

THE

Indian

Libertarian

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

EDITOR: D. M. KULKARNI

MAKE ENGLISH THE LINGUA FRANCA OF INDIA

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION Rs. 6.00

Vol. X No. 17

December 1, 1962

IN THIS ISSUE

	PAGE
EDITORIAL	2
War With China by M. A. Venkata Rao	5
Non—Alignment A Moral Imperative ? by M. N. Thota	7
The Task Before Us By C. Rajagopalachari	10
DELHI LETTER : Nehru Makes Out A Case For Our Joining NATO And SEATO	11
Book Review	12
Gleanings from the Press	13
News & Views	13
our Editor	15



EDITORIAL

HATE COMMUNISM TO WIN THE WAR

The present conflict wantonly inflicted on peaceful and democratic India by the treacherous and hateful Communist China has now assumed the proportions of a fullfledged war though undeclared by either of the sides. The Chinese troops have not only crossed the traditional MacMahon Line in NEFA but have almost reached the Assam borders after bombing our air bases near Walong. In Ladakh they have thrust deeper into our territory even beyond the area claimed by the China Government. All the bravery and sacrifice of our Jawans on the battle fronts have proved futile before the fierce onslaughts of the Chinese, premeditated and carefully planned for well over ten years ever since, in a moment of weakness, our Government gave up all our rights over Tibet inherited from the British and nonchalantly recognised sovereignty of China over Tibet without even giving a passing thought to the probable fateful consequences on India's security resulting from bringing the Chinese frontiers closer to our Himalayan borders. The Chinese who must have all along been laughing in their sleeves at our credulity and stupidity, have shrewdly enough, caught us now unawares and unprepared for a war and are steadily marching forward in the direction of Bramhaputra and Kashmir valleys.

All these sudden happenings have undoubtedly shocked our Government out of its self-complacency. Mr. Nehru and his colleagues, it must be admitted, are putting forth herculean efforts now to retrieve India's position on the war fronts which, sadly enough, is none too good and happy for our side at the present moment. There is of course much truth in what Mr. Nehru says that ultimately, India would win the war despite her initial reverses, since justice is on her side and that we need not lose our nerve but instead should bend all our energies to furthering India's war-efforts. The production of small automatic guns and arms is being speeded up in our defence factories. Arms are being imported from Western countries, which look upon India as the bastion of Democratic Freedom in East Asia and therefore do not wish India to go under in this fight with China. Mr. Menon, the evil genius who had been trying all along to isolate India from the Democratic Camp has been rightly hounded out of the Cabinet and

also from public life by his countrymen, outraged and scandalised by his crypto-communist foreign and defence policies. He has been replaced by Mr. Chavan the sturdy, strong minded and pragmatically inclined Maharashtrian leader and patriot, in the hope that he will be able to repair the damage caused to our country's prestige and honour as a free nation, by the pusillanimity of his predecessor. The cleansing of the Augean Stables has already begun. General Thapar has gone on a long leave and General Choudhary of the Burma and Hyderabad fame has been appointed in his place as the Commander-in-Chief in the NEFA Sector to ginger up India's grim fight against the Chinese hordes. These measures will certainly hearten the people who have been continually clamouring for a major change in the policies of the Government, if not in the composition of top leadership of the country.

But these measures will not touch even the fringe of the vast problem of India's defence, if they do not indicate a fundamental change in the outlook and thinking of those who are guiding the destinies of our country. It is admitted by the Government spokesmen that our troops were out-numbered and out-weaponed by the Chinese invaders, even when the latter were operating in Indian territory. That bespeaks our amazing and incredible military weakness. The Government at least now, should openly admit this fact and take adequate steps to remedy this sorry situation. Our Jawans, man-to-man, are undoubtedly superior to the Chinese soldiers, to judge them from their past heroic record in the previous two World Wars under the skillful British Commanders. What seems to be needed therefore at the present juncture, is the proper training of our troops in modern warfare and equipping them with modern tools. They also need to be placed under able Generals. All this help and skill are available to us from U.S.A. and Britain whose governments have expressed their ever willingness to extend whatever help is sought for, from them by the Indian Government.

But our Government, perhaps for its own good reasons is moving very cautiously in the matter. Its previous political commitments and ties particularly with Russia appear to inhibit it from taking quick decisions in this direction. Our leaders do not seem to have yet realised

that Russia has cast off her vaunted neutrality in the matter by roundly denouncing the McMahon Line as a boundary fixed by British imperialists. Russia has also her own reasons for not openly siding with China against India, one of them being that she is afraid of the striking power of U.S.A. and other democratic countries of the West, which might come to be employed even in the cause of preserving India's democratic freedom menaced by Chinese totalitarianism. Another reason for this attitude of Russia is that today she neither wishes Red China to be destroyed nor does she want China to grow so powerful as to challenge her leadership of international communist movement. Therefore, it may be that Russia will choose to follow the policy of standing equi-distant both from the 'Bourgeois Democratic and anti-colonialist India' under Mr. Nehru and 'Troskite China' under Mao. This seeming neutrality may be motivated by a desire to maintain the balance of military power in favour of China by preventing our leadership from going too far in seeking western military aid.

Even assuming that this conflict will in the end develop into the third World War, it will be none of India's seeking. China alone will be held responsible for the grave consequences of the war on World Peace. This fear psychosis of world war sedulously created and fostered by our Indian Reds and their fellow-travellers

in the name of Peace, should not bamboozle our leadership into compromising India's freedom and honour, for the questionable security promised by the Peace terms proposed by the wily and treacherous Chinese leaders. And it is heartening to note that Mr. Nehru has refused so far to fall into the trap of such 'Peace talks.'

