

HARIJAN

(FOUNDED BY MAHATMA GANDHI)
Editor: MAGANBHAI P. DESAI

VOL. XVII. No. 39

AHMEDABAD — SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1953

TWO ANNAS

RIGHT TO EMPLOYMENT

(By Gandhiji)

Every human being has a right to live and therefore to find the wherewithal to feed himself and where necessary, to clothe and house himself. But for this very simple performance we need no assistance from economists or their laws.

'Take no thought for the morrow' is an injunction which finds an echo in almost all the religious scriptures of the world. In well-ordered society the securing of one's livelihood should be and is found to be the easiest thing in the world. Indeed, the test of orderliness in a country is not the number of millionaires it owns, but the absence of starvation among its masses.

Speeches and Writings of Mahatma Gandhi, 4th Edition, Natesan & Co., Madras, page 350.

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

Young India, 13-10-'21

Imagine, therefore, what a calamity it must be to have 300 millions unemployed, several millions becoming degraded every day for want of employment, devoid of self-respect, devoid of faith in God. I may as well place before the dog over there the message of God as before those hungry millions who have no lustre in their eyes and whose only God is their bread. I can take before them a message of God only by taking the message of sacred work before them. It is good enough to talk of God whilst we are sitting here after a nice breakfast and looking forward to a nicer luncheon, but how am I to talk of God to the millions who have to go without two meals a day? To them God can only appear as bread and butter.

Young India, 15-10-'31

To a people famishing and idle, the only acceptable form in which God can dare appear is work and promise of food as wages.

Young India, 13-10-'21

We should be ashamed of resting or having a square meal so long as there is one able-bodied man or woman without work or food.

Young India, 6-10-'21

My Ahimsa would not tolerate the idea of giving a free meal to a healthy person who has not worked for it in some honest way, and if I had the power, I would stop every Sadavrata where free meals are given. It has degraded the nation and it has encouraged laziness, idleness, hypocrisy and even crime.

Young India, 13-8-'25

Do not say you will maintain the poor on charity. Only two classes of people are entitled to charity and no one else — the Brahmana who possesses nothing and whose business it is to spread holy learning, and the cripple and the blind. The iniquitous system of giving doles to the able-bodied idle is going on to our eternal shame and humiliation, and it is to wipe out that shame that I am going about with the message of the Charkha up and down the whole country.

Young India, 24-2-'27

ECONOMIC PLANNING AND SWADESHI

(By Maganbhai P. Desai)

During the Gandhi Jayanti Week on 6-10-'53 I happened to visit Baroda. There in the Naya Mandir Hall I had the good fortune to see a village industries and Swadeshi exhibition inaugurated that morning by Shri Vaikunthlal Mehta. One could easily imagine, from seeing it, the vast potentialities lying in our handicrafts to engage idle human power if we only encourage them and utilize their products. It was a clear proof of a huge potential lying untapped in our village handicrafts to better our economic life. Khadi work and its various processes, small things of bamboo-work, baskets, fans etc. made by our Harijan brothers, were displayed there. One could easily see from all this that as we began to make increasing use of cheap, mechanized goods and other wares which have grown fashionable these days we aggravated the distress of our brothers. Have we any right to do so? What kind of economics is it?

There were exhibited specimens of handicrafts conducted by various women's institutions, — needle-work; binding, print and embroidery, cooking etc. There were also exhibited specimens of hand-made shoes, sandals, money-bags etc. made by local shoemakers. They gave me their Union's resolution passed by them two months

before, with a cutting of late Shri Mashruwala's article in the *Harijanbandhu* of 12-10-'52. I reproduce below the important portion of that resolution :

"Of the various handicrafts in India shoe- and sandal-making has thrived from several generations and has been a source of livelihood to thousands and lakhs of families. For the last few years, Batas, Flex and other concerns are manufacturing these goods. Besides this, manufacturers of plastic goods are also turning out these goods. The indiscriminate production of these concerns has severely hit our home industry. Therefore, this Conference of Baroda shoemakers convened by Shri Kshatriya Mochi Mandal requests the Central as well as Bombay Governments to close these concerns as early as possible. And it appeals to the people of Baroda and the whole of Gujarat to use hand-made shoes and sandals in place of machine-manufactured ones. In the same way, it also exhorts them to prefer hand-woven cloth and other hand-made goods to factory-woven cloth and goods."

