

HARIJAN

Editor: MAHADEV DESAI

VOL. IX, No. 13]

AHMEDABAD — SUNDAY, APRIL 12, 1942

[FIVE PICE

SCORCHED EARTH

(By M. K. Gandhi)

Thus writes a correspondent on my article 'Scorched Earth' in *Harijan* :

"In your article headed 'Scorched Earth' appearing in *Harijan* of the 22nd March you say as follows :

'As a war resister my answer can only be one. I see neither bravery nor sacrifice in destroying life or property for offence or defence. I would far rather leave, if I must, my crops and homestead for the enemy to use than destroy them for the sake of preventing their use by him. There is reason, sacrifice and even bravery in so leaving my homestead and crops, if I do so not out of fear but because I refuse to regard anyone as my enemy — that is, out of a humanitarian motive.'

Firstly, although I do not approve of the violence which characterized Russia's resistance, I am of the view that there is great bravery and sacrifice in the scorched earth policy which they are adopting to resist the invader. I cannot, therefore, understand your saying that there is neither bravery nor sacrifice in destroying property for defence. Secondly, although you ask people to resist the invader, you would prefer them to leave their crops and homestead for the invader to use, not out of fear but out of a humanitarian motive. I cannot understand how this can be reconciled with your teaching of resistance to evil. I think that non-violent resistance to the invader demands it of me that I should prevent anything which will be of use to him, such as crops or homestead etc., from falling into his hands even if this means sacrificing my life. May I request you to clarify this subject because it is of vital importance that people should know how they should offer non-violent resistance to the invader?"

Surely the meaning is plain. There is no bravery in my poisoning my well or filling it in so that my brother who is at war with me may not use the water. Let us assume that I am fighting him in the orthodox manner. Nor is there sacrifice in it, for it does not purify me, and sacrifice, as its root meaning implies, presupposes purity. Such destruction may be likened to cutting one's nose to spite one's face. Warriors of old had wholesome laws of war. Among the excluded things were poisoning wells and destroying food crops. But I do claim that there are bravery and sacrifice in my leaving my wells, crops and homestead intact, bravery in that I deliberately run the risk of the enemy feeding himself at my expense and pursuing me, and sacrifice in that the sentiment of leaving something for the enemy purifies and ennoble me.

My questioner has missed the conditional expression "if I must". I have imagined a state

of things in which I am not prepared just now to die and therefore I want to retreat in an orderly manner in the hope of resisting under other and better auspices. The thing to consider here is not resistance but non-destruction of food crops and the like. Resistance, violent or non-violent, has to be well thought out. Thoughtless resistance will be regarded as bravado in military parlance, and violence or folly in the language of non-violence. Retreat itself is often a plan of resistance and may be a precursor of great bravery and sacrifice. Every retreat is not cowardice which implies fear to die. Of course a brave man would more often die in violently or non-violently resisting the aggressor in the latter's attempt to oust him from his property, but he will be no less brave if wisdom dictates present retreat.

Sevagram, 7-4-42

HOW TO BE WORTHY OF OUR HERITAGE

While the still-born proposals that Sir Stafford Cripps has brought are meeting the fate they deserved, a lot of speculation is going on as to whether the British Cabinet cannot yet be made to see the error of their ways and persuaded to revise the proposals and entrust the defence of India to us. Whether this can be done one does not know. But assuming that it can be done, it is worth while considering whether we can withstand an invasion violently. I have very grave doubts, and I shall endeavour to state some of the obvious reasons.

General Molesworth, Deputy Chief of the General Staff in India, in the course of an address at the Rotary Club, made what I should think was a grave admission for a General to make. Here are his words :

"Everybody in India is asking what are we going to do to keep the Japanese out. From the point of view of the Army in this enormous battle front we shall hold vital places which it is necessary to hold in order to make India safe, but *we cannot hold everyone.*

Therefore, what is to be done for the rest of India *where we are unable to put troops or air or naval forces?* That question is not entirely impossible of solution. The next few months will put us down in history either as *worthy or unworthy of our heritage.* This is the time at which we have got to put everything aside, political, communal, racial and social squabbles, and if we really feel India is worthy of having, we have got to see that we defend it. *We cannot arm all.* On the other hand we can do a great deal to educate the masses to give the Japanese a great deal of trouble.

This must be done by the civil people like you. *The army cannot do it. The people can work in bands and give trouble and delay and destroy invasion.* It may be there is no proper lead from the top and no proper leadership down below. Still I feel the Japanese invasion can be beaten, if we *educate the people on the lines of 'They shall not pass'*. Psychologically it can only be done by the intelligentsia, working definitely shoulder to shoulder to work up the peasant."

