

HARIJAN

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

Vol. XIX, No. 38

AHMEDABAD — SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1955

TWO ANNAS

MAHARASHTRA MUST FEEL SATISFIED

(By Maganbhai P. Desai)

The Working Committee of the Congress deserves the congratulations of the people for the wise decision it took regarding the reorganization of Bombay State. The recommendation of the S. R. C. was almost a still-born proposal because Maharashtra refused to accept it at all. Gujarat (i.e. including Kutch and Saurashtra) was prepared to accept it for discipline's sake; and when it saw that Maharashtra was in no mood to accept it as it was, but would do so if it was so amended as to include Vidarbha also in the bi-lingual State proposal of the S. R. C., it reiterated its acceptance of the S. R. C. formula as it was and refused to accept its amended formula of Maharashtra, and gave out its mind that it would opt out for its alternate proposal, viz., that the parent State of Bombay should then be better divided into three parts — Maharashtra, Gujarat and Bombay City.

The decision of the G.P.C.C. was acclaimed by almost all groups in Gujarat. The Maharashtra decision of a joint State of all Gujarati-speaking and all Marathi-speaking areas with Bombay City as its capital showed that Maharashtra did not swear by Sanyukta Maharashtra as a moral principle, but would be ready to consider alternate proposal if any. It would surely not agree to the S. R. C. formula.

The hitch in arriving at a reasonable way out of the tangle was twofold: (i) whether Vidarbha and Nagpur would join with Maharashtra and agree to constitute a single Marathi-speaking State and (ii) whether Bombay City will be joined with Maharashtra.

The Working Committee did the obvious and equitable thing in the matter and improved upon the recommendations made by the S. R. C. Report by deciding that Vidarbha may be prevailed upon to join with Maharashtra, but Bombay City shall be a separate State. And so that Maharashtra may have no cause to be dissatisfied, a proviso was added that after 1961 if the Bombay City Legislature newly elected after that year decided by 2/3 majority to join Maharashtra, Bombay City might do so. Thus the two difficulties were ironed out and the unhappy

situation that was worsening almost every day has been made easy and clear.

I hope Maharashtra would feel satisfied with this very wise, just and reasonable solution of the problem and accept it and henceforth turn its mind to making it a success by winning over Nagpur and Vidarbha with the help of the good offices of the Congress High Command. The people of Vidarbha will, I hope, readily agree to it, looking at the matter from a long-range view of having one single Marathi State, not too big nor too small for being a happy administrative unit of the Union.

11-11-'55

PATTERNS OF SOCIAL SERVICE

(By Maganbhai P. Desai)

When about five years ago the Government of Bombay initiated its Sarvodaya Scheme a constructive worker from Karnataka remarked, 'This is a scheme of *Government Sarvodaya*'. What he meant was, the policy of the Government was distinct from the Sarvodaya of Gandhiji's conception and would set up quite a different pattern.

Gandhiji carried on his work through village workers who functioned on the inspiration of a sentiment and with faith. A life-like quality of certain inner feelings of the heart was, therefore, in evidence in Gandhiji's work. Government servants would carry on the work as any servants would usually do. It is obvious, their work would not show the quality which a village worker would generally bring to it. As a consequence, the whole pattern of their work would be different.

Another distinction may also be noticed. The village worker carries on his activities directly among the people. The Government servant does so within the limitations of the instructions given to him by his department or the hierarchy of his superior officers. That is to say, he takes his orders from above. The officers on top or others do the thinking, out of which orders are issued and the work proceeds. This leads to a position where it is not possible to carry on the work keeping local peculiarities in view. The Government servant has no discretion to alter the orders he receives. It is not so in the case of the village worker. He has freedom and scope to

act in keeping with the local conditions. He makes alterations and adjustments accordingly, in the programme of work given to him. Government machinery cannot allow such freedom to its servants. It would look to the quantity of the work done and proceed with the execution of its scheme. The distinction between the two leads to a vital difference in the actual execution of the programme.

Other points of difference can be indicated in the same manner. I believe the opinion of the Karnataki friend quoted in the beginning arises out of the difference between the two approaches illustrated above. One feels as if the very pattern of the work for Sarvodaya undergoes a change as a result!