And above all, at least after the bitter experience of the communist trickery and fraud practised on them, our leaders should henceforth stop talking all sorts of nonsense about communism being a good ideal and its becoming a first casualty in this Sino-Indian War. On the other hand, they should tell the people the real truth that Mao and other Chinese leaders are behaving in the way they do, because they are thorough-bred communists and that aggressive expansionism is inherent in communist ideology and programme as expounded by the communist prophets, Lenin, Stalin and others. The Democratic Allies won the Second World War because they hated intensely Fascism and fought it out to the bitter end as a scourge and plague. India also will surely win the war, only when Indians particularly our leaders, learn to hate from the bottom of their hearts and souls, communism whether of the Chinese or Russian variety or of the Indian kind, as the devilish and dark spirit of the post-war period. Then only will they be in a proper frame of mind and spirit to fight back even with their backs to the wall, the brutal Chinese burglars and marauders and give a decent burial to RED NAPOLLANISM OF CHINA on the battle-fields of the HIMALAYAS.

MR. NEHRU AND 'NATIONALIST' REDS

Mr. Nehru's open recognition in the Parliament of the so called 'Nationalist' wing of the Communist Party of India under the leadership of Mr. Dange, as cent percent patriots may be a good pointer of the large-heartedness of the Leader of the Nation that sees no evil even in the enemy after the manner of Buddha and other saints. But it surely does not reflect creditably on Mr. Nehru's sense of a realistic understanding of the present political situation in India. His Panchashila having miserably failed with Red China, he seems to be eager now to give it another trial in his own country even during this national emergency. If Mr. Nehru were really satisfied with the stand taken by these nationalist Reds, he should have told them frankly to further implement their much-advertised resolution, by severing all political ties with international communism and function in India only as an independent Nationalist Party free to denounce not only

The Indian Libertarian

Independent Journal Of Free Economy and Public Affairs

Edited by : D. M. Kulkarni, B.A., LL.B.

Published On the 1st and 15th Of Each Month

Single Copy 25 Naye Paise

Subscription Rates :

Annual Rs. 6; 3 \$ (U.S.A.); 12 S. (U.K.)

ADVERTISEMENTS RATES

Full Page Rs. 100; Half Page Rs. 50; Quarter Page Rs. 25
One-eighth Page Rs. 15; One full column of a Page Rs. 50

BACK COVER..... Rs. 150

SECOND COVER..... Rs. 125

THIRD COVER..... Rs. 125

- Articles from readers and contributors are accepted. Articles meant for publication should be typewritten and on one side of the paper only.
- Publication of article does not mean editorial endorsement since the Journal is also a FreeForum.
- Rejected articles will be returned to the writers if accompanied with stamped addressed envelope.

Write to the Manager for Sample Copy and gifts to new Subscribers.

Arya Bhuvan, Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4.

Chinese aggression on India but also to take exception to the failure of Russia in denouncing this Chinese aggression. These Red Nationalists should also prove their patriotism by protesting against the characterisation of the Mc-Mahon Line by Russia as the boundary line determined by the imperialists.

As a student of world politics Mr. Nehru should know that there is nothing unusual about the apparent split between the Randive's 'Chinese lobby' and Dange's 'Moscow-lobby'. The so called rift between these two wings in India is a faithful reflection of the sharp differences of opinion that have arisen between Russia and China on the question of the best possible methods of bringing about the world communist revolution which, is the common aim of both. The communists have always been guided by the advice given to them by Lenin and Stalin that they should combine legal methods with illegal ones in bringing about such a revolution.

In fact, just as on the world stage, the Chinese illegal expansionism is being successfully combined with Russia's corrosive legalism, on the Indian front, Randive's 'progressive' adventurism may be harmoniously combined with Mr. Dange's wily and peaceful infiltration of our defence organisations and institutions. Let Mr. Nehru therefore beware, lest he should have to say once again that he was 'living in an artificial atmosphere'. But then it may be too late. 'People's Government' might any day spring up to overthrow his 'Bourgeois Democratic Government' with the full support of the military might of China already firmly entrenched in our Himalayan region.

PEKING'S DECEPTIVE MOVES

After the above notes have been written, the strange news comes that Peking has announced Cease-Fire along the actual China-India border as exists today from midnight November 21 and the Chinese will unilaterally withdraw from December 1, twenty kilometres behind the lines of actual control which existed on November 7, 1959. The Chinese Government expects Indian army to withdraw in the same way and leave a de-militarised zone between the Chinese and Indian army, pending a solution of the dispute by mutual negotiations. That the Chinese are dictating their own terms to India from their position of strength, after spilling India's innocent blood and humiliating her, is very clear from the warning given that they will renew fighting if Indian troops try to reach out again to the Mc-Mahon Line.

These proposals are as everyone will admit most damaging and insulting to our national

prestige and honour. We may remind Mr. Nehru and his colleagues of their promises to the country not to do anything in this matter which may be construed as being derogatory to India's self respect and territorial integrity. They should now refuse to negotiate with the Chinese Government till the Chinese invaders are pushed back far beyond the Mc-Mahon Line and India recovers every inch of the ground lost to the Chinese. Nothing less will satisfy India's wounded pride and outraged world democratic opinion. Our faith in democracy and freedom is on its trial. Any faltering in or deviation from it on the part of our leaders at this juncture, will amount to a clear breach of solemn promises and undertakings and people will never tolerate it. It is to be hoped that our leadership will rise to the occasion and hold aloft the banner of India's freedom and honour.

