

HARIJAN

Editor: MAHADEV DESAI

VOL. IX, No. 28]

AHMEDABAD — SUNDAY, JULY 26, 1942

[TWO ANNAS

FOR MUSLIM FRIENDS

(By M. K. Gandhi)

I have read with attention Quaid-e-Azam's reply to my article in *Harijan*. "Pakistan" according to him "in a nutshell" "is a demand for carving out of India a portion to be wholly treated as an independent and Sovereign State." This Sovereign State can conceivably go to war against the one of which it was but yesterday a part. It can also equally conceivably make treaties with other States. All this can certainly be had, but surely not by the willing consent of the rest.

But it seems he does not want it by consent. For he says, "Pakistan is an article of faith with Muslim India and we depend upon nobody except ourselves for the achievement of our goal." How is one to offer one's service in these circumstances?

But later he gives me hope, for he says: "Show your sincerity and frankness for an honourable settlement." In order to show both, I wrote the article to which the Quaid-e-Azam has objected. How else is one to show sincerity and frankness except through one's action and speech or pen?

Let me state my limitations. I cannot speak as a mere Hindu, for my Hinduism includes all religions. I can speak only as an Indian. If Pakistan as defined above is an article of faith with him, indivisible India is equally an article of faith with me. Hence there is a stalemate.

But today there is neither Pakistan nor Hindustan. It is Englistan. So I say to all India, let us first convert it into the original Hindustan and then adjust all rival claims. This is surely clear. After the restoration of India to the nation, there will be no Central Government. The representatives will have to construct it. It may be one Hindustan or many Pakistans.

If the Quaid-e-Azam really wants a settlement, I am more than willing and so is the Congress. He will forgive me for suggesting that his reply leaves on one the impression that he does not want a settlement. If he wants one, why not accept the Congress President's offer that Congress and League representatives should put their heads together and never part until they have reached a settlement. Is there any flaw or want of sincerity in this offer?

Sevagram, 20-7-'42

TO MY CRITICS

(By M. K. Gandhi)

The critics who impute motives to the Working Committee or to me harm the cause they profess to serve. The members of the Working Committee are all seasoned servants of the nation with full sense of their responsibility. It is no use damning me as a dictator like Herr Hitler. He does not argue with his coworkers if he may be said to have any. He merely issues orders which can only be disobeyed on pain of death or worse. I argue with my friends for days. I argued at the last meeting for eight days. The members agreed when their reason was satisfied. My sanction with my friends as well as self-styled enemies has ever been reason and love. It is a travesty of truth therefore to compare me with Hitler or to call me a dictator in any current sense of the term. It is an equal travesty of truth to abuse the Congress by calling it a Hindu or communal organisation. It is national in the fullest sense of the term. It is a purely political organisation with which can undoubtedly be compared the Liberal Party which is without the slightest communal taint. Unfortunately today although it has politicians who have a record of distinguished service, it has admittedly little or no following in the country by reason of its members holding unpopular views. Thus the Congress remains the sole representative national organisation in India with a mass following. Its gains belong not merely to itself but to the whole nation, irrespective of caste or creed or race. It is mischievous and misleading to discredit this organisation in America and Great Britain as a communal or pro-Axis or a purely Hindu organisation. If it was a pro-Axis organisation, it has courage and influence enough to make a public declaration to that effect in disregard of the consequences that might overtake it. It is not, and has never been, a secret or a violent organisation. If it had been either, it would have been suppressed long ago.

So much about some manifest misrepresentations.

Now about suppression of relevant Congress position.

Nobody has contended that the demand for withdrawal of British Power is not an inherent

right of the nation, irrespective of the demand to the contrary by those who by centuries of habit have lost the sense of freedom. It is said that it is wrong not intrinsically, but because of the Congress declaration of non-embarrassment to ask for such withdrawal at this moment.

The critics conveniently omit to mention the fact that in order to prove its bona fides and to prevent the Japanese attack the Congress has agreed that, in spite of the withdrawal of the British, the Allied troops should remain in India, naturally under a treaty with the Free India Government to be. So long as that Government, provisional or otherwise, has not come into being, there will be no authority to check their operations save their honour. For by declaring India free they will have absolved themselves from consulting anybody formally as they have to consult today members of their nomination. In this sense the declaration of Independence leaves them freer to adopt the military measures they may consider necessary. I know that this is an anomalous position for a free country to be in. But honesty dictates the course. As I have said and repeat here the Congress demand is fool-proof. Critics who are anxious to serve the Allies would do well to examine the Congress position and point out flaws, if there are any. Let me inform them that those who have come to me to understand my demand and who had serious misgivings went away convinced that it was wholly just and that if justice was not done the Congress would be right in taking action to vindicate its position.

Sevagram, 19-7-'42

QUESTION BOX

(By M. K. Gandhi)

Village Swaraj

Q. In view of the situation that may arise at any moment in India, would you give an outline or skeleton of a Village Swaraj Committee, which could function in all village matters in the absence of, and without relying upon an over-head Government or other organisation? In particular, how would you ensure that the Committee should be fully representative and that it would act impartially, efficiently and without favour or fear? What should be the scope of authority and the machinery to enforce its commands? And what should be the manner in which a committee or an individual member of it could be removed for corruption, inefficiency or other unfitness?

A. My idea of village Swaraj is that it is a complete republic, independent of its neighbours for its own vital wants, and yet interdependent for many others in which dependence is a necessity. Thus every village's first concern will be to grow its own food crops and cotton for its cloth. It should have a reserve for its cattle, recreation and playground for adults and children. Then if there is more land available, it will grow useful money crops, thus excluding ganja, tobacco, opium and the like. The village will maintain a village theatre, school and public hall. It will have its

own waterworks ensuring clean water supply. This can be done through controlled wells or tanks. Education will be compulsory up to the final basic course. As far as possible every activity will be conducted on the cooperative basis. There will be no castes such as we have today with their graded untouchability. Non-violence with its technique of Satyagraha and non-cooperation will be the sanction of the village community. There will be a compulsory service of village guards who will be selected by rotation from the register maintained by the village. The Government of the village will be conducted by the Panchayat of five persons annually elected by the adult villagers, male and female, possessing minimum prescribed qualifications. These will have all the authority and jurisdiction required. Since there will be no system of punishments in the accepted sense, this Panchayat will be the legislature, judiciary and executive combined to operate for its year of office. Any village can become such a republic today without much interference, even from the present Government whose sole effective connection with the villages is the exaction of the village revenue. I have not examined here the question of relations with the neighbouring villages and the centre if any. My purpose is to present an outline of village government. Here there is perfect democracy based upon individual freedom. The individual is the architect of his own government. The law of non-violence rules him and his government. He and his village are able to defy the might of a world. For the law governing every villager is that he will suffer death in the defence of his and his village's honour.