Now, this distinction is very fundamental. It shows itself coming out in various other ways. Probing deeper into it one is inclined to conclude that the fundamental distinction is due to the difference between the original sentiment and the inspiration of the popular worker on the one hand and that of the Government servant on the other.

Though the Government servant is called a 'public servant' his original inspiration is not a sentiment of service; he recruits for a professional job; and it is believed to be creditable for him if he does the work assigned to him 'impartially'. The usual experience, however, is that his prejudice or his sense of protest shows itself in the work he does. It is obvious that when he allows his personal prejudices or dislikes to get the better of him his work becomes a source of concern to the people. But this is very usual in Government departments. Government servants do not take to a particular type of work because they love it. They go wherever they are transferred and do the work they are asked and have to do. The position of a true public and popular servant is quite the reverse. It is expected of him that he loves his work and undertakes to do it with faith in it.

This is why the contact of the popular servant has one effect on the people and that of the Government servant quite another. The popular worker can educate and build up the capacity of the people by means of his work for them; the Government servant, at best, can only execute their work for them. If the Government servant were a good man, it would, of course, make a difference. On the other hand, if the popular servant lacked character, his work too would make a difference but of the other kind! What has been described above is, however, what would normally happen without taking into account variations due to individual peculiarities.

2

If we kept our eyes open we can see the effect the distinction is having in all manner of ways and in all places. Schemes of village deve-

lopment like Community Projects etc. have been initiated by the Central Government. Finance for them is provided in the Five Year Plan. And it is intended, shortly, to extend them to all the villages in the country.

The Government of Bombay commenced the work of their Sarvodaya Scheme before the Central plan came into being. As its name indicates its working was sought to be more or less on Gandhian lines. The Community Project and the National Extension Scheme are also Government ventures. Their names, however, show that they were hardly intended to proceed on Gandhian lines.

This state of affairs has prompted some people to remark that there are two constructive programmes in operation in the country today — one, the old one of Gandhiji and now the other, the new one, of the projects etc. of Jawaharlalji. This is not all. The distinction indicated by the Karnataki friend has developed further. The experiment of the Central Government under the name 'Community Project' constitutes a different type in addition to the Bombay Government's Sarvodaya Scheme. Its execution, conception and consideration are carried on from the highest top, that is, by the Central Government and its machinery. This works for another and entirely new effect. Something written to me by a friend from the South in this connection is worth sharing with the reader here.

Gandhigram in the South near Madura is considered a centre for both the constructive activities, — the Gandhian as well as the C.P.A. A friend, Shri Douglas Emsinger of the Ford Foundation was on a visit to the Centre. A worker of the Centre, Shri Kaithan had taken notes of the remarks made by Shri Emsinger, which he passed on to me. I quote from them below:

"It was two years ago here in Gandhigram that I discovered myself in India. Here I began to see clearly how the Gandhian Constructive Programme needed the Community Project, and how the Community Project needed the Constructive Programme. It was here that for the first time I saw clearly how the Community Programme needed a spiritual basis. That might well be supplied by the Gandhian constructive workers. It was here that I saw more clearly than ever how a purpose for living needed to be given to the people.

It is true that I knew something about Gandhiji and his philosophy before I came to India. I had learned this primarily through a Religious Education Instructor who had been sent to India to meet Gandhiji and to get a spiritual understanding of life.

"I would like now to raise the question with you as to how Social Education fits into a Community Programme. It is the responsibility and opportunity of Social Education Organizers to give the Community Programme a heart and soul. It is our duty to help the people to help themselves — to understand the full benefits of freedom — to give them a purpose to want to live better. It is for you to learn the spiritual basis necessary for the Community Project Programme — to learn the meaning of "Man does not live by bread alone". It is this that I refer to when I speak of a spiritual basis. In the beginning the special emphasis on physical targets disturbed me. But I am glad this is changing.

"Gandhiji will be primarily known as one who brought freedom to India through non-violence. Nehru will be known as the one who built India into a political unity and brought the message of world peace through non-violence to other nations. May you be known as the individuals who give leadership to the rebuilding of new India through a joint effort with the people of India's 5,58,000 villages. Yours is essentially a programme of giving leadership and direction to the process of social change—a recreation of a significant village culture. It is the rebuilding of each one of these units that will result in a New India. You have a challenge and an opportunity to make this unique contribution to India. May you take it up not as a job but as a *mission in life*."