—*—*—

'FOOD FOR THOUGHT'

'A society of sheep must in time beget a government of wolves'.

— Bertrand de Jouvenel.

'They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety.'

— Benjamin Franklin.

"Liberty therefore is imperfectly defined when it is said to be 'a Government by Laws and not by Men.' If the laws are made by one man or a junto of men in a State and not by COMMON CONSENT a Government by them does not differ from slavery."

— Richard Price.

"The peril to Liberty today comes from the Left, from the Soviet and Chinese Communism".

— William Henry Chamberlin.

"Communism may be defined as a worldwide, conspiratorial movement for the conquest of a monopoly of power in an era in which Capitalism is assumed to be in decline. Politically it is based upon terror and mass deception; economically it is or at least tends to be collectivist; socially it is totalitarian."

— James Burnham.

"Politicians are a set of men who have interest aside from the interests of the people, and who, to say the most of them are at least one long step removed from honest men. I say this with greater freedom being a politician myself"

Abraham Lincoln.

"It is error alone which needs the support of the government. Truth can stand by itself".

Jefferson.

War With China

M. A. Venkata Rao

So at last war on a major scale has overtaken us in spite of Nehru's sincere but unrealistic pacifism and preaching of peace and settlement of disputes through negotiation in all international forums.

So peaceful intentions, as we should have known all along, count for nothing in the jungle of international relations. Even signing panchsheela declarations with militant Powers like Russia and China have come to nought.

Membership of the UNO and enthusiastic and self-sacrificing assistance to its international efforts as in policing the Egypto-Israeli border and the Congo have been in vain in protecting us against serious aggression such as the one we are being subjected to by Red China on our northern borders today.

And so too the zealous maintenance of neutralism in the struggle of the cold war blocs has not purchased immunity from attack by a member of one of the blocs. Nonalignment has not dissuaded China from taking advantage of our military weakness.

The fear of nuclear war which (we had hoped) would prevent the starting of adventures by fool-hardy nations has not deterred China from venturing into a shooting war to grab territory from India on a flimsy historical basis. If Tibet had claimed Ladakh and Bhutan and NEFA and north Assam areas in the last century, that is no ground to disturb established international frontiers today. On this plea, India might as well claim Afghanistan since it formed part of the Mauryan empire under Chandragupta and Asoka. India might as well claim on similar grounds the whole of Malaya, Sumatra, Java, Borneo, the Philippine and Indo-China since for hundreds of years they were ruled by Indian rulers who had migrated from India under the name of the Sri Vijaya and Majapahit empires.

When Red China came to power in 1949, India had assumed sovereignty over the territories included in British India by voluntary transfer of power from Britain. The boundaries of the erstwhile British empire from Afghanistan to Burma and from Tibet to the Indian Ocean (with the Bay of Bengal and the Arabian Sea flanking the coasts of the South) formed the sovereign territory of India. If China had any valid claim on the northern part

of this domain, she had to apply to the UNO or the World Court to enforce her claims if she wished to play a civilised part in the modern world. Instead, she took recourse to arms.

Now war under such circumstances is inevitable and should be waged with all one's strength if national society is not to be dissolved and the country and people ground down to powder and subjected to foreign rule once again as a helpless unorganised mass.

India therefore has taken up the challenge of the Yellow Nation inheriting the imperialist tradition of the old Han Dynasty, to which has been added the aggressive and perfidious ambition of communist revolution aiming at world conquest. The expansionism and unscrupulousness of the two traditions have reinforced each other and have taken advantage of the inexperience and un-realistic pacifism of Jawaharlal Nehru who was deceived by his own wish-fulfilment and glamorous illusions regarding world communism.

Far from the leaders having to rouse the people to war moods and war sacrifices, the people have had to force them to wake up from their dreams and make good the deficiencies of military preparations. The people's temper acted on Congressmen who forced the Prime Minister to drop Mr. Krishna Menon from the Cabinet though reluctantly and after the failure of a half-hearted attempt to dismiss him from Defence Ministership while retaining him in the Cabinet as Production Minister and as representative of the Prime Minister. This is a lesson that the Prime Minister has to remember. He may yet be forced to change his faulty policies more radically by popular pressure.

Now it is necessary to have clear ideas as to the aims of war and peace. The aims should be crystallised and put across to the people and their consent taken. Only then will the war effort proceed smoothly and efficiently and without divided aims and confusions and mental reservations. Even yet, the Prime Minister seems to be reluctant to declare war against China. He seems to be afraid of displeasing Russia by taking adequate arms from the West, particularly from the USA. But is Russia prepared to give us all the upto-date arms required including missiles and nuclear bombs and bombers, fighters and all the latest items in modern

armoury? Even if it is, is it wise to depend only on Russia.

Is not Russia bound to China by a military pact?

Why should we care if Russia does not like our taking upto-date arms from the West? Are not Czechoslovakia and other iron curtain countries supplying arms to China? And is not China making use of Russian arms against us in these encounters in Ladakh and NEFA?

This fear of abandoning the psychological comforts of the policy of nonalignment should go decisively from Indian policy-making. The only supreme policy should be to take all the aid and undertake all the measures necessary for fighting modern army with a large, well-equipped ruthless military machine fed by immense manpower. All else should give place without squeamishness.

Rethinking foreign policy is therefore absolutely urgent and inescapable. This may involve a stock-taking and an inquest into the responsibility for the state of disastrous unpreparedness military and diplomatic in which the nation finds itself after fifteen years of independence. This is necessary to remedy the evil and avoid similar blunders and crimes in the present and future.