I would invite the reader to read carefully the words I have italicised. The General makes the candid admission that it is not possible for the Army to hold every one of the "vital places", and that there are vital places—how many he naturally did not like to say—where "we are unable to put troops, or air or naval forces." It might have been better if he had also told us what exactly is India's strength on the land, on the sea and on the air—after what India has sent to Lybia, Malaya, Singapore and Burma. And even though he has not acquainted us with these facts, it is not difficult to see that we are ill prepared to resist militarily a foreign invasion.

"But," it may be said, "if we are given full control, there is yet time, we can still get ready, and be yet worthy of what is really our heritage and not General Molesworth's heritage." It may not be forgotten that after all is said and done General Molesworth's heritage is not here but elsewhere. Britain is his heritage, and all the resources of Britain are being concentrated for the protection of Britain against a foreign invasion. In the face of that natural fact, can we pretend that we can militarily get ready, to face an invasion? Let us see.

Andre Maurois, the famous French writer, who served as a liaison officer attached to the British Army in 1914-18, and who served in a similar capacity with the British Army in France before the collapse of France during the present war, has recently published a book *Why France Fell* which throws a flood of light on the whole question. Before the war the French Army, it will be remembered, was regarded as invincible. Mr. Hore-Belisha, the British War Minister, was invited to France for the review of July 14th in 1939. He went there with Mr. Winston Churchill.

"It was a splendid occasion," writes Maurois, "Paris' last happy day. Never had the French army been more magnificent . . . Churchill beamed. 'Thank God for the French Army,' he said. We did not know at that time that the courage of men, their military virtues, and the traditions of even the finest regiments were *powerless when the mechanical equipment is not worthy of the Army.* . . . The procession of tanks reassured the onlookers in the Champs Elysees and filled them with enthusiasm, but the latter were uninformed of the situation in Germany; they did not know that the Germans possessed many more tanks, more heavily armoured and invulnerable to our anti-tank guns."

"In the afternoon," Maurois goes on to say, "Mr. Hore-Belisha came to see us at Neuilly with a colonel who was his aide-de-camp. He talked of the difficulties he was encountering in building up a British Army:

'Conscription,' he said, 'is all well and good, but for the moment it is more a formula than a reality. I cannot call up all the men who have registered, because I have neither equipment to give them nor officers to train them.'

'What about the officers of the last War?' I asked.

'They do not understand the new weapons.'

'And if war were to break out tomorrow, how many divisions could you send us?'

'Right away? Not more than six.'

That figure frightened me. I was even more terrified when I learned a few weeks later that our General Staff had asked from England for the whole duration of a European war only thirtytwo divisions."

I cannot summarise here the whole of Maurois' revealing document. There were numerous causes why France fell. Among them may be numbered (1) The stupidity of the French ways of industrial mobilisation; (2) The woeful paucity of machine-tools; (3) Failure of morale—"at a time of great peril Frenchmen and Englishmen were living routine lives governed by the petty rules of a military bureaucracy"; (4) Superannuated and scarce tanks in Britain; (5) Lack of enthusiasm created by the numerous political divisions and factions and squabbles in France, and too much optimism in England; (6) The intrigues of the three thousand persons in Paris, who, as Byron said, 'because they go to bed late believe they are the leaders of the world', "which placed the nation in great jeopardy"; (7) Successful German propaganda setting England against France and France against England.

But Maurois returns again and again to the charge and says that the principal cause was the military unreadiness and inferiority of France and even Britain.

"The war was lost, so far as France was concerned, at the very moment it was begun. It was lost because we did not have enough aeroplanes, or enough tanks, or enough anti-air-craft guns, and because we did not have enough factories to build what we lacked. It was lost because our Ally had only a tiny army and did not possess the means of expansion which could have permitted her to take quick advantage of her immense reserves of men and riches."

Again he says:

"A great civilisation was foredoomed because 5,000 tanks and 10,000 aeroplanes which we could have built or bought without trouble were not constructed in time."

Describing how the men in the army were unaccustomed to modern warfare Maurois says:

"I remember asking one of our Generals why he did not accustom his men to the sight of flame-throwing tanks and dive bombers. 'If their first experience of this method of attack takes place on the field of battle, they will be terrified.' 'You are perfectly right,' he replied. 'I asked about it on several occasions. But I received the answer that tank manoeuvres would ruin the crops and that the civil authorities were opposed to it.'"

This last extract reminds me of an article by Edgar Snow I read last year, in which he describes how China tried to train women for military service and what disasters occurred during the first months.

Many of the trained women screamed and fainted and fled, and casualties were heaviest without there being any casualty on the enemy's side.