It seems Shri Douglas Emsinger uttered these words before the recruits under training for jobs in the Government Community Project scheme. He has seen and described the distinction we have been considering from quite a new angle. The principle behind his view is the same, however, as is stated above.

3

There is another instance also which will help us understand the distinction better. It is true Government servants are there to carry on the administration of work useful to the people; but training them for their special jobs is considered essential. And servants who perform various services are trained for the various purposes. For instance, training is given for labour jobs, community project jobs etc. In comparison with servants inspired with a spirit of service and faith who work on their own initiative, trained Government servants form a different class. The following illustration will help us perceive the difference.

Some time back a professor of the College of Social Sciences of the Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda made a statement to the effect that Gandhiji, Shri Ravishankar Vyas who is better known as Ravishankar Maharaj all over Gujarat and many others of the same class could not be called 'social workers'! The statement was the cause of a serious agitation in Baroda. If we take into account the distinction pointed out above, it would be obvious that these well-known eminent servants of the nation can hardly be called 'social workers' in the sense that they were trained by a University School of Social Sciences with the purpose of filling certain jobs of the Government departments. Much less did people like the Mahatma or Maharaj study books written in foreign languages on those sciences; and they are certainly not Government servants or professional 'social workers'.

The secret of the distinction is that the method of work developed by Government machinery is so peculiar that the scheme of work as well as the main idea behind it cannot escape taking its colour. For this reason, like 'Government' Sarvodaya, social service is also becoming a 'Government' social service!

4

I will add another example to illustrate the point further. It throws light on the entire situation obtaining in our country at present. It was presented to the last Sarvodaya Workers' Conference at Puri by Shri Vinoba. He pointed to a type of non-violence which was described as Government Ahimsa!*

Going to the root of the whole question one is led to the conclusion that an organization or machinery or institution is inevitably necessary to actually achieve some aim in society. It is, of course, true the organization will partake of the nature of the aim. But if the aim is collective an institution for its achievement has to be set up, because otherwise the work for it does not gather volume and speed, nor is it possible to carry it on in an orderly manner. But here the real difficulty enters. Just as when the spirit takes a body in order to be able to function, the latter is sure to bring in with it the *maya* of *avidya*; so also a mission or social truth has to create a machinery or organization for itself to be effective, but that also brings in its *maya* along with it. The *maya* of Government organization works in one way; the *maya* of a popular organization (if the work is undertaken by an individual he too brings in his own *maya*) works in quite another. If some person were to insist that he would not create an organization for his work it only means he is an institution by himself and does not wish to go further and that he adopts for himself a kind of self-control or a duty of renunciation. But his work is sure to suffer in volume and intensity to that extent.

Today when talk of achieving social aims by the power and will of the people is in the air the idea stated above deserves particular attention. Nor can it be ignored that the institution of the State is an embodied expression of the power and will of the people. And the State is necessary for healthy control in society. If it is believed to be an 'evil', it is a 'necessary evil'. The remedy to counter the evil lies in individuals controlling themselves out of a sense of self-imposed religious duty.

(From *Harijan Bandhu*, 7-5'55)

*This is what he had said on the occasion:

"The other thing is about Gandhiji's Ahimsa. Some of us have gone into Government, some others have remained out of it. The Government meaning of non-violence these days is to coerce society as little as possible. We believe this definition of non-violence is dangerous to non-violence itself."

By Mahatma Gandhi
BASIC EDUCATION

Pages viii+114 Price Re. 1-8-0 Postage etc. As. 6

By K. G. Mashruwala

A VISION OF FUTURE INDIA

Pages v+69 Price Re. 1-0-0 Postage etc. As. 4

NAVAJIVAN PUBLISHING HOUSE
P.O. NAVAJIVAN, AHMEDABAD - 14

HARIJAN

Nov. 19

1955

THE PRESENT ECONOMIC CLIMATE

(By Maganbhai P. Desai)

I have on my pending file an important address by Shri G. D. Birla to be noted in these columns. Speaking to a Bombay businessmen audience on July 29, this year, he described what, according to him, was the economic climate in the country at present. This was done by him chiefly with the aim of replying to the question facing businessmen, viz., "What part are we (i.e. the private sector) going to play in the building of new India?" He admitted that the position of the private sector was "taking a rather serious turn at present. It might even mean that it may disappear altogether." However, he was firm that the private sector would surely survive, because "whatever public sector they (i.e. the Government) may have, ultimately they cannot do without the private sector for the simple reason that business brain is with the businessmen"; only they must be up and doing to meet the challenge of the time.