It is a matter for regret that although economic planners in our country say that there is truth in the 'Swadeshi' gospel, they do not make it the basis of their plans and seem to believe, it is enough if they only give a little charitable treatment to Swadeshi and home- and village-industries. Whether this shows lack of faith or otherwise on their part is not our concern. It is sufficient that they say that the true basis of economic planning must ensure banishment of unemployment and provision for adequate work for the masses. To bring this about, we shall have to so shape our plans, export-import and excise policies and controls as will encourage 'Swadeshi' goods. This will necessitate some adjustment on the part of dealers engaged in foreign trade as also those employed in it. Inevitable as it is, they should willingly submit to this in the true interest of the people and Swaraj. In the light of this change, Government should also revise its policies and programmes and enact suitable laws.

But till this is accomplished, — and let us realize that there is no escape without it, — we should not mark time. Even today a good number of home industries products of daily use are available. People should purchase these goods. We should learn to see that true art, patriotism and the real happiness of the country at large lie in these things. And we should avoid seemingly cheap foreign goods which ultimately aggravate our poverty. We must remember that the cheapness of foreign goods is at the cost of suffering general unemployment and starvation. If we do not do so, many more people will die of starvation resulting from unemployment and those few who will prosper will be the victims of jealousy and anger — an unpreventable calamity. If Government suppresses these it will have to cease to be democratic ; it will then have to be of the few rich and work for their interest only. But can we think of this? Even in the interest of democracy, therefore, let our rich people and Government realize that there is urgent need to

base our economic structure on Swadeshi and village industries. This is the only way to overcome unemployment and starvation and promote arts and industries. It will be good indeed if our policies are revised accordingly and in time. This is now the main task before the Government and the people for some years to come.

(From the original in Gujarati)

THE AGE OF FRIENDLY LOVE *

(By Vinoba)

The days of kings are past ; and so are those of the zamindars. The present age has no use either for the kings or the zamindars. The world to be belongs to the people whose voice will henceforth be supreme. The rise of the people in the affairs of the world signifies that the present age demands equality — equality as between friends. The relationship among different individuals constituting the society must be based on friendly love. It is, we might say, the age of friendly love.

The relation between Arjuna and Lord Krishna was that of friends. They worked as equals. Lord Krishna was a repository of vast knowledge. Arjuna's knowledge was limited. He was brave and skilled in the art of war but here too his power was limited while that of Krishna was unlimited. However, the relation between them was that of friends and therefore of equality. Arjuna had great respect for Krishna, but the relationship between them was on a basis of equality.

There had been another age before that of Arjuna and Krishna — a great and noble age which held up the ideal of loyalty — loyalty as that of a servant to his master. There was no lack of love between the master and the servant. The master looked after the wellbeing of the servant, and the servant served the master with perfect loyalty. This was the age of Hanuman. He served Rama with the devotion of a servant.

The present-day world, however, has set its heart on friendly love. Not service, but comradeship is its ideal. It does not mean that those who deserve respect will not receive it. Excellence will certainly receive due respect, but the relationship between individuals will be that of friendly equality.

The society in the days of Hanuman was organized on a different pattern. There were dominating personalities who gathered round themselves loyal servants and followers. They bore sincere love to one another but one was the master and the rest were his loyal followers. It meant that social progress in those days could not go beyond that stage.

Today, however, the master-servant relation, even though it may be based on love, is disapproved. This is because there were times in the past when the masters degenerated into tyrants and servants lost all respect for them.

* From a speech at Kijori in Monghyr (Bihar).

We may even today find a few cases exhibiting master-servant relations of an ideal kind. But the present age wants the friendship type of relations. The master-servant type does not suit the requirements of the new age. It was found wanting and has been finally rejected.

That is why when today we go to a prospective donor, we do not say, "You are our superior", or that "You are our master. Kindly give us something; we will be very grateful to you." We say, "We are all brothers; give us an equal share." We conceive *dan* i.e. charity, as an equal distribution of one's riches. If someone offers us only two acres out of his hundred or more, we refuse to accept the offer. If our approach had been that of the servant, we would have accepted even two acres. We would have bowed to him and been grateful to him for his kindness. But we do not do so because we are approaching the donors not as servants but as friends.