As regards military strategy, it must be said at once that the Prime Minister has erred again in not taking retired generals immediately into counsel. They should be constituted with the chiefs of staff in service today into a Council of War Strategy. The Defence Minister should keep the armed forces supplied with all the equipment they demand for the successful conduct of the war. Neither the Prime Minister nor the Defence Minister nor the other members of the Cabinet should interfere with the strategy and tactics that the generals decide upon. Politics and diplomacy should not intrude into the expert fighting man's job of winning the war in the field. We may lose battles in the initial stages but we should win the war in the end.

And what is the aim of war? It should be made clear to the leaders including the Prime Minister that the terms for talks with the enemy announced by the Prime Minister namely the withdrawal of the Chinese forces behind the line held by them on September 8 is totally unacceptable to the nation. This means loss of some territory south of the MacMahon Line in NEFA and the loss of the entire chunk of territory occupied by the enemy in the last five years—around 30,000 square miles! The cease fire line has a way of becoming the final line. Witness the cease fire line in Kashmir! The Prime Minister himself has declared unauthorisedly

that he is prepared to waive the territory beyond the line now held by Pakistan. The only firm condition for talks should be the withdrawal of the Chinese forces beyond the Indian borders as recognised before they entered Tibet in 1950-51.

The nation should be made to realise (and the leaders in power with them) that borders drawn on maps are unreal. They become real and effective only if they are backed up by physical force and war-making capacity. This is a law of the jungle no doubt but international relations have not transcended the jungle law unfortunately. The sway of law and order in advanced societies is no indication of the ripeness of the world for international law on the same terms. This will be possible only when a world federation with a world court whose decisions and awards are enforced by a world police comes into being. Till then nations should rely not on the fantastic ethics of panchsheel but on the policy of a balance of power under-pinned by military pacts and economic mutual aid.

The Chinese then will not leave our borders until we compel them to do so by force major—by superior arms, adequate numbers and superior morale and military strategy and skill. The nation should support the armies in the field with supplies and keep them in good heart by all ways possible. The nation should take adequate care of the wounded and provide for the families of the soldiers who die in battle or are disabled.

We should declare war on China irrespective of what the Russians may think or do. We should take fighter and bomber planes in sufficient numbers from the West. We should carry the war into the enemy territory in Tibet. We should bomb his supply dumps and communications and aerodromes in Tibet before he attacks our cities by air bombing. We should make Tibet untenable to him by arming the Tibetan rebels with arms and food through air dropping and through refugees in our midst who are willing to contact the rebels. The enemy should not be allowed to occupy Nepal and Bhutan and Sikkim and northern Assam. If he should come down into the plains, his position should be made impossible by continual harassment by guerilla and commando units. He should not be allowed to sleep or rest.

Air raid precautions should be taken immediately in all cities. All able bodied men should be helped to shoot with rifles in rifle training clubs in every town. Women should be trained for first aid.

The war aim should therefore be to drive the Chinese beyond Tibet. Tibet should be de-

(Continued on page 7)

Non—Alignment A Moral Imperative ?

(By M. N. Tholal)

The problem that non-alignment poses before the country is now disturbing the equanimity of every patriotic Indian who is trying to be wise after the event. It is no use blaming Mr. Nehru alone for it. It has truly been our national policy until the emergence of the Swatantra Party, which in matters international is more realistic than all the other parties combined. Even as such it has not concentrated on attacking non-alignment with single-minded devotion, as it might well have done, or as the present writer has been doing in the columns of this magazine. The PSP, the Jana Sangh, and the Socialist Party have all been wedded to non-alignment as such as the Congress. And for apparently good reasons. For it was this non-alignment which threw on us the mantle of a Daniel come to judgment in a selfish, warring world. In Korea, in Laos, in Gaza, in Congo, wherever a dispute became unmanageable, Indians were found coming to settle it. All these feathers in the cap of India within 15 years of her gaining independence!

We had indeed surpassed all other nations in our pursuit of justice and impartiality and,

(Continued from page 6)

militarised. We may give an undertaking that no offensive military establishment will be maintained by India against Russia or China. Tibet should enjoy local autonomy. Its foreign affairs should be under the control of India or of the UNO.

There is reason to think that such a settlement would be agreeable to Russia too. For Russia too has something to fear from China's inordinate territorial ambitions all along the Russo-Chinese border in Siberia, Manchuria and Mongolia.

Since in this war, India will be fighting not only for herself but for all the free world, the West would certainly help her if she makes a complaint against China in the UNO. Her experience with Pakistan will not be repeated for in that case, Western interest was against India, for India had declared herself a neutral in the cold war.

There will be no satisfactory settlement until Tibet is restored to its former position as a buffer State between India, Russia and China. Agreement short of this settlement would be futile and short-lived.

what is more, the world had been forced to recognise it. All this thanks to Nehru and his non-alignment. Not only that. The repeated suggestions by Khrushchev for the necessity of India's inclusion in the summit conferences between the Western and the Communist Powers made us feel certain that we were destined to lead the world and save it from utter destruction as a result of nuclear war. What more could a country expect of its Prime Minister? How many of us suspected that by their faith in our sense of justice the Communist Powers were leading us up the garden path of non-alignment to fulfil the prophecy of Lenin that the way to London lies through Peking and Calcutta? And more Khrushchev praised our non-alignment, the more non-aligned we became with our ideological friends.

