

HARIJAN

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

VOL. XVII. No. 46

AHMEDABAD — SATURDAY, JANUARY 16, 1954

TWO ANNAS

CONGRESS AND VANASPATI

(By Maganbhai P. Desai)

A reader of the *Harijan* sends a cutting or two bearing on the use and advertisement of Vanaspati. The advertisement is a half-page one with a newly married couple portrayed in prominence and a wedding feast etc. along with it, describing how to plan a wedding feast and how it was a success with Vanaspati cooking, and economical to boot!

Another cutting says, "Recently Himachal Pradesh appealed to New Delhi for permission to ban the import of Vanaspati. New Delhi has refused. It may be remembered that in large parts of Himachal Pradesh Ghee is the measure of value and the store of wealth."

But science and Government in India seem to believe otherwise. To the latter Vanaspati gives a few crores of easy income. Subsidised science must support and substantiate its use. It was agreed that to check its adulteration with Ghee, which seems to be at present the general law of our Ghee-manufacture, Vanaspati must be coloured. Science could not, or has no time till now to, solve this question for suitable colouration. In the meanwhile trade is having its way with the people through false advertisement and such other tricks.

We know that the Indian National Congress passed a resolution in its last session, if I remember aright, asking Governments to ban Vanaspati. It has not been heeded to. Will the Kalyani Congress remind them of it?

There is a much more fundamental question that arises here. Do the Congress Governments realize how the common people feel about all this? Like Vanaspati, not implementing Prohibition on an all-India scale is another thing that embitters the minds of the people who were promised it. The lure of drink revenue is the only thing that does not allow Governments to fulfil it. We have the tragedy of witnessing States seceding from Prohibition. Will the Kalyani Congress turn its eyes inward and get at the causes of growing popular frustration and frame a programme that may reasonably be expected to meet it? Will it see that it is at least carried out by

its Governments? The slogan of the Five-Year Plan will not work much longer. We need a bold policy and a sound all-India line of work for the common people in our villages. Let us realize that talk of big things passes over their heads, leaving them as they were, wondering, sullen, and frustrated.

4-1-54

THE LOGIC OF ARMED PEACE

One of the greatest dangers that exist in international affairs is the partial blindness that always afflicts the militarist mind.

Thus the armed forces of one's own land, or of one's ally (while he remains an ally) are for defence. The other armed forces are a threat to peace.

The lies and political stratagems that are resorted to on the other side are lies and evidence of black-guardism; on one's own side they are manoeuvres, regrettable possibly, but dictated by the imperative necessity that good shall prevail.

On the other side political tyranny is a monstrous invasion of human rights; on one's own side it is a necessary means to the defence of freedom.

States associated with Russian policy are dictatorships; Spain and Yugoslavia are just rather less free examples of the free world.

And so on.

The extent of this self-righteous one-sidedness is really staggering. In the heyday of British imperialism this is how British opinion as expressed in its newspapers must probably have looked to the world. It is something we should keep in mind when we marvel at the pronouncements of people like Senator Knowland and Mr Dulles today, and it should help us to a sense of humility.

This one-sided hallucination, this refusal to face facts, is so common in the outlook of the politicians and publicists of the West (it doubtless has its counterpart in the East) that it is becoming part of the permanent climate of opinion — an exceedingly dangerous condition.

(From *Peace News*, London, 20-11-53)

WAR-MAKING AS THE KEY INDUSTRY OF POLITICAL STATES

(By L. P. Jacks)

In a work of immense research, *This War Business*, by Arthur Guy Enock, abundant proof will be found that war-making is correctly named the key industry of political States. On what do these States spend the enormous sums extracted by taxation from the wealth of nations? Mr Enock answers the question. He produces statistics which make it very clear that war-making, which includes preparations for war, accounts for more of the total than all other objects of expenditure put together. He has compiled a table of the yearly spending on all objects of twenty-four leading States for the period of 1900-1946. In this period the total spent on war-making alone amounts to 321,316.7 million pounds sterling, and the total spent on all other objects to 313,759.9 million, some 8,000 million less. What further proof is needed that the political States are essentially war-making institutions and that war-making is their key industry, their young men cannon fodder for the battlefield, and the working community taxation fodder for the war-chest?