The present order of society will not accept anything less than friendship as the principle determining the pattern of relationships among its individuals. Even the teacher and the pupil will be friends to each other. They will love each other. The teacher will teach the pupil and the pupil will teach the teacher. Each will give to the other what he has and both will be mutually grateful. Thus the teacher and the pupil, the employer and the workman, the master and the servant will be equals to one another in respect of status.

There was a time when the wife looked on the husband as a deity to be worshipped and regarded herself as a slave to him. This kind of relationship had its good points and the times when it was practised are not to be condemned; but today we have gone a step further ahead. Today the wife will be devoted to her husband and the husband will be devoted to his wife. Both will regard each other as deserving of his or her devotion. Any special ability, whoever of the two may have it, will receive due respect from the other, but they will be equals.

We have to build our society in accordance with the demand of the age. We must realize that old values cannot last in their old forms. The values and norms which obtained when Tulsidas wrote his *Ramayana* cannot be accepted today. In those days a *brahmana* was considered inherently superior but today he cannot claim this superiority as a right. We will now respect virtues wherever we may find them, but the relationship in every case will be based on equality.

For example, in the factories there will be managers and workmen. The former will excel in intelligence and organizational skill, while the latter in their capacity for physical labour. So there will be no occasion for the workman to say that the manager was his master and he was a

servant. This kind of relationship will not be permitted now. Now they will be partners and co-workers in a common endeavour. The manager will be paid for his intelligence, and the workman will be paid for his labour on an equal basis. Reward for every kind of work, whether intellectual or manual, will be the same. Ability will be respected, but all will be equals and co-workers.

Those who refuse to keep pace with the changing times get not only defeated, but also suffer for it. No matter how big according to past standards an individual might be, in the changing times in which we are living, his old habits and manners smacking of a superior air will not be allowed.

Talking to the workers today, I said that we must get one-sixth land from every land-owner, as though it were something due to us in the way of a tax, and we were only to go and collect it. Actually however, we are only explaining to the people that in the present age all have an equal right over land and wealth and means of production. We are only voicing the demand of the age and that is why we are able to do our work so easily. There is no impudence about it. What is needed is a ready recognition on the part of the moneyed classes of the thirst for equality with which the new age has imbued the people everywhere.

Every man has his own speciality. A labourer, for instance, may be deficient in intelligence but rich in the qualities of heart. He may be brave and have the courage to die for a right cause. While an intelligent man, for all his intelligence, may be a coward. Thus every man has his strong and weak points. Our love for each other therefore must be that of equals.

Looking at Bhoodan from this point of view, you will see that it is just an expression of the demand of the age. Had it been otherwise, we could not have received land from small land-owners; and the bigger ones, in many cases, would have turned us out of their presence peremptorily. Besides, we would have had to owe a debt of enormous gratitude to every individual donor. But we just go to everyone without any hesitation and tell him quite frankly that he is not the owner of land. We even insist that there must be as many gift-deeds as there are land-owners. If you set out to awaken the sense of *dharma* i.e. ethical duty in the people for giving effect to what you have realized to be the demand of the age, then your words must prove irresistible. People will have to listen to you and do your bidding. Bhoodan represents just this demand of the age. It is not my invention. I want the workers to carry this message to the people and not merely collect land. Let them explain to the people that this is the age of friendly love and I am sure they will succeed in their mission.

(From Hindi)

HARIJAN

Nov. 28

1953

BHOODAN WAY FOR INDUSTRY

(By Maganbhai P. Desai)

Prof. Dantwala of Bombay University School of Economics, has drawn my attention to an article by Shri M. R. Masani (*Janata*, 30-8-53) and his reply to it. In his article Shri Masani raises the following question: "Can a technique which has, in a little over two years, made available for redistribution nearly 19 lakhs of acres of land and which has a target of 50 million acres to be achieved by 1957, have any application to the industrial sphere?"

And he asks, "Can a similar climate of trust and co-operation replace the prevailing mutual distrust between Industry, Labour, and the State?"

