

HARIJAN

(FOUNDED BY MAHATMA GANDHI)

Editor: K. G. MASHRUWALA

VOL. XIV. No. 7

AHMEDABAD — SUNDAY, APRIL 16, 1950

TWO ANNAS

GANDHI AND MARX

IX

What is the theory of Trusteeship? First let us note what it is not, but is erroneously supposed to be.

Some people think that it is just an euphemistic way of justifying one's possession and control of property, power etc., against other claimants, whether rival or rightful, on the ground that they could not part with it because none would be able to make a better use of that property or power than they in the interest of the public, who were still not competent enough to manage their own affairs. This was the argument advanced by the British for several years for retaining their hold on India. None was better fitted to govern India, they claimed, than they in view of the utter poverty and ignorance of the masses, their internal divisions etc. They said that they held India not in their own interest, but as trustees for the people. But as they did not govern India gratis, or, in the opinion of the then Indian politicians, on reasonable remuneration for the services they rendered, or even honestly, so their plea of trusteeship was regarded by the people as nothing but a pretence for not withdrawing from India.

Even legally appointed trustees, such as a guardian over a minor's property, often evade handing over charge to the minor after he has attained majority on the ground that he has not the adequate capacity to manage it. Such trustees are looked upon as hypocrites and they lose the confidence of the beneficiaries. Owing to this past experience the very word *trustee* and the theory of trusteeship fell into disrepute and 'progressive' politicians suspected that Gandhiji had obliged the princes, the zamindars, the capitalists and holders of power by subtly furnishing them with one more weapon to cling to their respective positions of advantage.

It is also supposed that the best trustee of Gandhiji's conception was no more than a man with some philanthropic urges. For instance, if there was a raja or a millionaire who lived a simple personal life, now and then gave handsome donations, founded good charitable institutions, or made a charitable trust of a part of his property, and if in addition to this, he was also kind to his servants, civil in his general

behaviour towards the poor, a hospitable host, obliging to friends, free from gross vices and a 'church-going man' (as he would be called in England), nothing more was to be expected of him to fulfil the obligations of a trustee. His personal household budget, or the manner in which he acquired his wealth was not to be inquired into.

But none of these suppositions are war-rantable. The word *trustee* is a legal term, and all the rights and duties that law chooses to assign to that term from time to time will apply to the trustee of Gandhiji's theory, *plus* a good deal more on moral grounds not covered by law. In 1936 I contributed a series of articles under the caption *Gandhism to Socialism*, which were edited and corrected by Gandhiji himself. Therein I explained the theory of trusteeship as follows:

"The problem of stopping exploitation is related to, and is often held to be identical with, the institution of private property, and in Gandhism-Socialism controversies this question is perhaps discussed with greater warmth than any other. On this matter Gandhiji has perhaps more radical views than the most extreme Communist. He would like to dispossess every person of all kinds of belongings. If he tolerates the institution of private property, it is not because he loves it, or holds it to be necessary for the progress of humanity, but because he has yet to discover a truthful and non-violent method of abolishing that institution. I think that all Socialists believe that possessions are absolutely essential for making mankind happy. Gandhiji does not accept that position in theory. But as a practical proposition, he feels, that mankind is not going to give up possessions, within a time which can be estimated. The only thing, therefore, to be considered is in what capacity should persons having actual control over and possession of property be deemed to have it or in what spirit should they be suffered to possess it? Gandhiji says that.....where persons possess property, whether that possession is vested in them in a manner deemed legal at the time or otherwise, they must be deemed to hold it in trust for society and not for themselves.

Much confusion arises from the fact that people do not take his statements as seriously as they should do. We have often heard British politicians declare that the British Government is a trustee for the welfare of the people of India, without in the least meaning it. We are now accustomed to regard such statements as pretensions, platitudes, if not indeed cant. In the same way, he is not taken seriously when he says that all possessors of property are, according to him, trustees for society. It seems that his critics on this point vaguely think that there is a difference between statutory trustees and constructive trustees in regard to the due fulfilment of their respective trusts. With Gandhiji there is none. He never propounds any theory without providing means for giving practical effect to it. He holds that every possession apart from that required for comfortable sustenance is possible only so long as the others permit it whether helplessly or through ignorance. When helplessness gives way to conscious strength and ignorance to wisdom, over-possession is possible only to the trustee. He says that the strength to be given to the people has to be non-violent if the dispossessed are in their turn not to become as bad as the present possessors."