The whole fabric of political discipline under which we live, as our fathers lived before us, and from which our citizenship derives its characteristics and our minds their habits of thought, will be found on examination to be adjusted throughout to the war-making needs of the State. These needs may be summed up into a fairly simple formula which would run somewhat thus: 'You must be ready, when war requires it, to place your life and property, on orders given, at the service of the State, to become a fighting man if competent, and to bear whatever taxation may be found necessary. Submit to this and you will be, in the essentials, a good citizen. Refuse to submit and you will be traitor.' The whole pattern of our citizenship lies within that framework. Were the framework removed by the abolition of war, the pattern would lose its cohesion and immediately dissolve. 'Peace-loving' we may well be but, no less than if we were war-loving, we live within a net of war-making needs, and the scope of our lives is no larger than the net allows. In that sense we are all prisoners of war, and disciplined accordingly. The patriotic citizen is the product of that discipline. By this time the eels have become well used to being skinned—as Mr Enock's figures abundantly prove.

It would be found that war-making has done more than anything else in the determination of economic structure; in other words, that this structure has tended continuously to take the form which renders the wealth produced by industry most easily accessible to the demands of the State and most easily divertible into its war-chest.

A notable advance in this direction has been made in recent years, by the adoption in many countries of a socialist economy. By nationalizing industry the wealth it produces is placed at the immediate disposal of the State, and made to flow into the required channels, a much less cumbersome practice than that of extracting it, by taxation or otherwise, from private owners. Nothing has happened in our time more conducive to moulding the economy of the State into conformity with the needs of its key industry. The best example is to be found, of course, in the thoroughgoing Socialism of the totalitarian States. Instead of halting half-way at the nationalization of capital, as British Socialism has done, these countries have nationalized the *labour* which makes capital productive; a strike in the labour force treated on the same level as a mutiny in the fighting force. They have nationalized the horse as well as the cart, the natural and necessary completion of the process, without which the nationalization of the cart is obviously a half-done job. All the totalitarian dictators have had the wit to see that State ownership of the means of production is futile unless it includes the chief 'means', and animating principle of all the others, which is, of course, the human worker. Therein lies the living essence or, as some would say, the poisonous essence of the totalitarian system. Poisonous or not, the advantage from the war-making point of view is self-evident. All the industries of the State are now linked together with the key industry in a single economy under a single control, and the worker brought under the same rule as the fighter—'theirs not to reason why; theirs but to do and die'. A 'planned economy', with a vengeance!

In all this I have been agreeing with the German war philosophers and to some extent repeating their arguments. But, unlike them, I have doubts as to whether the political State, in its present armed and war-making character, is worth preserving. Certainly I cannot regard it, as they do, as the final form of human society, than which there can be no better or higher—the conception of the State as the *summum bonum* to which all individual interests are subordinate and must, if necessary, be sacrificed.

Christianity came into the world as an offer, nay, as the expectation of a form of society infinitely more desirable, on every rational ground, than that presented by any political State now existing, or that has ever existed, or is likely to exist, on the earth.... In the life of such a community war-making, now the key industry of the political State, would naturally have no part; but it would have a key industry of its own, and the name of it, if a name must be given, is *education*, understood in its widest sense as the calling into activity of the spiritual wealth that lies hidden in human nature.

No wonder that the Roman Government persecuted it relentlessly. Hospitable as that

government was to all religions, it made an exception of this and would have none of it. It was politically dangerous. Were it allowed to spread there would be an end to the political State, to the Roman State. And that, at all costs, must not be. But the more the movement was persecuted the more it grew.

Then suddenly, and by a *volte-face*, perhaps the strangest of which history bears record, the movement was arrested. There came a time when, by the act of the Emperor Constantine, the new religion was adopted, and allowed itself to be adopted, as the religion of the State, which had hitherto regarded it as a poisonous superstition. And with what results we all know. The movement, which originally aimed at superseding the reign of power-politics, with its inevitable issue in war, by the peaceable reign of the Divine Spirit of loving kindness, itself became progressively infected with the power-politics it was intended to supersede, attached itself to the master it once threatened to overthrow, took his livery and adopted his ways, its ministers ready to invoke a blessing on the armaments which would never have come into being had its original purpose been retained. The adoption of Christianity as the official religion of the State is commonly regarded as the victory of the former. Are not the reasons as good for regarding it as the victory of the latter?