Such a question is natural, looking to the phenomenal success the Bhoodan idea has in our people. It therefore deserves consideration from us.

To begin with, we should understand Shri Vinoba's Bhoodan movement. It is not a mere question of creating a "climate of trust and co-operation" between the landlord and the tenant or the landless labourer, but is one of giving land to the landless and of rehabilitating him in his own village, and making of him an independent and self-reliant tiller of the soil. It is a movement for rehabilitating a crore of our landless families in their own villages and thereby starting a country-wide experiment and well-planned scheme of a rural agro-industrial economy.

The first thing therefore to do in this matter is to call upon the land-owning class for willing dispossession of their lands in favour of the landless. It is not a mere give-and-take relationship which the Bhoodan movement has envisaged, but it is a call on the sense of social justice and equality and for a fair distribution of the means of production amongst all, chiefly those who live and labour with them.

Therefore if we wish to evolve and apply a similar technique of willing dispossession of capital by Industry and Finance, it is not a question of merely replacing distrust between Industry and Labour and the State by trust and co-operation; it is rather one of finding out ways and means to see that capital is socialized in the interests of those who labour through it and produce social wealth. It is a change in the ownership of capital, which is really social, but is owned, under our present laws and ideas of property, by individuals and limited corporations and can be exploited by them in their own

selfish and limited interests or benefit. As I said in these columns previously, the question therefore is, how capital should be made to function as a social trust. Bhoodan suggests that there should be capital-gift. How can we do that in the interests of all, is the question that really comes to us.

The basis for such a change is given to us by Gandhiji's doctrine of trusteeship. Shri Masani invokes this idea in his discussion only to ease labour disputes and for re-establishing the confidence of the investor-cum-owner of industrial capital and the spirit of private enterprise in the managers of industry. The idea of trusteeship is really meant to do something else and more than that. Essentially it is a call to give up the right to capital in industry in favour of those capital-less labourers who really need it and should be free and independent of the exploiting capitalists. Like absentee landlordism, absentee capital-holding, which modern industrial organization, banking and finance have made possible, must be surely liquidated. The Bhoodan way for it would require us to see that it is done with the consent and willing co-operation of the capital-holder. Like the first Bhoodan-giver Shri Reddi, we should have a first capital-giver to begin this new movement. Shri Vinoba's idea of *Sampattidan* is helpful here in a general way. The following are a few suggestions for doing that:

All share-capital must be given over to labour, to be utilized for a co-operative effort on no-profit-no-loss basis;

Those who manage the industry must limit their remuneration bearing a reasonable proportion to the wages of labour;

The pernicious system of Managing Agency must be abolished; captains of industries — the Agents — should give up their rights in favour of the industrial co-operatives;

The State must, to begin with, put a ceiling on industrial profit and agency commissions; and all who work the industry as skilled or unskilled labourers or as technical or managerial workers must be put on a reasonable monthly wage basis.

The unhappy thing today is that our ideas of trade, commerce and industry as also finance and banking and planning are running in a different direction which inevitably leads to tensions and strifes. Unless we revolutionalize this, there is no way out of the capitalist *status quo*.

18-11-53

BHOODAN YAJNA

[Land-gifts Mission]

By Vinoba Bhawe

Pages viii + 134 Price Re. 1-8-0 Postage etc. As. 6

NAVJIVAN PUBLISHING HOUSE

Post Box 105, AHMEDABAD - 9

WAR AND SCIENCE

(By Magambhai P. Desai)

The following is a news item reported from the *National Herald*, October 6, 1953:

"Paris, Oct. 5.—The French physicist, Prof. Frederic Joliot Curie, said last night that if a new world war broke out the result would be purely and simply death for the greatest number of French people.

Addressing a meeting of the national council of the French Peace Movement, Prof. Curie said in the event of a world conflict France would find herself strategically the choice target for new weapons.

He said that the atomic and hydrogen bombs which have been developed and produced in the past several years represent a destructive power considerably greater than that of the atom bomb thrown on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the napalm bomb, and the bacteriological warfare such as has been tried out in Korea, China and Malaya.

