

# **SWARAJ AGAINST HUNGER**

George Kent

University of Hawai'i

(Draft of August 9, 2009)

## **GANDHI'S TALISMAN**

I will give you a talisman.

Whenever you are in doubt, or when the self becomes too much with you, apply the following test. Recall the face of the poorest and the weakest man whom you may have seen, and ask yourself, if the step you contemplate is going to be of any use to him. Will he gain anything by it? Will it restore him to a control over his own life and destiny? In other words, will it lead to Swaraj for the hungry and spiritually starving millions?

Then you will find your doubt and your self melting away.

- Mohandas K. Gandhi

India's approach to dealing with its massive problems of poverty and malnutrition has been dominated by the view of government-as-provider. People ask the government to meet their needs as if it were their father. They are articulate about what government should do for them, but have little to say about what they could do for themselves, either individually or in community with others. There is a need for a change in mindset, to one foreshadowed by Gandhi one hundred years ago when he penned his famous book, *Hind Swaraj*. The book served then as the basis for building self-reliance, and thus resisting the British raj. It could now serve as the basis for resisting the rule of hunger in India.

### **SWARAJ AND SWADESHI**

For many years the website of the Indian Embassy in Washington, D.C. has described India's agriculture and rural development as "a saga of success." It boasts, "From a nation dependent on food imports to feed its population, India today is not only self-sufficient in grain production, but also has a substantial reserve (Embassy 2009)."

It is true that the country now produces enough food to feed all its people, but millions are not fed adequately. Despite India's growing wealth and its agricultural successes, India still has a huge number of malnourished people, more than any other country. What is there to celebrate in this supposed self-sufficiency? What does it mean?

Many people concerned with nutrition issues are preoccupied with the idea of food self-sufficiency, meaning local production for local consumption. Some focus on self-sufficiency at the national level, while others pursue self-sufficiency at more local levels. For example, some people are concerned that the city of London "imports" more than eighty percent of its food (Boycott 2008), and for that reason they support urban agriculture. Some want self-sufficiency even at the family level, and promote homestead food production.

These movements are often sensible, but at times they go too far. Is it really a problem that London imports most of its food? It is a city, after all. If cities start producing all their own food, what are the rural areas to do? Should we really be thinking about high-rise urban pig farms, as some have proposed (Gorrie 2009)?

How far should any family or community go in pursuing economic independence? We can go to Mahatma Gandhi for guidance. He was among the first to challenge the globalizing imperatives of the industrial revolution, advocating self-rule (*swaraj*) and economic independence (*swadeshi*) in its place. He argued that systems for providing life's basic needs should be understood as human, social systems, and not simply as industrial or economic systems whose efficiency must be maximized in a mechanical way.

When Gandhi was asked, "Is the economic law that man must buy in the best and the cheapest market wrong?" he replied, "It is one of the most inhuman among the maxims laid down by modern economists (Gandhi 1921, 16)." However, he was not completely opposed to purchasing food and clothing and other things in the marketplace. Suggesting that everyone should refuse to

buy anything would be inhuman as well. Instead, one should make carefully considered informed judgments about what to buy and what to produce.

In particular, it is important to consider the impacts of one's economic decisions on the well-being of other people, and not just the impact on oneself. Gandhi explained, "The economics that disregard moral and sentimental considerations are like wax-works that being life-like still lack the life of the living flesh." Thus, in contrast to the position of the World Trade Organization and other advocates of so-called free trade, he would have welcomed taking human rights into consideration (e.g., was child labor used in the product's manufacture?). He supported favoring products from members of one's own community just because they were part of that community.

In this understanding, free trade is free when you can trade as you wish; forced trade is not free trade. No country should be pressured to accept another's exports in the way that Haiti, for example, has been pressured to accept rice imports from the United States, or Mexico has been obligated to accept corn imports from the United States, undermining their own small producers.

Gandhi said *swaraj* "means complete freedom of opinion and action without interference with another's right to equal freedom of opinion and action. Therefore it means India's complete control of sources of revenue and expenditure without interference from or with any other country (Gandhi 1921, 14)." This can be understood as a form of sovereignty, independence. It implies active decision-making and action, as opposed to passivity.

Gandhi clarified the meaning of *swaraj* "by introducing a distinction between *swaraj* as self-government or the question for home rule or the good state, and *swaraj* as self-rule or the quest for self-improvement (Parel 1997, xv, liii-liij)." Thus, the concept can be meaningfully applied to governments or to individual people. It may be compared to the concepts of development or empowerment, understood as the increasing capacity of individuals or groups to define, analyze, and act on their own problems. This is a much richer understanding than the suggestion that development in children is merely physical growth, or that the development of nations is nothing more than growth in aggregate income.

*Swaraj* emphasizes increasing power over oneself, as distinguished from power over others. As Gandhi put it, "It is *Swaraj* when we learn to rule ourselves (Parel 1997, xli, 73)."

Some people take *swadeshi* to mean owning land (Global Swadeshi 2009). Their idea is that families should have small plots of land so they can provide for themselves. Its broader meaning is meeting one's needs through one's own production, self-sufficiency. Gandhi placed great emphasis on the importance of spinning one's own cloth in order to avoid dependence on foreign cloth. It symbolized the boycott of British imports. However, focusing narrowly on subsistence farming and making one's own clothes, and ignoring other possible ways of providing for oneself, could be a way of ensuring perpetual poverty for all.

The website of the Embassy of India says that, "Agriculture is the means of livelihood of about two-thirds of the work force in the country (Embassy 2009)." Is this something to boast about, or is it rather an indication of the lack of other opportunities? Could it be that the pursuit of family self-sufficiency on the land has gone to excess, and has led to widespread insufficiency?

Having every family isolated on its own plot of land, producing mainly for itself, can weaken community ties. Instead of suggesting that every family and every community should live in the same bare-bones lifestyle, we should welcome having each of them make carefully considered decisions about what to accept and what to reject from the outside. They should be encouraged to seek or to create greater opportunities for themselves. And they should live in strong communities, acting with concern for one another's well-being.