On one point I was not quite explicit then, as it was not clear to myself. It was this :

Who was the rightful owner and who were the beneficiaries of the property purported to be held in trust ? What was the nature of property which fell under this category ? And what was the nature and extent of property, which would be allowed by Gandhiji to be treated as private ?

I shall try to explain this here. The theory of trusteeship makes no distinction between private and non-private property. All property is held in trust, no matter who possesses it, and what its nature or quantity is. Indeed, the theory of trusteeship does not apply only to tangible and transferable property, but also to places of power and position and to intangible and non-transferable property such as the muscular energy of a labourer or the talents of a Helen Keller. Even a cripple in an asylum for invalids is a trustee to the extent he is able to exercise his will. Every human being not mentally deranged is only a trustee of all that is within his control.

Who is then the owner ? Gandhiji will say, God. To God alone belongs the universe and all that is in it, animate or inanimate, tangible or intangible. To take an instance, neither the shareholders, directors, managing agents, technicians, and the labourers, jointly or severally, nor even the State is an industry's absolute owner. They are all contributors to the working of the industry ; and the different kinds of contributors are invested with different functions for the efficient working of the industry. Every

one of them must use those powers honestly and diligently and take no more from it for personal consumption than what is just and proper under the conditions in which humanity round about him lives.

The idea of God's ownership, or of absence of ownership of any human being, or even of the whole of humanity, in anything whatever rejects all claims either by shareholders, managers, experts or workers to dividends, commissions, bonus etc., *in proportion to profits*. The claim that God created everything in the world for man is not acceptable. He must use everything sparingly for himself and regard himself accountable for all his acts. Every one who has contributed to the success of the industries to the best of his capacity may take a wage (if he needs), but the wage should be in accordance with his needs and not in accordance with the value of his contribution. If the capacity of a crippled worker is no more than sit on a stool and check the articles that leave or enter the factory, and if he performs that duty honestly, he is entitled to the full ordinary wage *plus* what he needs more on account of his physically helpless condition. As against him the wage of the engineer or an able-bodied worker may be just full ordinary. The managing agent, if he is also getting a wage in another capacity or elsewhere, may not take any wage at all. The monetary wage would be no guide for evaluating a man's capacity or worth.

The idea also rejects the right of the State or directors or workers to destroy that property wantonly, on the ground that they might do anything with what belongs to them.

The idea of ownership being thus disposed of, the next question is who are the beneficiaries of a property ? The answer is, the entire creation is the beneficiary. For instance, it is not only those who are actually engaged in working an industry that are entitled to its fruits. But everything is to be shared with every one else, not forgetting even non-human life.

No doubt, man's limitations of vision will limit the application of the principle of co-sharing proportionately. It will be applied to the local region first ; there, too, man will be served in priority to other life. But as the vision expands and resources allow the duty is to expand the field of service progressively to as great an extent as possible. Not even a self-sufficient village has the right to all its production, if it is wanted for life in distress in another part of the world. And if it does not need anything which the other can spare, or if the latter is too poor to give anything in exchange, it cannot demand any price for it.

The question as to the nature and extent of property Gandhiji would allow to be used as private is now easily answered. That which is due to a worker and needed by him, he may use in a discreet manner for proper purposes. If,

however, for any reason, he does not need it, and may not require it in the near future, he should give over to one who needs it or to the common fund of his unit.

It is also not difficult to understand after the foregoing why Gandhiji was opposed both to expropriation on the one hand and to the payment of compensation on the other. Expropriation is unnecessary and unjust if the present holders consent to fulfil the obligations of trustees. An attempt should be made first to convert them to that position. Compensation is unnecessary because no trustee is ever compensated on removal. If he is unwilling to fulfil the obligations of a trustee, claiming the property as his own, he takes up a position which cannot be accepted. He has therefore to be removed and a new arrangement has to be made. So, there is no case for compensation.

Akola, 1-4-'50

K. G. MASHRUWALA

BULLOCK THE BULWARK OF AGRONOMY

"In view of the fact that the Zamindari and other systems of land tenures are being abolished in this province (State) and the ryotwari system is being established under which the tiller of the soil is to get the right of ownership of his holding, this Assembly recommends to Government to undertake suitable legislation which will make it obligatory on the tiller of the soil to raise fodder crops on a portion of his holding of farm lands on a percentage basis for producing adequate fodder for his cattle."