I would like to find out whether with all our man power we can be militarily ready, even within ten years, to fight Germany and Japan; whether we can have the necessary training; whether millions of our men—if we could put them in the field—would not be mown down like hay. Let us also remember that we shall have to depend entirely for training on the British officers; let us also remember Mr. Hore-Belisha's admission to Maurois (already quoted) that "they do not understand the new weapons"; let us remember too that we shall have to depend for most of the infernal weapons of warfare on America, and General Molesworth's admission that "the whole difficulty is that the production in U. S. A. has not come up to expectation. They are always ten months behind whatever they may say. Let us remember too that, even if America was capable of producing much that we required, America like Britain has to look to her own protection. Britain, which was regarded as immune until a little while ago, is daily thinking in terms of an invasion, and America is no better case." Louis Fischer, in his book of memoirs, *Men and Politics*, says, referring to an interview he had with M. Reynand just before the outbreak of the war: "Reynand thought America would be in grave danger if Germany won the war. 'In 1914,' he recalled, 'we never dreamed of the arms that we were using in 1918. This war will see the birth of new weapons and the perfection of old ones which will bring the United States within easier range of European armed forces.'"

One last extract from Maurois bearing on the point I am trying to make. Talking of England before the outbreak of war, he says: "England had turned a deaf ear to all talks of armaments and fighting. Her professors taught the youth of the country that war was a survival of barbarism and could easily be eliminated. They did not tell their pupils that, unless force is used to sustain justice, injustice will triumph." Well, we do not know how much, if any, was the effect of the British professors' pacific teaching on the mind of the British youths. But if it really had the effect of undermining their mental and physical readiness for resisting a foreign invasion, how colossal unreadiness must be for that sort of resistance, when we have regard to our forcible emasculation since 1857!

One last consideration. A thing which is entirely forgotten by our military enthusiasts, if I may so call them, is that we who talk so loudly of a free and independent India shall have to be dependent on England and America, if we can dream of ever possessing the military equipment necessary to face a foreign invasion in the orthodox way. They refuse to calculate or even to contemplate the consequences of that dependence.

I am, however, thinking only of the human chances of our readiness, assuming that everything

else was favourable. I think I have shown that they are none. President Roosevelt, in his proclamation declaring April 6 as the Army Day, called the day a total war day and reminded the Americans that "our army is a mighty arm of free liberty. It is the living part of the American peoples, a tradition that goes back to Israel Putnam, who left his plough in a New England furrow to take up a gun and fight at Bunker Hill." Can we get our kisans to leave their ploughs and march to the front with guns? Even if we can, General Molesworth has frankly said, "We cannot arm all."

What then is the alternative? Louis Fischer, in the book I have already quoted from, also analyses the causes of the fall of France in pretty nearly the same way as Maurois. While Germany was concentrating on giant tanks and giant bombers, France was watching supinely. "Cot shouted, 'More planes.' Colonel Charles de Galle cried, 'Produce tanks.' The appealers, the defeatists, the defensivists replied, 'We have the Maginot line.'..... But it is not merely a matter of counting planes, guns and soldiers. Munich demoralised France and made it more defeatist. That applied to some extent to England too. The small countries of Europe had less confidence in the stamina and courage of the big Western powers. *Spirit can often be weighed against planes.*" There is no defeatism here, there need be none. But defeat—irretrievable defeat—stares us in the face, if we choose the wrong weapons. It is the spirit that we have to weigh against the planes. And that spirit, thanks to the practical teaching and experience of twenty years, we have in a fair measure. Even General Molesworth, who knows that he cannot arm our peasants, knows that they can be educated on the lines of 'They shall not pass', in other words, non-cooperation. That is in our bones. A few years' suffering, no matter how meagre, has trained us somewhat in the art. That can be cultivated without any foreign experts and foreign equipment. It does not require long time either. All that is needed is the spirit, the will to resist, the will to shake off our lethargy, cowardice, inertia, the will not 'to live routine lives'. The other thing is no better than a will-o'-the-wisp. Spirit pitted against tanks and planes can alone make us worthy of our heritage, which is essentially a spiritual one.

Whether the nation as a whole is prepared to offer non-violent resistance is another matter. As Gandhiji said to an Australian war correspondent, "That the nation is not behind me does not worry me. There is no cause to be impatient. What right have I to be impatient when I know that I cannot carry even my closest associates, the members of the Working Committee, with me? It is my fault. It means that I have not yet the necessary amount of non-violence to take everyone with me." The beauty of the non-violent method is that even individuals can make their contribution. Everyone must give expression, as best he can, of the witness he bears to the faith within.