The reader may well ask me, as I am asking myself while penning these lines, as to why I have not been able to model Sevagram after the picture here drawn. My answer is, I am making the attempt. I can see dim traces of success though I can show nothing visible. But there is nothing inherently impossible in the picture drawn here. To model such a village may be the work of a lifetime. Any lover of true democracy and village life can take up a village, treat it as his world and sole work, and he will find good results. He begins by being the village scavenger, spinner, watchman, medicine man and school-master all at once. If nobody comes near him, he will be satisfied with scavenging and spinning.

Sevagram, 18-7-'42

Honourable Means of Dying

Q. Will you please explain more fully your dictum that "a person who would die rather than go through inhuman tortures would find honourable means of dying"? Do you endorse suicide in such cases? Or do you suggest that mere intense will to die will result in death?

A. I would not rule out suicide in such cases as a means of escape from torture—not for the pain of it, but for showing the tyrant that his torture would not bend the suicide. Tyrants have prevented suicide for the purpose of the pleasure tortures give them. But I do not regard suicide as necessarily

an honourable means of dying. Of course, the most honourable means would be the intense longing to die, so intense as to induce death for the mere will. But this is given to one in a billion. What I had in mind when I wrote the paragraph was a variety of struggles of the prisoners with the warders in which resistance though non-violent must end in death. Thus supposing that A compels B to crawl on his belly, resistance can be carried to the breaking point. Every form of such resistance unto death I would count as honourable. This resistance can be offered by the weakest as well as the strongest—by the weakest perhaps more effectively, certainly more expeditiously. The indispensable condition is the possession of a stout heart and an iron will. I am not writing theory. My opinion is based on personal experience and that of others who have been under my observation. A very weak woman could not be bent under the cruel will of her imperious husband. Youngsters frail in body have successfully defied the orders of hard schoolmasters or heartless parents. The crux of the question is whether there is real readiness, nay will to die. The will will most assuredly point the way.

Ineffective Sympathy

Q. Why should not the Congress declare that as long as India is herself in bondage, she can be neither a friend nor an enemy of any country? What is the value of her sympathies with China, Russia etc., when she has no freedom to assist them in her own way? Has Russia thought of India?

A. You are right. India's sympathy can give no effective help as her enmity can do no harm to any person or nation so long as India is herself not free. Nevertheless Pandit Jawaharlal with his international outlook and generosity has accustomed us to express our sympathy to nations in distress without expectation of like return. We lose nothing by expressing sympathy even though we realise that it can cut no ice. If Russia has no thought of India today, in the long run she is bound to recognise the utterly unselfish character of our sympathy. It should not be forgotten that sympathy without ability to render effective help has its own moral value. We receive with appreciation sympathy from those who we know are unable to render us effective help in our struggle.

Your question is itself an additional justification for our demand for the immediate withdrawal of the British power. Having learnt to show sympathy to nations in distress the knowledge of our helplessness and the knowledge that if we are free we can render much effective help makes us or should make us specially anxious and oblige us to realise our ambition even during the war.

Sevagram, 10-7-'42

The Indian States' Problem

By Gandhiji

687 Pages, Price Rs. 4. Postage 10 As. extra.

Status of Indian Princes

By Pyarelal

Price 4 As. Postage As. 1½ extra.

HARIJANS AND SAVARNAS

I have received several letters regarding my note in the *Harijan* with respect to the Vile Parle Crematorium, correcting one or two of my statements and asking me to state Gandhiji's views on two or three concrete questions. I do so without delay.

The crematorium is being used for several years by Harijans, and the exclusion of Harijans from the use thereof by locking it by a certain individual was wrong.

My note would leave no one in doubt about the indefeasible right of the Harijans to use the crematorium, and the Harijan and Congress workers who are helping them to use it are simply fulfilling a sacred duty. No Satyagraha is involved in this, for the simple reason that there is no order or law that is being disobeyed. That there is a case pending in this connection is beside the point. Therefore no office-bearer of the Harijan Sevak Sangh or of the Congress Committees concerned may shirk his duty in this behalf on the ground that there is no resolution of the Congress or the Harijan Sevak Sangh in this behalf. A resolution for starting Satyagraha would be necessary when the Magistrate gives a decision in favour of the complainant.

I have therefore no hesitation in saying that Gandhiji would regard indifference or neglect in this behalf by Hindu office-bearers of the Congress Committees and by the office-bearers of the Harijan Sevak Sangh concerned as a dereliction of duty. I know that individual workers are helping the Harijans and thus fulfilling an obvious duty that Savarnas owe to the Harijans. But those responsible must not stay aside.

There is no limit to the mercilessness to which irreligion masking as religion will go. The Civil Surgeon here was telling me of a pathetic case he noticed when he was on tour last week. There is cholera in this district, and he found during his inspection that in a Harijan's house five members had already died of cholera. They were all drinking contaminated water from the river, because the Savarnas would not let them use the village well which had been disinfected. The Civil Surgeon, who is a Hindu, with another responsible official, took the heartless Savarnas to task, and invited the Harijans to go and draw water from the well in their presence. This they did and it is hoped that the Harijans will now be allowed to use the well without let or hindrance. But one is painfully astonished that people who can be so heartless have the hardihood to call themselves Hindus.

Sevagram, 18-7-'42

M. D.

By R. B. Gregg

The Power of Non-violence

Price Rs. 2. Postage 6 Annas extra.

A Discipline for Non-violence

Price Six Annas. Postage 1/6 Annas extra.

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

HARIJAN

July 26

1942

TO EVERY JAPANESE

I must confess at the outset that though I have no ill will against you, I intensely dislike your attack upon China. From your lofty height you have descended to imperial ambition. You will fail to realise that ambition and may become the authors of the dismemberment of Asia, thus unwittingly preventing World Federation and brotherhood without which there can be no hope for humanity.

Ever since I was a lad of eighteen studying in London over fifty years ago, I learnt, through the writings of the late Sir Edwin Arnold, to prize the many excellent qualities of your nation. I was thrilled when in South Africa I learnt of your brilliant victory over Russian arms. After my return to India from South Africa in 1915, I came in close touch with Japanese monks who lived as members of our Ashram from time to time. One of them became a valuable member of the Ashram in Sevagram, and his application to duty, his dignified bearing, his unfailing devotion to daily worship, affability, unruffledness under varying circumstances, and his natural smile which was positive evidence of his inner peace had endeared him to all of us. And now that owing to your declaration of war against Great Britain he has been taken away from us, we miss him as a dear co-worker. He has left behind him as a memory his daily prayer and his little drum, to the accompaniment of which we open our morning and evening prayers.