The above resolution sponsored by Shri C. S. Patel, stands on the agenda of the Bombay State Assembly for its current session (February-April 1950) for discussion and decision, to realize the national objectives of intensive cultivation, growing more food, producing more milk and breeding healthy pedigree draught and milch bovines. They are mostly uncared for without regulated supply of energizing fodder and feeds and for want of them have been famishing, emaciating and their non-descript bulk has been roaming the land, consuming and crushing the scanty fodders which uncertain monsoon grows for them.

Bullock the Bulwark

On September 13, 1949 the Livestock Expert of the Bombay Government opined, "The cow and the bull were the backbone of Indian agriculture and unless proper attention was paid to the *improvement* of cattle the 'Grow More Food' campaign will be jeopardized."

Emphasizing this, Shri M. P. Patil, Minister for Agriculture, said, "The majority of cultivators would have to depend on cattle for their agriculture and the *improvement* of livestock was, therefore, as important as the improvement of agriculture." The Minister stressed the importance of rotation grazing. Thus improvement is by grazing well.

On September 18, 1949, Sir Datarsingh, Vice-Chairman of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research said at Madras, "The growth of India's agriculture depended on a large scale on the *bullock power* and the consequent develop-

ment of cattle-wealth (and bullock power improves by nourishing fodder and feeds).

Sir Datar regretted that the average efficiency of Indian cattle was low. According to him, the causes for this were:

- (i) "gradual ploughing of pasture lands" for cultivation of crops,
- (ii) want of enough food for cattle,
- (iii) low economic position of cultivator and his consequent inability to maintain good cattle. The Royal Commission on Agriculture had found it so in 1926 (paras 171-187) and had recommended for growing by statute fodder crops also on a percentage portion of cultivators' own farm (para 187).

Again on December 30, 1949, Sir Datarsingh in a written address at Poona reiterated that "the *improvement* of the country's livestock was no less a vital necessity than the increase of crop production. In fact the former was basic to the latter as long as agriculture continued to depend on animal power."

January 1, 1950, Dr. Rajendraprasad, presiding over the All-India Agricultural Economics Conference, Madras, emphasized that "mechanization of agriculture in India, at any rate, in present conditions, is impossible. The size of the holdings and the large-scale unemployment consequent on its adoption rule it out."

Mr. Norris Dodd, Director General of Food and Agriculture Association of the U. N. also opined that India cannot launch on wholesale mechanized cultivation. Cattle-raising must receive a great deal of attention, both for nutritional reasons and for draught power. This programme would call for a suitable production of feeds (including fodders).

Unanimous Conclusions

Knowledgeable authorities are also unanimously of opinion, that

- 1 the bullock is the essential bulwark of Indian agronomy; the cow necessarily takes the same place of honour;
- 2 for intensive cultivation and lifting draught irrigation the bullock must be vigorous;
- 3 for invigorating the bullock regulated nourishing fodder power must be supplied to him in the same way as 17,30,000 gallons of diesel oil is supplied for power to engines of tractors and bulldozers (Shri M. P. Patil, September 13, 1949);
- 4 the impecunious and improvident farmer has not been so supplying;
- 5 Indian hay and grass is too fibrous to be adequately nourishing;
- 6 milk, the only protective animal protein and vitamin A supplying perfect food to Indians, who are by and large vegetarians, is consumed in India on an average of 3 oz. per unit of population whereas at least 16 oz. are essential (Dr. J. R. Kothawala, January 15, 1950, Madras); in other countries it is 50 oz.

Grow Fodders by Statute

For 'growing more food', providing more milk, for premium bulls and premium cows and vigorous cattle-wealth the State should by statute oblige the tiller-owner of the soil to grow nourishing fodders on a percentage portion of his farmland. If the bullock cannot till well, "Grow More Food" will fail.

'Madhuli',

SARABHAI PRATAPRAI

Bombay, 8-2-'50

HARIJAN

April 16

1950

THE MEANING OF PARTITION

The Bombay Chronicle and other friends have one more argument against me.

"Now that partition has been brought about" certain things must be accepted as irrevocable, inevitable, implied etc., is the common burden of their arguments.