New Delhi, 3-4-42

M. D.

HARIJAN

Apr. 12

1942

NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

(By M. K. Gandhi)

Japan is knocking at our gates. What are we to do in a non-violent way? If we were a free country, things could be done non-violently to prevent the Japanese from entering the country. As it is, non-violent resistance could commence the moment they effected a landing. Thus non-violent resisters would refuse them any help, even water. For it is no part of their duty to help anyone to steal their country. But if a Japanese had missed his way and was dying of thirst and sought help as a human being, a non-violent resister, who may not regard anyone as his enemy, would give water to the thirsty one. Suppose the Japanese compel resisters to give them water, the resisters must die in the act of resistance. It is conceivable that they will exterminate all resisters. The underlying belief in such non-violent resistance is that the aggressor will, in time, be mentally and even physically tired of killing non-violent resisters. He will begin to search what this new (for him) force is which refuses co-operation without seeking to hurt, and will probably desist from further slaughter. But the resisters may find that the Japanese are utterly heartless and that they do not care how many they kill. The non-violent resisters will have won the day inasmuch as they will have preferred extermination to submission.

But things will not happen quite so simply as I have put them. There are at least four parties in the country. First the British and the army they have brought into being. The Japanese declare that they have no designs upon India. Their quarrel is only with the British. In this they are assisted by some Indians who are in Japan. It is difficult to guess how many, but there must be a fairly large number who believe in the declaration of the Japanese and think that they will deliver the country from the British yoke and retire. Even if the worst happens, their fatigue of the British yoke is so great that they would even welcome the Japanese yoke for a change. This is the second party. The third are the neutrals, who though not non-violent will help neither the British nor the Japanese.

The fourth and last are non-violent resisters. If they are only a few, their resistance will be ineffective except as an example for the future. Such resisters will calmly die wherever they are but will not bend the knee before the aggressor. They will not be deceived by promises. They do not seek deliverance from the British yoke through the help of a third party. They believe implicitly in their own way of fighting and no other. Their fight is on behalf of the dumb millions who do not perhaps know that there is such a thing as deliverance. They have neither hatred for the British nor love

for the Japanese. They wish well to both as to all others. They would like both to do what is right. They believe that non-violence alone will lead men to do right under all circumstances. Therefore, if for want of enough companions non-violent resisters cannot reach the goal, they will not give up their way but pursue it to death.

The task before the votaries of non-violence is very difficult. But no difficulty can baffle men who have faith in their mission.

This is going to be a long drawn out agony. Let non-violent resisters not make impossible attempts. Their powers are limited. A resister in Kerala is not physically responsible for the defence of Assam which is just now in imminent danger. If Assam is non-violently inclined, it is well able to take care of itself. If it is not, no party of non-violent resisters from Kerala can help it or any other province. Kerala can help Assam etc. by demonstrating its non-violence in Kerala itself. The Japanese army, if it gets a foothold in India, will not stop at Assam. In order to defeat the British, it has to overrun the whole country. The British will fight every inch of the ground. Loss of India will probably be admission of complete defeat for them. But whether it is so or not, it is quite clear that Japan will not rest till India is wholly in her hands. Hence non-violent resisters must remain at their posts wherever they are.

One thing has to be made clear. Where the British army is actually engaging the 'enemy', it would be perhaps improper for direct resistance to function. It will not be non-violent resistance when it is mixed with, or allies itself to, violence.

Let me therefore reiterate what I have said so often. The best preparation for, and even the expression of, non-violence lies in the determined pursuit of the constructive programme. Anyone who believes that without the backing of the constructive programme he will show non-violent strength when the testing time comes will fail miserably. It will be, like the attempt of a starving unarmed man to match his physical strength against a fully fed and panoplied soldier, foredoomed to failure. He who has no belief in the constructive programme has, in my opinion, no concrete feeling for the starved millions. He who is devoid of that feeling cannot fight non-violently. In actual practice the expansion of my non-violence has kept exact pace with that of my identification with starved humanity. I am still far from the non-violence of my conception, for am I not still far away from the identification of my conception with dumb humanity?

On the train to Wardha, 5-4-42

Constructive Programme

Its Meaning and Place

By Gandhiji. Price As. 4. Postage 1 Anna extra.

Constructive Programme

Some Suggestions

By Rajendra Prasad. Price As. 4. Postage 1 Anna.

Can be had at Navajivan Office, Post Box 105, Ahmedabad, and at 130 Princess St., Bombay.

GOVERNMENT CONTROL OR PUBLIC CONTROL ?

[A friend having great experience sends the following note.]

While the shortage of foodstuffs is partly due to the deficit in the total supply caused by the stoppage of rice imports from Burma and wheat imports from Australia, coupled with exports of wheat from India, the position has been greatly aggravated by the inefficient handling of the entire situation by the authorities in this country. Unless suitable measures are taken to rectify the defects of the present administrative control, the growing scarcity of foodstuffs in the country as a whole may lead to consequences, the implications of which may be very grave and widespread.

