

HARIJAN

12 Pages

Editor: PYARELAL

VOL. XI, No. 25

AHMEDABAD — SUNDAY, JULY 20, 1947

TWO ANNAS

WHY ARMIES ?

An English friend, deeply interested in education and a hater from the bottom of his heart of war, said to me the other day: "I am dreadfully sad about the partition but I suppose it could not be avoided. What, however, I can never understand is why any country needs armies. We talk glibly of human rights and world peace but how can there be peace so long as armies, whether of the land, air or sea exist in any country? Why cannot an adequate police force be enough for any country to maintain law and order and why cannot all armies be disbanded? In the initial stages an international police force may be necessary. I had hoped India would, under your chief's guidance, give the world this lead. But I realize that the communal strife has, I hope only for the time being, obscured what I have always believed was India's own goal. If you are forced to spend an enormous amount of money on armaments, what about education? It will be the same old cry and there will be no money for your primary needs."

Perhaps nothing, next to the partition itself, has filled Gandhiji's heart with such utter dismay as the division of the army. In agony of heart he has painted to his prayer audiences the awesome picture of, perhaps, a Hindu and a Muslim army facing each other with intent to kill and destroy utterly—almost as if the continuing orgies of violence were not or had not been enough to turn men's minds for ever from arson, loot, murder and rape!

The English friend's fears are justified. A poor country like India, if forced to maintain a strong army, will never be able to spend liberally on nation-building activities and its last state will be worse than the first.

Two Indonesian friends, who dropped in to see Gandhiji, asked how it was possible for them to resist European aggression except by aggression. Europe had always believed in force and the Indonesian friends did not see how any country could meet it except by force.

Gandhiji gently remonstrated by saying that such a question betrayed complete ignorance of non-violence. "Let me put you a counter-question," he said. "Supposing the armed and combined might of Britain, America and Russia wished to enslave you, what amount of violence would you need to counter it? I suggest that you could not violently stand up to it unless, perhaps, you had the backing of the whole of Asia and even then you might lose if the European weapons of war were better. But you

could resist them alone with non-violence. You might be annihilated to a man but no one could conquer you." Gandhiji went on to tell them what he has been saying on more than one occasion recently that the Indian struggle for independence had been mere passive resistance which is a weapon of the weak and often a stepping stone to active armed resistance. If the Congress had really adopted non-violence, the present communal strife just could not have come into being. The bravery of the heart was far greater than the bravery of the body. A non-violent Indonesia could lead the East, a position Gandhiji would have liked India to hold. But today a mighty flood of violence was sweeping over India which they had not, to their hurt, learnt how to resist non-violently. "Unless," he ended, "we cultivate this strength, India will not fulfil the high hopes I have cherished for her in my heart all these many many years."

New Delhi, 10-7-'47

A. K.

NOTES

The Problem of Europe

The Dutch Ambassador Mr. Winkleman visited Gandhiji the other day. He said that he was a philosopher rather than a diplomat. He was soon to leave for Singapore and another would take his place. He was sorry to leave India, when India was passing through eventful times. He wished Gandhiji a long life. There was a lot to be done yet. "Do you expect a lot of trouble still?" he asked Gandhiji.

Gandhiji: "If I can forecast the future, I feel there is some more trouble in store for us before we settle down."

"You are a believer in God," said the visitor. "Your mind must be at rest if you feel that India is going in the right direction. Europe is not. The troubles of Europe are due to the fact that Europe has left Christianity."

"Yes, I have believed that for a long time," replied Gandhiji.

"What do you think of the situation in Europe?" asked the visitor.

Gandhiji: "I think nothing. It is beyond me. It is a complicated affair."

"Yes, it is complicated," agreed the visitor. He had met Dr. Malan in 1939 in Europe. He was asked several questions about Europe. He said that there was no hope for Europe. Asked why, he had replied: "Europe has lost its religion. The philosophy of materialism has come to stay. They think they can do everything without God. They will be making so many mistakes that another upheaval will come before long." "And it did," added the

visitor. "People think that they can separate religion from business and lead two lives. It cannot be done."

"I have held that opinion for a long time," replied Gandhiji.

Darkest Hour before Dawn

Another European friend dropped in later. He had first come to India during Gandhiji's Hindu-Muslim Unity Fast of 21 days at Delhi. "The fast does not look like a success so far," he said, "but there must be some result. Today people seem to have lost sight of the basic fact that the real thing is a mutual understanding and friendship. Everyone seems to be concentrating on boundaries. They do not matter at all."