And the challenge, according to him, is unemployment. Mr Birla said that it was of two sorts: 1. agricultural under-employment, and 2. educated unemployment. He admits that the first touches 75 per cent of our population. But he dismisses it with remarking that "an agricultural economy helps only upto a point", and shrewdly enough dilates upon the importance of the second sort and says, "these young men are a serious menace to the country when they are forced to be unemployed. It is a challenge not only to you but to everyone of us." And he declares that it can be met only through capitalism and industrialization, and not through small-scale village industries of an agro-industrial economy as conceived by Gandhiji.

Mr Birla, in his scheme of industrial re-organization, has a place for small-scale industries also, but in a totally different context or pattern. These must, according to him, hang on or revolve round heavy or large-scale industries. And the latter must, as he definitely believes, belong to the private sector. Thus the scheme of things industrial, according to him, comes to mean that the industrial life of the people must revolve round private capitalists and industrialists—resulting into an economic order which generally goes by the name of capitalism. And we know there is now a school of economists chiefly in America, the home of the new brand of 20th century capitalism, which says that capitalism of the previous century was bad, but it is now changing to be a democratic and co-opera-

tive set-up aiming at a Welfare State just like the much-vaunted Socialism.

Gandhiji stood for a radically different thing. He put the common man and his self-reliant life and labour in the centre of his pattern of a free and independent peace-loving community. In such a pattern large-scale or heavy industries were not ruled out. They took their places in the broad vista of an industrial community mostly living in its villages and producing its necessary consumers goods—food, cloth etc. in a decentralized way and with such simple implements that even the best of scientific skill would give them. Man would rule supreme in such an order, and not money and machine controlled by few. Gandhiji would not place the cart of the heavy industries before the horse of the massive small-scale industries of the nation. Mr Birla definitely proclaims his disbelief in such a pattern and posits instead a heaven on earth that he sees actualized in western countries and would like to copy it in India. This is what he said he wished to see in India, "People are no longer interested just in seeing some big man enjoying life, but they want to enjoy prosperity themselves. I feel, therefore, that the best way to preserve capitalism in this country is to make almost everyone, small or big, a capitalist."

And he, I think, has no misgivings on the score that all possibly cannot be capitalist. Therefore, shrewdly enough, he chooses who out of the crores in India should directly enjoy and share with the capitalist what prosperity the latter might bring through his brains. Surely the captains of industry and capital are there as the first chosen few. Round them must be gathered together the educated unemployed, who are really the people for whom it can be said, as Shri Birla does above, that they want to enjoy prosperity like the capitalist; the inert mass of our people is still not so conscious. The former are the people who go by the term 'intelligentsia' or the middle classes. If a social order is made possible in which these are satisfied, it is naively believed that it will be possible to manage and control the whole body politic through these classes who will be trained in their universities and will man not only diverse services of the private sector but will also supply technicians and government servants. The inert mass of agriculturists and the rest may carry on as they did before, with this change that their new masters will be Indians and not outsiders and therefore they can rest contented with having a happier deal from them.

And Mr Birla boldly claims for his fraternity that "we have to make everybody comfortable in this country. All talk of private sector or public sector must be considered in this context. If the Congress cannot solve this problem, it will have to disappear. Only he who can solve this problem will be able to survive. We have to put our heads together and try to solve the problem

in a more realistic manner." And this manner is as is shortly described above.

The Government also, in the name of its public sector with a controlled private one and its army of officers and experts, makes the same claim. They also need the wherewithal, viz. abundant capital, to fulfil it, as the private sector. The private sector needs further that the State policy must be as the businessmen wish it to be, i.e. in the interest of the order they swear by. In short, the capitalist and the industrialist must, if not dominate, at least direct or influence the powers that be in the Government of the day. This they would if they can. The most uncomfortable part for them in this regard is the slogan of a socialistic pattern, which therefore needs to be explained away or interpreted in a manner suitable to their ideas and interests. I think this is being well done these days. The Government of the day also stands for an economic order, more or less of the same conception. Hence it does need the help and services of the private sector, — a situation which, therefore, emboldens Shri Birla and others to say that "business brain is with businessmen" and hence they have an importance and a value even the Government cannot but admit.