Prof. Curie, who is the president of the World Peace Council, said that hydrogen bombs, whose power could be increased in an 'infernal manner', might render all life on our globe impossible. 'This is what is involved when one speaks of world war today', he added.

Prof. Curie said, 'It is the duty of scientists to inform public opinion seriously on these immense dangers and it is their duty to be in the first rank of those who are determined to banish such dangers for ever.'

'The scientists know all the good that science has already brought to humanity. They also know all that it could give now in a world given over to peace. They no longer want to be told that science is leading us to destruction by the atomic and the hydrogen bombs.

'Scientists will know that science cannot be blamed. The guilty ones are certain men who put the results of science to bad uses.' — UPI-AFP.

Why does Prof. Curie isolate the scientists from the blame and thereby make them immune from the joint responsibility to banish war? Is the scientist or science not to be blamed? Why does the scientist lend his talents in search of a thing like an atom bomb or a hydrogen bomb which has obviously no other use but that of human destruction in an 'infernal manner'? Those who use such 'infernal' results of science are undoubtedly guilty. But can the scientist be exonerated from the guilt?

In our own country, scientists are not being asked to use their wits for discovering 'infernal' weapons of war; it is said they are to find out how atomic energy might be used for peaceful and economic gains. They are being asked to prepare synthetic foods and such other goods, which are of dubious value from the point of view of the good of our whole people and their full employment and happiness. These are to serve the ends of an ideal of a social order which is generally described as industrialism. It is increasingly being realized, even in the West, that war and cut-throat competition, poverty and exploitation, colonialism and massacre on a global level are inherent in such an industrialized order. It is science that has brought it about. Can it therefore absolve itself from the ethical question raised above?

If the world is to move forward and out of the slough of war, misery and moral decay in

which it has landed itself during the last few centuries of so-called scientific advance and rationalism, it must begin to question the credentials of its pursuit of science, whether it is a pure activity having no ethical meaning or significance, as we are told to believe till now. It was the great Russian seer Tolstoy who had warned the West long ago in terms which are well worth reproducing even today. (The reader will find that reproduced below). Thinkers must seriously go into this question and build up an ethical code of behaviour for scientific men. Otherwise the all-powerful modern State will continue to exploit them for its 'infernal' business of war.

14-10-'53

SCIENCE FOR LIFE

(By Leo Tolstoy)

It is necessary that another equally important spiritual human activity — science — in intimate dependence on which art always rests, should abandon the false path which it too, like art, is following.

Science and art are as closely bound together as the lungs and the heart, so that if the one organ is vitiated the other cannot act rightly.

As art in general is the transmission of every kind of feeling, but in the limited sense of the word we call nothing art unless it transmits feelings acknowledged by us to be important, so also science in general is the transmission of all possible knowledge, but in the limited sense of the word we give the name of science to that which transmits knowledge admitted by us to be important.

And the degree of importance, both of the feelings transmitted by art and of the information transmitted by science, is decided by the religious perception of the given time and society, that is, by the common understanding of the purpose of their lives possessed by the people of that time or society.

Scientists of our day affirm that they study *everything* impartially; but as everything is too much, is in fact an infinite number of objects, and it is impossible to study all alike, this is only said in theory, while in practice not everything is studied, and study is applied far from impartially — only that being studied which, on the one hand, is most wanted by, and on the other hand, is pleasantest to, those people who occupy themselves with science. And what the members of the upper classes who are occupying themselves with science most want is the maintenance of the system under which those classes retain their privileges; and what is pleasantest are such things as satisfy idle curiosity, do not demand great mental effort, and can be practically applied.

And therefore one side of science, including theology and philosophy adapted to the existing order as also history and political economy of the

same sort, are chiefly occupied in proving that the existing order is the very one which ought to endure; that it has come into existence and continues to exist by the operation of immutable laws not amenable to human will, and that all efforts to change it are therefore harmful and wrong. The other part, experimental science—including mathematics, astronomy, chemistry, physics, botany, and all the natural sciences—is exclusively occupied with things that have no direct relation to the purpose of human life: with what is curious, and with things of which practical application advantageous to people of the upper classes can be made. And to justify that selection of objects of study which (in conformity with their own position) the men of science of our times have made, they have devised a theory of science for science's sake, quite similar to the theory of art for art's sake.