In the background of these pleasant recollections I grieve deeply as I contemplate what appears to me to be your unprovoked attack against China and, if reports are to be believed, your merciless devastation of that great and ancient land.

It was a worthy ambition of yours to take equal rank with the great Powers of the world. Your aggression against China and your alliance with the Axis Powers was surely an unwarranted excess of that ambition.

I should have thought that you would be proud of the fact that that great and ancient people, whose old classical literature you have adopted as your own, are your neighbours. Your understanding of one another's history, tradition, literature should bind you as friends rather than make you the enemies you are today.

If I was a free man, and if you allowed me to come to your country, frail though I am, I would not mind risking my health, may be my life, to come to your country to plead with you to desist from the wrong you are doing to China and the world and therefore to yourself.

But I enjoy no such freedom. And we are in the unique position of having to resist an imperialism that we detest no less than yours and Nazism. Our resistance to it does not mean harm to the British people. We seek to convert them. Ours is an unarmed revolt against British rule. An important party in the country is engaged in a deadly but friendly quarrel with the foreign rulers.

But in this they need no aid from foreign Powers. You have been gravely misinformed, as I know you are, that we have chosen this particular moment to embarrass the Allies when your attack against India is imminent. If we wanted to turn Britain's difficulty into our opportunity we should have done it as soon as the War broke out nearly three years ago.

Our movement demanding the withdrawal of the British Power from India should in no way be misunderstood. In fact if we are to believe your reported anxiety for the Independence of India, a recognition of that Independence by Britain, should leave you no excuse for any attack on India. Moreover the reported profession sorts ill with your ruthless aggression against China.

I would ask you to make no mistake about the fact that you will be sadly disillusioned if you believe that you will receive a willing welcome from India. The end and aim of the movement for British withdrawal is to prepare India, by making her free for resisting all militarist and imperialist ambition, whether it is called British Imperialism, German Nazism, or your pattern. If we do not, we shall have been ignoble spectators of the militarisation of the world in spite of our belief that in non-violence we have the only solvent of the militarist spirit and ambition. Personally I fear that without declaring the Independence of India the Allied Powers will not be able to beat the Axis combination which has raised violence to the dignity of a religion. The Allies cannot beat you and your partners unless they beat you in your ruthless and skilled warfare. If they copy it their declaration that they will save the world for democracy and individual freedom must come to naught. I feel that they can only gain strength to avoid copying your ruthlessness by declaring and recognising *now* the freedom of India, and turning sullen India's forced cooperation into freed India's voluntary cooperation.

To Britain and the Allies we have appealed in the name of justice, in proof of their professions, and in their own self-interest. To you I appeal in the name of humanity. It is a marvel to me that you do not see that ruthless warfare is nobody's monopoly. If not the Allies some other Power will certainly improve upon your method and beat you with your own weapon. Even if you win you will leave no legacy to your people of which they would feel proud. They cannot take pride in a recital of cruel deeds however skillfully achieved.

Even if you win it will not prove that you were in the right, it will only prove that your power of

destruction was greater. This applies obviously to the Allies too, unless they perform *now* the just and righteous act of freeing India as an earnest and promise of similarly freeing all other subject peoples in Asia and Africa.

Our appeal to Britain is coupled with the offer of Free India's willingness to let the Allies retain their troops in India. The offer is made in order to prove that we do not in any way mean to harm the Allied cause, and in order to prevent you from being misled into feeling that you have but to step into the country that Britain has vacated. Needless to repeat that if you cherish any such idea and will carry it out, we will not fail in resisting you with all the might that our country can muster. I address this appeal to you in the hope that our movement may even influence you and your partners in the right direction and deflect you and them from the course which is bound to end in your moral ruin and the reduction of human beings to robots.

The hope of your response to my appeal is much fainter than that of response from Britain. I know that the British are not devoid of a sense of justice and they know me. I do not know you enough to be able to judge. All I have read tells me that you listen to no appeal but to the sword. How I wish that you are cruelly misrepresented and that I shall touch the right chord in your heart! Any way I have an undying faith in the responsiveness of human nature. On the strength of that faith I have conceived the impending movement in India, and it is that faith which has prompted this appeal to you.

Sevagram, 18-7-'42

I am

Your friend and well-wisher

M. K. Gandhi

WITH THREE PRESS CORRESPONDENTS

Three press correspondents stayed after the Working Committee in order to have a leisurely interview with Gandhiji for a full clarification of certain questions. They had already been present at the general press interview the day before, but they thought their countries would be specially interested in certain questions, and they tried to represent the mind of the average man in their respective countries. Mr. Steele represented the *Chicago Daily News*, Mr. Stuart Emeny the *News Chronicle*, and Mr. Richard Jen the *Central News Agency of China*.

The Programme

Mr. Emeny was full of doubts and fears — at any rate he represented the doubts and fear of the average Englishman. "Could you give me an idea of the plans of your movement? Would it include breach of the Salt Laws, calling out Government servants and labour?"

Gandhiji made a full reply to the question: "As I said yesterday the programme covers every activity of a strictly non-violent character included in a mass movement. Therefore undoubtedly the things you have mentioned are included. But it is not my intention to undertake at once any over-whelming programme. I want to watch and see, because whatever may be said to the contrary, even in

conducting the movement I want to guard against a sudden outburst of anarchy or a state of things which may be calculated to invite Japanese aggression. I believe that India's demand is fundamental, it is indispensable for national existence as I conceive it to be. Therefore I shall take every precaution I can to handle the movement gently, but I would not hesitate to go to the extremest limit, if I find that no impression is produced on the British Government or the Allied Powers. I hold it to be legitimate to make the Allied Powers responsible for all that may happen in India, because it is open to them in the interests of the common cause to prevent the happening of anything that might disturb the even course of the war. I think I have sufficiently answered your very pertinent question. I am unable to give you a more detailed answer, not because I want to suppress or shirk it, but I am not ready with a planned programme as yet."

"It will be your biggest movement?"

"Yes, my biggest movement."

Time Limit?

"But if there is no response," asked Mr. Emeny, "what time limit would you set before launching your campaign?"

"Assuming that the A. I. C. C. confirms the resolution, there will be some time—but not very long—taken. As far as I can see just now it may be a week or two."

"But you will give time?"

"Of course—as I have always done before launching on every struggle."

"If the Viceroy asks you to go to Delhi, will you accept his invitation?"

"Oh, yes. And then you forget that the Viceroy and I have become personal friends, if a public man and a Viceroy may be so called."

Knowing what the Government has always done Mr. Emeny put a plain blunt question: "Will your campaign collapse if Government sent you and thousands of your followers to jail?"