Gandhiji agreed. He was doing what he could, but he was like a spent bullet, he said.

The visitor did not agree. "You are the biggest force, you are the centre still. Tell us what can be done," he asked.

"Pray," was Gandhiji's simple and brief reply.

"There is a growing feeling of retaliation in people's minds," he said. "It is bad."

"I do not think this feeling will stay," replied Gandhiji. "If it does, it will mean goodbye to freedom. India will commit suicide."

"Many Hindus feel that the area ceded to Pakistan has got to be taken back. It irritates the Muslims," said the visitor.

"Personally I feel Pakistan has come to stay," said Gandhiji.

"On that basis," said the visitor, "friendship is possible."

"Pakistan has come," said Gandhiji, "but how friendship can be achieved, I do not know."

"Things have got to get worse before they get better," said the visitor. "It is darkest before dawn."

Noakhali

Gandhiji's mind has been constantly turning to Noakhali. Some of Gandhiji's party have left the place mostly on account of illness. The climatic conditions, the diet, the dismal sights one sees and the gruesome tales one hears are most trying. Among those who are still there are Shri Pyarelalji and Shri Kanu Gandhi. They have been doing good work. Bibi Amtul Salam who preceded Gandhiji to Noakhali is also still there and has refused to come away in spite of very poor health. Then there are the stalwarts from the Khadi Pratishthan under Satish Babu and Hemaprabha Devi. Lastly, the one Sikh in the person of Sardar Jiwan Singhji of the I. N. A. has stuck to his post.

News coming from Noakhali is far from reassuring. Referring to it Gandhiji said in the prayer meeting:

"The Hindus in Noakhali are nervous lest they may not get the compensation promised or might find at liberty those who are locked up pending trial for murder etc. I hope all such fear is unjustified."

In a letter to Shri Kanu Gandhi he wrote: "My body is here, but my heart is in Noakhali." He is restless in the Capital of India. He feels that his place is in Bihar and Noakhali. But he does not so far as possible wish to go against the wishes of his friends. "I have promised to do or die in Noakhali. The picture is gloomy. It looks as if I will have to die there"—he remarked in the course of a conversation. A friend reminded him that when he had sent the members of his party to different villages, he had said, they won't have to be away for more than 5 or 6 months at the most. "Yes", said Gandhiji, "I did say that, but then I went to South Africa for one year and was there for twenty and I went to Champaran for three days and stayed there for one year. Such is life with its uncertainties."

New Delhi, 10-7-'47

S. N.

LET US LEARN

Dr. Hugh Dalton, Chancellor of the British Exchequer speaking in the House of Commons a few days ago laid down certain principles on which he is working to meet the shortage of food in Great Britain and also dealt with the maintenance of the economic machinery by properly regulated exports. The economy of Great Britain differs widely from that of ours. Bulk of food materials in Great Britain comes from abroad while she exports great many manufactured articles to pay for it. However that may be, the policy followed is capable of being applied to our own country. The underlying motive in Dr. Dalton's policy is to provide the people with sufficient food and everybody to be dealt with equally. India can supply her own needs if she has a definite policy to govern her economic organization. This, we are afraid, is now lacking. Therefore, it would be well for us to study the way the statesmen are handling the situation in Great Britain.

Dr. Dalton said: "The guiding principle adopted in framing this policy is to sustain the productive power of Britain and, therefore, to safeguard in the first place those imports which are essential to the health and strength of our people, to the employment and to the efficient equipment of our industry." To do this it is imperative that we should have a scale of values on which to see which articles should be given priority. As Dr. Dalton put it: "We must achieve economies of the less essential imports." He proposes to do this by a substantial reduction of the imports of tobacco, petrol and newsprint. We know that these three articles have in Great Britain an inelastic demand—that is, the people would buy them at any price. British smoking habit, their dependence on petrol-driven vehicles and their interest in public affairs make these three items almost necessities and yet their statesmen have the foresight and courage to cut out these when food is in danger. Furthermore, he has also said that he will have to arrange for exports of textiles to enable imports of food. This means

that Dr. Dalton has the courage to meet not only the consumers but also the vested interests in the textile industry. These measures, they call, "austerity cuts".

In Great Britain, in addition to the above articles, they are imposing a duty on films. These again have now assumed the role of necessities in countries like Great Britain.

In contrast to this determined attack on food shortage, we find here in India that the Government is allowing cotton to be exported. This means that we are growing more cotton than food. India is an agricultural country. The first charge on the land must be for food-crops and no money-crop should be grown when there is a shortage of food. There are extensive lands under cultivation of tobacco and also long staple cotton for mills. Are we then to follow the good example set by Great Britain and act with grim determination?

