households "marital, familial, ecclesial see Matt. The Trinity has set sail in the visible ark that is the Church: If God still has a vocation for Anglicans the world over, bound in love as one family to hasten wider unity and reconciliation within the one Church, praise the Lord. Just this hope should be our aim; that is, we must not fail to place even the steps of a General Convention within the comprehensive, world-historical frame of the gospel. Our church "I speak as an Episcopalian" is a very small part of the movement of Christ-followers across time and space, but it may still serve as a site for the formation of evangelical and catholic disciples. When we lose our way, repentance, conversion, and re-initiation should be sought! And this is a good word for us now: Given that God has placed me here, where I can still serve with real affection for my fellows and for our broadly Anglican tradition of holy teaching and saintly sacrifice, my question concerns how we may non-idiosyncratically answer the call of Catholic truth and unity, holding the two together. We do well to consider carefully the theological coherence of these incipient arrangements. But let me first sketch what the General Convention in Austin apparently tried to do and offer my optimistic reading. Ways of Walking Start with the end to which convention committed itself in Resolution A Can these two, arguably contradictory commitments be held together by the Episcopal Church, and if so how? We shall see, of course. Just insofar as the task force is promptly organized, properly populated, and otherwise equipped to do serious work, we may hope that it can give a push down a common path, even if it proves necessary for us to walk at something of a distance from one another in the short-, middle-, and even long-term. And this takes us to the interim means to the possible path of our future common walking, namely, Resolution B Marriage Rites for the Whole Church. Here the creative key is the eighth resolve, which, in sprawling fashion, states that in dioceses where the bishop exercising ecclesiastical authority or, where applicable, ecclesiastical supervision holds a theological position that does not embrace marriage for same-sex couples, and there is a desire to use such rites by same-sex couples in a congregation or worshipping community, the bishop exercising ecclesiastical authority or ecclesiastical supervision shall invite, as necessary, another bishop of this Church to provide pastoral support to the couple, the Member of the Clergy involved and the congregation or worshipping community in order to fulfill the intention of this resolution that all couples have convenient and reasonable local congregational access to these rites. What has been established here? This resolve was supplied as an amendment on the floor of the House of Deputies by Christopher Hayes of California, and it served to draw the already-amended B closer to the substance of its original writing. Even so, some critics on the left have, in retrospect, expressed consternation at the total accomplishment of B First, per Canon III. The diocese, not the congregation, forms the basic unit of the Church. We believe that the provisions of B for supplemental episcopal pastoral care enable the local adaptation of the historic episcopate, as provided in the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, as a means toward unity within our church and with the wider Anglican Communion. We do well to recall that what became A, the Task Force on Communion across Difference, started as a part of the original B in order to aid the development of wise arrangements, mindful of property and polity, beyond the heat and blunt force of General Convention. If the proposal before us [namely, B] passes at General Convention, we pledge to work within its bounds in a spirit of collegiality and friendship with all members of our church. Where We Are We say across

difference, and by this we mostly mean, at the moment, differences about marriage, its definition and parameters. Here, long histories of abuse, oppression, occupation, and grievance foster hardened resentments. From all such injuries inflicted on one another: Good Lord, deliver us. In other words, Lord, save us from ourselves. Remove from us our warring Gentile pride, circumcise our hearts Deut. Let us assume, therefore, that all Christians are called to a common anthropological labor across difference on the way to truth and reconciliation, thence right ordering of our lives and communities under God. As our Lord and St. Augustine taught, neighbor love starts at home with the sister and the brother ready to hand; with the mugged man upon whom we happen; with the unlovely person in the adjoining pew. This is the school of the corpus mixtum – the mixed body of wheat and weeds, which is the Church see Matt. The faithful should avoid all of this, while also recognizing that egregious sin cannot be extricated from the Church, by divine design. For God himself shows forbearance toward such people, both to use this perverseness to train his own chosen ones in faith and good sense and thus strengthen them, and also because many of the number of the perverse progress beyond their present state and, out of compassion for their own souls, turn with intense passion to God so as to be pleasing to him. But this is only part of the story. And we should say something more. Baptismal unity has grasped us, which bestows a character, and commonly shared faith follows. So far, so Augustinian.