"I hope not," said Gandhiji laughing heartily, "on the contrary it should gain strength if it has any vitality."

Why not a Truce?

And now Mr. Emeny pleaded, "With the enemy at the gates, what is your objection to calling a truce?"

"This struggle has been conceived," said Gandhiji, "in order to avert a catastrophe. At the critical moment an un-free India is likely to become a hindrance rather than a help. The Congress resolution itself hints at the possibility of a large number of Indians going over to the Japanese side—if they effected a landing on the Indian shores—as we now know happened in Burma, Malay and for aught I know Singapore too. I am of the opinion that this might have been prevented at least so far as Burma is concerned, if she had been made independent. But it was not done. We know the result. We are determined so far as it is humanly possible to secure our Independence, so that no Indian worth the name would then think of going over to the Japanese side. It would then become as much

India's interest, as the Allies' interest, to resist Japanese aggression with all her might."

Moral Duty

"But with time so short don't you think you have a moral duty to stand beside the Russians and the Chinese?" was Mr. Emeny's next question. If Gandhiji was keen on winning a dialectical advantage over his questioner, he might simply have said, "whose moral duty is greater — that of the Allies to make India Free or that of an un-free India to help the Allies?" But, no. He calmly replied: "Don't you see if it was a purely personal question, what you say would have been perfectly possible. But even with the combined influence of every member of the Working Committee, it would have been impossible to enthuse the masses in favour of the Allied cause, which they do not understand, cannot understand."

"But," said Mr. Emeny. "I have the feeling myself that you could, if you would, with your tremendous authority with the masses, do anything. They are sure to listen to you."

"You credit me with an influence which I wish I had, but I assure you, I do not possess. And in proof of this I shall give you two solid facts. If I had that influence you will agree that we would already have won our Independence without causing any trouble to anybody. But, as you know, I have no influence, nor has the Working Committee with the Muslim League and the Princes. That is one solid fact. Then, there is another thing. During the last war as you perhaps know, I had thrown myself heart and soul into it. I had become a voluntary recruiting agent for the British. And I began my agency in the district in which I had just been leading a campaign for agricultural relief with fair success. I should have made great headway there. But I tell you I did not do so. I used to walk miles in the hot burning sun in order to collect recruits and to make an impression on the people about the urgency of it. But I could not. You will see, therefore, that my influence great as it may appear to outsiders, is strictly limited. I may have considerable influence to conduct a campaign for redress of popular grievances because people are ready and need a helper. But I have no influence to direct people's energy in a channel in which they have no interest."

"Then, what part of the people, you think, will believe in your movement?" put in Mr. Steele.

"I wish I could tell you definitely. It is all problematical. I simply trade on the absolute purity of the cause and the equal purity of the means which are non-violent."

American Opinion May Be Antagonised

"Are you not apprehensive," added Mr. Steele, that the Working Committee's resolution will antagonise American opinion?"

"Of course it may. But I have never embarked upon any campaign in the belief that I would have world sympathy at my back. On the contrary, the odds, almost in every case, have been against me. And in the very first Satyagraha struggle which started in South Africa, every outward element was

hostile to me. I had stated then — though I had no experience of the working of Satyagraha that I have now — that a handful though we were in the midst of millions who had no sympathy for us, we had to rely upon our own inner strength and the absolute justice of our cause. And that sustained us through the long-drawn-out agony lasting eight years. I do not know why I should lose the sympathy of the American people, or the British people, for that matter. And why should they fight shy of a just demand for absolute freedom?"

"Speaking as an American," said Mr. Steele, "I can say that the reaction of many Americans would be that a movement for freedom may be unwise at this moment for it would lead to complications in India which may be prejudicial to the efficient prosecution of the war."

"This belief is born of ignorance," replied Gandhiji. "What possible internal complication can take place if the British Government declare to-day that India is absolutely independent? It would be in my opinion the least risk the Allies could take on behalf of the war effort. I am open to conviction. If anybody could convince me that in the midst of war, the British Government cannot declare India free without jeopardizing the war effort, I should like to hear the argument. I have not as yet heard any cogent one."

Open to Conviction

"If you were convinced, would you call off the campaign?"

"Of course. My complaint is that all these good critics talk *at* me, swear *at* me, but never condescend to talk *to* me."

China

The Chinese friend now took his turn. He said, "You have implicit faith in non-violence. But we have seen that armed resistance alone can succeed against the Japanese?"

"China never tried any experiment in non-violence. That the Chinese remained passive for some time is no proof that it was a non-violent attitude. For the first time in history non-violence instead of being confined to individuals, religious enthusiasts and mystics, has been brought down to the political field and been experimented on by vast masses of mankind. Just imagine, that instead of a few Indians, or even a million or so, all 400,000,000 Indians were non-violent, would Japan make any headway in India, unless they were intent upon exterminating all the four hundred million?"

"If India were made of four hundred million Gandhis —" interrupted Mr. Steele.

"Here," said Gandhiji, "we come to brass tacks. That means India is not sufficiently non-violent. If we had been, there would have been no parties, and there would be no Japanese attack. I know non-violence is limited in both numbers and quality, but deficient as it is in both these respects, it has made a great impression and infused life into the people which was absent before. The awakening that showed itself on April 6, 1919, was a matter of surprise to every Indian. I cannot today account for the response we then had from every nook and corner of the country where no public worker had

ever been. We had not then gone among the masses, we did not know we could go and speak to them."

"What can Free India do for China?" was Mr. Jen's question.

"If India were to listen to me, she would give non-violent help to China. But I know that will not be. Free India would want to be militarist. She will then get all the materials and men she needs — although it appears that China with her vast populations will not need men. Today unfree India cannot send a single person to China. I go further — Free India can even plead with Japan and Japan will have to listen."

Provisional Government

"Can you give me an idea who would take the lead in forming a Provisional Government — you, Congress, or the Muslim League?"

"The Muslim League certainly can; the Congress can. If everything went right, it would be a combined leadership. No one party would take the lead."

"Would it be within the present constitutional structure?"

"The constitution will be dead" said Gandhiji. "The Government of India Act of 1935 is dead. The I. C. S. would have to go and it might be anarchy but there *need* be no anarchy, if the British withdraw with goodwill. *Free India Government* would set up a constitution suited to Indian genius, evolved without dictation from outside. But whether India would be cut up into autonomous provinces or not, I do not know. The permanent structure may take time — all the time the war may require. But the Provisional Government may continue to function. It may be somewhat after the pattern of the present government, but with great modifications. The two communities will certainly work in hearty combination. It would be a combination not superimposed, but brought about by internal effort. The dictating factor will not be an outside one, but wisdom. And I believe there will be abundant wisdom among us."

"Would the Viceroy cease to exist as such?"