Not only should we produce more food but we must conserve the food already grown. We have time and again mentioned in these columns that production of white sugar decreases the food value of our agricultural product. Similarly, milling of rice and polishing of it reduce the food value found in paddy. Therefore, if we are courageous enough to meet the situation today, we should be banning all rice mills and reducing our sugar product.

Unfortunately our Governments are slack where the interests of the masses are concerned. News comes from Bihar that five new sugar factories are to be constructed in different parts of the province and the Government is about to issue licences in a few weeks. Some of the sugar factories, we hear, have the audacity to launch on legal proceedings to recover damages from the Government. They seem to hold that the fixing of sugar prices have led them to losses. It would, therefore, be wiser on the part of the Government, instead of dabbling and controlling of these prices, to cut out the erring limbs altogether by banning sugar mills and rice mills as an anti-social device for destruction of food.

We hope that in a Swaraj Government where the ministries will have the popular support, their hands will be strengthened to fight the vested interests at every turn.

J. C. KUMARAPPA

THE NATION'S VOICE

(Second Edition)

[Being a collection of Gandhiji's speeches in England and Sjt. Mahadev Desai's account of the sojourn — September to December 1931]

Edited by

C. Rajagopalachar
and

J. C. Kumarappa

Price Rs. Three

Postage etc. As. Seven

THE RELOADING

With reference to the article *Jettisoning the Ballast*, the Director of Information and Publicity, Madras, supplies us with the following information to give a complete picture, correct any misapprehensions and allay fears:

In the four Circars districts the Producer-cum-Consumer Societies started by the late Ministry and entrusted with procurement work were found to be unsuitable for the purpose for which they were constituted. Procurement in these districts failed to make headway, the principal reason being that the Societies had insufficient time and were unable to perfect their procurement machinery by the season when procurement operations should have been in full swing, and the rationing system in the deficit districts of the province was in serious danger of a complete breakdown owing to deficient procurement by the Societies in the surplus districts mentioned. Confronted with this threat of shortage of food in the deficit districts, the Government had to make a choice between continuing procurement work through the Societies and making more effective arrangements which would ensure speedier results. They decided on the latter course as a matter of pure necessity. While announcing their intention to take away procurement for the present *kharif* season from the Producer-cum-Consumer Societies, they emphasized that the "Government are anxious to prevent the frittering away of the large share capital collected by these societies and to put the societies to the best use possible they have appointed a special agency without delay to examine and devise suitable means of stabilizing the societies for the benefit of the community." Arrangements have been made to bring into existence the investigating agency referred to. The societies in Malabar which have been doing good work are being continued.

"In the case of Estate Land Revenue Bill, the present Government have taken a more drastic step in the line of reform. While the Prakasam Bill sought to perpetuate the permanent settlement on a new basis, the present Government are introducing a Bill for the abolition of Zamindaris; the present Zamindari ryot will become a ryotwari ryot with all the rights to the soil etc., now enjoyed by the latter. The new Bill is almost ready and will surely be introduced in the next session. The present Bill also includes whole *inam* villages sought to be excluded by the previous Bill, and this has the approval of the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee and all ryot associations.

"The Government are also considering the question of reorganizing the Co-operative Movement so as to transform it into an effective instrument for the economic amelioration of the people and a means of rehabilitating agricultural and rural economy.

"What has been stated should clearly indicate that far from throwing overboard the programmes of the previous Ministry in certain matters, the present Ministry in Madras are only trying to reshape some of those programmes and to infuse them with

new life and new meaning. If some modifications and alterations have been made or are proposed to be made in the details of the scheme initiated by the previous Ministry, it is only to bring them into stricter conformity with the needs and requirements of the existing situation and to make them better instruments for the promotion of the good of the masses."

We are extremely glad to know that the present Ministry is eager to infuse new life into their programme.

J. C. KUMARAPPA

HARIJAN

July 20

1947

SOCIALISM

(By M. K. Gandhi)

II

Truth and *ahimsa* must incarnate in socialism. In order that they can, the votary must have a living faith in God. Mere mechanical adherence to truth and *ahimsa* is likely to break down at the critical moment. Hence have I said that truth is God. This God is a living Force. Our life is of that Force. That Force resides in, but is not the body. He who denies the existence of that great Force, denies to himself the use of that inexhaustible Power and thus remains impotent. He is like a rudderless ship which, tossed about here and there, perishes without making any headway. The socialism of such takes them nowhere, what to say of the society in which they live.