The resources available for social services of all kinds, so long as these are conducted within the framework of the war-making State, are clearly limited to what is left over when war-making needs have been satisfied. This, as Mr Enock shows, is in the total considerably less than half. The standard of life can rise no higher than this limitation allows. It is a very severe limitation.

The abolition of war, and the consequent disappearance of the key industry we have been discussing, would obviously be attended by economic disturbance in the States affected by it. In our vision of the good that might be done, if the enormous wealth now expended on war-making were diverted to works of peace, we assume too readily that the wealth of nations would still be forthcoming on the same scale or possibly on a greater. Either is conceivable, but neither is certain. Some think it more probable that the disappearance of the key industry would be followed by widespread unemployment and a great fall in production all over the world. We have to remember that the wealth of nations which permits of the colossal expenditure on war-making revealed by Mr Enock has itself been produced under pressure of the war-making need. Were that pressure removed would Mr Enock's millions of millions still continue to be forthcoming, but now set free for the work of peace?

(Adapted from chap. XI, "Near the Brink")

THE CRUX OF THE PROBLEM

(By M. P. T. Acharya)

I

Between financing and marketing all non-productive payments — like interest, rent, profits and taxes — have to be paid — which makes marketing impossible. Whether production is done individually, co-operatively or capitalistically or by State ownership, — whether by hand or machine, or this technique or another, it becomes more and more difficult to sell goods. Getting subsidies or credits will not make selling easier. Unless new pastures are found, selling will become impossible.

All changes proposed without changing — abolishing — the fundamentals, this basis of production and "distribution" will only narrow down sales. The remedy or palliatives within these limits will make the disease worse — will make sales less and less. That means less people will buy every day.

There can be no remedy or palliatives within these fundamentals — no temporary or transitional measures within these limits. Without considering and avoiding — abolishing — these limits, all schemes are useless and vain attempts.

II

All production and distribution are subordinate to these:

1. Money, business and State,
2. Buying and Selling,
3. Prices and Wages,
4. Rent, interest, profits and taxes.

Nothing can be produced or distributed outside these conditions.

No. 1, through Nos. 2 and 3, forces payments to No. 4 — all together in conspiracy to suck the people dry. Yet they expect, even the Bolsheviks, they will distribute goods after production, raise the standard of living, and abolish unemployment. They are day-dreamers, fooling themselves to fool others, taking advantage of others' troubles. They can only produce less and distribute lesser still through the mechanism which they want to wield or are already wielding — they are bound by the machine they wield; the machine conditions and forces their actions. They cannot force a stationary engine to run like a locomotive — it will refuse to. The only way production and distribution can be liberated and put to social purpose is by overthrowing this inhuman paraphernalia — not by maintaining it. Not till then can human needs be satisfied with whatever technique and science it may be. All techniques and science will cease to function when this paraphernalia destroys consumption — which it is doing, which is all it can do, which it is there to do. It can only do violence to consumption and then stop.

HARIJAN

Jan. 16

1954

ANGLO-INDIAN COMMUNALISM

(By Maganbhai P. Desai)

The Constitution of India provides for special consideration to the Anglo-Indian community by way of its representation in legislatures of the States and the Parliament, reservation of seats in certain services, and grant-in-aid for its educational institutions. This community was a privileged one under the ex-British rule, and the legacy thereof continues in the above manner. But it is mentioned in the Constitution that these privileges shall cease to have effect on the expiration of a period of 10 years from the commencement of this Constitution.

As we know, there are certain other classes also who are similarly shown consideration by the Constitution; for example, the Scheduled Classes and the Scheduled Tribes. As a matter of fact, Part XVI of the Constitution is wholly devoted for such classes. It was to meet the special claims of these classes, which were entertained by the British people under their rule here, that the Constitution conceded these privileges, in spite of its fundamental principle that the State shall not discriminate against any citizen on the ground of religion, race, caste, etc. The exceptions made thereto should therefore be only temporary, and as we saw above, they are valid for 10 years only.