Chapter 5 : Means and Ends | WordReference Forums

What does this information mean? Prerequisites You must be a Lvl 95 Channeler. You must speak Draconic, Sathirian, Death's Whisper, Koda'Dal, and Krombal languages.

The journey was coming to an end. The end of her speech had to be cut short because of time. The happiness of the people is the end of government. What is to be the end of all this bickering? He met a horrible end. Another war would be the end of civilization. He does his end of the job very well. His stupidity is the end. Show More verb used with object to bring to an end or conclusion: We ended the discussion on a note of optimism. This was the battle that ended the war. This passage ends the novel. A bullet through the heart ended him. You just committed the blunder to end all blunders. Show More to come to an end; terminate; cease: The road ends at Rome. Extravagance ends in want. Show More final or ultimate: Show More Idioms at loose ends, without an occupation or plans; unsettled; uncertain: He spent two years wandering about the country at loose ends. The cartons were turned end for end. He backed the truck until it was end on with the loading platform. The pipes were placed end to end on the ground. She went off the deep end when she lost her job. In the end they shook hands and made up. Despite her meager income, she tried to make ends meet. Also make both ends meet. They were pleased no end by the warm reception. They talked for hours on end. End, close, conclusion, finish, outcome refer to the termination of something. End implies a natural termination or completion, or an attainment of purpose: Close often implies a planned rounding off of something in process: Conclusion suggests a decision or arrangement: All evidence leads to this conclusion; the conclusion of peace terms. Finish emphasizes completion of something begun: Outcome suggests the issue of something that was in doubt:

Chapter 6 : Means And Ends Quotes (11 quotes)

Title: Means and ends From a philosophical point of view this third assumption is the most interesting of the three I have identified. Postman's test applies only if technology is exclusively purposive, that is, entirely a matter of means to ends.

October 04, November 01, It is the first transaction-based real-time system for any public works programme in the country that is available in the public domain. There has been a digitisation of all the processes in MGNREGA – right from a worker registering demand for work, to work allotment, to finally getting wages for completed works. Another notable feature of the MIS is the availability of information through online reports at various levels of disaggregation. This has enabled any citizen to monitor the implementation of the programme and has consequently charted a new paradigm of transparency since the enactment of the Right to Information RTI Act. The sheer scale of information available on implementation is also no mean achievement. Individual worker details from around 2. While this system is certainly a great feather in the cap of a transparent democracy, it is critical to understand its current shortcomings and possible ways to improve its functioning. Shortcomings To begin with, the MIS is accessible only from 6 a. This is a huge impediment for collaborative work across time zones. Second, it does not provide any data dictionary. Such a dictionary is crucial so that any citizen accessing the online reports can understand the content in them. As things stand, unless somebody has spent a lot of time in rural areas, it is difficult to comprehend the details of many reports. Third, the nomenclature of the column names in the online reports is not consistent. The same column name is labelled differently in different reports. Payment Date is also a misnomer as it does not refer to the date on which a worker gets paid. Although obfuscation of the column names may not be intentional, it nevertheless becomes excruciating for any citizen or researcher to make meaningful sense of the reports. Fourth, some obvious worker-centric links in the data structure are missing. This number is crucial to get work. On the MIS, there is no clear link between these two crucial pieces. As such it becomes difficult to follow the trail of each job card holder from the time of work demanded to getting the wages. Passing the baton of accountability While computerisation of all transactions is a welcome move, officials are passing the baton of accountability. There are several situations when a written request for work by a worker is not entered in the MIS till funds for work allocation are made available from the Centre. This is illegal as the Act mandates provision of work within a stipulated time of requesting for it. Similarly, the generation of the FTO is withheld till funds for wage payments are released. There are other instances when the FTO is not generated if a worker fails to furnish his or her Aadhaar number. Some are harder to locate as there is no paper trail or stated intention but realised only retrospectively once the workers are affected. There are other such examples illustrating how the IT infrastructure becomes a tool prioritising administrative needs as opposed to being a programme enabler. Code, as in software, and code, as in law, can both be instruments of social control. Or we can build, or architect, or code cyberspace to allow those values to disappear. There is no middle ground. Code is never found; it is only ever made, and only ever made by us. For instance, consider the flawed mechanism of the calculation of delay compensation when wages are not paid on time. Ideally, the compensation should be calculated from the 16th day of completion of a work week till the day on which the workers actually receive their wages. The difference of the two calculation methods run into crores of rupees that rightfully belong to the workers. While the automated calculation is a progressive measure, its basis must be correct and transparent. The fact that even with the flawed calculation no compensation has been paid corroborates that technology can be a strong aid but not a replacement for accountability. The MIS is a powerful mechanism to have an evidence-based discourse for monitoring basic services. But a governance framework for the MIS needs to be put in place that lays out the minimum standards and accountability of the Ministry managing the system. The system design choices should reflect the values of the worker-centric programme and hence principles need to be followed for compassionate design. Sakina Dhorajiwala is a student of Public Policy at St. Rajendran teaches at Ashoka University, Sonapat.