"We have accepted the partition finally and for good. Pandit Jawaharlal makes this clear when he says that there is no going back upon it, even if Pakistan were to ask for it," writes one friend. I accept this and do it honestly, except that all man-made arrangements are only relatively final and permanent. But it is because I accept this that I have laid down the several propositions of that article. Indeed, unless the propositions are accepted, the entire partition might become just a tragic event brought about and annulled in an inhuman manner. For, we must remember that there are powerful forces which refuse to accept the partition "finally and for good", and which, if they succeed in overthrowing Pandit Jawaharlal, make no secret of their violent intentions upon Pakistan even as Pakistan has not given up its ambition to reconquer India some day. Let it be realized that the ambitions both of Pan-Islam and Pan-Hinduism which were born together will grow together and feed upon each other until they end in destroying each other, except on one condition, namely that both forsake their imperialist motives and sublimate themselves into missions working for the benefit of the whole of mankind assuring peace and goodwill to every one without imposing any condition upon the recipient to accept any particular creed or external feature in order to be entitled to their service.* The various propositions put forth by me are meant to ensure the finality of the partition and the present sovereignty of both Bharat and Pakistan, (until there is a genuine desire on the part of both the States to modify it).

The Bombay Chronicle was right enough in saying that "the shape of Pakistan was determined by the decision to have predominantly non-Muslim areas in India." It need hardly be said that 'predominantly majority areas' does not mean 'completely or only one community areas'. Not only was that impossible, but was also never mentioned. Indeed, the boundary commission was even expressly instructed not to mind giving over a district or part of a district

* Some one once drew Gandhiji's attention to a national song, in which the idea expressed was, May our three-coloured banner of *ahimsa* be victorious and fly highest in the world; and he asked Gandhiji if that sentiment was proper. Gandhiji said that he did not see anything objectionable in the ambition, if the condition of *ahimsa* was implicitly honoured. It meant that the message of non-violence was to be spread in the world and that was certainly a noble ambition.

with a predominantly other community majority to Bharat or Pakistan, as the case may be, if other considerations made its inclusion in that State essential. The minorities in each were to be fully protected by their State with due constitutional safe-guards. Each regarded the migrations as having been thrust upon it by movements outside its control, even if responsible leaders and officers were involved in them.

Let us also remember that when Pakistan was accused of aiming at establishing a "theocratic" State, Mr. Jinnah stoutly denied it.

Therefore, the Muslim League ideal of making Pakistan an Islamic State must be understood and interpreted against the background of these facts. That is, it can only be such Islamic State as is consistent with a non-theocratic or secular State. Let us see what kind of Islamic State can that be in an honest manner.

There are various matters in life, which are purely secular and have nothing to do with religion directly, but religious doctrines, disciplines, rituals, mythologies, traditions, history, literature, art, sculpture etc., have cast their influence upon them in one way or another. These influences persist even when a particular religion is long forsaken and a new one is adopted. For instance, though Europe is wholly Christian now, the language, literature, art etc., of the Greek, Roman and other pre-Christian civilizations and religions continue to influence the Christian peoples to this day. Modern European civilization is a compound of Judaism, Christianity, Roman, Greek and several other religious cultures. A modern European country might renounce Christianity altogether, but whatever institution or tradition it founds will be most likely modelled on some similar institution of Christianity. This would be so not because it believes in Christianity, but because it is familiar with only these.

We have proclaimed India as a secular State. But a very large majority of us are born in Hinduism and are familiar only with the tenets, traditions, ideas, art etc., of the Hindu religion only. Our languages are nourished by Sanskrit, the shapes of our buildings, the emblems and forms of our institutions, rules of social etiquette, manner of dress, dinner, music etc., are necessarily based on those familiar to us in Hindu temples and religious lore. This predominance of Hindu ideals, institutions and forms in Indian life is almost unavoidable. The other day when Mr. Peter Koinange of East Africa visited Sevagram, the ladies honoured him by putting a saffron mark upon his forehead. He was pleased and rightly took it as a token of treatment on equal rank. The delegates of the World Pacifist Meeting were also similarly honoured. Every one appreciated it. But I know Muslims who have resented this ceremonial, and have considered that in a national or non-communal institution such forms of welcome should be abandoned. This is narrow thinking, because whatever form is adopted it will have been copied from some familiar model, Hindu,

Muslim, Christian, Parsi etc. Though originally taken from some religious practice, it is secular and social and not religious. Thus, a Hindu shows respects to his elder by almost falling upon or touching his feet, joining both his hands and bending himself down. It is also the way in which he prays to God. A Muslim takes the hand of the elder and touches it with his eyelids. He respects the tomb of a saint also in a similar manner. It is difficult to say whether the social etiquette is taken from the religious way of worship or *contra*. But in social life it must be regarded as purely secular, and if a Muslim is accosted in the Hindu fashion or a Hindu in the Muslim fashion, it is still a secular custom and not religious.