As by the theory of art for art's sake it appears that occupation with all those things that please us—is art, so, by the theory of science for science's sake, the study of that which interests us—is science.

So that one side of science, instead of studying how people should live in order to fulfil their mission in life, demonstrates the righteousness and immutability of the bad and false arrangements of life which exist around us; while the other part, experimental science, occupies itself with questions of simple curiosity or with technical improvements.

The first of these divisions of science is harmful, not only because it confuses people's perceptions and gives false decisions, but also by its mere existence, occupying the ground which should belong to true science. It does this harm, that every man, in order to approach the study of the most important questions of life, must first refute these erections of lies which have for ages been piled around each of the most essential questions of human life, and which are propped up by all the strength of human ingenuity.

The second division—the one of which modern science is so particularly proud, and which is considered by many people to be the only real science—is harmful in that it diverts attention from the really important subjects to insignificant subjects, and is also directly harmful in that, under the evil system of society which the first division of science justifies and supports, a great part of the technical gains of science are turned not to the advantage but to the injury of mankind.

But science, true science,—such science as would really deserve the respect which is now claimed by the followers of one (the least important) part of science,—is not at all of this kind: real science lies in knowing what we should and what we should not believe, in knowing how the associated life of man should and

should not be constituted: how to treat sexual relations, how to educate children, how to use the land, how to cultivate it oneself without oppressing other people, how to treat foreigners, how to treat animals, and much more that is important for the life of man.

Such has true science ever been and such it should be. And such science is springing up in our times; but, on the one hand, such true science is denied and refuted by all those scientific people who defend the existing order of society, and, on the other hand, it is considered empty, unnecessary, unscientific science by those who are engrossed in experimental science.

The great majority of men in our times lack good and sufficient food (as well as dwellings and clothes and all the first necessities of life). And this great majority of men is compelled, to the injury of its wellbeing, to labour continually beyond its strength. Both these evils can easily be removed by abolishing mutual strife, luxury, and the unrighteous distribution of wealth—in a word, by the abolition of a false and harmful order and the establishment of a reasonable human manner of life. But science considers the existing order of things to be as immutable as the movements of the planets, and therefore assumes that the purpose of science is, not to elucidate the falseness of this order and to arrange a new reasonable way of life, but, under the existing order of things, to feed everybody and enable all to be as idle as the ruling classes, living depraved lives, now are.

And, meanwhile, it is forgotten that nourishment by corn, vegetables, and fruit, raised from the soil by one's own labour, is the pleasanter, healthiest, easiest, and most natural nourishment, and that the work of using one's muscles is as necessary a condition of life as is the oxidation of the blood by breathing.

To invent means whereby people, while continuing our false division of property and labour, might be well nourished by means of chemically-prepared food and might make the forces of nature work for them, is like inventing means to pump oxygen into the lungs of a man kept in a closed chamber the air of which is bad, when all that is needed is for the man no longer to be confined in a closed chamber.

Such false ideals could not exist if science were not on a false path.

It is to be hoped that the work I have tried to perform concerning art will be performed also for science; that the falseness of the theory of science for science's sake will be demonstrated; that the necessity of acknowledging Christian teaching in its true meaning will be clearly shown, and on the basis of that teaching a reappraisal be made of the knowledge we possess and of which we are so proud; that the secondariness and insignificance of experimental

ANNUAL OFFERING OF YARN HANKS

(By Vinoba)

Writing on the offering of yarn hanks—*Sootanjali* I had suggested the idea of having a mountain of yarn offerings—*Sutra-kuta*. The idea caught the imagination of constructive workers and at several places yarn hanks were collected and arranged in the manner of a mountain and photos were taken of them and sent to me. They were not mountains, nor hills; they were only small heaps. However, I liked it for it showed that the idea of *Sootanjali* had taken roots in the popular mind.

Last year about a lakh and a half yarn hanks were collected from all over the country, out of which Gujarat alone had contributed 40 thousand. Youths of Gujarat have this year resolved to collect 75 thousand yarn hanks. From the population point of view it comes to one yarn hank per one hundred persons. I have no doubt that with a little effort Gujarat will reach its target. For seeds of Gandhiji's ideas are deeply sown in the soil of Gujarat.