Not only that, we would expect that the communities concerned increasingly develop a proper mind in the matter and during that period of grace adjust themselves with the rest in the general body politic. But unfortunately a demand seems to be formulating itself in the mind of these classes to prolong these privileges; and I fear, the Anglo-Indian community also is out for such prolongation in its favour. If so, this is surely a dangerous phenomenon for our growing democracy and all who care to see that real democracy grows and develops in India must be forewarned about it.

The latest warning comes from the Anglo-Indian leader, who has been at present agitating over the Bombay State language policy in education. He is declaring that Anglo-Indian education is in danger on the ill-conceived plea of English in danger, and asserts that this is in violation of the Constitutional protection given to it, and is openly asking English teaching schools in Bombay to disobey and defy Government orders under that policy. It is almost a call for Satyagraha—civil disobedience. Apart from the merits of the case, it is at least interesting to see that ideas of Satyagraha are finding acceptance even among those people who were dead against them only a few years back.

Coming to the merits of the case, we see that there is no case for the kind of agitation that is being organized in Bombay. As the Minister of Education, Bombay State, said the other day, the language policy of the State is not a new one at all. It was adopted as far back as 1948 and instructions were accordingly issued to all English teaching schools. The policy was further clarified in 1951, and these schools were given clear instructions regarding admission of pupils. But these were obeyed in breach only and an uncivil kind of secret disobedience by them has been continuing till now. As the Education Minister said, there was a great deal of dishonesty and abuse in the whole affair. What is done now is to declare that this policy will be strictly enforced henceforth and schools have again been circularized that 'any pupil other than a pupil belonging to a section of citizens the language of which is English, namely Anglo-Indians and citizens of non-Asian descent' should not be admitted by these schools.

This policy has nothing communal or racial about it, as some of its antagonists try in vain to make out. It is based on the sound and fundamental educational principle, which is generally accepted by all now, viz. that primary and all secondary education in India should be conducted through the medium of the regional languages of the pupils. The principle has been accepted by the Secondary Education Commission also, as all-India policy.

It must also be noted that under the Constitution, English is not one of the recognized Indian languages. However there are certain sections of our people like the ones named by the Government, viz. Anglo-Indians, and citizens of non-Asian descent, who profess to have English as their mother tongue. Under the Bombay State policy these are also given the right to have their children educated through English. Therefore to cry out that Anglo-Indian education is in danger is, to say the least, entirely misleading and not at all convincing.

It is unfortunately true that in the transitional stage in which we are today there are certain parents in Bombay city still who wish to continue to remain in the old order of English education, wherein English language was considered the most prominent and almost the chief and only subject worthy of study. The Constitution lays down that English goes out of that imperial overlordship and Indian languages are fully developed and find their legitimate place of honour in the new India that we are building up.

Do those who are agitating against the implementation of this fundamental policy of the Union by Bombay State,—do they stand for the old *status quo*, or do they move with the progressive elements of the country? These vested interests born of English education must surely be prepared to adjust themselves to the demands of our democracy, and not stand in the way of its onward march.

The Anglo-Indian leader will therefore pardon me when I say that, in the interest of his own community, he should desist from the communal war-path that he, I fear, seems to be on and be satisfied with the reasonable assurances that have been given by the Educational Minister of Bombay. He should also note that the Government order does not apply to Anglo-Indian schools only, — it applies to all English teaching schools in the State.

Again, an irrelevant confusion is being created in the public mind by proclaiming that the policy is against English language, and that its teaching is being stopped. This is a very unbecoming and untrue thing to do. It only betrays that a false case is being bolstered up by such wrong propaganda. As we know, English is to be taught from Standard 8, which is the first year of the High School stage. It is a subject of study in our universities also, almost as before till now. Surely nobody is against the learning of English as a great world language. The question is to dislodge it from its old imperial throne and put it in its due place in our national educational system.