The late Qaid-i-Azam said several years ago to the effect that with a permanent Hindu majority in India, every institution will take a Hindu colour. There would be *Ram-raj*, *Rashtrapati*, *Vande Mataram* and so on. It was felt that even if there was no harassment or molestation of the Muslims, and even if they had their fair representation in all public bodies, services and trades, the colour of the State would be Hindu and not Muslim, and the latter would not have much chance of developing all those things in the Muslim way in public matters. Though even on these matters a composite culture has always evolved in course of time, it might be conceded that the predominant colour of India would have been Hindu. It is unavoidable with the facts of the situation.

But acquiescence to this unavoidable position did not satisfy the Muslim League leaders. They had their own partiality for Islamic institutions. They hungered for some region in India in which they would express themselves in Islamic ways and develop their language, literature, art, architecture etc., on Islamic models. It is a natural desire. This feature is independent of theocracy, which would involve submission to the authority of *maulvis* in Pakistan and of *pandits* in India.

But in order to thrive, one must survive. And neither Hinduism nor Islam (nor for the matter of that Christianity) can survive unless each renounces its arrogant claim that it possesses the whole truth and the final or the most perfect message of God and the best political, social or economic order of the world. It must also renounce its fanatic zeal to promote its own culture, creed or civilization. Each must try to adjust and accommodate itself with each other and other systems of the world, and also modify its life, outlook, customs, institutions etc. to the changed conditions of the times. Each must purge itself of all those teachings which promote hatred for others and instigate crusades against them.

If imperialistic, fanatic and *goonda* ambitions and methods are renounced on both the sides, the existence of two secular States, one with a composite culture in which the Hindu

colour naturally predominates, and the other with a composite culture with the Islamic colour predominating is quite understandable. Each would necessarily be composite, for each has come under the influence of the other, and of the British civilization as also of the modern scientific civilization, which is the common property of all mankind, and so none can be purely Islamic or purely Hindu.

I therefore repeat that though the colour of Bharat's culture might be predominantly Hindu, and that of Pakistan predominantly Islamic as unavoidable results of its predominant populations, none of them must be founded in the name of or dedicated to the culture, religion or principles of any one of them. Thus may both thrive and be beneficial to all mankind as two sovereign States, until both will otherwise. But any violent intention upon each other or violence upon any minority in each must end ultimately in the destruction of both.

K. G. MASHRUWALA

[P. S. — I notice that the *Bombay Chronicle* has again contested my views in its editorial of the 5th April. I only wish it had waited till I had finished my comments. I do not see any reason to revise my views. What I have said is intended as a contribution to the cause of peace, cordiality and development of what is good in every culture and, what is more, is in accordance with Truth and Non-violence. The principles apply not only to India and Pakistan, but also to similar situations elsewhere.

6-4-'50

K. G. M.]

BENGALI HINDUS OF INDIA AND PAKISTAN

We must congratulate our Prime Minister on his determination to make the best of a bad situation by taking upon his Government to give relief and rehabilitate every one coming away from East Bengal, and to keep the door open for whosoever may like to come. Let us urge upon him that if he decides to make a joint declaration with the Prime Minister of Pakistan one of its conditions should be that both countries will facilitate voluntary migration and sale or exchange of properties in the respective countries.

The real hurdle is economic. We appreciate the moral breakdown but we do not admit of the treatment, because we do not see how we could rehabilitate the people after migration. The hugeness of the number bewilders us because we are over-conscious of a standard of living which only few can afford. But if we take it in the proper spirit and method there is nothing to fear. Displacement it will mean and with it a great deal of hardship to begin with, but it will restore the spirit which is more important in life and therefore we cannot shirk it.

Not cities and factories but villages can take them and give them home and work and a decent life, a decent life to all the people existing in India today and to all our brothers and sisters who may come and live with us.