I think Mr Birla is right here. The Government as well as the industrialist swear by heavy industries. Both would have small-scale industries also, but in a manner and of a conception different from Gandhiji's. Both are careful to win over the intelligentsia or the unemployed educated middle class with giving jobs etc. to them. The masses, thus, almost go out of the picture. Their colossal unemployment is neither's *direct* concern.

Gandhiji's scheme of things and affairs directly aimed to make the good unto the last of the masses its direct concern round which other interests of the classes will find their places even to their own good also. If this idea of his is not made the most active and operative principle in the rebuilding of new India, we must be sure that we are heading for a day when the masses will be driven to find their new leaders and put the reins of their own destiny in their hands. Democracy in India expects us and requires the Government to see that the common man among the masses is directly served so that he comes to his own in his own self-reliant way. If economic freedom means anything, he need not be made to depend on the State and its ruling bureaucracy nor on the mercies of the private capitalist and his satellites, the educated middle classes. We must avoid such a battle between the classes and the mass of our people. The only sure way to it is the Gandhian way, and not the way of appeasement of the intelligentsia by either sector — the Government or the capitalist-cum-industrialist.

7-11-'55

INEVITABILITY OF VILLAGE INDUSTRIES

(By Vinoba)

It can never happen in the villages of India that village industries be planned with a view to ease the unemployment situation and after four years they be given up to give place to machines. Population in India as also in the world is on the increase, but the area of land in India is surely not going to extend itself. Under the circumstances we will have to realize that village industries have an abiding function and place in the economic planning of this country. Planning village industries is not something which can be done to order; only planning roads and constructing them can be done to order.

Like avoiding agriculture in this country as well as the world, avoiding village industries in India is unthinkable. In whatever condition one can think of, the world will have to pursue agriculture. This could not be said of village industries. In a country where the population is very thin you can have industries other than village industries. In place where land is available for cultivation in profusion, one can think of employing machines in agriculture. But in a country like India where the area of land available for cultivation is less in proportion to the population you cannot employ big machinery in agriculture, and even in the field of industries only village industries can work. For this reason I emphasize that we had better not plan through the fear of the demon of unemployment but do so with a permanent planned solution in view.

It is, of course, open to anyone to ask me why I make such difference. I do so because it is obvious that when you are planning for the country as a whole it would not succeed unless you had some definite ideas in view. I have already said it is good that a beginning in the field of village industries is being made with the aim of removing unemployment. But if not now, tomorrow certainly, you will have to make up your mind that in the planning you want in this country you will have to give a place of importance to the item of village industries and also consider it a part of your way of life.

There is no question that village industries are inevitable for India. This is not to say that we should not improve our implements and tools. Improvement there must be and as the world knows we have been at it for the last twenty-five years. For years we have been experimenting with the spinning wheel and as a result we have the Ambar Charkha now in the field. So such improved tools and improvements have their place in our scheme of things. They do not injure our cause at all. But even if the Ambar Charkha enters the field our *takkli* and the spinning wheel will retain their place; no one thinks of giving them the go-by.

And village industries, too, cannot sustain themselves alone by themselves. All the people

in a village will have to plan village industries together. If the people in a village decide not to import cloth from outside, they will have to plan for the whole process of cloth-making from growing cotton to weaving cloth in the village itself. I do not believe the idea of village industries can be successful and spread unless it was planned on these lines. An individual may successfully ply village industries for himself, but his effort is not going to develop into a plan for the whole village. An individual may voluntarily take to spinning and supply the need for his own cloth by himself. But that would not be enough for planning for the village as a whole. In order to plan for the entire village it must have a committee. But so long as inequalities persist in the village all the people in it will not obey the decisions of the village committee. Even distribution of land in the village, therefore, is essential.

I have already placed before you some principles which have been evolved during our work. Without village industries we cannot hope to regenerate the village. Village industries cannot prosper in the absence of proper planning for the entire village. You cannot have such planning unless you have a village committee for the purpose. And last but not the least, the committee will not be recognized by the entire population of the village till you have fair distribution of land in it. Thus you will see that village industries and redistribution of land are inseparably associated with the idea of regenerating the village.