"We shall be friends *even* then, but on a par, and I have no doubt that Lord Linlithgow will welcome the day when he will be one of the people."

Why Not Today?

"Why can't all this be done today, without the British withdrawal," said Mr. Emeny returning to the charge.

"The answer is simple. Why can't a prisoner do a thing which a free man can do? You may not have been behind prison bars, but I have been and I know. Imprisonment means civil death, and I suggest to you that the whole of India is civilly dead. The very breath is controlled by British power. Then there is another experience that you lack. You have not been a member of a nation that has been under subjection for several centuries. Our *habit* has been that we can never be free. You know the case of Shri Subhas Bose, a man of great self-sacrifice who might have had a distinguished career in the Indian Civil Service, but who is now an exile because he cannot possibly tolerate this helpless condition and feels that he must seek the help of Germany and Japan."

"You have said there is no more room for negotiation. Does it mean that you would ignore any conciliatory gesture if it was made?" was the final question put on behalf of all the three.

Negotiations?

"So far as we are concerned, we have closed our hearts. As we have said in our resolution all hopes have been dashed to pieces. The burden is shifted. But it is open to America, to Britain, to China and even to Russia to plead for India which is pining for freedom. And if an acceptable proposal is made, it would certainly be open to the Congress or any other party to entertain and accept it. It would be churlish on our part if we said 'we don't want to talk to anybody and we will by our own strong hearts expel the British.' Then the Congress Committee won't be meeting; there would be no resolutions; and I should not be seeing press representatives."

Sevagram, 16-7-'42

M. D.

THE MILLSTONE

Some time ago Sir Stafford Cripps wrote that it was not possible for him to read the history of the British Empire without a sense of shame. But Mr. Amery has declared that the British have "every right to be proud of what we have done in India. We have every right to be even more proud of what we are attempting to do in India." (Foreword to the volume of his speeches.)

Mr. Edgar Snow in his latest book *The Battle for Asia* has casually examined this claim, in trying to show what a losing political battle the so-called democracies are fighting. India he calls "an enormous millstone round the neck of oriental emancipation and the progress of the whole world," and says:

"Americans may not realise that British India is a generation older than the United States. After 180 years of British rule, 93 per cent of the Indian population is still illiterate. In 40 years of American rule in the Phillipines illiteracy was cut down from 98 per cent to 45 per cent, while in 20 years the Soviet Union reduced illiteracy from 78 per cent to 8 per cent. In the Soviet Union in a single year (1937) there were 45,900 graduates of industrial and agricultural schools. In India, with twice Russia's population, 960 engineers were graduated. India has generous reserves of coal, but produces only about one-sixth as much as Russia and even less than China. Although India has the third largest iron reserves in the world (surpassed only by the United States and France) her production of steel increased in ten years only to 879,000 tons where it stood in 1935. In the same period in the Soviet Union steel production rose from a million and a half tons to 16 million tons. Little Japan, one-seventh the size of India and with extremely meagre iron resources, produced seven times as much steel. India's water-power resources are second only to those of the United States, yet she has developed only 3 per cent of them as against the latter's roughly 40 per cent. Russia increased her electric power output in 20 years from 1900 million kilowatt hours to 36,500 million in 1937, when India's output stood at 2500 million hours."

"...India suffers from the double incubus of British imperialism buttressed by a string of 563 feudal princes fastened upon masses of men who live in a social darkness unimaginable to a western mind. The princes' territories covering a third of the nation's 1,800,000 square miles, constitute the social waste lands of the East, the regions of "permanent decay". Purely parasitic the princes contribute nothing to Indian society but oppression for the people and glamour for the tourist, while they exact astounding tributes for their personal amusement and luxury. The King of England receives from Parliament a bounty of about one in 1600 from the taxation of his subjects. Some of the Indian princes collect as high as one in two; the least backward (the Maharani of Travancore) gets one in 17. The Prince of Bikaner retained from his annual budget 2,24,000 rupees or more than he spent on education for all his subjects. The royal family, the royal weddings, the royal palaces and the royal retainers absorbed two-thirds of Bikaner's entire budget. Contrasts between the vast wealth and plunder of the richest princes and the British officials and merchants with the poverty and degradation of the Indian people is the measure of the inadequacy of 180 years of rule by the British Raj."

This is a bare statement of non-controversial facts, not made with a view to a study of India, but in order to demonstrate "Britain's political weakness in India", "otherwise there should be no necessity for American aid to hold her position in Asia. India is a nation of nearly 400 millions, with a war potential far richer than Japan and China combined. If the British are unable to defend India and its frontiers at Singapore and Burma without American help it is a significant commentary."

The book was written before America's entry into war, and so then the author wrote, "It is not America's business to decide the destiny of India or any other British colonies." But he added, "It may become inescapably our business if we identify our own fate with that of the British colonial empire." But he was not oblivious of the fact that "democracy in England in particular needs to reinforce itself with something no less than a new charter of human liberty, a new declaration of the rights of man. . . . Britain and the Dominions need to proclaim a programme of emancipation of the colonies as the basis of a world commonwealth of democracies. . . . It will be suggested that the emancipation of India would mean the end of British 'unity'. It may be the only way in fact to create it. The strongest allies democratic England has today are Canada, Australia and New Zealand, and without the help of a certain former colony south of Canada she might not survive at all. A free India could become as valuable an asset to England as a free America. As a matter of fact India is so crucial in the whole imperialist structure that once it were liberated the rest of Britain's colonial problem would be simple to solve."

Mr. Snow proceeds further to point out that it is easy for Britain to throw away this millstone round her neck:

"India's population constitutes four-fifths of the overseas population of the Empire, and nearly nine-tenths of Britain's subject colonial population. Two-thirds of the British capital investment in the colonies, or 438 million pounds, is in India; but on the other hand this is only 12 per cent of the total British capital invested abroad. The colonial empire means little to the British people as a whole. What does it mean to the British investors? The whole thing, brings them an income of about 38 million pounds a year, which is less than one-fifth of the total overseas investment income, and less than one-hundredth of Britain's total national income. India's importance in Britain's trade is also often exaggerated. Nine-tenths of Britain's production is sold at home and more than half of the tenth which goes abroad is sold outside the Empire. India takes only about two per cent. Jobs? All the imperial colonies combined employ at most less than half of one per cent of the British population and nearly all belong to the upper-bracket income group which constitute but five per cent of Britain's people. Thus if Britain lost India altogether it would mean the sacrifice of only about four pounds per capita in her national investment income and a two per cent reduction in her total market. The loss in income would in fact be felt by a small group of Britain's monopoly capitalists. Such an item is infinitesimal compared to the terrific levy now being exacted by war and what is yet to be paid in the future."