A crisis reveals hidden forces, as the border crisis has done, and throws up friends as well as foes. Whether our Prime Minister acknowledges it or not, non-alignment is now in the melting pot. Addressing a public meeting in Delhi on November 5, Rajaji said: "We have already lost a great deal of time in believing that Russia will come to our assistance in settling our dispute with China. We have to fight the Chinese not with the help of the Russians but with the help of others in the world. It is a sad thing to confess that we can't fight the Chinese alone." As against this, the Chief of RSS, Mr. Golwalkar, remarked some time ago, "We can fight ten Chinas, if necessary." The difference between the two presumably is that the former remembered that China defied the United Nations in Korea successfully while the latter does not think it necessary to remember such insignificant details of recent history.

Acharya J. B. Kripalani in an article—"Our Neutrality—Now!"—asks: "Does our nation, apart from our Government, consider neutrality as a policy or as a fundamental moral imperative? Further, is the nation in defence of this normal principle, prepared for martyrdom? Gandhiji in the pursuit of his principles of truth and nonviolence, was prepared for individual and, if need be, for national martyrdom. Does our Government feel like that about our neutrality? I ask this question because, when China broke Panch Sheel to which it had pledged itself, our Prime Minister said in Parliament that whatever China did, India stood firm on the principles of Panch Sheel. He seems to have

changed his position since and said that the principles of Panch Sheel are not unilateral but bilateral. . . . Can a nation engaged in war, even if it is a defensive war, be called neutral?"

POLITICAL COMPULSIONS

Rajaji later said non-alignment had received a shattering blow "by the twin factors of Chinese invasion and Anglo-American help to India." The practical implications of the war with the Communist China have their political compulsions. We shall have no option but to adopt policies which promise results, and the sooner we do it the better it would be for the nation. Preservation of our integrity, our independence, our honour must come first. And the realisation will also come to us in course of time—at what cost it is difficult to say at the moment—that interdependence with like minded people is a far more practical objective than an independence which we have neither the means of preserving nor the will to secure the means.

At the moment, as a western statesman has observed, we are fighting their battle as well as our own. Obviously, success would have been surer and swifter if we were fighting the battle together. But it is no use crying over spilt milk. What would have been welcomed by the Western Powers even a few weeks ago—the reference is to an offer of alignment by India—is likely to be cold-shouldered now that we find ourselves at grips with the Chinese giant. The western and pro-western statesmen, who are willing to help us with arms, are now almost unanimous in emphasizing their approval of our policy of non-alignment. It seems to be the Westerners' turn now to praise our non-alignment. Never has a disastrous policy received such universal applause. The British Ambassador in USA, Sir David Ormsby Gore, addressing a luncheon meeting of the Commonwealth Club of California, said on November 17: "Obviously, neither we nor the Indians wish to do anything which would enlarge this Sino-Indian crisis. We have no wish to encourage India to abandon her policy of non-alignment which she has freely chosen. This would only encourage the Chinese and Russian Communists to sink their considerable differences and make common cause against India and all those who are now helping her economically and in other ways. In so far as continued co-operation between India and Russia contributes to these differences, the opponents of Communism everywhere will take comfort."

It is to be hoped that the Sino-Russian differences are not growing in the West, as they have been growing in India, as a result of wish-

ful thinking. In any case, the Westerners would appear to be of the opinion that the Indians should lie on the bed they have made for themselves, and there is no reason to think that our application for alignment would be granted as soon as it is presented, unless the situation takes a far more serious turn. On the other hand, at a public meeting in Delhi on November 11, Mr. Nehru deplored that some people in the country were utilising the border war to bring about a change in India's policy of non-alignment and socialism. "We shall never give up our basic policy out of fear," he said, and asked, "What will the world think of us if we do so?" The determination regarding never giving up our basic policy out of fear is very vaguely put. Fear of what? Does our Prime Minister mean to imply that even fear of defeat will not make him change his policy of non-alignment or that defeat will be preferable to a change in the basic policy of non-alignment. If that is what he meant, he was answering Acharya Kripalani's question in the affirmative, the question being, "Does the Government consider neutrality to be a fundamental moral imperative in defence of which the country should be prepared for martyrdom?" Obviously Mr. Nehru could have meant to say nothing of the kind and was only trying to keep up appearances and to put a bold face on recent events.

THE SIMPLE TRUTH

Mr. Rajeshwar Patel, Congress MP from Behar, said in Parliament on November 10 that he believed in the policy of non-alignment, but it had been given a deliberate twist in the United Nations and elsewhere. He maintained that whatever had followed was the result of that twist; the result of the diplomacy India carried on in the UN was that even those countries which were regarded as friends had gone against India in her hour of crisis. "The removal of Mr. Krishna Menon is not going to help the country," he said, adding, "The entire machine which thinks in these terms should be recast." Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan also said on the same day that correction was needed in the Government's policy of non-alignment. He said in a statement from Banaras: "Those coloured glasses must now be thrown away that made everything look rosy on the one side and everything dark and dismal on the other. Congressmen as much as the Opposition leaders owe it to the country to turn to past acts and policies a fearless light of scrutiny in order to root out the weakness and errors so that the country is better able to face the present challenge."