*Swaraj* and *swadeshi* might seem similar, but the difference is important, especially for India today. Each term has several concepts that are at least roughly equivalent. *Self-reliance* emphasizes local control, but allows for exchange with outsiders. *Self-sufficiency* refers to local production to meet local needs. Self-reliance is about *autonomy* or self-rule, or what Gandhi called *swaraj*. Self-sufficiency is about *autarky* or economic independence, *swadeshi*.

| <b><i>Swaraj</i></b>  | <b><i>Swadeshi</i></b>               |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Self-rule             | Economic independence                |
| Self-reliance         | Self-sufficiency                     |
| Autonomy              | Autarky                              |
| Trade when beneficial | Minimum trade                        |
| Local control         | Local production to meet local needs |

The pursuit of self-reliance calls for mindful attention to possibilities for working out good relationships with others. The pursuit of self-sufficiency suggests maintaining independence of others, even if it means foregoing potential benefits.

The major objective should be self-reliance in the sense of local control over policy (*swaraj*), not self-sufficiency in the sense of localizing production (*swadeshi*). Self-sufficiency means little if it allows people to go hungry. Importing and exporting food and other commodities is fine so long as local people have made a fair and informed judgment about what serves their interests. They must find the right balance. Going thoughtlessly to one extreme or the other is never the right balance.

To be more precise, decisions should be made locally *provided* there is a reasonably democratic decision-making procedure and a sense of community that ensures that the interests of all are served. Where local politics are undemocratic, local self-reliance does not make much sense (Banik 2007). For example, when the Rajasthan government agreed to devote local pasture lands to produce biofuel, displacing the Gujjar tribe whose livelihood depended on those pastures, it certainly was not acting in their interest (Barsamian 2009).

How far should one go in pursuing economic independence, whether at the level of the individual, the community, or the nation? The answer comes from understanding that *swadeshi* is important as a *means* to *swaraj*, and not as an end in itself. Thus, *swadeshi* should not be carried too far. One should limit one's dependence on others, but this does not mean one must cut off all relationships. Whether communities produce their own things or buy products from outside is up

to them, but this is an issue that should be addressed thoughtfully, with regard for the impacts on oneself, others, and the environment, currently and in the future.

Outsiders should not be allowed to come in to plunder one's markets and local resources under the guise of free trade. One should not be ruled by mindless rules. The powerful are the strongest advocates of so-called free trade simply because they are most capable of taking advantage of unconstrained opportunities to reach into others' markets.

Self-sufficiency in some degree can protect a family or a community from exploitative outsiders and from unpredictable changes in weather, prices, and other external conditions over which one has little control. However, there are always local risks as well, such as crop failures. It is best to assure food security by diversifying ones sources, and not depending on any one source. Also, pushing self-sufficiency too far can mean depriving oneself. There is no reason for families or communities to produce all their own food, shoes, televisions, and surgeons. As Vandana Shiva put it, "Localization does not imply isolation from the larger world, but self-determination with interdependence (Shiva 2005, 71).

When applied to food and nutrition issues, *swaraj* foreshadowed the modern call for *food sovereignty*. According to the International Planning Committee on Food Sovereignty, a nongovernmental organization:

Food Sovereignty is the RIGHT of peoples, communities, and countries to define their own agricultural, labour, fishing, food and land policies which are ecologically, socially, economically and culturally appropriate to their unique circumstances. It includes the true right to food and to produce food, which means that all people have the right to safe, nutritious and culturally appropriate food and to food-producing resources and the ability to sustain themselves and their societies (IPC 2008).

Shifting from a policy of exporting and importing food and other essential goods, and instead aiming at total self-sufficiency would exchange one set of vulnerabilities for another. In a world of many shifting uncertainties, there is a need for resilience. This means drawing on multiple sources for fulfilling needs, and having the agility to shift from bad sources to good sources as the need arises. It is decision-making that needs to be localized, not food production. The fact that McDonald's may draw from local food suppliers is less important than the fact that the business is controlled by outsiders. The need to build decentralized resilience is becoming increasingly clear, not only with regard to nutrition, but with regard to all kinds of security issues (Foley, 2009; Robb 2007).

Localized decision-making is essential to *swaraj*. Thus, it meshes nicely with the principle of subsidiarity, "the principle that each social and political group should help smaller or more local ones accomplish their respective ends without, however, arrogating those tasks to itself (Carozza 2003, 38, note 1)." This principle was enshrined in the Treaty of Amsterdam, establishing the European Community, and is retained in the successor Treaty of Lisbon. The task is to work out an appropriate division of responsibilities, with the localities taking the leading role. The principle of subsidiarity could be used as the basis for the central role of local self-reliance in ending hunger worldwide.

## FACILITATING VS. PROVIDING

In the global human rights system, the right to adequate food was mentioned briefly in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and it took binding form in article 11 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which came into force in 1976. The most authoritative interpretation of that global right is in a UN document described as General Comment 12 (United Nations. Economic and Social Council 1999).

The obligations of states in relation to the human right to adequate food are fall into three main categories, *respect*, *protect*, and *fulfill*. In turn, fulfill is divided into two categories, fulfill in the sense of *facilitate*, and fulfill in the sense of *provide*. Paragraph 15 of General Comment 12 interprets *facilitate* and *provide* as follows:

- The obligation to *fulfil (facilitate)* means the State must pro-actively engage in activities intended to strengthen people's access to and utilization of resources and means to ensure their livelihood, including food security.
- Whenever an individual or group is unable, for reasons beyond their control, to enjoy the right to adequate food by the means at their disposal, States have the obligation to *fulfil (provide)* that right directly. This obligation also applies for persons who are victims of natural or other disasters (United Nations. Economic and Social Council 1999)."

The major obligation of government with regard to the human right to adequate food is the obligation to *facilitate*, which means that governments must establish enabling conditions under which people can provide for themselves (Kent 2005, 106-107). This means they are obligated to support self-reliance, *swaraj*. It is only when that proves inadequate that governments should *provide* food directly. Thus, the importance of self-reliance is implicitly recognized in the human right to adequate food as it is understood globally.

This has important implications for social service programs of all kinds, including nutrition programs. They can be either empowering or disempowering for their clients. It is important to make this distinction, and to make sure that the programs help their people to grow and blossom, building their self-reliance, rather than keeping people dependent and weak. Micro-loan programs, for example, generally are empowering because they help people to start up small businesses and eventually become self-reliant. In contrast, programs that provide free food without end can keep people down and lead to dependence on the programs. As Ivan Illich put it, people need to provide for themselves because "people die when they are fed (Illich 1973)." Dignity comes from providing for oneself, not from being fed.