As against that slight material loss, put the tremendous moral and political gain. Mr. Snow does not use the terms "justice" and "equity". He simply says: "A dynamic strategy is the first political necessity." The Axis powers are making capital of the present anomaly. Britain is fighting, they say, in order to keep her ill-gotten gains, and America is bolstering her up. But when the democracies, says Mr. Snow, "have divested themselves of hypocrisy, they would have seized the initiative in vitalizing men's minds with a new promise and hope, in its period unassailable from any new quarter. The democracies would win not only the war but the peace." "Britain offers her allies behind enemy lines little to fight for, and in this transitional world, it is not enough to have something to fight against."

All this, as I said, was written before America threw herself on the side of Britain. It is all the more imperative now for America to help herself and Britain to throw off the hypocrisy. "The world is today divided between 'ruler' peoples fighting each other for control of subject peoples", sums up Mr. Snow, "and there is no peace until subject peoples become free." Slave India is a millstone dragging Britain down, and may make victory impossible. Free India means the emancipation of all, including Britain. There cannot be a better case for the immediate emancipation of India.

Sevagram, 13-7-'42

M. D.

CASUAL NOTES

American Propaganda

The New York *Sun* informed America that the latest expansion of the Viceroy's Council had a hearty reception in India, and a sobering effect on the extremists, Gandhiji having even agreed to the stationing of the Allied troops! Well, Gandhiji had expressed his view about the stationing of the Allied troops at least two weeks before the announcement of the expansion.

Now comes the *American Life*, said to have a circulation of three million, giving numerous photographs of the Generalissimo's meeting with Gandhiji, with mischievous comments under them. "Chiang Kai Shek", it says "is the fighting leader of Free China. Mohandas Gandhi is the 'talking leader of subject India.' How wretchedly unimportant from the point of view of war purposes India is, *Life* proceeds to point out in this picturesque way: "Actually India ceased being productively important about a century ago when the machine made its handicraft economically obsolete. In electric energy—the modern world's guage of industrial power—India is about on a par with the State of South Carolina. Skipped by the industrial revolution, its 390,000,000 people have been largely reduced to the meanest level of agricultural subsistence." (What a proud record that for British rule!) Further: "Only about 1 per cent of this population is really represented by the Hindu leaders. Most of the rest of India do not know the name of Nehru, perhaps not even the name of Gandhi." And yet foolish America clamours for the help of the "talking" leader Gandhi, and Nehru, and of a subject and productively unimportant India!

But I must pick out a few more gems. "These are the people who will presently meet the Jap, unless Chiang Kai Shek's troops under American General Stilwell can stop that common enemy in Burma." (Alas, this was written in April.) Again: "The two contrary ways of meeting destiny have probably never been better symbolized than by the two men above. Gandhi has decided to leave India the football of destiny. Chiang long ago decided that China would and could make its destiny." A correcter way to describe "the two contrary ways" would have been to say that Gandhi would let India decide her own destiny, China would have her destiny decided by benevolent helpers like America and Britain.

Still more gems: "At first, Gandhi refused to meet the Chiangs at New Delhi, on the ground that he was their host and by Chinese custom they must come to him at Calcutta. The Chiangs obligingly went to Calcutta." An insult, as Indian readers well know, at one stroke, both to Gandhiji and the Generalissimo. Gandhiji, in spite of his poor following, is described as "the chief obstacle to Britain's plan for India," and Nehru "leader of India's dominant Congress party, is described under one photograph as working with Madame Chiang, "on details of India's war effort." There is also a libellous reference to Birla as "Gandhiji's backer,

a man willing to do business with anybody", and a parting kick at Gandhiji, where Birla's money is described as coming from the manufactured cotton goods that Gandhi crusades against."

But that is American 'Life'!

Unworthy of Their Salt

How some ex-satrap, who are still enjoying fat pensions from India's treasury for "services" rendered to India, are continuing to do those "services" may be judged from pronouncements by two of these. In a lecture on conditions in Orissa delivered before the East India Association in London, Sir John Hubback, is reported (*Times of India*, July 13) to have said that "the unrest which had resulted in the outrage"—Major Bazalgette's murder—"had without question been organised by the Congress party's 'High Command,' as part of their campaign to compel the Rulers of all States to agree to the election of State representatives to the Federal Legislature with a view to securing Congress domination at the centre." Apart from the several lies that he has packed in one sentence, Sir John is guilty of a libel, against the Working Committee of the Congress, which the Government of India ought, in fairness, ask him to withdraw. The agitation was the result not of Congress propaganda but of the gross misrule in the small states that even officials including the Viceroy had condemned, the agitation was kept under control by the Congress, and the outrage was condemned in unmeasured terms by every responsible man in the Congress. If the Congress High Command were in any way responsible, why was Sir John Hubback silent over the incident so long? Sir John vainly talks of the Federation scheme which the Congress had all along boycotted and has not a word to say about the brutal shooting down of hundreds of unarmed men and women in Dhenkanal, Talcher, Ranpur and Gangpur.

Now comes a libel against Gandhiji by Sir Henry Lawrence, who acted as Governor of Bombay for a little while. Gandhiji can be libelled with impunity, for his non-violence will not let him go to the law courts. This is what Sir Henry wrote to *The Spectator* (London):

"Sir,—Mr. Gandhi's views on Civil War in India may shock some of your readers, but he has made no secret of his hostility to the Moslems for many years.

"Last summer his private secretary, M. Desai, published a life of the present President of the National Congress, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad (with a foreword by Mr. Gandhi). Writing of Hindus and Moslems Mr. Gandhi is quoted as saying 'if it is to be our lot that we must shed each other's blood, then I say that the sooner we do so the better it is for us.'"

Sir Henry must have ample evidence of Gandhiji's "hostility to the Moslems for many years", but he produces none in this poisonous letter, beyond the sentence he has quoted in it. Let us see what a wilfully vicious distortion it is. It is wrenched out of a context that I must indicate in brief and give the whole quotation. The extract is from a chapter

in my book entitled 'The Turn of the Tide', describing the worsening of the Hindu-Muslim situation, followed by Gandhiji's 21 days' fast, the Unity Conference in Delhi and so on. Then these two paragraphs follow:

"But neither the fast nor the resolutions of the Unity Conference solved the problem of Hindu-Muslim Unity. The Conference was attended by most of the prominent leaders, but they had not come as representatives of their communities, and none had the strength to get the warring groups to listen to them or act upon the resolutions. Almost immediately after the Fast riots broke out in Jubbulpore and Allahabad. In 1925 the sad tale was repeated at various places in the country, so much so that in May of that year Gandhiji had to declare at a public meeting in sheer exasperation and almost in desperation:

"I have admitted my incompetence. I have admitted that I have been found wanting as a physician prescribing a cure for this malady. I do not find that either Hindus or Muslims are ready to accept my cure, and therefore I simply nowadays confine myself to a passing mention of this problem and content myself by saying that some day or other we Hindus and Muslims will have to come together, if we want the deliverance of our country. And if it is to be our lot that, before we can come together, we must shed one another's blood, then I say the sooner we do so, the better it is for us. If we propose to break one another's heads, let us do so in a manly way."