That, as usual with J.P., is beautifully vague, but the fault lies not so much in the twist

as in non-alignment itself. The simple truth is that countries on the borders of Communist giants cannot afford to indulge in the luxury of non-alignment. Recent history proves it. Our non-alignment was a triumph of hope over experience and hopes are often dupes. Communism is on the prowl, Dulles used to remind us and get abused for his pains. The quarry was Korea first, then Quemoy and Matsu, then Burma and then India. The United Nations came to the rescue of the first, the United States to the rescue of the second. Burma threatened to seek US military aid and to join SEATO and turned the Chinese gaze on India. Nothing very subtle about it. It is all very simple. It is there in the Bible of Communism as well as in the speeches and statements of the late John Foster Dulles. And yet we refused to believe facts of recent history and seemed to believe that the Chinese were massing their armies on the borders of India to fight Soviet Russia.

It is not yet too late to develop and show a sense of realism. One goes in vain through the list of members of the National Defence Council to find the names of Cariappa, Kunzru and Kripalani, the three men who know more about matters pertaining to defence than the whole Congress Party put together. Is it intended to be a Council of "Jo hukums" and "Ji-huzoors"?

ABERRATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT

The ambition to play mediator between East and West in the cold war, the desire to be a leader among the so called anti-imperialist nations, the congenital attachment to the Nasser-Nkrumah-Sukarno club, the notion that socialism bound India with China and Russia rather than with the prosperous Western Powers—it is these aberrations that misled those now in authority and kept the country unprepared, not any type of pacifism as ineptly as well as unjustifiably pleaded now. Undeniably, the Government thought that Soviet Russia would help us out of the trouble. This was a delusion and a snare. Even if we tried to get the Soviets to intervene, it was thoroughly foolish to have been unprepared for the eventuality. Wise rulers, even when directly negotiating with the enemy with every prospect of success, 'keep their powder dry'. Let us not be unwise any longer. Let us not gamble with fate any longer. I am a peaceman, but I do not think that unpreparedness, when it issues out of error of judgment, is love of peace. Deliberate disarmament would be a great spiritual gesture and worth while making. But lack of adequate armament, due to want of thought, has nothing to do with pacifism or disarmament or the taking of risks

in the cause of building up a higher civilization. We have sent brave men to the front with inadequate weapons to be slaughtered, which has nothing to do with the principles of peace.

Some people hold the view that there should now be no criticism of the Government when it is involved in the serious task of defending the border against a determined and powerful enemy. So long as the Government does not feel the need for any coalition government it is the patriotic duty of those who are not in government to be alert and to criticise and advise wherever they honestly feel they should do so. It would be poor co-operation to desist from this duty.

—C. Rajagopalachari (Swarajya)

RAJAJI HAILS 'WISE' NEHRU STAND ON CEASE-FIRE

Mr. C. Rajagopalachari welcomed the attitude of the Union Government towards the Chinese cease-fire.

Often in war, "strategy and deception may put on the cloak of a gesture of peace."

The Swatantra leader said it would, therefore, not be wise to accept the cease-fire declaration at face value. The Government was right in being wary about it.

The cease-fire should not be allowed to become a vacation for the enemy to consolidate his newly acquired position.

Our preparations to recover positions lost in recent days should not be suspended or relaxed, even though there might be no firing on either side, he stated.

China's being "not a temporary trouble," demanded a great and drastic change in our policy in order to build up a balance of power to preserve the peace and independence of Asian nations.

Rajaji said neither pride nor consistency should come in the way of a positive alliance with the Western Powers though it might be inconsistent with our past postures.

He was sure that China, now enjoying the liberty of an outlaw, could not retain any part of India.

He called upon Pakistan and India jointly to resist the expanding force of communism in Asia.

Summing up, Rajaji warned against the mistaken notion that China and Russia, who were only "rivals and not enemies," were moving away from each other.

He called upon the people and the Government to redouble their efforts to "see that India is independent and not swallowed up by China or anybody else."



The Task Before Us

By C. RAJAGOPALACHARI

Intense agitation both within the Congress Party and outside succeeded at last in bringing about the resignation of Sri V. K. Krishna Menon. The Prime Minister held out to the end, so that at the close of battle the defeat was of them both. Mr. Krishna Menon's exit is a triumph for democracy but the nation will do well to remember the battle of NEFA is not over with this minor incident.

Two of our best generals have been called out from their retirement, Thimmayya and Thorat. The latter has served in the Eastern area for many years, till so recently as 1960. These two ex-army leaders will certainly be more useful in the intimate consultations that will have to be held at Army Headquarters and in the Cabinet in connection with our defence strategy against the aggressor than in the general discussions in the so-called Defence Council recently constituted on a wider basis.

Neither Sri Jawaharlal Nehru nor his party seems inclined to look on the present juncture as one calling for a broadbased national government; so that, any suggestion from those who are not in the ruling party but who share the general anxiety for reorganization of the administration, must be confined to the present Cabinet personnel.

There is a general feeling in the country, which is fully justified, that the Prime Minister has taken too much of a burden which he ought to share with at least two dynamic personalities. One should be put in charge of the Defence Ministry till recently in the hands of Sri Krishna Menon. He should be one who can face the urgent and difficult problem of reorganizing administration and policies to meet the new situation. The initiative must be wrested from the Chinese. Their military bases must be attacked. This requires an enormous volume of procurement of arms of all kinds, virtually amounting to a complete *de facto* alliance with the Western Powers. Without this, India cannot cope with the present crisis. The Chinese power is too big for India to face alone.

A total change of policy is therefore called for, involving much eating of the humble pie. Luckily our friends abroad in the West have shown a deep and abiding interest in our vic-

tory and have come out handsomely, and unreservedly, to help us in our hour of need.

Apart from re-organizing the ministries of defence and external affairs and maintaining them so as to suit the present crisis, the function of an overall minister of supplies in charge of all civil as well as military needs, production as well as procurement, is a matter of the greatest importance.