For rehabilitation the Government need do nothing but mobilize credit and enterprise for rural life by giving the required economic preference to agriculture and village industries and give and direct an overall pattern of decentralization. Thus we may turn a thorn into a flower and lay the foundation of a new order of life where peace and prosperity shall rule. If we failed to keep the unity of Hindus and Muslims as they were, let us not fail to keep the unity of Indians and Pakistanis and build up for the unity of humanity.

Not the two hundred thousand refugees from East Bengal that the Government have so far planned to receive in West Bengal and the neighbouring three or four states of Orissa, Bihar, Assam and Tripura, but there should be readiness to receive all the ten or twelve million Hindus who, according to our Prime Minister himself, would like to come away if they got the facilities to come. For their immediate relief however we need leadership, men and money. Proof of leadership we have got in Panditji when he promises to receive whosoever will come. But it will be a huge task requiring a huge effort if it is to be fulfilled efficiently. For this there should be a Service Corps calling upon men having equipment for all kinds of service not only as volunteers but also by conscription if necessary. And money should be collected by a graded taxation over incomes above Rs. 1,500 per annum as in a national emergency.

And last but not the least in importance is to settle the Bengalis in a Home Land of their own in West Bengal, if necessary by extending her borders by incorporating the Bengali-speaking areas of Orissa, Bihar and also part of Assam. I do not mention any part of East Bengal as it involves international politics, which I have kept out of this discussion. But the Bengalis must not be scattered in the different states as has been arranged for the present, as this will on one hand perpetuate racial bickerings and on the other prevent growth and solidarity of the Bengalis, which is essential not only for themselves but also for their relation with the body politic of India.

Solution of the problem of Hindu Bengalis seems to me a prerequisite to the solution of the problems of India and Pakistan.

P. K. SEN

Barrackpore,
West Bengal

Khaira Professor of Agriculture,
Calcutta University

[Note: I publish Prof. P. K. Sen's article with hesitation. I am doubtful about the soundness of some of his suggestions.]

It is not fully realized that the principle that every regional unit should be homogeneous i.e. inhabited only by people having a particular common feature, or its counterpart that all areas with the majority of the people possessing a common feature must be grouped together in

the same State, amounts to the substantial acceptance of the two-nation theory. If it were a sound theory, it should be accepted wholeheartedly with all its implications. If it is not so, we should not propose solutions based on that theory or its extension. Thus the suggestion "to settle the Bengalis in a Home Land of their own in West Bengal, if necessary, by extending her borders", and that "the Bengalis must not be scattered in different States", is of the same type as that which led to the partition of the country and of Bengal and the Punjab, along with their migrations and killings. It is a theory which leads to religious, linguistic, caste and other jealousies and feuds, and might involve the country in perpetual internal disturbances. People having a common feature will naturally nest together. It is one thing to recognize and roughly maintain their regional units in administration; it is quite another thing to make it a principle of State formation.

The emphasis on the regional principle appears to me of doubtful benefit to the Bengalis themselves. Bengal is a thickly populated province. It needs spreading its population wherever facilities are available. Since they are already uprooted from their home in East Bengal, it is all the more desirable that they should be encouraged to move even to distant parts, if that will give them better opportunities of settling down well. It would not be wrong even to colonize them outside India, if conditions are favourable. It is only thus that nations prosper. Then the Bengalis of Bihar, Orissa, Assam or any other province should rather give a dogged fight to the Governments of these States if they are not treated by them on an equal rank with the so-called original inhabitants of these provinces than ask for a revision of boundaries with every alteration in the linguistic or religious structure of the people of a particular area. They must refuse to regard themselves or treated as a separate minority in any part of the country. The slogans like "Bihar for Biharis", and "Bengal for Bengalis" are un-national and must be resisted with determination. One should not be put forth in answer to another of the same type. We must learn to mix and combine and not to break and divide.

Akola, 29-3-'50

K. G. M.]

New Publications

A PILGRIMAGE FOR PEACE

Gandhi & Frontier Gandhi among N.W.F. Pathans

By Pyarelal

21 Illustrations 2 Maps Pages xvi, 216
Price Rs. 5 Postage etc. As. 11

STRAY GLIMPSES OF BAPU

By Kaka Kalelkar

Pages viii, 153 Price Rs. 2 Postage etc. As. 8

A LETTER FROM DACCA

[The following has been received from Mr. Horace Alexander.]