And further, a cry of a community's education in danger in the name of the Constitution is not the proper nor dignified way to resent inevitable adjustments that are bound to come upon the present system as it begins to be remodelled by free India. The Government of Bombay deserves to be congratulated upon its bold lead in this matter and we hope other States also will begin to follow it, even to step up the long delayed and overdue revolution in our educational system through Basic Education as envisaged by Gandhiji.

11-1-'54

PUNCTUALITY AND ORDER

(By Gandhiji)

It would be a distinct gain to the national cause if the leaders and workers strictly keep their hours. No man is expected to do more than he really can. If at the end of the day there is surplus work left or he cannot get through it without missing a meal or encroaching upon the hours of sleep or recreation, there is mismanagement somewhere. I have no doubt that if we cultivate the habit of punctuality and acting according to programme, the index of national efficiency will go up, our advance towards our goal will be rapid, and the workers will be healthier and longer lived.

Harijan, 24-9-'38

SELF-HELP

(By Gandhiji)

I have not conceived my mission to be that of a knight-errant wandering everywhere to deliver people from difficult situations. My humble occupation has been to show people how they can solve their own difficulties.

Harijan, 28-6-'42

My work will be finished if I succeed in carrying conviction to the human family, that every man or woman, however weak in body, is the guardian of his or her self-respect and liberty.

The Hindustan Standard, 6-8-'44

OUR BASIC INTERNATIONAL POLICY

(By Jawaharlal Nehru)

What is the basic international policy of India? We want to be friendly with all countries. We work for peace in so far as we can. We have no pretensions about our strength to do this or that. We are struggling to consolidate ourselves, to strengthen ourselves, economically and politically. We are not strong enough like other countries. When we say we work for peace, we do not make mighty difference in the world. It is not in a spirit of boastfulness that we work for peace. We work for peace because it is essential for the world.

Therefore, in so far as we can, we have thrown our weight for the avoidance of war and in search of peace. Because of that we want other countries to follow that idea, more especially our neighbouring countries. In many matters, we have co-operated with them either here or in the U. N., and a kind of group arose there called the Arab-Asian group, where there is no compulsion, but there is good deal of co-operation. We welcome that and we welcome co-operation in other ways too. We have found that Pakistan has co-operated in this matter. We found that these neighbouring countries of ours, more or less, thought like us, not because we are leaders and they are followers, but because they were conditioned in the same way as we were conditioned in the past history and events and other things. They reacted in the same way and it was our hope and it is our hope that there would be an ever-growing area where war would not take place even if the catastrophe and misfortune of war come to some other parts of the world.

New Delhi, 23-12-'53

(From A. I. C. C. Economic Review, 1-1-'54)

SECURE SWARAJ BY SELF-RELIANCE *

(By Vinoba)

People ask, how is it that though there is Swaraj they do not yet feel its glow? It cannot be that the sun should rise and yet darkness be not dispelled from our homes. As soon as there is sunrise, the light descends upon the village and every hut in the village has light and warmth. This is no doubt true, but the fault lies with the people themselves. The advent of Swaraj should have transmitted to every individual the feeling that it was now his 'rajya'; that he was now the master of the situation and free architect of his destiny. That is the inalienable sign of Swaraj. Under Swaraj men must take to work; they must use their hands and feet and cultivate self-reliance. They will have Swaraj in the measure that they do so. An individual who has the taste of Swaraj would consider himself strong even though physically he may be very weak. He would not oppress

* From a speech at Shrinagar, Saharsha, on 18-12-'53.

anybody nor would he consent to suffer any oppression from any quarter. He will feel that he has the power to manage his affairs in his own possession and that he must use it well.