If such be the case, does it mean that no socialist believes in God? If there be any, why have they not made any visible progress? Then again, many godly persons have lived before now; why have they not succeeded in founding a socialistic state?

It is difficult completely to silence these two doubts. Nevertheless, it is possible to say that it has perhaps never occurred to a believing socialist that there is any connection between his socialism and belief in God. It is equally safe to say that godly men as a rule never commended socialism to the masses.

Superstitions have flourished in the world in spite of godly men and women. In Hinduism itself untouchability has, till of late, held undoubted sway.

The fact is that it has always been a matter of strenuous research to know this great Force and its hidden possibilities.

My claim is that in the pursuit of that search lies the discovery of *satyagraha*. It is not, however, claimed that all the laws of *satyagraha* have been laid down or found. This I do say, fearlessly and firmly, that every worthy object can be achieved by the use of *satyagraha*. It is the highest and infallible means, the greatest force. Socialism will not be reached by any other means. *Satyagraha* can rid society of all evils, political, economic and moral.

New Delhi, 13-7-'47

(Translated from the original in Gujarati)

THE CONFLICT

On the 25th of June Gandhiji said in his post-prayer speech that he was torn between several conflicts. He felt that Bihar was calling him, so was Noakhali where he had commenced work among the riot-affected refugees and tried to specialize in the work. When a month ago he left Patna, he was under the impression that he would return to Bihar inside of a week. But events had taken place during the month in such quick succession that perhaps a generation had been packed into a month. So he was vegetating in New Delhi hoping that thereby he was serving both Bihar and Noakhali. Then he fancied that the Punjab was also calling him. He saw no guiding star unmistakably telling him which way to take. He, therefore, went by the saying that had gripped him years ago — "When in doubt stay where you are."

At one stage he thought of going to Uttarkashi before going anywhere else. The late Shri Malaviyaji had given him a glowing account of the holy place and of the holy men one came across in that place. He had insisted that he would take Gandhiji to Uttarkashi some day. The day never came during Malaviyaji's lifetime, but it would certainly please his soul, wherever he was today, to see Gandhiji perform the pilgrimage. Sheth G. D. Birla on hearing of Gandhiji's wish undertook to make all arrangements to enable him to perform the pilgrimage — practically on foot. This was an added inducement for Gandhiji. Shri Mirabeen who had gone to Uttarkashi in quest of peace and inspiration from the Himalayas wrote to say that the climate at Uttarkashi won't be suitable till September. So the trip was dropped for the present.

The public on hearing of his proposed visit to Uttarkashi began to speculate that he was thinking of retiring to the Himalayas because of his differences with the leaders. He has his differences with them. The dream of his *Ramaraj* does not seem to be materializing. But he has developed the quality of detachment to a large extent. He is doing what he has done all along, show the right path, proclaim the truth from house tops irrespective of whether anyone listens or not. The leaders have to do their duty by the public. That is the law of democracy. They cannot force on the people what they do not want. So the picture of a free India as it is emerging today is far different from what anyone had imagined. It distresses Gandhiji more than anyone else. He often wonders whether he had led the country astray during the last thirty years. He has already confessed that the non-violence of our people was not the non-violence of the brave, else they would not have discarded it in favour of violence to settle their domestic troubles. The air is full of violence. In spite of all his efforts there seems to be no sign of the growing bitterness giving way to goodwill and friendship. So he has now begun to say that our struggle was but passive resistance which is a precursor of armed resistance.

Would it not have been better if the country had trained itself along violent lines from the beginning, he wonders. The answer is 'no'. The experiment has shown what even non-violence of the weak can achieve. He has to give a demonstration of the non-violence of the brave. It was with this view that he vowed to do or die in Noakhali. He must keep his promise. Speaking at the prayer meeting on the 12th instant, he referred to the *bhajan* sung wherein the poet wondered why man forgot God and Truth and clung to his six bitterest enemies like anger, greed etc. He then reminded the audience of his promise to do or die in Noakhali. He had said that he would not leave Noakhali till the Hindus and the Muslims assured him that he could go without feeling the slightest anxiety about the honour, life and property of the Hindus there. Who was he to achieve such a result? He was but a servant of God. If God wished it, He would make him the instrument of such service. If He did not do so, he would be content to do or die in Noakhali. He would just live in the midst of the people of Noakhali rendering such service as he could. His friends told him that he was crazy to attach so much importance to Noakhali. What was Noakhali as compared to the whole of India? they argued. Why should he not use his talents for the service of India as a whole instead of confining himself to Noakhali? If things were alright in India, they would be alright in Noakhali. He was made differently. His mother, an illiterate village woman had taught him *यथा पिण्डे तथा ब्रह्माण्डे*. The atom reflected the universe. She had explained to him that he should take care that he did the right thing. His universe was his immediate surroundings. If he served them the universe would take care of itself.