This is the approach that China has emphasized, especially through its development of manufacturing enterprises along its eastern seaboard and its huge advances in aquaculture production. The new jobs created in China may not look like good ones to outsiders, but judging from the vigor with which people seek them, they clearly provide new opportunities that are better than those that people had faced earlier. This approach makes China's people stronger, and

at the same time it makes the government stronger. One major result is that China has been reducing its once-massive hunger program at a very rapid rate.

Governments should feed people directly only when they cannot provide for themselves for reasons beyond their control. Instead, governments should emphasize facilitation, helping people to become self-reliant. The primary obligation of government is to make sure that people have decent opportunities to provide for themselves.

India's right to food movement does not make a strong distinction between the obligation of government to facilitate people in providing for themselves and the obligation to provide food directly. Right to food advocates in India generally take the right to food to mean free food, or heavily subsidized food. This is unfortunate. Free food is sometimes needed to help people through a difficult time, but when it is sustained it weakens people and makes them dependent and submissive.

In India there is now a widespread tendency to view government as the provider, as a kind of father figure. This tends to keep people in a child-like state, dependent on government provisions throughout their lives. It is sad that in India millions of people's greatest aspiration is to be categorized as Below the Poverty Line so that they might be allowed to purchase heavily subsidized rice and obtain other benefits from government. Indeed, it has been estimated that forty percent of those holding BPL cards really are not qualified for them (Ram 2009).

Maturity requires finding ways to provide for oneself. The social service schemes should be reviewed in terms of their capacity to help build *swaraj*, self-reliance. For the long term, the most effective programs are likely to be those designed to reinforce and reward the climb out of poverty, not poverty itself. These programs should empower, not disempower.

Consider India's National Rural Employment Guarantee Act. Without question, it helps people who have limited options. However, while giving people opportunities to earn small amounts of money by doing simple physical work may help to nourish the body, it does little to nourish the mind or nurture human dignity. Imagine what might happen if the money the government spends to give a person one hundred days work in building roads was instead used to provide fifty days training in carpentry or whatever other skills might be in demand locally. Chances are that that person would not come back for more work on the roads. Similarly, some of the funds now used to provide food directly to the poor could instead be used to create employment opportunities for them, or to show them how to produce food for themselves.

The programs could be modified so that beneficiaries are somehow actively engaged in their operations. Consider, for example, the plans for improving the Integrated Child Development Services as described in *Strategies for Children Under Six*, which was prepared at the request of India's Planning Commission (Strategies 2007). While the proposal offers many good ideas, it views the mothers and children as passive beneficiaries of ICDS. They are not actively engaged in designing the program, implementing it, or ensuring that they get what they are supposed to get under the program.

Mothers and young children could be involved in various ways. Their engagement could be based on letting them know exactly what their children are entitled to under the program, and

letting them know what they could do if they don't get it. They and their community leaders could be given some latitude to choose what services are provided and how they are they delivered. They could also be invited to participate in evaluating the services. If there are no good arrangements for receiving complaints about the quality of services, means for doing that could be created. A good start could be made by creating committees of a few parents to articulate the concerns of all of them.

The Mid Day Meals program could be used to help build school children's self-reliance. As children mature, they could be given increasingly active roles in organizing the meals. If the government loosened its tight control over what foods were used and how the meals were managed, schools could draw more on their own productivity and creativity. Local communities could have an active role in deciding menus. Food production at the schools could be encouraged.

Students could also be involved in assessing their meals to determine whether they meet the standards set by the government. Schools that are not aided by the government program could set up their own standards, and students could be involved in ensuring that those standards are met. Schools could set up committees, including children, to oversee the implementation of the Mid Day Meals program. These committees could inform themselves, the teachers, and the students about the standards that are supposed to be met, and they could take complaints about the program under guidelines that they set up.

It was at least partly to press for increased self-reliance among the poor that the United States did a radical overhaul of its welfare programs in 1996. Many people judge the changes to be a great success (Boushey 2002). Some changes were quite simple, such as limiting the time people could stay in particular programs. Surely the schemes in India could do more to help people and communities help themselves. All of the government schemes in India could be reviewed in relationship to *swaraj*, and modified as needed to ensure that they help to liberate, not trap, their clients.

## SWARAJ AND ACCOUNTABILITY

In any well-developed rights system there are three major roles to be fulfilled: the *rights holders*, the *duty bearers*, and the *agents of accountability*. The task of the agents of accountability is to make sure that those who have the duties carry out their obligations to those who have the rights. Thus, to describe a rights system, we need to know:

- A. The nature of the *rights holders* and their rights;
- B. The nature of the *duty bearers* and their obligations (duties) corresponding to the rights of the rights holders; and
- C. The nature of the *agents of accountability*, and the procedures through which they ensure that the duty bearers meet their obligations to the rights holders. The accountability mechanisms include, in particular, the remedies available to the rights holders themselves.

Rights imply entitlements, which are claims to specific goods or services. Rights are—or are supposed to be—*enforceable* claims. Enforceability means that the duty bearers, those who are to fulfil rights/entitlements, must be obligated to do so, and they must be held accountable for their performance through suitable administrative or judicial procedures

Where there are no effective remedies, there are no effective rights. While there can be many different mechanisms of accountability, the most fundamental is that available to the rights holders themselves. Thus, rights should be enforceable not only by lawyers, government officials, and organizations of various kinds, but also by the rights holders themselves, through means that are appropriately designed and readily available to them. Rights holders must know their rights, and they must have appropriate institutional arrangements available to them for ensuring their realization. They must have a role in shaping the world in which they live.

*Strategies for Children Under Six* offers a number of excellent recommendations on how the Integrated Child Development Services and related programs could be improved (Strategies 2007). However, while the term *entitlement* is used, its significance is not explained. There is a call for entitlements regarding food, but not with regard to childcare or health services. The Strategies study could have explained that entitlements should be enforceable through administrative or judicial procedures established for the rights holders.