[Shri Vinoba has rightly insisted that village industries are not merely a temporary phase in the development of our economy as, perhaps, some of our Five-Year planners seem to believe, but they are a permanent and inevitable part of it.

I may be permitted to add one point here. Shri Vinoba has said, and rightly again, that "an individual may voluntarily take to spinning and supply the need for his own cloth by himself, but that would not be enough for planning for the village as a whole." Even so if people in one village were voluntarily to undertake planning by themselves, it would not be enough for a successful working of village industries in the whole of India. Planning to that end will have to be undertaken keeping the whole country in view. If the State failed in ordering the economy and the industrial structure of the whole country on the basis of equality and restoration of village industries, the necessary atmosphere for village industries to thrive and take root will not spread in the country. One single village or a group of them may serve the purpose of the ideal exception: For this reason also basic education, too, will fall to take root and progress and to manifest its all-embracing corporate power. We should not forget the old dictum, 'the State makes the times' (राज्य कालस्य कारणम्) in this connection also.

31-10-'55

(From Hind)

— M. P.]

By Vinoba Bhave

BHOODAN YAJNA

[Land-Gifts Mission]

Pages viii + 134 Price Re. 1-8-0 Postage etc. As.5

NAVAJIVAN PUBLISHING HOUSE
P.O. NAVAJIVAN, AHMEDABAD-14

RURAL CIVILIZATION FOR INDIA

(By Vaikunthbhai Mehta)

[From his Presidential Address delivered at the Rural Life Conference, on the 28th October, 1955.]

The various aspects of rural life have to be considered in relation to one another. It is not mere co-ordination that has to be attempted, but a synthesis. It is a synthetic approach that Mahatma Gandhi adopted when he put together the different social activities that he promoted in his constructive programme. It is appreciation of the same principle that is reflected in the decision of the planning authorities of the country to adopt the programme of Community Development Projects as the method and the National Extension Service as the agency for promoting all-round progress in the countryside. The Sarvodaya Centres of the Government of Bombay are inspired by the same trend of thought.

Without entering into details, I would observe that there are some factors that need consideration in planning for rural India. In the Community Development Projects every effort is being made to secure the co-operation if not the active participation of the people in the activities carried on for their benefit. Often, however, the initiative comes from the Projects Administration and responsibility rests with officers connected with the Administration. Even at the risk of slowing down the pace of progress, I would urge that at all stages and at all levels, it is the people's organizations that should be educated into taking the initiative and assuming responsibility. By people's organizations I do not mean merely *ad-hoc* committees or even statutory bodies such as Panchayats. To my mind voluntarily constituted bodies such as co-operative societies and social service agencies can contribute effectively to the task of building up, especially when, in order to be successful, the construction has to be from below.

A recent survey of our rural economic conditions discloses the fact that even where Panchayats and co-operative societies have settled down successfully to their tasks, benefit from their activities flows mainly to the more well-to-do sections of the rural community and that very often the poorer classes among whom may be included those belonging to the scheduled castes remain untouched by these activities. To what extent this results from the influence exercised by the better-off sections of society and in what degrees our caste system is responsible for this phenomenon, it is somewhat difficult to assess. But, if there is to evolve anything like a cohesive rural community, caste has to disappear. The observance of untouchability in some form is still not, we must admit, a relic of the past, especially in our village. Until caste goes, I cannot conceive of the total extinction of the distinction between "caste" and "outcaste".

Turning to altogether another topic, I would like to observe that, though I do not subscribe to

the slogan "produce or perish", I do certainly take the view that there is a bleak future before the country unless we can find productive work for the vast numbers who are today unemployed or under-employed.

In case we fail in this effort, the employment to be provided may have to be unproductive or unemployment relief will have to be afforded to vast numbers. This latter alternative has merely to be mentioned to be ruled out. So we are practically left with only one line of action, namely, to engage the unemployed or under-employed sections of our rural population in industries. The state of imbalance between agriculture and industries has to be rectified without delay as a deliberate part of national policy. I would add here that the unregulated flow of people from villages to large towns that we witness today gives rise to slums and creates a number of social problems. In the interest of a healthy society this flow has to be checked. This can happen only if we provide suitable remunerative work for people in the countryside.