Other provinces can well follow the example of Gujarat. For that it is necessary to prepare a well-thought out plan. Every village should be approached. After the demise of Gandhiji there had arisen a doubt about the propagation of Sarvodaya ideology. Happily that doubt has now been dispelled. The Bhoodan movement has so much influenced the people that they do not now find that Sarvodaya is "an excellent but impracticable" programme. They have come to feel that it can and will achieve the welfare of people. Workers should fully avail themselves of this changed atmosphere.

Government have now come to realize the importance of Khadi in the Five-Year Plan. Khadi is gaining importance, though not from a view to build self-sufficient village republics, but only to combat the problem of unemployment. It has slowly been realized now that as "Khadi was a livery of Freedom" in the struggle for Independence, it can well become the symbol of *Samya-yoga* (egalitarian order on spiritual basis) after the attainment of Independence. Those who felt that after Swaraj Khadi has one of its wings cut off have realized that a new wing is now sprouting in its place. It means that yarn offerings can be collected now not only from villages but from New Delhi also. Workers should exploit this favourable psychology of the people.

The power of yarn offering lies in the slogan (Mantra), 'Each one should donate a yarn hank'. It will help create a brotherhood of yarn offerers on an ideological basis. Sarvodaya Samaj might have a few thousand names on its registers. But the yarn hank offerers will be in lakhs. They may even be crores if only workers put in a more concentrated effort. The donor should attach a

label to the yarn hank bearing his name and full address. He should specify in it his age too. All persons including small children and aged persons can take part in it. This will therefore be not only a reflection of the present but also a pointer to the future.

The Sarva Seva Sangh will ordinarily use the yarn hanks in the provinces from which they are received. Yarn hanks have been considered as very useful in raising institutions dedicated to sacrificial body labour. I suggest 10 lakhs yarn hanks as the target for the next year. Yarn hanks can be offered up to 12th February. I hope all those who love non-party Sarvodaya ideology will enthusiastically participate in this work.

Sakarpara (Bihar)

(Adapted from Hindi)

"Burying Sins in Concrete"

Dear Sir and Friend,

In yesterday's *San Francisco Chronicle* I read the following article:

"A small section of tissue from a victim of the world's first atomic attack will be placed in the cornerstone of the new atom-bomb-proof Armed Forces Institute of Pathology Building here in Washington. The tissue is from a victim of radiation from the bomb explosion over Hiroshima. The cornerstone of the building will be laid in a ceremony on October 20. The building has reinforced concrete walls of extra thick construction, without windows except in the administrative wing. The structure has three floors below ground and five above ground."

It seems to me that America is burying its sins in concrete!

With best regards,

Mrs Willemina Ogterop
Berkeley — California

SARDAR VALLABHBHAI PATEL

Vol. I

The original in Gujarati

By *Narhari D. Parikh*

Pages, xii + 406 Price Rs. 6 Postage etc. Re. 1-5

THE DIARY OF MAHADEV DESAI

Vol. I

Translated from the Gujarati and edited

By *Valji Govindji Desai*

Pages, viii + 335 Price Rs. 5 Postage etc. Re. 1-3

NAVAJIVAN PUBLISHING HOUSE
Post Box 105, AHMEDABAD-9

CONTENTS	PAGE
RIGHT TO EMPLOYMENT .. Gandhiji	305
ECONOMIC PLANNING AND SWADESHI .. Maganbhai P. Desai	305
THE AGE OF FRIENDLY LOVE .. Vinoba	306
BHOODAN WAY FOR INDUSTRY .. Maganbhai P. Desai	308
WAR AND SCIENCE .. Maganbhai P. Desai	309
SCIENCE FOR LIFE .. Leo Tolstoy	309
PROHIBIT VIVISECTION .. Wilfrid Tyldesley	311
SATYAGRAHA vs. BLACKMAIL .. Caroline F. Urie	311
ANNUAL OFFERING OF YARN HANKS .. Vinoba	312
NOTE:	
"BURYING SINS IN CONCRETE" .. Mrs Willemina Ogterop	312