"This situation, even fifteen years since that pathetic declaration, is just the same, perhaps worse. But among those who hold steadfastly to the will to unite whatever happens—and that is what will ultimately count—the name of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad stands in the forefront."

But that is the British way of being worthy of the salt one has eaten!

"Criminally Irresponsible"

A correspondent in the *Nottingham Guardian* inveighs against the talk of "a generous gesture" towards India, for "unfortunately Hindu India, Moslem India, and the Princes India are three separate and antagonistic entities. None trusts the others, and it would be a criminally irresponsible act on the part of the British Government to give one power over the others." He then wisely adds:

"Mr. Churchill, with characteristic clear sightedness, has always recognised these obstinate facts. Consequently he has been called a reactionary, a die-hard and worse. If Indians themselves will not get together and agree upon a basis of self-government, in spite of endless suggestion and persuasion from the British side, then no system imposed from outside can be other than a disastrous failure."

That is exactly what we say. It is because we agree that any system imposed from outside would be a disastrous failure and would be "criminally irresponsible", we want the British to retire in dignity, and let the Indians do what they like with themselves.

Commonsense

That there is sturdy commonsense in certain quarters is evident from what the *South London*

Press said about Sir Stafford Cripps' visit to India. It hoped—alas vainly—"that Cripps, a personal friend of the Indian people's leaders, will offer them nothing less than complete equality with Britain," but wisely added,

"Whatever her status, it is obvious that India does not want to be invaded, nor is it likely that even pacifist Gandhi's followers would want to talk "peace" with Japan."

"As a nation with its own rulers, India could fight on the same terms as any other of our allies."

"Like any other country, she could form a war-time alliance for strategic reasons without the slightest reference to the internal politics of either ally."

"Well, to conquer nearly 400,000,000 people is not easy. And if only a proportion carried out Gandhi's non-cooperation ideas, it would be virtually impossible."

What India wants today is to be "a nation with its own rulers", and yet as the paper rightly says "whatever her status India does not want to be invaded."

"Negligent Use"

How Tommies can be free with their revolvers is evident from a recent issue of the *Ceylon Daily News* containing the report of "a case in which a member of the R. A. F., was charged with attempted murder." "Crown Counsel told the jury that the injured boy was travelling in a motor bus from Colombo to Rakwana and the accused (Gordon, Cooke) was driving in a motor lorry. The evidence indicated that the accused shouted out to the driver of the bus to stop it. The accused felt that he had been obstructed and having overtaken the bus the accused got down from his vehicle and came up to the bus which was stopped with a revolver in hand and shot at the back of the bus. The bullet penetrated the body of the bus and struck the injured boy's leg." Mercifully the bullet killed nobody. "His Lordship ordered the accused to enter into a bond with a surety to be of good behaviour for a period of one year and further ordered him to pay a sum of Rs. 50 as compensation to the injured boy."

Was the use of the revolver just "negligent use" or was it criminal use? At any rate it is something that the culprit was tried, and the case allowed to be reported.

Sevagram, 19-7-'42

M. D.

Home and Village Doctor

By Satis Chandra Dasgupta

Written at Gandhiji's instance. He hopes every village worker will possess a copy. 1940 pages, 18 chapters, copious index of 32 pages, 216 illustrations.

Price Rs. 5 cloth-bound; Rs. 6 leather-bound.

By V. P. P. Rs. 6; leather-bound Rs. 7 By V. P. P.

Practical Non-violence

By K. G. Mashruwala

Price Six Annas. Postage 1/6 Annas extra.

Constructive Programme

Some Suggestions

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

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

PUNDIT KACHRU EXTERNEED

(By M. K. Gandhi)

Pundit Kachru is a well known public worker attached to the States People Conference. When Shri Jainarayan Vyas went on hunger strike at Jodhpur, he was deputed by the President Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru to proceed to Jodhpur and watch events and report to me. For reasons known to the authorities and unknown to Pundit Kachru he was served with an externment order on the 5th inst., at 11.40 p. m., to depart from Jodhpur the next morning by 7-15 a. m., train. He telephoned to me for instructions and Mahadev Desai who answered the phone advised him in the first instance to obey the order and report. He is now in Wardha trying to finish his report to the point he was able to reach in Jodhpur.

Here is the order :

"From information received the Government of Jodhpur is satisfied that Dwarkanath Kachru (name) is acting in a manner prejudicial to the maintenance of public order and the efficient prosecution of War.

"With a view to prevent the said Dwarkanath Kachru from so acting, the Government of Jodhpur, in exercise of its powers conferred by Rule 26 (1) (a) of the Defence of India Rules as applied to the Jodhpur State territory is pleased to order that the said Dwarkanath Kachru shall remove himself from Marwar in railway train 1 up of 6-7-42 (manner) which leaves Jodhpur at 7-15 a. m. (via Marwar Junction) and further that the said Dwarkanath Kachru shall not return to Marwar for a period of one year from the date of this order.

"The Inspector General of Police, Jodhpur, is hereby directed to see that the above order is promptly carried out."

The important question arising is how long will the States regard people from outside their jurisdiction as foreigners and deal with them summarily as the Jodhpur authorities have done? And how long must they allow themselves to be treated as such? The Congress has exercised the greatest self-restraint in this matter. Its men deserve a better treatment. If the authorities have justification for their order, they should publicly state it. It is not a matter that can be forgotten. Pundit Kachru ought to be able to return unless satisfactory explanation is offered for his externment.

Sevagram, 12-7-'42

Since the foregoing was written, much is reported to have happened in Jodhpur. Fortunately the fast has satisfactorily ended. But repression is said to be going on merrily. I refrain from giving the details. I understand that the State has made a generous use of my last note for it contains certain statements crediting them with what appeared to be praiseworthy. Now I have angry letters repudiating principally the admission made by Shri Sriprakash that Balmukund Bisa's death was not due to any ill-treatment by the State. My correspondents say that Shri Sriprakash having not had much time was misled. I have asked the correspondents for proofs and if I get them I hope to submit them to the authorities, instead of publishing

them straightway. I can only hope that the favourable impression created on Shri Sriprakash will not be belied by any action of the authorities. I hope next week to deal with the simple demands of the Lok Parishad.