It is common knowledge that India is normally self-sufficient in respect of the total food requirements of her people. Virtual cessation of rice imports from Burma, which on an average amounted to nearly 14 lakhs of tons during the last three years, and of the small quantity of wheat imported from Australia, would no doubt cause a considerable deficit in the total available supply of rice and wheat for internal consumption. But it should be remembered that, against the imports of 14 lakhs of tons of rice from Burma, India's total production of rice was as much as 24 million tons in 1938-39 and 25 million tons in 1939-40. We may add to this the production of other food grains which amounts to nearly 23 million tons. The deficit caused by the cessation of imports thus hardly amounts to nearly 3 per cent of the total supply. Apart from the gap caused by the cessation of imports, the mishandling of the situation by the Government of India is, in the main, at the root of the serious position in respect of foodstuffs, which has developed in the market in recent months.

The attempt of the Government to control prices of foodstuffs has proved a complete failure. It is common experience that, far from benefiting the consumer, the recent control of the price of wheat at a maximum of Rs. 4/6 per maund created a regular wheat famine in a number of marketing centres inasmuch as it led to a psychology of panic and hoarding for private consumption. The result has been that wheat is not obtainable at any price in the market. The whole procedure of price control followed by the Government was wrongly conceived and inefficiently executed. They had no machinery for administering distribution of supplies, while whatever private machinery there was, was destroyed by the Government action. If the Government wanted to control the price of wheat, the proper course was to create efficient machinery for purchasing of supplies and distributing the same at cost price. This meant a vast and efficient machinery. That was not set up. The Government announced a maximum price for wheat one morning and then set about the task of searching for supplies. Such amateurish attempt of the Government to control prices without due regard to the machinery of distribution and the cost of replacement, coupled with the terrorising of the middleman in many places,

the restrictions about the method of accounts in provinces like U. P., and the restrictions on the free movement of grain from one place to another, even from one district to another, seriously dislocated the normal channels of trade and led to public panic with the consequent hoarding for private consumption.

The authorities would, therefore, be well advised in abandoning the control over prices, distribution and free movement of food grains. The prices of certain foodstuffs, such as wheat, would tend to rise sharply upon the abandonment of control. But so long as the mass of consumers is not able to get adequate quantities of foodstuffs at the so-called controlled rates, the present policy can only cause artificial scarcity of food grains to the consumer. In most cases the control of prices as instituted by the Government led to a strange result in that all stocks in the market disappeared and the consumer was not able to get the controlled commodities at any price. The conclusion is, therefore, irresistible that the absence of control will be far more in the interests of the consumer than inefficient and incomplete control.

If there is no control, the public have a special responsibility. They must not get panicky and hoard foodstuffs which are out of all proportion to their normal requirements.

Traders and merchants should realise their duty by the country in these grave and difficult times by giving up all attempts at profiteering. Any policy of hoarding would be a serious danger to their own interests while causing great distress to the nation.

The mercantile community can do what the Government have failed to do.

Notes

Curious Non-violence

A friend sends the following extract from A. Vamberg's translation of *Travels and Adventures* by Sidi Ali Reis (16th Century) :

"Amongst the learned of this land of Banians (Gujarat), there is a tribe which they call the Bats (Bhats), whose business it is to escort merchants or travellers from one land into another, and, for a very small remuneration, they guarantee their perfect safety. Should the Rajputs, i.e. the mounted troops of the land, attack the caravan, the Bats (Bhats) point their daggers at their own breast, and threaten to kill themselves, if they should presume to do the slightest harm to the travellers entrusted to their care. And out of respect for the Bats (Bhats), the Rajputs generally desist from their evil purpose, and the travellers proceed on their way unmolested. Occasionally, however, the Bats (Bhats) carry out their threat, otherwise it would have no force. But if such a thing does happen, if a caravan is attacked and the suicide of the Bats (Bhats) becomes necessary, this is considered a terrible calamity, and the superstition of the people demands that the offenders be put to death, and not only the offenders themselves but the chief of the Rajputs deems it necessary to kill their sons and daughters also, in fact to exterminate the whole of their race. The Mohammedans of Ahmedabad had given us two such

Bats (Bhats) as an escort, and so, about the middle of Safar of the said year, we started on our overland journey to Turkey."

On the train to Wardha, 5-4-42 M. K. G.

A Correction

The Secretary to Government C. P., Education Department, writes:

"With reference to the allegation that 'the closing down of the Basic Normal Schools at Wardha and Seoni is, it is understood, being seriously contemplated by the Government of the Central Provinces,' published under the paragraph 'Sad contrast' in the issue of *Harijan* dated the 15th March 1942, I am directed to state that there is no proposal to close down the Basic Normal Schools at Wardha and Seoni. Adequate budget provision for 1942-43 has already been made on account of the two Basic Normal Schools. The allegation referred to above has, therefore, no basis whatsoever."