China and the Soviet Government do not relish the present tide in our external affairs which has brought about a seachange in our policy which had been one of isolation. The communist bloc might now seek to lure us into negotiations which may stop this process of alignment and, perhaps, even create doubts and hesitations once again which may bar the growing friendliness with the West and put us back into the old morass. Not only should we not fall into any such trap, but everything should be done to advance our *de facto* alignment with the West, and remove all the ambiguities and misunderstandings created by the image of Krishna Menon, which luckily no longer blurs the scene.

Peace is always our goal but it has to be secured with and through prudence and not by an unjustified trust in one communist Power or another. Trust in communist Powers has landed us in our present complete unpreparedness. We should no longer nurse prejudices about the Western Powers or give cause for fear on their part that our heart is elsewhere.

An essential part of our changed policy is what we should now do to restore faith and friendliness with Pakistan. Every consideration leads to the conclusion that Pakistan and India should not run in different directions but should move together. This, too, calls for the right type of man to handle diplomacy in this section of our external affairs. The occasion calls for fresh thinking, for brave and liberal-minded imagination, and for a personality of no less national acceptance than that of the Prime Minister himself. He must handle this most important and difficult matter himself or ask his illustrious sister to do it. This is not the time to immure her in a Governor's Bhavan.

Nehru Makes Out A Case For Our Joining NATO And SEATO

(From our Correspondent)

November 20 has been a sad day for the country. It heard that day of the fall of Bomdi La and it read the Assam Chief Minister's appeal to his people to face the trial arising out of Chinese aggression with patience, courage and discipline. "We have great faith in our defence forces," he said, adding, "Even then, I should be frank and tell you that we should be prepared for the worst."

That same day we read the Prime Minister's broadcast of the previous evening, declaring, "I want to take the pledge here and now that we shall see this matter to the end and the end will have to be victory for India." That is certainly better than his declaration in the Rajya Sabha on November 9: "In fact it is very difficult for them to think of defeating us and still more difficult for us to defeat them."

It is perhaps something to be thankful for that the Prime Minister did not in his broadcast of Nov. 19 re-endorse his policy of non-alignment. He said China was "a menace for Asia, a menace for the entire world". If that is so, he should appeal to the entire world to come to our assistance and promise co-operation and alignment to those who do, not only with arms but also with their soldiers and officers. Surely this "life-and-death" struggle, which is a matter of survival for us—the quotations are from the Prime Minister broadcast—should not find the Prime Minister standing on prestige and sticking, out of sheer obstinacy, to his precious principle of non-alignment.

"We must stand up to it," he said in the same broadcast, adding, "Not only we but all decent-minded persons and decent-minded countries who value their freedom anywhere in Asia, Africa, Europe or America." Surely, this standing up together of all decent-minded countries, which he is asking for, is alignment. It is not non-alignment. Mr. Nehru should try to be logical at least in the interest of his own country. Decent-minded countries, who value their freedom as well as the freedom of others, will be entitled to ask Mr. Nehru if he and his country will, when the need arises, be prepared to stand for the freedom of other countries. If the an-

swer is in the affirmative, the case for India joining NATO and SEATO is complete.

Indirectly also the Prime Minister made out a case for our joining NATO and SEATO when he said in the course of his speech on November 9:

"We are up against one of the biggest powers in the world. . . . There might be no limit to our courage but there was a limit to the totality of a nation's strength. . . . We should outlast our opponent and enemy. That is the problem before us. . . . the Chinese had facilities to bring their forces and war material from their "huge reservoirs" in Tibet."

(Mr. Nehru says Communism is not a major issue in this contest. Where did the Chinese get the contents of their "huge reservoirs" from, if not the USSR?)

Speaking in support of the resolution, "With faith and hope this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India, however long and hard the struggle may be," Mr. Nehru said: "Some people say we must not negotiate or have talks with the Chinese till they are completely pushed out of Indian territory. That is a very good thing, but one does not have to talk with anybody whom you have defeated completely and pushed out. The question of talk then does not arise." He had himself moved the resolution which he was supposed to be supporting!

The main cause of our discomfiture was given by Mr. Nehru himself and is worth quoting: "The Government thought of manufacturing semi-automatic rifles in India. Arguments about manufacturing them in India went on for a long period. It took two or three years to determine what type of semi-automatic rifles should be produced in India. . . . This outlook of ours about manufacturing things ourselves, rather than buying them, governed our whole approach to this question. Buying equipment from abroad was conditioned by several difficulties like finance and foreign exchange. . . ."

'THE LEADER' IS EMERGING

The National Development Council on November 5 pledged every effort and sacrifice "to effect the vacation of the Chinese aggression," while Chief Ministers of states pledged "the entire resources in men, money and materials of their respective states to the making of a supreme effort to maintain inviolate the integrity of the country." (Emphasis mine.)

A declaration made by the Council said, "We are fighting for our freedom and our honour, to save the democratic way of life adopted in our Constitution." It did not prevent the Council from declaring "the determined will of the nation, transcending all differences, to stand solidly behind the leader." The leader is neither named nor spelt with a capital L. Since the National Defence Council is a body of Congressmen, the determined will of the nation to stand behind their leader, should have, in the fitness of things, been given expression to by parties other than the Congress, for obviously no single party can claim to interpret the determined will of the nation—and that too regarding their own leader. Or are we moving towards a one-party state? In the Rajya Sabha on November 12 Dewan Chamanlal made a significant observation when he asked the Home Minister to use the Emergency powers to "crush the little cliques" fighting for political ends in the present situation. He explained that members of a party had criticised the Prime Minister and said, "He is not indispensable." He observed, "Our cry must be: One party, one nation, one leader."