Sevagram, 20-7-'42

REPUDIATION

One wonders if the good men who ask us to wait for Independence which, as the *Manchester Guardian* says, "will in any case be India's within a few years," realise that that Independence will not be worth having whilst fresh commitments are being made and fresh burdens are being imposed every day on India. Sir Jeremy Raisman is now on his way to England to discuss with the War Office on the allocation, of the war expenditure incurred in India, or on behalf of India, as between India and England. All kinds of conjectures are being made as regards the questions which will form the subject-matter of the discussion. These we are told may include not only the allocation referred to above, but the disposal of the huge sterling balances which are steadily mounting up, and also the effect on India of the Lease-Lend Agreement with the United States.

Now without entering into the details of the intricacies of these problems, it should be obvious to the meanest understanding that these questions cannot be discussed in the interests of India by one who in no way represents India. We know the scandalous way in which India has been made to take over the millions of pounds of debts incurred by the East India Company for the conquest of India, and we can well imagine how a Britisher who must always think in terms of British interests will help in making the various deals in the interest of Britain and Britain alone. The object of the Military Financial settlement was to "limit India's financial liability in connection with the war to such measures as are within her financial capacity and have clearly been or will be taken for the local defence of India." But the term "local defence of India" can be made to cover a multitude of sins, according to the sweet will of the Finance Member who owes no responsibility to India. He is equally incompetent to determine the way in which the utilisation of the sterling resources will be made for the economic and financial benefit of India.

The Federation of the Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry have lodged its emphatic protest against the manner in which these problems are being dealt with. But theirs is bound to be a cry in the wilderness, while the British Government can bamboozle an ignorant world into believing that the Government of India executive is predominantly Indian, and while these "Indian" members will not be able to move their little finger in protest against a procedure which is wholly detrimental to the interests of the country they are professing to serve. But the procedure adds strength to the Congress demand.

Sevagram, 20-7-'42

M. D.

FASTING IN NON-VIOLENT ACTION

(By M. K. Gandhi)

If the struggle which we are seeking to avoid with all our might has to come, and if it is to remain non-violent as it must in order to succeed, fasting is likely to play an important part in it. It has its place in the tussle with authority and with our own people in the event of wanton acts of violence and obstinate riots for instance.

There is a natural prejudice against it as part of a political struggle. It has a recognised place in religious practice. But it is considered a vulgar interpolation in politics by the ordinary politician though it has always been resorted to by prisoners in a haphazard way with more or less success. By fasting however, they have always succeeded in drawing public attention and disturbing the peace of jail authorities.

My own fasts have always, as I hold, been strictly according to the law of Satyagraha. Fellow Satyagrahis too in South Africa fasted partially or wholly. My fasts have been varied. There was the Hindu-Muslim Unity fast of 21 days in 1924 started under the late Maulana Mahomed Ali's roof in Delhi. The indeterminate fast against the MacDonald Award was taken in the Yerawada Prison in 1932. The 21 days' purificatory fast was begun in the Yerawada Prison and was finished at Lady Tharckersey's, as the Government would not take the burden of my being in the Prison in that condition. Then followed another fast in the Yerawada Prison in 1933 against the Government refusal to let me carry on anti-untouchability work through *Harijan* (issued from prison) on the same basis as facilities had been allowed me four months before. They would not yield, but they discharged me when their medical advisers thought I could not live many days if the fast was not given up. Then followed the illfated Rajkot fast in 1939. A false step taken by me thoughtlessly during that fast thwarted the brilliant result that would otherwise certainly have been achieved. In spite of all these fasts, fasting has not been accepted as a recognised part of Satyagraha. It has only been tolerated by the politicians. I have however been driven to the conclusion that fasting unto death is an integral part of Satyagraha programme, and it is the greatest and most effective weapon in its armoury under given circumstances. Not every one is qualified for undertaking it without a proper course of training.

I may not burden this note with an examination of the circumstances under which fasting may be resorted to and the training required for it. Non-violence in its positive aspect as benevolence (I do not use the word love as it has fallen into disrepute.) is the greatest force because of the limitless scope it affords for self-suffering without causing or intending any physical or material injury to the wrong-doer. The object always is to evoke the best in him. Self-suffering is an appeal to his better nature, as retaliation is to his baser. Fasting

under proper circumstances is such an appeal *par excellence*. If the politician does not perceive its propriety in political matters, it is because it is a novel use of this very fine weapon.

To practise non-violence in mundane matters is to know its true value. It is to bring heaven upon earth. There is no such thing as the other world. All worlds are one. There is no 'here' and no 'there'. As Jeans has demonstrated, the whole universe including the most distant stars, invisible even through the most powerful telescope in the world, is compressed in an atom. I hold it therefore to be wrong to limit the use of non-violence to cave dwellers and for acquiring merit for a favoured position in the other world. All virtue ceases to have use if it serves no purpose in every walk of life. I would therefore plead with the purely political-minded people to study non-violence and fasting as its extreme manifestation with sympathy and understanding.

Sevagram, 20-7-'42

If Japanese Come?

The British United Press has cabled the following questions for Gandhiji's reply. They are couched in evidently angry language. But Gandhiji had no hesitation in sending straight replies to them.

Q. 1. Whether Gandhiji is willing to see British go while Japanese on the Frontier.

A: This question should not occur to anybody who has read my writings for they contemplate Allied arms operating in India during war.

Q. 2. Whether he would urge non-cooperation with Japanese after Japanese occupation.

A. Japanese occupation is inconceivable while Allied arms are operating on the Indian soil. If Japanese inflict defeat on Allied arms and succeed in occupying India I would most decidedly advise full non-cooperation.

Q. 3. Whether he would persist in urging (non-cooperation) if Japs shot non-cooperators;

Q. 4. Whether he would rather be shot than cooperate himself.

A. to 3. & 4. Non-cooperation worth the name must invite shooting. In any case I would rather be shot than submit to Japanese or any other Power.

Sevagram, 21-7-'42

M. D.

CONTENTS		PAGE
FOR MUSLIM FRIENDS	...	M. K. GANDHI 237
TO MY CRITICS	...	M. K. GANDHI 237
QUESTION BOX	...	M. K. GANDHI 238
HARIJANS AND SAVARNAS	...	M. D. 239
TO EVERY JAPANESE	...	M. K. GANDHI 240
WITH THREE PRESS CORRESPONDENTS	...	M. D. 241
THE MILLSTONE	...	M. D. 243
CASUAL NOTES	...	M. D. 245
PANDIT KACHRU EXTERNEED	...	M. K. GANDHI 247
REPUDIATION	...	M. D. 247
FASTING IN NON-VIOLENT ACTION	...	M. K. GANDHI 248
NOTE:		
IF JAPANESE COME?	...	M. D. 248