Chapter 7 : Means And Ends | AntiDem

*Let us focus on ends, not means - whether those means are abstract universalist principles, particular forms of government, or old pieces of paper***. Let us say: Victory for good and defeat for evil - at any cost and by whatever means necessary - that is what we want.*

Its means and ends Subrat Mangaraj Advertisements: Education is not only imparted in schools and colleges. President Abraham Lincoln spent less than a year at a school, and yet he was the author of the great Gettysburg speech. The school of experience is the most effective school "if only we are devoted students of it. Keen observation through travelling and other means rather than books, experience rather than men, are the best educators and teachers. Hence, the most effective means of teaching is to make students learn to use their senses properly. The child must be taught to feel, to observe and to receive impression. In this way, the mind blossoms and opens out. It is ready to receive, absorb and remember. These are the first steps. A mind that is both alert and sensitive will learn easily and readily from all kinds of experiences, whether from life or from books. This is the way in which Shakespeare taught himself, to be the greatest dramatist of the world. Prophet Muhammad learned at the school of Nature and Socrates, the great Greek philosopher, knew through observation. Even Rabindranath bunked school classes but taught himself by reading books. Perhaps the second step is to teach the child its mother tongue. By that means, the mind, which has so long been receptive, will be made active. It will learn to think, to make use of that which it has received. For the great object of education is to energize the mind, - to enable the mind to form judgments, and make decision. What is assimilated by observation is expressed in words, and this is done best in the mother tongue. After this, the problem becomes simpler. Put the child into any school and he will make good progress. The teacher will guide his learning and correct his judgment and then he is to be left to his resources. He will organize his thoughts. The end of education is often mistakenly thought to be the furnishing of the mind. A wisely devised educational system aims at something more: Equally important is to train the moral sense. Feelings and passions must be regulated and kept under full control, in thought, speech and action. Gandhiji valued spiritual education most. He expected that students would learn spiritual values by observing and emulating the ways of the teacher. Not only must one think correctly and creatively; one must act rightly, as a matter of habit. This will create the correct temperament when one will act rightly and spontaneously. Along with moral and intellectual education, one must devote some time to physical education. A sound mind can only exist in a sound body. The Greeks at the centre of their educational system had the gymnasium. Education should help a man to be true to himself, to be straightforward and sincere in his dealings and opinions. Our entire system of education, which is at present overwhelmingly book based, must be changed and restructured. Rabindranath Tagore showed us the way at Santiniketan. There lies the key to the future of education in our country.

Chapter 8 : All about means and ends - Comment - The Hindu

a means to an end a thing that is not valued or important in itself but is useful in achieving an aim. End and means are compared or contrasted in several proverbial sayings, for example the end justifies the means (see end) and he who wills the end wills the means.

Chapter 9 : A Means To An End | Definition of A Means To An End by Merriam-Webster

This is a very relevant article and sparks debate and thought, which is critical to our education and preservation of open mindedness necessary to ensure we do not become static and accepting of institutionalized ideas such as the ends-ways-means construct as the end all, be all solution.