And this is what we preach to the people when we go to them and say that the power to make your village happy lies in your own hands. You may get help from outside, but principally it is for you to work out your own progress. No doubt it is our Government which now rules the country and as such it should and surely it would come to your help. But the help from the Government would be after all only an infinitesimal fraction of what is needed to raise your life to its full vigour. He who believes that the uplift of the villages would be brought about through the help and the initiative of the Government has not understood the true meaning of Swaraj. Not even God, much less the Government can help the indolent. The Kisans know it from their experience. If they do not work and prepare the fields, the land would not grow the crops, however much it may rain from above. The crop would grow only if they prepare the fields and sow the seeds. He alone gets God's help who thinks, plans and works. When even God's help is thus conditioned, it is an error to think that you can sit idle and the State will still come to your help and do all that is needed. The feeling and the confidence that we can and will mould our life into the shape of the ideals which we stand for is of the essence of Swaraj.

Where there is no such realization of one's power to do things, there is no Swaraj. Swaraj would then be merely a change from one set of rulers to another. True, the new rulers are from amongst us, they are our own; and that is a matter of joy to us. But that is not sufficient; people must wake up to a sense of their own strength in order to wrest its full value from the Swaraj which they have achieved after a long struggle and untold sacrifices.

Achievement of Swaraj then means an opportunity with more favourable circumstances for greater work. It means an invitation to rise to our fullest height. What would we say of a Kisan who having been restored to his lost land is so far bewildered with joy that he thinks he has nothing more to do and that security is now assured to him for all time? Obviously we will call him foolish, but that is exactly how most of us are behaving. Most of you, who are assembled here are clothed in mill-cloth purchased from the market. Tulsidas has said, "Happiness cannot be had even in dream, under bondage." You purchase your cloth from outside, use mill-oil, get your grain ground in the flour-mill and your rice pounded in the rice-mill. If you purchase all your needs—grain, sugar, shoes from outside and thus transfer so much of your work to be done by others, is it any wonder that you are unhappy? The townsmen believe

that they are obliging the villagers by giving them cheap goods. They think they are serving the villages and in effect we find that the villagers, condemned to forced idleness, are being increasingly impoverished. The way out lies in building up self-sufficiency in all that you need. All the land and all the wealth should be treated as that of the village community which should be empowered to administer it in the interests of all. The Government will surely not stand in your way if you decide not to purchase your oil or cloth from outside. If Delhi can rule over Patna and Patna rule over your village, why cannot you rule over your own village?

Governments come and go. India has had a number of them in the course of its long history, none lasting for more than two hundred years. Governments after all play only a very limited part in shaping our life and conduct. A far greater part is played in this respect by *dharma* i.e. our sense of duty, by thought, and by fellow-feeling. How is it that people in our country yet observe the custom of taking a dip in the holy Ganga at the time of an eclipse? Certainly the Government does not compel them to do it. It is just an unwritten social compact which our forefathers came to centuries ago and which people still observe. It is clear that the peace and order which we find in the society is not created mainly by Government, but it is brought about by the power which *dharma*, love and thought naturally exercise over our minds.

The mother suckles and feeds her child; it is because of love. With the sun going down in the west, the Mussalman bows down in prayer and the Hindu sits up for his *sandhya*, the evening meditation; — it is because of *dharma*. We do not steal and consider the thief to be a sinner; — it is because of the power of thought. All these powers which have sustained man and society for ages are still at your disposal. The power of the Government is as nothing compared to them. Acquire them, spread them, use them and you will be happy.

There is enough land in every village. Share it among yourselves and all will have enough to eat.

Then why should you not administer justice locally in the village itself? Is it necessary that you should always carry your disputes to Patna or the District Headquarters? Is there no good man in your village whom all could trust? All these things can be done quite easily. You have only got to be conscious of your strength and power and use it for the welfare of all.

(Adapted from the original in Hindi)

BHOODAN YAJNA

[Land-gifts Mission]

By Vinoba Bhawe

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

NAVAJIVAN PUBLISHING HOUSE

Post Box 105, AHMEDABAD - 9

THE WORLD PEACE FRONT

[The following is the formal declaration of a peace front in the modern war-worried world. It was adopted by the Peacemaker Conference held in Chicago, Ill. on October 4, 1953. It seeks to formulate why neither the Russian nor the American Camp, but a separate World Peace Front, called the 'Third Camp' or the 'Third Area' as radically different from the above two, is the need of the world today. Such a move is not mere 'neutrality' nor 'equidistantism', but is a positive position of peace-loving peoples *vis-a-vis* the war, cold or hot, whatever it may be.