A friend from Noakhali had written to him that if he did not return there by the 15th of August, he might have to repent. 15th August was the dead line for the division of India and the transfer of power from British to Indian hands. As a matter of fact the division was a settled plan already. But God could upset the plans of men. An earthquake could destroy the whole of India before the appointed day. A foreign invasion might upset man's pretty and petty plans.

But humanly speaking, Pakistan would be a legally established fact on the 15th of August. He had left Noakhali to go to Bihar. He had done a lot for the Muslim brethren there. The number of deaths in Bihar far exceeded that in Noakhali. It was nearly 10,000, whereas in Noakhali it was under 500. When the call came from Bihar he went there. He was, therefore, bound to take Bihar on his way to Noakhali. He was anxious to reach there as early as possible. He felt out of place in Delhi. It was not so in Bihar and Noakhali. He wanted them to pray that God might enable him to return to Noakhali early and fulfil his promise.

S. N.

New Delhi, 12-7-47

FROM GANDHIJI'S SPEECHES

[Selected and condensed where necessary.— S. N.]

THE WAY OUT

Last evening I showed why the coming freedom seemed to create no enthusiasm. This evening I propose to show how we can, if we will, turn the calamity into a blessing. It will profit us nothing to brood over the past or to blame this party or that. Technically freedom is yet to come a few days hence. In fact the parties having jointly accepted the situation, there is no turning back. Only the inscrutable Providence can undo what men have agreed to do.

One easy and ready way out is for the Congress and the League to come together and arrive at a mutual understanding without the intervention of the Viceroy. The League has to make the first move. I do not at all suggest the undoing of Pakistan. Let that be treated as an established fact beyond dispute or discussion. But they can sit together in a mud hut large enough to accommodate not more than ten representatives and undertake not to part till they have reached an agreement. I dare swear that if such an event occurs, it will be infinitely better than the Bill recognizing the Independence of India cut up into two States enjoying equal status.

Neither the Hindus nor the Muslims are happy over what is happening before their helpless selves. This is first-hand evidence unless the Hindus and the Muslims who daily see me or correspond with me are deceiving me. But—it is a big *but*—I seem to be aiming at the impossible. Now that British intervention has done the trick, how can the League be expected to come down to their adversaries and produce an agreed settlement as between brothers and friends?

There is an alternative which is also, almost if not quite, as difficult. This creation of two opposing armies out of one, hitherto with one and a common goal, whatever it was, must frighten every lover of India. Will the two armies be created, not in order to "face and fight a common danger but to destroy one another and demonstrate to a gaping world that they were unfit for any other purpose but to fight one another unto death?"

I have put the prospect in its awful nakedness so that everyone may see and shun it. The alternative escape is undoubtedly attractive. Will the vast mass of the Hindus and those who had joined them in the struggle for Independence realize the danger in its proper perspective and rise to the occasion and swear even now that they do not wish to have any army at all or at least refuse ever to use it against their Muslim brethren whether in the Union or outside it in Pakistan? This proposal is tantamount to asking the Hindus and their associates to turn thirty years' weakness into strength of great beauty. Perhaps to state the problem thus is to demonstrate its absurdity—may be God has been known before now to turn man's folly into wisdom. The effort is worth making for the sake of all the parties who have subscribed to

the dangerous division of the army into two self-destroying warring camps.

NEVER WRONG

Gandhiji referred to a countryman from the South who had asked several questions which the latter invited him to answer as had become his wont of late, in his post-prayer speeches.

As the writer did not know the national language and as he rightly thought that he (the speaker) would not read Tamil with facility, if at all, the question was thus put in English:

"George Bernard Shaw has remarked that 'an Englishman is never in the wrong. He does everything on principle. He fights you on patriotic principles; he robs you on business principles; he enslaves you on imperial principles; he supports his King on loyal principles and cuts off his King's head on republican principles.' I am eager to know from Gandhiji under which of these principles the Englishman is now quitting India. Is the Englishman glad over the present economic and political condition of our beloved country? Does he feel satisfied in the secession of Travancore and Hyderabad States from the Indian Union? Has he any axe to grind in scrapping the 'May '46 Paper' and bringing forward in its place the recent 'Partition Plan'? Does he *feel* for the horrible happenings in Noakhali, Bihar and the Punjab—which happenings have forced the Congress to accept that Plan? What can be the reason or the idea behind Mr. Churchill and his company endorsing the Plan? Gandhiji has often said that he knows the mind of an Englishman better than any other Indian, and has repeatedly been advising us in his post-prayer speeches to trust the faith, sincerity and good intentions of the Englishmen in transferring power to our hands. I, therefore, believe that he should be in a position to make matters clear. He alone can dispel our doubts in a convincing manner."