Industrialization in India, so far, has been lop-sided. It has displaced numbers of persons from their traditional employment without creating opportunities for the absorption of even an appreciable fraction of these in alternative employments. The potentiality of this form of industrialization to provide, in the future, employment for the huge numbers concerned is admittedly very limited. It is to the acceptance of this stark fact of our economic situation that may be attributed the value that is attached in the draft of the Second Five Year Plan to the promotion of village and small-scale industries as an integral part of the plan.

The acceptance of this view has a twofold implication. It will be the duty of the State, firstly, to make available the resources and the organization needed to help in the resuscitation and development of these industries and secondly, to ensure that, during the period of readjustment and transformation, they are protected from the competitive influence exercised by the large-scale organized industries in the private sector.

Thus, it will be seen that in both the sectors of our rural economy, agricultural and industrial, we have to plan for a new social order. For some years, we spoke of the establishment of a co-operative commonwealth as being the goal of our national efforts. Today, we have begun to think in terms of a socialistic pattern of society as being our ideal. The two are not incompatible, because socialism does not connote merely nationalization. To my mind, in the context of rural economy, a co-operative commonwealth may well be the order of society towards which we should progress. The creation of a rural civilization for India was one of Mahatma Gandhiji's dreams.

SATYAGRAHA IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

(By Horace Alexander)

[Horace Alexander, British Quaker who was closely associated with Mahatma Gandhi wrote a letter to the Editor of *The Times*, London, published on September 5. The following part of his long letter is reproduced from *Peace News*, September 5, 1955.]

In his articles on Goa on August 25 and 26, your Delhi Correspondent has, I think, rendered a valuable service in opening a discussion on the place of what Mr Gandhi called Satyagraha in international relations.

Will you allow me to comment on some of the issues he has raised?

First of all, what did Mr Gandhi himself understand the role of Satyagraha to be? In the course of 20 years' close association with him, I discussed this matter with him more than once, and I think I have read most of what he has written about it in the last 20 years of his life.

Mr Gandhi believed (as who does not?) that the continued use of armed conflict as the normal means of settling differences between masses of men is disastrous for humanity and needs to be superseded by other methods.

As far as possible, of course, both in international and in industrial and other group relations, negotiations and arbitration should be preferred; and Mr Gandhi again and again showed himself a patient conciliator.

But he also believed that situations sometimes arise when one side to a dispute shows itself so obstinate and unyielding, so unwilling to agree to any compromise, that the other party is obliged to look for some effective way of showing that to it the continuance of the *status quo* is intolerable. Such is, I take it, the reason for recognizing the right to strike in industrial relations.

Satyagraha was, in Mr Gandhi's philosophy, more or less the equivalent in international affairs of the right to strike in the industrial field.

It was a very important part of his conviction that, in such extreme situations, those who undertake direct action should be prepared to accept suffering but not to inflict it.

It is important also to recognize that Mr Gandhi was not a pacifist in the sense in which that word is sometimes used. He did not believe that war is always the worst choice. On the contrary, he again and again insisted that those who are not willing to follow the way of Satyagraha exclusively are sometimes under moral obligation to fight.

I do not know why your Correspondent only mentions his approval of the Indian action in Kashmir and the Chinese resistance to the Japanese. It may be called that he wrote with the utmost appreciation of the heroic resistance of the Poles to the Nazi hordes in the autumn of 1939, and showed strong sympathy to the British decision to assist the Poles at that time.

When, as your Correspondent recalls, he urged the British to resist Hitler without violence in 1940, this was due to his conviction that the British were of such heroic mould that they, if any people, might thus show the world a more glorious way of resisting, and perhaps in the end subduing an invader. But in fact it may perhaps be doubted whether any nation is yet morally fit

for true Satyagraha — resistance in unity to the death without hate and without committing any violence.

144 Oaktree Lane, Selly Oak,
Birmingham, 29.

WILL B.C.G. DOCTORS HEED TO THIS ?

[The following important piece of news is culled from the October 18, 1955, issue of the *New York Times*. It indicates how the West is awake about the use of the questionable prophylaxis B.C.G. and the doctors therefore have an experimental approach to it and work with a spirit of research and humility.]

Dr. Carol Palmer is not only the head of T. B. Research of the U.S.A. Public Health Department, but is the head of the WHO research team at Copenhagen. Hitherto he has been a great protagonist of B.C.G. Therefore the admissions that he makes about B.C.G. in the following article are very important and particularly noteworthy.

