In search of the great

While the term "great" has fixed meaning, unfixed standards lead to its misleading uses and we have a bumper crop of great men and women. Is their greatness true of take? How do we detect the frauds and revere really great? This is an attempt to analyse the essence of greatness. "Greatness" is linked with art, architecture, literature, literature and science, Public Affairs, Wealth and Professions and Services.

Third and fourth areas are distinctly inferior to first and second. Location of great among the rich is the easiest because the standard is only the size of wealth. One with the largest wealth is the greatest. If the sting of scorpion lies in its tail, the weakness of wealth lies in its collection. The means of money-making are neither clear nor pure. Greater the fortune, higher are the suspicions. Hence, even the wealth is from when they are valued by volume of wealth. There cannot be great among the rich and rich among great.

The bureaucrats and professionals are mediocre pure and simple. Their claim for greatness is, therefore, the most ridiculous. Both show what Coerliger called "shopboy cleverness". A bureaucrat may flatter himself as secretary or secretary-general. He is basically a "glorified clerk." Lenin correctly judged the administration when he asserted that even a cook can administer the state. However, Lenin was unfair to the cooks. Anytime, a culinary artist is far superior to an administrator. When King George VI tried to snatch their cook, the Rothschilds retained him by giving salary higher comtimeous to the scalled steel-frame of the British Raj. Nehru dismissed the ICS as the pageboys of the British viceroy and as Prime Minister created a variety of pageboys who are literally the doorkeepers of the rulers in Swaraj.

Nehru dismissed the ICS as the "boys of the British viceroys and Prime Minister created a variety of offices to which persons nominated and elected. Only serviles and sycophants are nominated. Gandhi highlighted this established fact whilst exposing the hand picked Indian nominees of the British at the Second Round Table Conference in London. What was true then is true today of all nominated offices in Swaraj. Crows sitting on the top of temples do not become eagles. Easier, by definition, are anti-great. Those who claim the world of fair elections but fairness means a prudent mixture of force, fraud, manipulations, money and muscle.

These leaders also claim "sacrificing" their lives and talents for "serving" the people and at the same time they hold. Indian Constitution creates many offices to which persons nominated and elected. Only serviles and sycophants are nominated. Gandhi highlighted this established fact whilst exposing the hand picked Indian nominees of the British at the Second Round Table Conference in London. What was true then is true today of all nominated offices in Swaraj. Crows sitting on the top of temples do not become eagles. Easier, by definition, are anti-great. Those who claim the world of fair elections but fairness means a prudent mixture of force, fraud, manipulations, money and muscle.

True, authors and poets are not born but made. It is a blunder to believe that they are not born but created. It is a blunder to believe that they are made by the Sahitya Academies and Business Foundations. The difference between masterpiece and common-place is the difference between Ganges and gutters. The state can patronise commonplace; it cannot make Ganges out of gutters. Patronage of state is bad. That of the philanthropists is worse. All admit that philanthropy is an outlet for tainted money and once again the Noble prizes are an excellent example. Prize money comes from the Noble industries. How the Noble industries make their money has been shown by their main subsidiary the Bofors.

In literature, usual standard to determine greatness is the prizes won. Great literary works can never be known by the prizes. Prizes are awarded by the state and the philanthropists. It has been well said that he who pays the piper calls the tune. He who gives the prize fixes its parameters. The selection by committee is a game where canvassing, connections, intrigues and manipulations decide the prize. Nobel prizes, the most prestigious prizes of the world, prove the point. A great literary work is always known by its intrinsic merit and nothing else as could be seen from the works of Kalidas and Shakespeare. Great works are evergreen and are like angels short and bright.

Every civilization stands or falls by its cultural achievements. Art, architecture, literature and science are vital components of culture. The standards deciding their quality should be rigorous to guarantee the great of the highest order. In our times, the pretenders to the throne of activity use methodically subtle techniques but they do not survive for long. The great in arts, architecture and science are discernible by their inherent elegance, originality, superiority and splendor. It is possible to distinguish between peacocks, jackdaws and jackdaws in peacock's feathers. Not so in literature.

In literature, usual standard to determine greatness is the prizes won. Great literary works can never be known by the prizes. Prizes are awarded by the state and the philanthropists. It has been well said that he who pays the piper calls the tune. He who gives the prize fixes its parameters. The selection by committee is a game where canvassing, connections, intrigues and manipulations decide the prize. Nobel prizes, the most prestigious prizes of the world, prove the point. A great literary work is always known by its intrinsic merit and nothing else as could be seen from the works of Kalidas and Shakespeare. Great works are evergreen and are like angels short and bright.

True, authors and poets are not born but made. It is a blunder to believe that they are not born but made. It is a blunder to believe that they are made by the Sahitya Academies and Business Foundations. The difference between masterpiece and common-place is the difference between Ganges and gutters. The state can patronise commonplace; it cannot make Ganges out of gutters. Patronage of state is bad. That of the philanthropists is worse. All admit that philanthropy is an outlet for tainted money and once again the Noble prizes are an excellent example. Prize money comes from the Noble industries. How the Noble industries make their money has been shown by their main subsidiary the Bofors.

The readers may disagree with this analysis. They would surely agree that there must be definite criteria and standards to know greatness if the world is not to be flooded with the "great" that are "dirt-cheap."