There are some accountability mechanisms in place. For example, the government has established School Meal Monitoring Committees for the Mid Day Meal program at national, state, district, and block levels (Ministry 2006). The Commissioners to the Supreme Court of India regularly write letters to the Supreme Court on the violations of the food and employment schemes, and they submit detailed reports to the Court. The Commissioners also visit the states to assess compliance, and when necessary they convene a Joint Commission of Inquiry.

Having recourse mechanisms available to high-level officials such as Commissioners to the Supreme Court of India is very different from having such mechanisms available directly to the rights holders for voicing their complaints. Rights holders should fully understand their entitlements, and they should have safe and effective mechanisms through which they can complain if they do not get what they are supposed to get.

Children and their parents should know what they are entitled to, and they should be assisted in making their own clear judgments about whether they have in fact received it. They also need to have some place to take their complaints. This is the key missing piece in India's social service programs (Kent 2006).

Providing suitable recourse mechanisms and encouraging people to stand up for their rights can be a means for building self-reliance, *swaraj*. Such systems can be instituted locally, on a small scale. To illustrate, to monitor the performance of the Mid Day Meals program at a particular school, one parent or teacher could be appointed as the meals ombudsman, responsible for taking complaints and passing them on to appropriate authorities. Or a small committee could be formed in the school to take complaints. The committee could be formed of, say, one student from each grade level, and one or two teachers.

Asking students to assess even a few aspects of their Mid Day Meals, and letting them know that their views matter, could have a substantial impact. It would help to ensure that the Mid Day Meals program works well, and it would enhance the participating students' education. The educational value would lie in their obtaining new information about nutrition and about their rights, but more importantly, it would empower them, helping them to understand what rights mean and how they can be used.

Engaging students in this way would make them more capable of standing up for their rights. *Swaraj* grows out of this sort of standing up and speaking out. *Swaraj* grows with practice.

### **SPECIALLY FORMULATED FOODS**

The relevance of *swaraj* to modern India can be demonstrated by reference to current debates in India and around the world regarding the management of severe malnutrition in young children. There are concerns about specially designed products such as Plumpynut, especially when they involve outside organization or corporations, and when attempts are made to shift from purely therapeutic uses of the product to using them to prevent malnutrition.

The fears are prompted by approaches such as Médecins Sans Frontières' Campaign for Access to Essential Medicines (Médecins Sans Frontières 2008a; Médecins Sans Frontières 2008b). Critics of the campaign object to the idea of bringing in special formulations from outside the community as if they were medicines. In their view the appropriate remedy would be to improve the local food supply. While it might be appropriate to treat *existing* cases of severe acute malnutrition as requiring special medicines, the critics do not want that approach used for the *prevention* of such malnutrition.

It is not easy to draw a clear line between these categories. Firms that get started by providing therapeutic foods to humanitarian agencies also look to fortify everyday foods that can be sold in the market. They are backed by GAIN (Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition) which serves as "a kind of dating agency for the public and private sector . . . to create national strategies, and even laws, to fortify foods eaten by majority of a population (Anderson 2009)."

The World Alliance for Breastfeeding Action is very concerned:

Programmes promoting use of fortified complementary foods, including those from commercial, not-for-profit and charity sectors, have the potential to de-value continued breastfeeding and indigenous foods, further commercialise infant feeding, and delay the gradual transition to family foods and sustainable meal patterns (WABA 2008).

People have become troubled over the promotion of "public private partnerships" in dealing with serious malnutrition (Varshney 2009). There is now a generalized fear that when private interests get involved in government-sponsored nutrition programs, corporations will push their particular products in an overly aggressive way. Their favorite remedies then squeeze out other possibilities. They might provide free or low cost products for a time, thus building up demand, and then withdraw their subsidies.

There has been large-scale promotion of synthetic vitamin A in India, while the promotion of increased intake of green leafy vegetables and other locally available foods rich in vitamin A has been neglected (Kapil 2008).

Another example that has drawn criticism is the partnership between Danone and the Grameen bank to establish a factory in Bangladesh to produce an inexpensive yogurt product that is “designed to provide nutrients essential to the health of the Bangladeshi population, and most of all children.” Danone offers strong arguments for the product’s benefits in both nutritional and economic terms (Danone 2009). Nevertheless, the project has aroused suspicion. The International Baby Food Action Network (IBFAN), which has been broadly critical of Danone, quoted Arun Gupta, Member of the Prime Minister’s Council on India’s Nutrition Challenges, and also Southeast Asia Regional Coordinator for IBFAN:

The global baby food market is worth more than \$31 billion and is growing by 10% each year. India and SE Asia are prime targets for the baby food industry and strong legislation to control unethical marketing is far from implemented everywhere - in this context the last thing we need is for companies to be given renewed power to influence policy makers to create markets for their products. It is all too easy for parents to believe packaging claims that processed foods will make babies healthier and stronger and to forget the risks. Fortified foods can be useful in carefully managed programmes, but it is vital that these programmes are not influenced by the commercial agenda which is relentless (IBFAN 2009).

The critics are also concerned that the economic factors are not addressed with sufficient clarity. Who will pay for these specially formulated foods? For how long? How efficient is it to set up long supply chains to deliver packages of nutrients that might instead be provided by using locally available resources (Teams 2009)? The advocates of specially formulated foods have not addressed these issues adequately.

The debates over specially formulated foods are broad and multi-faceted. To some the main issues are scientific questions regarding the merits of the proposed treatments, and for others the economic side is more interesting. However, one of the deeper issues, not well articulated, is the political one of *locus of control*. Who should decide how children are to be fed? There is a deep concern that outsiders advocating specially formulated foods might override local decision-making as to which foods would be best, and they might have interests that divert them from doing what is best for the children.

When outside agencies proposed a new complementary food program for infants based in part on commercial processed foods, people in India objected, asking, “Who is to decide what will be eaten by Indian children? Is it the health and nutrition experts from India or corporate-driven bodies from abroad (Rajalakshmi 2008; also see Gopalan 2008; Kapil 2009)?”

India’s Planning Commission expressed a similar concern when it criticized the child development minister’s proposal to feed 80 million poor children with pre-packaged micronutrient fortified food instead of hot cooked meals. The commission called it a retrograde step and said that the scheme would lead to serious health risks for children (Sethi 2008).