He (Gandhiji) could only paraphrase the idea in his speech. Bernard Shaw's banter was by no means exhaustive nor were Englishman's resources. He had no doubt that he was quitting India on principle. Man had the supreme knack of deceiving himself. The Englishman was supremest among men. He was quitting because he had discovered that it was wrong on economic and political grounds to hold India in bondage. Herein he was quite sincere. It would not be denied, however, that sincerity was quite consistent with self-deception. He was self-deceived in that he believed that he could not leave India to possible anarchy if such was to be India's lot. He was quite content to leave India as a cockpit between two organized armies. Before quitting, he was setting the seal of approval on the policy of playing off one community against another. And he lacked the courage to do the right so far as the States were concerned. Gandhiji hoped that before he finally left on the 15th of August, he would bring the two parties together, now that one had got all it wanted. He could do so, if he willed it. Travancore and Hyderabad had not yet become

independent States. He, the speaker, admitted freely that if the Englishman left India in an uncertain condition and left the possibility of several warring States, all independent of England and, therefore, of one another, he could not conceive a greater reflection on the British name than this would be. Dominion Status would then stink in the nostrils. But he had not given up hope that British statesmanship would not have declared utter bankruptcy before August 15th. Till then he preferred to defer judgment in spite of the correspondent's profound distrust of British declarations however high-minded they might be to read. Let their acts be the real judge of their words. He would believe a man's word unless he had good reason to doubt it. That 'Mr. Churchill & Co.' were disposed to bless the Bill for Indian Independence proved that they had realized the economic and political necessity of the step. He, however, had no hesitation in admitting that recent signs were portentous enough to rouse suspicions. He did not, however, believe in dying before his death.

CONVERT POISON INTO NECTAR

Gandhiji referred to another extract from the letter dealt with on the previous evening. It was as follows:

"I believe that it was in the year 1940 that Gandhiji wrote in the columns of his paper that he smelt violence in the air he breathed. What has he to say of the 'living present'? The whole body politic is in chaos: corruption in its worst and most virulent form is having its unprecedented sway everywhere; money is demanded shamelessly, and money is given stealthily. People don't seem to care for the *means*; moneyed people get all they want by every heinous means possible. The air is moistened with all forms of evil: violence, hatred, bitterness, mistrust, enmity, uncertainty etc. On the top of all this from June 3, 1947 onwards, 'Division is' in the air'. One never opens a day's newspaper without reading reports of strike, theft, loot, arson, murder and stabbing, in various parts of India. Where is the brave law of 'love' for hate, truth for untruth and toleration for intolerance, which Gandhiji has been daily hammering in the ears of the people? Who is responsible for this sorry state of affairs in the history of our country? Were the untold miseries, sufferings and sacrifices of Congressmen and women from the top rank leaders down to the *bhangi* during the past three decades or so designed for this end? Is the *amrit* viz. 'Poorna Swaraj', required to be preceded by the *poison* in the name of all the above-stated evils which have resulted in the division of India into two political entities? Gandhiji alone in all India is capable of killing that *poison*, and thus enabling us to reap the benefits of 'Complete Independence'."

There was no doubt, Gandhiji said, that murder, arson, loot etc. were never so rampant as at present. He had admitted his share of responsibility for the sorry state of things by saying that what was done during the past thirty years under his leadership

was no better than passive resistance. It was good enough to induce the British power to quit India. Passive resistance, unlike non-violence, had no power to change men's hearts. The consequences they knew but too well. They need not engage further attention. The Swaraj of their dreams was far off. What was to be done to convert the *poison* into nectar? Was the process possible? He knew that it was and he thought he knew the way too. But whereas the Indian mind was ready to respond to the effort at passive resistance, it was not receptive enough to imbibe the lesson of non-violence which, and perhaps which alone, was capable of turning the *poison* into nectar. Many admitted that it was the way but they had not the heart to adopt the golden path. He could proclaim from the house top that non-violence had not, had never, failed. The people failed to rise to it. He did not mind being told that he did not know the technique of propagating non-violence. His critics even went so far as to suggest that he had no non-violence in himself. God alone knew men's hearts. He could say with confidence that if the world was to have peace, non-violence was the means to that end and no other.