The statement that the closing down of the schools in question was contemplated was based on authority which there was no reason to question. But I am thankful for the assurance that the Government do not propose to close down the Basic Normal Schools at Wardha and Seoni.

New Delhi, 4-4-42

M. D.

The Merits of Amla

Vitamin C or ascorbic acid, the vitamin which prevents scurvy, is found in fresh fruits and vegetables. Among vegetables, the green leafy varieties are the best sources. When pulses and cereal grains are allowed to sprout this vitamin C is formed in the grain and in the growing green sprouts. *Amla* (Indian gooseberry) grows abundantly in all Indian forests and is obtainable in almost unlimited quantities from January to April. The fresh juice contains nearly twenty times as much vitamin C as orange juice, and a single fruit is equivalent in vitamin C content to one or two oranges. It is possible to preserve *Amla* without losing much of the vitamin, for unlike other fresh fruits or vegetables it contains substances which practically protect the vitamin from destruction on heating and drying. *Amla* is included as an ingredient in many Ayurvedic medicines and tonics. It was found to be a most effective cure for scurvy in 1940 in the Hissar famine area. The above useful information is gleaned from *The Indian Medical Gazette* of March 1942.

Improved Diets

"One of the tasks of those who are striving to improve diet in India is to educate the educated," writes Dr. Aykroyd in *Health Bulletin* No. 23. He bemoans the fact that it is not only the poor, whose choice is extremely limited, who are ignorant and prejudiced, but also those who can afford an excellent diet who do not feed properly, with the result that their children suffer from malnutrition and food-deficiency diseases. Even for people with limited incomes effective improvement can be made with little increase in cost. He says it is desirable that children should consume upwards of 8 oz. of milk a day, but, if funds do not admit, then buttermilk or skimmed milk may be supplied, for "even a little milk is better than none. Careful experi-

ments have shown that the giving of 8 oz. of skimmed milk daily to children fed on an average 'ill-balanced' Indian diet results in an acceleration of growth and a great improvement in health and well-being." Calcium is found abundantly in milk, and children need relatively more calcium and other minerals than adults, just as they need relatively more protein. Rice being very deficient in calcium, its insufficiency is one of the most important defects of the rice-eater's diet. The milled rice eater, therefore, needs more 'protective' foods—milk, green vegetables, fruits, etc. than the consumer of whole wheat or *ragi*. "Parboiled rice, even when milled, is superior in nutritive value (particularly as regards the anti-beri-beri vitamin) to raw rice milled to the same degree." Since diets among the general population are low in fat, Dr. Aykroyd suggests that "addition of extra vegetable oil (at the expense of a quantity of cereal supplying an equivalent number of calories) does not greatly increase expenditure. Pure ghee or butter is, of course, preferable to vegetable fat, but very much dearer." Fruits, he avers, must always be included in children's diets. Tomatoes, oranges and other juicy fruits are richer in vitamins than bananas.

Sevagram, 5-4-42

A. K.

Non-slaughter Leather

At the last meeting of the Board of Management of the A. I. V. I. A. it was decided to give our support to the sale of goods made from leather tanned from the hides of cows, bullocks and buffaloes which have died a natural death. The reason that weighed with the Board was neither ethical nor religious, but purely economic. In most other countries cattle are reared for milk and meat. Milch cows are kept well, and when they cease to yield milk or bear calves they are sent to the slaughter house. Apart from the stud bulls the others are fattened for the table. Therefore rarely do any of them die a natural death. In India the case is almost the reverse. Excepting in large towns and cities, cattle are not slaughtered. A majority of them die in villages. Machine or factory tanning, which requires a large and steady supply of hides, is not possible in the villages, as only a few hides at a time are available in rural areas, and that not regularly. However, in addition to slaughterhouse hides, large numbers of hides from cattle dying a natural death also are collected, salted, and sent to tanneries near towns. Comparatively this type of town-tanned leather is only a small proportion of the whole. Leather of slaughtered animals is usually in good condition and without blemishes from improper handling. Further, town-tanned leather on cottage basis is of good quality and capable of standing on its own merits with machine- and factory-tanned leather. So tanneries in towns do not stand in such dire need of help from our Association as the tanneries in remote villages. Hence our choice lay between leather that was machine-tanned, or cottage-tanned in towns, or cottage-tanned in villages, of which the last group was the largest and the most in need of improvement. The first two were concerned with hides of slaughtered

animals mostly, while the last was exclusively with hides of naturally dead cattle. Therefore the Association decided to limit its patronage to leather from hides of non-slaughtered cattle. We hope, therefore, that not only those who have scruples on religious grounds against the use of leather from slaughtered animals but also the larger public which, even if indifferent to the question of leather from slaughtered or non-slaughtered animals, still have at heart the welfare of the indigent chamar in the villages, will restrict their patronage to the leather of non-slaughtered animals on economic grounds.