No matter what benefits might be claimed for any specially formulated food, one key question is, who should weigh the evidence and make final decisions? Many people want these decisions to be made locally, not in the national capital, in foreign countries, in international agencies, or in corporate boardrooms. Local people should be fully involved in solving their own problems, even—and especially—when it involves assistance from the outside. Drawing on the best available advice, food decisions should be made at the child's home or as close to it as possible. Exceptions could be made if there were convincing evidence that well informed local people could not make good decisions, but there should be a proper process for managing such exceptions. In the absence of that process, final decisions should be made locally.

These concerns are rooted in the principles of *swaraj*. One may interact with outsiders and work with them in various ways, but one's self-reliance, *swaraj* must be maintained.

At the community level, *swaraj* requires a local decision-making body to study the issues, obtain the best available advice, and make the judgments that need to be made. This body should work in behalf of the local community, advising as to when and how to export or import or establish any other kinds of relationships with outsiders. Local government can exercise this role. In some cases it might be sensible to establish local Nutrition Policy Councils to deal with those issues.

Much of the debate over specially formulated foods would become irrelevant if we accept that democratically representative local bodies should make decisions in behalf of local people. The task of outside experts is to offer advice, not to make final decisions. The task of local people is to inform themselves, or their chosen delegates, about the issues and the options, and to make informed choices based on local interests. Outsiders often have other interests, and often they are well hidden.

It might make sense to use specially formulated foods on a temporary basis while building local capacity to provide the nutrients and the services that are needed. Plans for using special products from outside should include clear plans to limit dependence on them. Often this will mean that the program plans should include clear strategies for phasing them out. The basic guideline is that programs should be empowering for local people, building their capacity to deal with the issues long after the outside experts have gone away.

## **COMMUNITY-BASED NUTRITION SECURITY**

In India and worldwide, efforts to deal with problems of malnutrition generally are conceived in terms of intervention from the outside (Bhutta 2008). This is a top-down approach, based on the medical model. It is based on the assumption that there is some sort of deficiency in those who are malnourished, not a deficiency in the social system in which they are embedded. Hunger is viewed as mainly a technical problem, not a political problem.

Just as this top-down approach to dealing with malnutrition has not worked well globally, it has not worked well in India. Endless stories demonstrate that people do not get their due from India's social service programs (105 Schools 2009; AHRC 2009; Center 2009; Chandauli 2009;

Jamwal 2008; Kids 2009; Kumar 2009; Malnutrition 2009; Ramalingan 2009; Sanket 2009; Tiwari 2009; Why Ragpickers 2009).

India's poor suffer being treated by bureaucrats in a way that echoes their ancestors' maltreatment under the British Raj. Gandhi said, "If I have the power, I should resist the tyranny of Indian princes just as much as that of the English (Parel 1997, 77)." Surely he would resist Indian bureaucrats as well. Now, as then, top-down thinking should be replaced with a decisive community-based approach. *Swaraj* is as important now as it was then.

Local communities can make policy mistakes, just like central governments and international agencies. The advantage of localizing decision-making is that it ensures that local interests are the highest priority, and people are protected from outsiders who always have other interests.

In India, advocates for the right to food call for more funding from the national government, but have little to say about what local communities might do for themselves. Unquestionably, interventions by outsiders sometimes are needed, but why start with that? Why not begin by asking what people could do for themselves, with their own resources?

Where there are calls for assistance from outside, they should be for assistance that is enabling, empowering, capacity-building, and not assistance that is disempowering and demoralizing. Where local people do not have the capacity to solve nutrition problems themselves, the task is to build that capacity.

There is convincing evidence for the effectiveness of community-based efforts in dealing with nutrition and other health issues. For example,

UNICEF is collaborating with the Indian government to increase the effectiveness of ICDS by demonstrating low-cost, community-based solutions to improve health care delivery. The specific interventions supported include strengthening the management and supervision system, improving the knowledge and skills of anganwadi workers and increasing the time and attention they give to infants, improving community involvement through joint village situation analysis, identifying village volunteers and providing them with basic training in infant care, and increasing the number of home visits made by anganwadi workers and volunteers in order to increase the caring behaviour of parents and improve the outreach of health services (UNICEF 2009).

The approach has proven effective in the six states in which it was tested: "In Rajasthan, for instance, it was found that early initiation of breastfeeding was higher and the prevalence of stunting significantly lower in intervention villages than in control villages."

However, UNICEF's community-based efforts emphasized engaging local people only in the implementation of programs, while the basic decision-making and design of the programs come from outside the states and the villages. Similarly, to some agencies community-based therapy for children suffering from severe acute malnutrition means only that they are to be treated at home rather than in hospitals and clinics (Prudhon 2006; World Health Organization 2007).

Some people think of heavy reliance on home gardens as a basis for community-based food security, but if the people do not connect with one another, this would be community-based only in a geographic sense. As understood here, a community is not simply a cluster of people who happen to live at the same spot on the map. In strong communities, people have special concern for, and act to improve, one another's well-being, and they are involved together in active decision-making at the community level. In this view, a program that is managed mainly by outsiders with little guidance from local people should not be viewed as genuinely community-based.

The Hunger Project (THP), a nongovernmental organization, provides an example of a true community-based program because it is based on local planning and control. THP defines the three pillars of its work as:

1. Mobilizing people at the grassroots level to build self-reliance;
2. Empowering women as key change agents;
3. Forging partnerships with local government.

The organization has designed a specific methodology for building self-reliance, based on conducting village-level workshops in which people create their own vision for the future, commit to achieving it, and outline the actions that are needed to succeed.

THP is active in India, as illustrated by its work in Karnataka. It has launched a federation of 5,000 elected women leaders there who "will now have a unified platform from which to speak, and the strength and support that comes from that solidarity." Thus, THP's orientation is based on building *swaraj*, even if it does not use that term.

Our overview here confirms Gandhi's insight regarding the importance of *swaraj*, not only for his time, but also for ours. Recalling its historical roots, India needs to build self-reliance for its people, for its communities, and for the country as a whole. The social service schemes should be modified so that they systematically build self-reliance. In the long run, people do not need to be fed; they need decent opportunities to provide for themselves.