For example, he says, three quarters of 100,000 new cases of tuberculosis each year came from the positive group. So the real problem in tuberculosis is the tuberculin-positive cases and not the tuberculin-negative cases only in which B.C.G. vaccine is indicated. The latter are hardly 2 per cent in adult population and about 18 per cent in school-going children, according to statistics obtained by B.C.G. workers in Ahmedabad.

The last para of this article is very important. It points out that even workers in tuberculosis are divided in their opinion about the efficacy of B.C.G. mass vaccination in tuberculin-negative cases. It hardly reduces the infection by 3 per cent. It is not indicated in tuberculin-positive cases. For this small figure of 3 per cent, should Government of India sponsor this campaign and make it almost compulsory? The fact that these inoculations are not free from dangers is already pointed out before. (See "Tuberculosis After B.C.G. Vaccination" in the *Harijan* of Sept. 17, 1955.)

8-11-55

M. P. J.

A prophylaxis against tuberculosis is under study in the hope of preventing the disease among persons who are "tuberculin positive". Those persons comprise 75 per cent of tuberculosis cases.

The National Tuberculosis Association and the United States Public Health Service announced here yesterday that they had been making tests on a programme of prophylactic doses of INH (isonicotinic acid hydrazide) to tuberculin positive subjects since last February. The results will not be available for some time, but officials of the Public Health Service are so pleased with the indications that they are using the technique on their own laboratory technicians and others exposed to tuberculosis infection.

The report of the development was made yesterday afternoon after an all-day meeting on TB immunization at the Henry Hudson Hotel, 353 West Fifty-seventh Street. The meeting was under the auspices of the National Tuberculosis Association and was attended by 150 leaders in Tuberculosis therapy.

Dr. Carol Palmer, chief of tuberculosis research for the United States Department of Public Health, explained that the experiments on the INH programme was started among 900 children who had shown a positive reaction to the tuberculin test. Half of the children are

getting small doses of INH while the other half, as controls, are given inert pills.

The official adoption of INH as a prophylaxis depends on the results of the tests. However, the data will not be available until the experiment. He said that to his knowledge not one of the patients under treatment had contracted active tuberculosis.

Would Offer Wide Protection

If the INH prophylaxis proved effective it could give protection to the group most likely to contract TB. Until now B.C.G. vaccine (bacillus Calmette-Guerin) has afforded a degree of protection to "tuberculin negative" persons, but it cannot be given to "tuberculin positives". A tuberculin positive is a patient whose skin reacts to a tiny dose of killed tuberculosis bacilli. The dose is often called at patch test and indicates that one either has active tuberculosis or has recovered from what may have been a minimal infection.

Dr. Palmer estimated that there were 50,000,000 tuberculin positive persons in the United States. He said statistics indicated that three-quarters of the 100,000 new cases of tuberculosis each year came from the positive group. In New York City nearly half of the population is believed to be positive.

INH, it was explained, is a simple chemical that can be produced cheaply. In conjunction with streptomycin and sometimes also with P.A.S. (Paraamino salicylic acid), it is widely used for the treatment of active tuberculosis. It is considered harmless in the small doses given for prophylaxis. It was said that the prescribed prophylaxis dose would probably be one small pill the size of an aspirin tablet once a week.

Dr. Palmer indicated that the INH prophylaxis might also be effective for negative persons. He said the Public Health Service was giving it to negative laboratory technicians.

The conference also heard reports on the efficacy of B.C.G. vaccine. Although there was a division of opinion on its value, it was agreed that it should be used only for "tuberculin negative" persons who come in close contact with heavy infection. Mass inoculations, it was said, seldom result in a decrease attributable directly to B.C.G. of more than 3 per cent.

CONTENTS	PAGE
MAHARASHTRA MUST FEEL SATISFIED ..	Maganbhai P. Desai 297
PATTERNS OF SOCIAL SERVICE ..	Maganbhai P. Desai 297
THE PRESENT ECONOMIC CLIMATE ..	Maganbhai P. Desai 300
INEVITABILITY OF VILLAGE INDUSTRIES ..	Vinoba 301
RURAL CIVILIZATION FOR INDIA ..	V. L. Mehta 302
SATYAGRAHA IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS ..	Horace Alexander 303
WILL B.C.G. DOCTORS HEED TO THIS ?..	304