The following is the preamble—the main thesis of such a world peace movement today. What the 'Third Camp' concretely means is given by the Declaration in its latter half, which will follow in the next issue.

5-1-53

M. P.]

The second half of the Twentieth Century finds the world in a profound crisis. In the midst of tremendous opportunity for material abundance, made possible by technological advance, we are living under the shadow of war and economic insecurity, and in danger of social disintegration. Armaments increase, cleavages deepen, wars which cost the lives of hundreds of thousands of men are fought under the guise of "police action". Despite surface changes in the international scene, each day seems to bring us closer to an appalling Third World War fought with weapons more barbaric than poison gas, more destructive than atomic bombs.

For these and other reasons, large numbers of people in this and other countries are victims of fear, apathy and a sense of frustration which prepare the ground for yielding to totalitarian control.

In facing this situation, we have, as our starting-point, a deep-seated concern for and belief in democracy. By this we mean a way of life and an order of society based on the recognition of the dignity and worth of the human individual and of his need of and inalienable right to self-determination. Only on this condition is he able to achieve true self-expression and to make his full contribution to the development of community among all men in all relationships and throughout the whole world.

Integral to our conception of democracy is non-violence of spirit and method. Democracy ceases to be democracy when it seeks to base itself on coercion and violence rather than upon consent. A democratic society can neither be achieved nor maintained by undemocratic means.

It follows from the nature of the crisis and from our deepest convictions, that we cannot look to either of the power blocs which divide the world into two armed camps—American or Russian, Western or Eastern—for the solution of the crisis by the achievement of a global democratic society. The world is undergoing the most complete and far-reaching social revolution in history. From the Ganges to the Nile, peasants and workers who have been oppressed by

poverty, disease and tyranny for thousands of years are suddenly striking out for freedom. Africa and Asia are afire with movements for independence. British, Dutch and French imperialism, which flowed from the West's betrayal of democracy, is discredited and is in retreat where it has not already been overthrown.

Both the Soviet Union and the United States belong in a real sense to the past from which these groups are revolting. The latter has consistently ignored the world revolution, or sought to thwart it, giving support to those governments and those groups which could maintain the *status quo*, act as a "bulwark" against Communist thought, and help in the attempt at military "containment" of Communism. The United States cannot support the revolutionary movements, partly because she is so involved in the political-economic pattern of imperialism, and partly because she dare not risk freeing a nation lest it take an independent course in the cold war.

The domestic as well as the foreign policies of this nation force us to the conclusion that the longer men support the "American Camp," the more certain the prospect of war, the more inevitable the prospect of the Garrison State.

Nor do we look to the heavily armed bloc of Communist totalitarianism and the regimes which it inaugurates in various countries, as instruments to abolish war, end oppression and terror, and build a true community of free men. Communism has indeed recognized the significance of the great popular revolution, which largely accounts for its spread in recent years and still gives it a formidable appeal to multitudes of people, especially in the technologically backward and exploited lands. But Communism sets up totalitarian regimes where it comes into power, imposes a rigid State collectivism without regard to the human cost, and regiments the masses into huge war machines instead of leading them to peace as it professes to do. Thus Communism betrays the popular revolutions and in its own way is clearly a part of the undemocratic, imperialist past rather than the free society of the future.

Since, therefore, neither of the present dominant regimes and power blocs provides a democratic answer to the problems of world revolution and the needs of mankind, we necessarily take a third position and belong to what is sometimes called "The Third Camp".

(To be continued)

A VISION OF FUTURE INDIA

By K. G. Mashruwala

Pages v + 69 Price Re. 1 Postage etc. As. 5

NAVJIVAN PUBLISHING HOUSE

Post Box 105, AHMEDABAD-9

BHOODAN AND CHARITY

(By Maganbhai P. Desai)

A reader of the *Harijan* seeks an answer to his following query. He quotes from Gandhiji's article 'Right to Employment' which was reproduced in the *Harijan* of 28-11-'53 (p. 305) and considers the question of Bhoodan in the light of that and asks:

"The landlord, whether big or small, is asked to give at least a portion of his land to be distributed among the landless, as charity. Is this not a charity of land to the landless? Without any effort the landless gets land. Giving free land is something like giving free meal. Is this not against the Gandhian principle? Perhaps, this is the reason why Gandhiji did not think of Bhoodan work. If he had willed, he could have included this item of work in his Constructive Programme."