Globally, hunger cannot be explained simply as a problem of poverty. The world is not poor. Where many people are malnourished and that pattern persists over time, there is something radically wrong with the social structure. We need to recognize that in many social relationships, people exploit one another, improving their own situations at the expense of others. Even if people do not exploit others, they may show massive indifference to others' well-being, which also leads to dire consequences. However, there are also many situations where people do treat each other well, especially in small communities. This is demonstrated in examples such as the state of Kerala, which does so well on most social indicators, and the various experiments with *sarvodaya* in Sri Lanka, India, and elsewhere. Few people have recognized the potential of strengthening communities as a means for addressing serious malnutrition.

People need to have the capacity to say *no* to those who would exploit them, and join with those who would support them. Strong communities can be defined as those whose people have an especially high level of concern for one another's well-being. In strong communities, people do not allow their neighbors to go hungry.

Where powerful groups treat weak groups badly, those who are weak would be well advised to withdraw from the relationship as quickly as possible. They need to reduce their dependence on the strong. Strategies of self-sufficiency, *swadeshi*, would serve them well.

How far should they go? They should persist until they can build up their strength enough so that they can resume relationships with others on a more equal basis. At the global level, we see a good example of this in China's withdrawal from the world for many decades, and then its resumption of its contacts from a position of strength in the late twentieth century.

The strategy of self-sufficiency can serve as a foundation for home rule, *swaraj*. Rather than having to accept terms of engagement dictated by foreigners, the newly emergent China became capable of standing up and saying *no* to foreigners. It learned to formulate and press for its own clear demands. It has not gotten its own way all the time, and should not expect that, but like other countries, it has become able to negotiate from a position of equality rather than a position of servitude.

The same principles apply at the village level. If the local poor find that owners of large farms offer only meager wages, they need to find alternative means of livelihood, and break their dependence on those farms. Dependence means vulnerability to exploitation. As Vandana Shiva says, "We need to build the levels and kinds of relationships that allow communities to feel as one (Barsamian 2009)." People who are not in strong communities should work to strengthen them or, if necessary, move to them, or create them.

Increasing local self-reliance with respect to nutrition is just one part of the much broader challenge of achieving real development based on local empowerment. Nobel Peace Prize winner Wangari Maathai spoke about this in relation to Africa:

At both the top and the bottom, all Africans must believe in themselves again; that they are capable of walking their own path and forging their own identity, that they have a right to be governed with justice, accountability and transparency, that they can honor and practice their cultures and make them relevant to today's needs, and that they no longer need to be indebted-financially, intellectually, and spiritually-to those who once governed them. They must rise up and walk (Maathai 2009).

This message is meaningful for all people who have been living in poverty and hunger. In any community, genuine development, the increasing capacity to define, analyze and act on one's own problems, is about building self-reliance, *swaraj*.

To exercise *swaraj* there is a need for clearly identifiable local bodies that study and advise on issues based on local interests. Imagine that every community created a specialized council to look after the nutrition status of all its people. These Nutrition Policy Councils could serve as the locus of food sovereignty, exercising *swaraj* at the community level.

In this approach the major function of higher levels of governance would be to provide support to the local councils, based on the principle of subsidiarity. Local councils could be advised by

nutrition councils at higher levels of governance. For example, state-level nutrition councils could advise on how to monitor nutrition status, and they could offer a variety of resources, including information, advice, and services. This multi-level system of nutrition councils could be established through appropriate legislation. If each community had decent opportunities to address its own nutrition problems, had reasonable resources to support the work, and was encouraged to take responsibility, probably most would address the issue with great vigor.

Given decent opportunities to do so, who among us would not feed our children well? People need the opportunity, and a bit of guidance, and in time their capacity to manage malnutrition will grow. Nutrition programs need to be designed to build that competence, building *swaraj* at family, community, and national levels. As Gandhi's talisman suggests, hunger should be addressed not by feeding the poor, but by making sure that they have increasing control over their own destinies.

Serious problems of malnutrition should be owned by the local community, and not taken away from them by corporations or by higher levels of governance. Higher levels may help and may serve as backup in case of local failures, but they should not take away that responsibility. We should not steal people's problems from them.

Just as strong communities would not allow any of their people to go hungry, strong nations would not allow any of their communities to be so weak as to allow hunger to persist. A well-governed world would support all of its nations in supporting all of their communities in ensuring that no one anywhere goes hungry, ever.

In strong communities, where people are especially concerned for one another's well-being, people don't go hungry. However, we have to acknowledge that in India, as in other countries, many communities are divided, and people do not treat each other well. That problem that needs to be addressed or the hunger issue will never be solved.

What does it take to build strong communities? What could they do for themselves? And what could higher levels of governance do to support them? These are fundamental questions that should be addressed as India formulates its new Right to Food Act (Patnaik 2009). Strong communities based on *swaraj* might provide the breakthrough that is needed. This might be the best means available for ending hunger in India and in the world.