NO APPEASEMENT

Seeing that India was cut into two, they had to consider their conduct accordingly. Unfortunately it had become the fashion nowadays to act as if they were enemies one of the other. Gandhiji could not subscribe to any such belief, nor did he approve of the method of appeasement — a word that had come to have a bad odour. If he did not believe in appeasement, why, he was asked, did he dance attendance on Jinnah Saheb for 18 days in 1944? A friendly approach was not one of appeasement. Appeasement was possible between enemies. This was supposed to have happened about the late Hitler. England and Germany were opposing Powers. The late Mr. Chamberlain was supposed to have been guilty of the policy of appeasement. Gandhiji owned no enemies. He, undoubtedly, made an offer to the Qaid-e-Azam of which he was proud. If Jinnah Saheb had accepted the offer, he could have been master in what might have been called the Pakistan area but there would have been common subjects as between friends. They would then have had one India before the whole world and free of all domination by a third power. All the bloodshed, loot and arson would have been avoided. Now they were snarling at one another. He refused to scent independence in this barbarous state. He could not be enthusiastic over the independence that was coming until the look of things was changed during the next thirtyfive days. He wanted us to develop bravery of the highest type that would surrender nothing to violence and much to genuine friendliness, not friendliness that was euphemism for hypocrisy.

INDIA IS HOME FOR ALL INDIANS

What then were they to do, the Hindus and the Sikhs and the other non-Muslims in Pakistan? They would not anticipate evil and leave their homes for fear of evil overtaking them. He would give the Muslim fellow countrymen credit for common honesty and human behaviour. There were

mandirs and *gurudwaras* in the Pakistan areas. Were they to be demolished? Was admission to them to be forbidden to the Hindus, the Sikhs and the others? He could not bring himself to entertain any such fear. Taking the contrary example, one of the finest Juma Masjids in the world was in the Indian Union, the Taj was there, the Aligarh University was there. Did the partition make the slightest difference in the Muslims approaching these great places and many others he could name? He thought not.

Then there was the question of the Hindus who could not stay in their own homes in Pakistan through fear, vague or real. They could not, if their trade or movements were restricted and they were treated as aliens in their own province. It was, undoubtedly, the duty of the provinces in the Union to receive such refugees with open arms and give them all reasonable facilities. They should be able to feel that they had not come to a strange land. The whole of India was the home of every Indian who considered himself and behaved as such, no matter to what faith he belonged. The condition for the new comer was, as he had said in Haradwar, that he must be as sugar was to milk. He must aim at adding sweetness and richness to the life around him.

CHOICE OF THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Gandhiji referred to the criticism that had reached his ears in regard to the fact that while the Qaid-e-Azam had been appointed the Governor-General of Pakistan, the Congress leaders had agreed to keep Lord Mountbatten on as the Governor-General of India. It had been hinted that the leaders had weakened and, by asking Lord Mountbatten to stay on, had shown that they were still dependent on England. Gandhiji wished to ask such critics to rid their minds of such suspicion. Could they imagine men like Panditji and the Sardar, a born fighter, ever bowing the knee or bootlicking anyone? He wanted them to know that after August 15th it was within their power to ask anyone to become their Governor-General. If it had been his choice he might even have chosen a Harijan girl. But he had no wish to deceive them in refusing to suspect Lord Mountbatten's appointment. After all they could always fight him if he proved false to them. It was now known through the newspapers that in the first instance both India and Pakistan had agreed to have Lord Mountbatten as their common Governor-General. But at the last moment Jinnah Saheb had changed his mind and nominated himself. The Congress leaders could have then done likewise but they did not like to go back on their plighted word. He sensed nothing wrong in this. Lord Mountbatten would be on trial in his new job in spite of the fact that he would be the constitutional head of the Government. Gandhiji hoped that he would come through the test with flying colours by being their servant which is what the appointment stood for. They would be foolish to imagine that no Englishman could ever be a friend of India and loyal to her or that Lord Mountbatten would not be a servant of

the Indian Union because he was of royal blood and because now his nephew was going to marry the future Queen of England. They should never mistrust anyone until and unless he proved himself unworthy.