J. C. K.

Hand-weaving in New Mexico, U. S. A.

Textile World, a New York monthly, for December 1941, contains a short article by Fremont Kutnewsky on the revival of hand-weaving in New Mexico (one of the Southern States of the U. S. A.) of which Santa Fe is the capital. Hand-weaving "was an old art in 1540" when the first seeds of European civilisation were sown in the American South-West. The "Red" Indians who lived there at the time "were weaving cotton garments for which they had grown the cotton and woven the fabrics." "Spanish settlers brought sheep, and taught the Indians to card and spin the wool. The art continued to develop in a homely way for 300 years, till Yankee traders brought in cheaper yarns and dyes, and the industry of hand-weaving in New Mexico became an adjunct of the curio shop." A few remnants of it survived in the shape, for instance, of the "heavy, well-woven rugs" woven by Navajos in their village homes.

The years following the last World War saw a revival of the craft, when "a group of artists and writers decided to stimulate the native arts, and Preston McCrossen and his wife arrived on the scene and gave the first big push to hand-woven production" by taking up weaving themselves in a village. Hand-weaving seems to have some decided advantages in this territory. "It requires," says the writer, "no costly machinery. A large number of the looms in use today were made by hand. The labour supply is unlimited. . . . McCrossen Hand-Woven Textiles Inc., of Santa Fe, have become the largest producers of hand-woven fabrics in New Mexico. They are now taking the lead in finding new world markets for tweeds and other fabrics." But they have evidently realised that no revival of the textile handicraft could be complete, stable and self-reliant without the spinning wheel. So they and several other operators are beginning to use hand-spun, vegetable-dyed yarns, from New Mexico wool." This is happening in a part of the United States of America, the most mechanised country in the world.

This is but one of the many instances which show how organised attempts are being made in many parts of the world to foster handicraft as an alternative method of production, in some ways even superior to the machine method. It possesses a vitality that has enabled it to withstand the onslaughts of machinery and survive to an extent which is astonishing.

Ahmedabad, 23-2-42

C. S.

NATIONAL WEALTH

(By J. C. Kumarappa)

An American Mission is coming to India to organise industries to help the war effort of the Allies. Up to now our raw materials have been taken away from the country and production of manufactured goods had given employment to nationals of countries other than our own. The difficulties of transport, shortage of shipping accommodation and the urgency for the materials in the Middle East has made the warring nations turn to India for production. The avowed purpose of this Mission is not the creation of wealth for India, but the seeking of better and quicker ways of destroying the opponent. Destruction cannot be the end of true wealth, nor can destruction create wealth.

At every turn we hear the word 'wealth', but few of us understand its full significance. We talk of 'wealth production', 'distribution of wealth', 'national wealth' and so on. What does wealth consist of? It is commonly used to signify the possession of materials in plenty. The root meaning signifies welfare, which implies the wholesome reaction of material things to human well-being. The man who possesses merely gold is not wealthy unless he can make it serve his needs. What good is the yellow metal in the pockets of a man who is sinking in water? It will only make him sink the faster. Therefore, before we can declare anything to be 'wealth', we have to see how it affects the welfare of human beings. Do we produce wealth when we merely add to the number of chairs we possess when there are no human beings to sit on them?

When a country abounds in iron ore can we say that that country is wealthy? If not, how can we convert that iron ore into wealth? Iron ore can be regarded as wealth only from its relationship to human welfare. If such iron ore afforded opportunities to the people to supply their wants, then such opportunities are wealth. We cannot convert that iron ore into wealth by selling the material any more than a young man can produce wealth by selling his ancestral property. He may convert that inherited property into cash and run through it by wasteful living. But that is not wealth production. Our country is much in the position of such a prodigal when it exports its raw materials which represent rich potentialities of being converted into human well-being if such raw materials were worked on and made into consumption goods by the people of the land where such materials are found. Working up the raw materials of India is the birthright of the Indian people. Therefore, exporting of such raw materials to other lands to be converted into consumption goods is to impoverish our own land. It is for this reason that we have been advocating the converting of raw materials into finished goods by the people of the locality as far as possible.

Production of goods of any kind in itself is not wealth creation. Manufacture of a lancet for a surgeon or fruit knife may be wealth as these are calculated to increase the welfare of human beings.