## REFERENCES

- 105 Schools to Face Action for Mid Day Meal Irregularities* 2009. *Gaea News*. May 20.  
<http://blog.taragana.com/n/105-schools-to-face-action-for-Mid%20Day-meal-irregularities-64667/>
- AHRC (Asian Human Rights Commission) 2009. "India: Tribes, Living in Stigma and Starvation." AHRC/ReliefWeb. <http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/rwb.nsf/db900SID/KERN-7SP7V6?OpenDocument>
- Anderson, Tatum 2009. "Firms Target Nutrition for the Poor." *BBC News*. June 24.  
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/8114750.stm>
- Banik, Dan 2007. *Starvation and India's Democracy*. London: Routledge.
- Barsamian, David and Vandana Shiva 2009. "Vandana Shiva on Gandhi for Today's World." *Yes Magazine*. Summer.  
[http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&ct=res&cd=1&url=http%3A%2F%2Fyesmagazine.org%2Fyes50barsamian&ei=SIZRSru\\_JYOqtgP30vWqDQ&usq=AFQjCNGJjUMqwuciR4IS6ytnD2GetiuHtw&sig2=Zk2BM-oaT91UUpYDqETJsQ](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&ct=res&cd=1&url=http%3A%2F%2Fyesmagazine.org%2Fyes50barsamian&ei=SIZRSru_JYOqtgP30vWqDQ&usq=AFQjCNGJjUMqwuciR4IS6ytnD2GetiuHtw&sig2=Zk2BM-oaT91UUpYDqETJsQ)
- Bhutta, Zulfiqar A.; Tahmeed Ahmed; Robert E. Black, Simon Cousens; Kathryn Dewey; Elsa Giugliani; Batool A. Haider; Betty Kirkwood; Saul S Morris; H. P. S. Sachdev and Meera Shekar 2008. "What Works? Interventions for Maternal and Child Undernutrition and Survival." *Lancet Series, Maternal and Child Undernutrition*. Vol. 371, 417-440.  
<http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140673607616936/fulltext>
- Boushey, Heather 2002. *The Effects of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act on Working Families— Viewpoints*. Economic Policy Institute. March 4. [http://www.epi.org/publications/entry/webfeatures\\_viewpoints\\_tanf\\_testimony/](http://www.epi.org/publications/entry/webfeatures_viewpoints_tanf_testimony/)
- Boycott, Rosie 2008. "London's Achilles Heel." *The Guardian*, 1 October.  
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/oct/01/food>
- Carozza, Paolo G. 2003. "Subsidiarity as a Structural Principle of International Human Rights Law." *American Journal of International Law*. Vol. 97, 38-79.  
<http://www.asil.org/ajil/carozza.pdf>
- Center for Environment Concerns 2009. *Delivering NREGS: Challenges and Opportunities*. Hyderabad, India: Center for Environment Concerns.
- Chandauli 2009. "Chandauli is High-burdened with Malnourished Kids." *Times of India*. June 8.  
<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/Varanasi/Chandauli-is-high-burdened-with-malnourished-kids/articleshow/4631626.cms>

- Danone 2009. *Discover the Project: Danone Communities : A Great Idea for Social Entrepreneurship*. <http://www.danonecommunities.com/project/>
- Embassy 2009. *Agriculture & Rural Developments*. Washington, D.C.: Embassy of India. <http://www.indianembassy.org/dydemo/agriculture.htm>
- Foley, Michael W. 2009. "Coming Chaos? Maybe Not." *The Oil Drum: Campfire*. January 26. <http://campfire.theoil Drum.com/node/5013>
- Gandhi, M. K. 1921. Young India, October 27, 1921. *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, Vol. 25. [www.gandhiserve.org/cwmg/VOL025.PDF](http://www.gandhiserve.org/cwmg/VOL025.PDF)
- Global Swadeshi 2009. Website: <http://www.globalswadeshi.net/>
- Gopalan, C. 2008. "Vitamin A Deficiency – Overkill." *NFI Bulletin (Bulletin of the Nutrition Foundation of India)*. Vol. 29, No. 3 (July), pp. 1-3.
- Gorrie, Peter 2009. *High Rise Farms? The New Model for Sustainable Cities*. AlterNet. April 20. [http://www.alternet.org/environment/135410/high\\_rise\\_farms\\_the\\_new\\_model\\_for\\_sustainable\\_cities/](http://www.alternet.org/environment/135410/high_rise_farms_the_new_model_for_sustainable_cities/)
- Heredia, Rudolf C. 1999. "Interpreting Gandhi's *Hind Swaraj*." *Economic and Political Weekly*. June 12. <http://www.swaraj.org/interpreting.htm>
- IBFAN (International Baby Food Action Network) 2009. *Danone no longer on the Board of GAIN*. [http://www.ibfan.org/site2005/Pages/article.php?art\\_id=589&iui=1](http://www.ibfan.org/site2005/Pages/article.php?art_id=589&iui=1)
- Illich, Ivan 1973. *Tools for Conviviality*. Berkeley, California: Heyday Books. <http://www.opencollector.org/history/homebrew/tools.html>
- IPC 2008. International NGO/CSO Planning Committee. <http://www.foodsovereignty.org/new/whoweare.php?PHPSESSID=d09f0c60dc998c86b7160b5a248518d6>
- Jamwal, Nidhi 2008. "Consumed by Hunger." *Down to Earth*. August 31. [http://www.downtoearth.org.in/full6.asp?foldername=20080831&filename=news&sec\\_id=50&sid=45](http://www.downtoearth.org.in/full6.asp?foldername=20080831&filename=news&sec_id=50&sid=45)
- Kapil, Umesh 2008. "Ethical Issues in Vitamin A Supplementation in India." *Indian Journal for the Practising Doctor*. Vol. 5, No. 4. <http://www.indmedica.com/journals.php?journalid=3&issueid=132&articleid=1745&action=article>
- Kapil, Umesh 2009. "Ready to Use Therapeutic Food (RUTF) in the Management of Severe Acute Malnutrition in India." *Indian Pediatrics*, Vol. 46, 381-382. <http://indianpediatrics.net/may2009/may-381-382.htm>

- Kent, George 2005. *Freedom from Want: The Human Right to Adequate Food*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press. <http://press.georgetown.edu/pdfs/9781589010550.pdf>
- Kent, George 2006. "ICDS and Right to Food." *Economic and Political Weekly*. Vol. 41, No. 45 (November 11).
- Kids 2009. "Kids Go Hungry at Some Anganwadi Centers." *E-Pao*. June 8. <http://e-pao.net/GP.asp?src=1..090609.jun09>
- Kumar, Arun 2009. "Bureaucracy Stands in the Way of Benefits." *Hyderabad News Network*. June 12. <http://hyd-news.blogspot.com/2009/06/bureaucracy-stands-in-way-of-benefits.html>
- Maathai, Wangari 2009. *The Challenge for Africa*. New York: Pantheon.
- Malnutrition 2009. "Malnutrition in Melghat: State Yet to Wake Up." *Times of India*. July 12. <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/Mumbai/Malnutrition-in-Melghat-State-yet-to-wake-up/articleshow/4646513.cms>
- Médecins Sans Frontières 2008a. *Food Aid Basket Missing Critical Ingredients—dire consequences for children under two*. April 23. <http://www.msf.org.hk/public/contents/news?ha=&wc=0&hb=&hc=&revision%5fid=29010&item%5fid=29009>
- Médecins Sans Frontières 2008b. *Winners and Losers in India*. March 31. <http://www.doctorswithoutborders.org/news/article.cfm?id=2581>
- Ministry 2006. *National Programme of Nutritional Support to Primary Education, 2006: [Mid-Day Meal Scheme]: Guidelines*. New Delhi, India: Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of School Education & Literacy. <http://www.schooleducation.kar.nic.in/pdf/files/mdmguidelines2006.pdf>
- Patnaik, Biraj 2009. *How to Tackle India's Hunger*. Livemint.com July 2. <http://www.livemint.com/2009/07/02205358/How-to-tackle-India8217s-hu.html>
- Parel, Anthony J., ed. 1997. *Hind Swaraj and Other Writings*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Prudhon, Claudine; André Briend; Zita Weise Prinzo; Bernadette M.E.G. Daelmans; and John B. Mason, eds. 2006. *SCN Nutrition Policy Paper No. 21 - WHO, UNICEF, and SCN Informal Consultation on Community-Based Management of Severe Malnutrition in Children*. Geneva: United Nations System Standing Committee on Nutrition. [http://www.who.int/nutrition/publications/severemalnutrition/FNB\\_0379-5721/en/index.html](http://www.who.int/nutrition/publications/severemalnutrition/FNB_0379-5721/en/index.html)