It is not that such a question has not been answered before. However, it is as well an answer might be given. The following was written by me in reply:

"Your poser in yours of 2-1-'54 regarding Bhoodan as a form of charity, I pass on to Shri Vinoba. However, I may draw your attention to one thing: Land is a means of production and is not a produce like consumer's goods or cash money that the giving of which is usually associated with objectionable form of charity. Again, the right of property in land is created by the State; it is therefore a matter of social justice to see that the right is not allowed to be a means of the tiller's exploitation. I would say, the property right is not directly productive, unlike the right of the tiller who produces with his own labour. Therefore if a landlord gives up his right to some land, he does it, not so much from a sense of charity, but rather for fulfilling claims of social justice.

I do not think it is justified to say that Gandhiji did not suggest Bhoodan because it was objectionable as charity. As far as I know, to tackle the land problem under an alien rule was very difficult if not impossible, was perhaps what made Gandhiji desist from it. However, this is not important and we might well leave out Gandhiji in this discussion."

The correspondent at the end of his letter advises the landless by saying:

"Let the landless person work hard, save something and purchase land from his savings. Then, we can think of giving him land at a concession rate instead of as charity. Now, so far as work is concerned, the State should see that each individual is provided with some kind of productive work."

The advice, so far as it goes, is good enough. Well may landlords begin to give their land at concession rate to those landless who want to and can buy it. However, I would only add that the State has to see that land reaches in the hands of those who till it from those who are absentee landlords. Again, not that the landless do not

have any work; their difficulty is that it is not remunerative enough, nor is it always forthcoming, wherefor they have to remain idle or under-employed; and further, the landowner or the Zamindar usually extorts heavy rent from his tenants and ejects them even. The State has to see that all this is set right as quickly as possible. The Bhoodan way is the people's own effort to achieve the object noted above. It is not quite the form of charity that is held to be objectionable even by the public mind.

8-1-'54

The Two Khan Brothers

Just as this goes to the Press, we learn that Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan and Dr. Khan Saheb along with other Khudai Khidmatgars who were locked up in Pakistan jails are released by the Pakistan Government. This is really a very good new year's gift to the world. At the time when important and far-reaching things are being considered by that country, it would be nothing short of one's own undoing to keep these great and noble servants of the people behind bars. Prime Minister Mohammed Ali has added a feather in his cap by the wise step that he has taken now. Similarly, he will be only serving his country if he gets out of the mistake of believing that he would be stronger by contracting for American military aid. It would be an act of very great service even to his own country.

The Khan brothers need rest after a long period of ailment and bondage. During the last 6 years much water has flown down the great rivers of the world,—of India and Pakistan. They have to study it all. We pray to God, may He restore them in health so that they might again begin to work as Khudai Khidmatgars—God's servants, that they have vowed to be.

6-1-'54

M. P.

(From the original in Gujarati)

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
CONGRESS AND VANASPATI .. Maganbhai P. Desai	361
THE LOGIC OF ARMED PEACE ..	361
WAR-MAKING AS THE KEY INDUSTRY	
OF POLITICAL STATES .. L. P. Jacks	362
THE CRUX OF THE PROBLEM .. M. P. T. Acharya	363
ANGLO-INDIAN	
COMMUNALISM .. Maganbhai P. Desai	364
PUNCTUALITY AND ORDER .. Gandhiji	365
SELF-HELP .. Gandhiji	365
OUR BASIC INTERNATIONAL	
POLICY .. Jawaharlal Nehru	365
SECURE SWARAJ BY	
SELF-RELIANCE .. Vinoba	365
THE WORLD PEACE FRONT ..	367
BHOODAN AND CHARITY .. Maganbhai P. Desai	368
NOTE:	
THE TWO KHAN BROTHERS .. M. P.	368