We, who sign this letter, have been resident in Dacca throughout the recent disturbances. We do not for a moment belittle their seriousness; we believe that the great majority of people in East Pakistan are ashamed that it was possible for such things to happen and are anxious to prevent them from ever happening again. We also think that the atmosphere of mutual distrust which has been deepening ever since has obscured some points which peace-loving people over the border would be glad to see clearly stated.

The most important one is that the East Pakistan Government took very thorough and effective measures to quell the rioters and restore order. It is true that Dacca was taken completely by surprise when the disturbances began, and that for the first two days the police were unable to stop them. On the second day, when this was clear, the city was put under military control; by the third day, casualties were reduced to back-street incidents, and we believe that it is correct that the last solitary one in the city occurred on the fifth day. If, at the beginning, there were any misguided people in Dacca who believed that the Government had some lurking sympathy with the rioters, they were soon disillusioned.

It was also soon evident that the Government had the respectable citizens wholeheartedly behind it. On the first day and night of the riots, when the streets were dangerous, many Muslim men and also women were out in them doing their best to save Hindu victims and rendering First Aid. Students and teachers took an active part in this work and continued to make themselves useful at the Relief Camps after the first excitement had died down. We have a strong impression that these and similar activities had full public sympathy behind them.

We had mentioned only what happened in Dacca itself because it is best, in making such general statements, to stick to firsthand observation. But we have good reason for believing that it was the same in the mofussil. To give one instance, a prominent Muslim of Barisal lost his life in a successful effort to save a number of Hindus who had taken shelter with him.

We have no doubt that similar things could be reported from West Bengal and we wish that they could be given as much publicity as the threatening and militant voices. Insecurity is highly infectious, and on both sides of the border there are plenty of people engaged in spreading it in speech and writing. Judging from the Press, there seems to be a wide-spread belief in West Bengal that the majority of people here, for some unknown reason, want communal strife to continue and will not try to put an end to it unless they are forced by pressure

from outside. We are convinced that this is very far from the truth.

A. G. STOCK

(Dacca University)

ATUL PRASAD ROY CHOUDHURY

(Rai Bahadur)

ABDUS RAHMAN KHAN

(Principal, Jagannath College)

MR. SHAHIDULLAH

(Dacca University)

AJIT KUMAR GUHA

(Jagannath College)

HOW NOT TO DO IT

To raise funds for a group of institutions working for social welfare a carnival was organized at Madras last month. Some highly placed constructive workers drew my attention to the carnival and stated that it was functioning as a gambling den. Not being prepared to take this verdict without further examination I walked into the carnival and found that their description was only partly right. No doubt the 'gambling den' part of it was not an adequate enough description but there was more to it than caught the eye.

Anti-social Means

The sign-boards over the booths were all familiar public social bodies bearing well-known names throughout that Presidency, such as All India Women's Conference, Women's Welfare Department, Children's Aid Society, Seva Samajam and a host of others. On nearing the booths, one caught sight of some leading society ladies, staunchly supported by a bevy of young ladies, fashionably dressed, such as the ones usually to be met with in a Government House Party! It aroused my curiosity as to what these ladies were doing. To my dismay, I discovered that booth after booth consisted of lucky dips, shooting galleries, "ringing the duck" and various other similar devices and games of chance, miscalled games of skill. Some of the booths appeared empty and on enquiry, I was told the Police raided them the previous night and closed down about a score of these as being "gambling dens". It is deplorable that these anti-social activities, that trade on the gambling instinct in man and on the greed to get something for nothing, should be harnessed for the purposes of collecting money though they may be for laudable ends. We have been constantly urging the public to create sufficient public opinion to do away with horse-racing and other fashionable methods of gambling. But here was an attempt to raise funds by amusements which were bound to give a wrong direction to public education and that too by bodies avowedly working for the good of the people.

There were one or two worthwhile booths which were aiming at public welfare. The "general check-up" conducted by the T. B. Association, the Blood Bank by the Red Cross and the working model of the Kolar Gold Fields were perhaps the exceptions to the general catering to the lower nature of man.

Digression ?