- Rajalakshmi, T. K. 2008. "The Food Question: Moves to Float a Corporate Alliance to Promote 'Complementary' Baby Food Evoke Protests." *Frontline*, Vol. 25, No. 9 April 26-May 9. <http://www.hinduonnet.com/fline/fl2509/stories/20080509250912700.htm>
- Ram, F.; S. K. Mohanty; and Usha Ram 2009. "Understanding the Distribution of BPL Cards: All-India and Selected States." *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XLIV, No. 7. February 14.
- Ramalingam, Krithika 2009. "Tamilnadu's Paradox: Alarming Malnutrition Pushing Children Out of School –Parts I and II." *India Together*. June 21. <http://www.indiatogether.org/2009/jun/hlt-malnutr1.htm>
- Robb, John 2007. *Brave New War: The Next Stage of Terrorism and the End of Globalization*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sanket 2009. *Moribund ICDS (a study on the ICDS and Child Survival issues in Madhya Pradesh)*. Bhopal, India: Sanket - Centre for Budget Studies, Vikas Samvad & Right to Food Campaign Madhya Pradesh Support Group. <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&ct=res&cd=2&url=http%3A%2F%2Fsouthasia.oneworld.net%2FFiles%2FICDS.pdf&ei=DRpeSo6MH4ncsgP2uZWZCQ&usg=AFQjCNHDIhsIQgWe7bv9-Bj0z6d1dyMIRA&sig2=v5A1uq0RGToWn8PO4s3srg>
- Shiva, Vandana 2005. *Earth Democracy: Justice, Sustainability, and Peace*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: South End Press.
- Strategies 2007. "Strategies for Children Under Six." *Economic and Political Weekly*. December 29, 87-101. <http://www.bpni.org/EPW-Article-on-ICDS.pdf>
- Teams 2009. "Teams inspect anganwadis for stale food packets." *Times of India*. June 3. <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/Mangalore/Teams-inspect-anganwadis-for-stale-food-packets/articleshow/4613942.cms>
- Tiwari, Mrigank 2009. "CAG Reports Anomalies in Govt's Mid-day Meal Scheme." *Times of India*. May 29. <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/Allahabad/CAG-reports-anomalies-in-govts-mid-day-meal-scheme/articleshow/4594670.cms>
- UNICEF (United Nations Children's Fund) 2009. *India: Reducing Undernutrition through Community-Based Interventions*. New York: UNICEF. [http://www.unicef.org/evaluation/index\\_49150.html](http://www.unicef.org/evaluation/index_49150.html)
- United Nations. Economic and Social Council 1999. *Substantive Issues Arising in the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: General Comment 12 (Twentieth Session, 1999) The Right to Adequate Food (art. 11)* Geneva: ECOSOC E/C.12/1999/5. [www.unhcr.ch/tbs/doc.nsf/MasterFrameView/3d02758c707031d58025677f003b73b9?Opendocument](http://www.unhcr.ch/tbs/doc.nsf/MasterFrameView/3d02758c707031d58025677f003b73b9?Opendocument)

USDA (United States Department of Agriculture) 2009. *Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program: Facts About SNAP*. Washington, D.C.: USDA.  
[http://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/applicant\\_recipients/facts.htm](http://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/applicant_recipients/facts.htm)

Varshney, Vibha 2009. "Private Via Public: Alliance with UNICEF in Question." *Down to Earth*. September 30.  
[http://www.downtoearth.org.in/full6.asp?foldername=20080930&filename=news&sec\\_id=4&sid=7](http://www.downtoearth.org.in/full6.asp?foldername=20080930&filename=news&sec_id=4&sid=7)

WABA 2008. *Protecting, Promoting and Supporting Continue Breastfeeding from 6-24 + Months: Issues, Politics, Policies & Action*. Penang, Malaysia: World Alliance for Breastfeeding Action. [http://www.waba.org.my/pdf/gbpm\\_statement\\_June09.pdf](http://www.waba.org.my/pdf/gbpm_statement_June09.pdf)

*Why Ragpickers Prefer Land Fills to Schools* 2009. *Yahoo! News India*. June 13.  
<http://in.news.yahoo.com/32/20090613/1056/tnl-why-ragpickers-prefer-landfills-to-s.html>

World Health Organization 2007. *Community-based Management of Severe Acute Malnutrition. A Joint Statement by the World Health Organization, the World Food Programme, the United Nations System Standing Committee on Nutrition and the United Nations Children's Fund*. Geneva: WHO.  
[http://www.who.int/nutrition/topics/Statement\\_community\\_based\\_man\\_sev\\_acute\\_mal\\_eng.pdf](http://www.who.int/nutrition/topics/Statement_community_based_man_sev_acute_mal_eng.pdf)

World Health Organization 2009. *Community-based Management of Severe Acute Malnutrition*. Geneva: WHO.  
[http://www.who.int/nutrition/topics/Statement\\_community\\_based\\_man\\_sev\\_acute\\_mal\\_eng.pdf](http://www.who.int/nutrition/topics/Statement_community_based_man_sev_acute_mal_eng.pdf)