Similarly Gandhiji felt that the Governor-Generalship of Pakistan was going to be an acid test for Jinnah Saheb. Doubtless, he was taking up the office to show to the world that he had acquired an Islamic State. But the acquisition would be nothing worth unless he followed in the footsteps of the great Khalifs. Gandhiji referred to the Khalifa Omar in particular of whom it was said that he never wanted anything for himself. His sole concern was meting out even-handed justice to the people under him. If Jinnah Saheb becomes the Governor-General with the intent to wear a crown of thorns, i. e., to be the first servant of India and not as a ruler, he would make Pakistan a land worth living in. His Governor-Generalship would be a test not only for him but for Islam too. Gandhiji hoped that he would come through it with flying colours.

New Delhi, 13-7-'47

PEACE AND POSSESSIONS

At the Diocesan Conference at York, His Grace the Archbishop is reported to have said, "Britain must be armed if the peace of the world is to be preserved" and reinforced his arguments with the words that "an unarmed nation with great possessions was an incentive to aggressive nations, and an unarmed nation had little influence in world decisions."

The Prince of Peace taught us that life does not consist in the abundance of things we possess, that we were to do good to them that despitefully used us, and that we were not to lose the soul even if it be to gain the whole world, and when Satan tempted Him with the kingdoms of the earth He turned him away scornfully saying: "Get thee behind me, Satan. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and Him only shalt thou serve."

Here is a Prelate of the Church today preaching just the opposite. Great Britain has great possessions and she should have influence in the Council of Nations. For these she needs armed forces to kill all who come in the way of the realization of her greed. Is this the path of peace? Jesus counselled the young ruler with great possessions to sell all he had and distribute it to the poor. Would he not advise Great Britain today to unburden herself of all this superfluous wealth and restore it back to the poverty-stricken millions who are languishing for the lack of the very needs of life?

Alongside of this comes the news that Dr. Hugh Dalton, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, placed on record in Parliament the "clear judgment" of the British Government that they do not recognize the moral validity of the war debts to Egypt. Are moral considerations a matter of convenience?

World peace can never be achieved by injustice or might. All the tribulation humanity has passed through in the last two global wars does not appear to have brought this truth home to our leaders. Shall we never learn even with all this bitter experience?

J. C. KUMARAPPA

RAJKOT RASHTRIYA SHALA SPINNING DEMONSTRATION

(From 26-7-'47 to 11-10-'47)

On the 12th day of *Bhadrapada*, the 11th day of October is Gandhiji's 79th birthday.

This school has been celebrating Gandhiji's birthday as *Charkha Jayanti* for the last thirteen years. Therefore, people will be spinning for 78 days commencing from 26th July to 11th October. Gandhiji has given the spinning wheel the central place in the scheme for Swaraj based on non-violence. He believes the wheel to be the chief instrument for obtaining political, economic and moral freedom. The millions, however, have not shared that belief. Had they done so, we would not be in the sorry plight of today.

What is the lover of the wheel to do in this condition? Duty bids that when the atmosphere is against you, you should perform it ever so much more diligently. How many are such persons? It is to be hoped that many will take part in this act of sacrifice, which begins from 26th July after prayer. Members of the Charkha Sangh, government officials and others should take part in it. They should send in their names beforehand.

Those who wish may contribute even 78 coins of any value, though Gandhiji prefers yarn to coins. It is to be hoped that as usual some distinguished son or daughter of India will be present on the 11th October to celebrate the occasion and receive the yarn and cash.

NARANDAS GANDHI

[One would think that lovers of the wheel will show unusual enthusiasm about this *yagna*, not necessarily by spinning more diligently than ever but by concentrating on the full meaning of spinning i. e., on truth and non-violence. Those who do not believe in these and do not enforce them in their lives are not called upon to take part in this *yagna*. They must be believers in God as their sole Help.

— M. K. G.]

CONTENTS		PAGE
WHY ARMIES ?	... A. K.	237
LET US LEARN	... J. C. KUMARAPPA	238
THE RELOADING	... J. C. KUMARAPPA	239
SOCIALISM	... M. K. GANDHI	240
THE CONFLICT	... S. N.	240
FROM GANDHI'S SPEECHES	... M. K. GANDHI	241
PEACE AND POSSESSIONS	... J. C. KUMARAPPA	244
RAJKOT RASHTRIYA SHALA SPINNING DEMONSTRATION	... NARANDAS GANDHI	244
ENGLISH INTO HINDUSTANI— INSTALMENT XXIV		245
NOTES:		
THE PROBLEM OF EUROPE	... S. N.	237
DARKEST HOUR BEFORE DAWN	... S. N.	238
NOAKHALI	... S. N.	238