The central part of the ground was traversed by a noisy train on a truck line which after every few minutes ran across the grounds drowning all other noises. We are familiar enough, especially in Madras, with over-loaded trams and trains. It was beyond me why this method of transport should have been included in what was evidently meant to be an amusement park. One would have imagined that the office-goer would have to undergo this nerve-racking means of transport twice a day to and from the office. In addition to these, why they should themselves voluntarily get into this train is beyond human comprehension.

This is an indication that Madras is fast deteriorating in its choice of pastime. This is a serious symptom of a nervously over-wrought population seeking excitement and digression in meaningless activities. Its close approximation to the American amusement parks, without the redeeming feature of some of the educative booths one finds in such entertainment organizations, is an alarming sign.

Meaningless

One of the incomprehensible sections of the Carnival was the "Piccadilly Circus". In one corner various illuminated signs advertised commercial goods. In the centre, was a statue of Eros, built as a cheap imitation of the one at Piccadilly Circus in London. Even the end of Regent Street coming into the Circus is indicated as well by an imitation "Lyons Corner House". One can understand the British Tommy, away from home, taking a delight in such reminiscences of his homeland. But most of the visitors to this Carnival were blissfully innocent of what "Piccadilly" was or what it stood for. It shows a woeful lack of imagination on the part of the organizers. If this had happened prior to India becoming a Republic, one would have felt inclined to attribute it to the desire of the organizers to create an "inferiority complex" in the minds of the visitors, and to train them into looking up towards everything British. But even for this, it appears an anachronism.

At a time when the Government is calling for productive effort, this encouragement of wasteful expenditures baffles the serious on-looker. Thousands of electric lights were used in the decorations and fireworks were illuminating the sky. Amongst the crowd could be seen, not merely the man in the street with his family, but also high Government officials and Ministers moving about like queen-bees with their retainers hovering about them! The whole picture was one which was out of setting in a nation wishing to put forth its efforts to rebuild itself. It spelt decadence and decay. Those who are responsible for organizing such shows would do well to view these undertakings in their proper setting and those who have taken part from the

various organizations should ponder over their responsibilities and see if they are furthering the cause for which their institutions stand by trading on the weaknesses of man to build up their financial resources. We can only congratulate the vigilance of the Police in closing down some of the gambling dens run perhaps by less influential public persons. We wish they had done their job thoroughly and closed down the whole show. On the whole, the Carnival was a cheap and useless attempt at amusing the public and the organizers can hardly be said to have justified the efforts they seem to have put in getting up the show. In every public work we should be cautious to ensure that the means benefit the ends. It is a responsibility we dare not ignore. By a wrong choice of means we may be destroying a more important set of values.

J. C. KUMARAPPA

A MEASURE FOR ECONOMIC UPLIFT OF THE POOR

[The following message was sent by Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel to the people of the State of Bombay on the occasion of the inauguration of the Prohibition Act in the State.]

The Government of Bombay today fulfils after ceaseless efforts its solemn undertaking to introduce complete prohibition. It is undoubtedly a great achievement. It is possible that some persons belonging to the educated class, which has been subject to the influence of Western civilization and which is captured by its false glamour, may not realize the importance of this great social revolution or may oppose it without understanding its true significance, but with the passing of time that class also will not fail to realize the good results of this drive. When they will experience that benefit they will also give up their opposition and will begin appreciating it. Looking at it from a short-term point of view, this will no doubt mean a considerable loss to the Government just now. Some unpopular measures might have had to be taken to make up this deficit, but I have not the slightest doubt in my mind that numerous poor families will be prevented from going down the path of destruction, will experience the economic and moral uplift and will bless the Government for this. I hope the people of Bombay will give their wholehearted co-operation to the Government of Bombay in this great endeavour of theirs.

New Delhi, 5-4-'50

CONTENTS	PAGE
GANDHI AND MARX — IX ... K. G. MASHRUWALA	57
BULLOCK THE BULWARK OF AGRONOMY ... SARABHAI PRATAPRAI	59
THE MEANING OF PARTITION ... K. G. MASHRUWALA	60
BENGALI HINDUS OF INDIA AND PAKISTAN ... P. K. SEN	61
A LETTER FROM DACCA ... A. G. STOCK & OTHERS	63
HOW NOT TO DO IT ... J. C. KUMARAPPA	63
A MEASURE FOR ECONOMIC UPLIFT OF THE POOR ... VALLABHBHAI PATEL	64