Shall we call a burglar's jimmy or an aerial torpedo, which are intended to injure or destroy others, wealth? Leading economists of the West have stated, "Burglars' jimmies are wealth by the very fact of the marketable services that they afford, their proceeds." Is this going to be our criterion? Is the bearing of children for the purpose of replenishing the army true motherhood?

Industries must provide for supply of the needs of people, distribute wealth in the process, and contribute towards the happiness and well-being of mankind, if they are to be real contributors to the national wealth of the country. Ammunition production may make a few men rich, but it does not ennoble humanity. On the other hand, it degrades it to the level of beasts of prey.

QUESTION BOX

(By M. K. Gandhi)

The Theory of Trusteeship

Q. From your writings one gathers the notion that your 'trustee' is not anything more than a very benevolent philanthropist and donor, such as the first Parsi Baronet, the Tatas, the Wadias, the Birlas, Shri Bajaj and the like. Is that so? Will you please explain whom you regard as the primary or rightful beneficiaries of the possessions of a rich man? Is there to be a limit to the amount or part of the income and capital which he can spend upon himself, his kith and kin and for non-public purposes? Can one who exceeds such limit be prevented from doing so? If he is incompetent or otherwise fails to discharge his obligations as a trustee, can he be removed and called upon to render accounts by a beneficiary or the State? Do the same principles apply to Princes and Zamindars, or is their trusteeship of a different nature?

A. If the trusteeship idea catches, philanthropy, as we know it, will disappear. Of those you have named only Jamnalalji came near, but only near, it. A trustee has no heir but the public. In a State built on the basis of non-violence, the commission of trustees will be regulated. Princes and Zamindars will be on a par with the other men of wealth.

Sevagram, 6-4-42

Expedience

Q. Several years ago I once had the temerity to ask whether the fact that you had allowed non-violence to come into the Congress as an expedient rather than as a creed would not be conducive to its breakdown at the critical time. You said you did not think so. But do you still feel the same? Would you not today have had an organised band of believers in non-violence whom you could have sent in groups all over the country? It almost seems as if we had lost time and are found unprepared, as it were, to shoulder responsibility?

A. Yes, I adhere to my opinion that I did well to present to the Congress non-violence as an expedient. I could not have done otherwise, if I was to introduce it into politics. In South Africa too I introduced it as an expedient. It was successful

there because resisters were a small number in a compact area and therefore easily controlled. Here we had numberless persons scattered over a huge country. The result was that they could not be easily controlled or trained. And yet it is a marvel the way they have responded. They might have responded much better and shown far better results. But I have no sense of disappointment in me over the results obtained. If I had started with men who accepted non-violence as a creed, I might have ended with myself. Imperfect as I am, I started with imperfect men and women and sailed on an uncharted ocean. Thank God that, though the boat has not reached its haven, it has proved fairly storm-proof.

The Roman Script

Q. You are prejudiced against the Roman script because you are prejudiced against the English. Otherwise you would unhesitatingly advocate it in the place of Devanagri and Persian.

A. You are wrong. I am prejudiced against neither. But I am against anything or anybody usurping a place not belonging to it or him. The Roman script has come to stay in India. But it cannot take the place of the Indian scripts. If I had my way, there would be only the Devanagri script, for all the provincial languages, and Devanagri and Persian for the all-India speech. The Arabic script, from which the Persian is derived, is a necessity for Muslims as Sanskrit is for Hindus. Roman has been suggested as a compromise and not for its merits. It has none except that it is almost universal in the West. But it must not displace either Devanagri, which is the parent of most provincial languages and is the most perfect of all the known scripts, or Persian, because it is written by millions of Hindus and Muslims in the North. So far as the scripts are keeping them apart, Hindus and Muslims will not come together by adopting a neutral and imperfect script. But they will, if both take the trouble, for the love of one another, to learn both scripts. The Roman script has its own great and unique place. It need not aspire after greater.

Sevagram, 7-4-42

CONTENTS

SCORCHED EARTH ...	M. K. GANDHI	109
HOW TO BE WORTHY OF OUR HERITAGE ...	M. D.	109
NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE	M. K. GANDHI	112
GOVERNMENT CONTROL OR PUBLIC CONTROL?		113
NATIONAL WEALTH ...	J. C. KUMARAPPA	115
QUESTION BOX ...	M. K. GANDHI	116
NOTES:		
CURIOUS NON-VIOLENCE	M. K. G.	113
A CORRECTION ...	M. D.	114
THE MERITS OF AMLA	A. K.	114
IMPROVED DIETS ...	A. K.	114
NON-SLAUGHTER LEATHER	J. C. K.	114
HAND-WEAVING IN NEW MEXICO, U. S. A. ...	C. S.	115