(Prof. Ranga, leader of the Swatantra group, had said in the Lok Sabha on November 8, while assuring his Party's full support to the Government: "There is such a thing as a peacetime leader and a war-time leader. The leadership that is good in days of peace might not necessarily be so in times of war.")

Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri, the Home Minister, addressing a public meeting in Delhi on November 12 said, "This is not the time for the Swatantra Party or the Jana Sangh to extend their political influence. If they are doing that, they are not helping the country. Their only aim should be to strengthen the country." Extension of political influence of a party does not depend upon the party alone. It also depends—to a much greater extent—on the people and their views in turn depend upon the results shown by other parties or the ruling party. Mr. Shastri was a party to the resolution of the National Defence Council asking the nation "to stand solidly behind the leader." Did not the resolution aim at extending the political influence of

the Congress? Was the National Development Council helping or strengthening the country by passing such a resolution?

Apparently, the Congress leaders are aware of the rapidly waning influence of the Congress party and leadership and they want to use their power under the Emergency laws to crush the other parties which stand to benefit from their dwindling influence. The course, it is to be hoped for the nation's good, will be avoided. Is it the time to fight China unitedly or to fight the other parties to crush them?

It is impossible to disagree with Mr. Shastri when he said, with reference to the observation of a Southern Communist, that it was fantastic to suggest that China attacked India because of the Prime Minister's provocative order to the Army to throw out the Chinese from Indian soil. Every one must likewise endorse his "appeal at the present moment... that they must remain careful and say or do nothing which will in any way have an adverse effect on our war effort." But when he says with reference to the role of newspapers, that the stage for criticism or condemnation was past, he does not understand the role of newspapers in a democracy.

When Mr. Shastri asks with reference to the demand for a war-time leader, "Is there any other better leader, any other man who has stood by those principles during the last 15 years since Gandhiji's death, except Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru?" it becomes one's duty to point out that the country wants results and is well-nigh fed up with talk of principles which have brought it to its present pass. "The stake in the India-China fighting," as he said, "is a vast Continent" and "it is our fight". All parties realise it and therefore it will be sheer presumption on the part of leaders of any party to say that only their party realises it.

Book Review

Cultural Anthropology by Nirmal Kumar Bose Published by Asia Publishing House, Bombay pages 140. 1961. Price Rs. 6.50.

This a collection of essays on anthropology published first in 1929 and re-issued in 1952 when its views were referred to by a western standard publication on Culture by Prof. Kroeber and Prof. Kluckhohn. The present publication is a revised edition with a couple of appendices on practical hints to students on field work.

Professor Bose was an associate of Gandhi and was imprisoned from 1942 to 1945. He has

lectured on Geography and Anthropology in Calcutta University prior to his tenure of the post of Director of the Anthropological Survey of India which he relinquished in 1959.

The author takes a wide view of the scope of anthropology as the science of man and his culture and civilisation. Culture and civilisation have grown up like coral reefs in the ocean by mutual adjustment of human groups to each other and to nature with only ad hoc use of the intelligence directed empirically to particular problems. Even after the emergence of the sciences, arts, theologies and philosophies in history in different nations, social life and institutions in their bearing on the quality and direction of life have not been subjected till recently to systematic investigation. Thus civilisation has so far happened as a byproduct of struggle and evolution. Today thanks to science and technological advances on an unprecedented scale, it is necessary for leaders of mankind to plan civilisation and control the enormous destructive tendencies let loose both by way of weapons and by way of ambitious energies aiming at world conquest.

There is little to distinguish between the related sciences of anthropology, social psychology and sociology in the way the author deals with his subject. So far the only difference seems to be that anthropology deals with primitive man while the other social sciences deal with modern man. The author juxtaposes remarks on changing traits in the habits of an Orissan tribe called the Juangs (by reason of its proximity to more advanced peoples) with observations on Vaishnavism as a culture-complex. Also he refers to advanced cultural movements like the Ramakrishna-Vivekananda religious revival and Gandhi's views on varnashram to illustrate changing cultural traits.

Culture is referred to as the whole complex of ideas, institutions, customs as well as material elements influencing and channelling the life of a people. He lists Clark Wissler's classification as a basis of study: Speech, Material Traits, Arts, Mythology, Knowledge, Religion, Family and social systems, Property, Government and War. He also makes an interesting use of the Indian terms of dharma, artha, kama, moksha, achara and tattva to group human activities and values.

The scientific approach to culture by way of analysing it into elements, traits, complexes and constellations and tracing their transformations through the contact of cultures (and their diffusion in space and evolution through time) is clearly apparent in the author's treatment.

Today (and in the coming period) we need a humanist and naturalistic study of culture and civilisation and their values. We seek a rational basis for the values and institutions found essential to make life meaningful and to resolve the conflicts between groups that have so far disfigured human history and rendered all the gains of civilisation so precarious.

In this need of our times anthropology and the other social sciences (together with philosophy pursued in the spirit of pure reason) have an essential role to play. The book under review is a freshly written introduction to cultural anthropology that will be useful in this work.

— M. A. Venkata Rao

Gleanings from the Press

NEHRU'S "ANTI-IMPERIALISM"

The Prime Minister, when he spoke in Parliament initiating the war-debate, took up the cudgels against imperialism re-erupting in China; but in passing he had a dig at the Suez episode, inferentially paying a tribute to President Nasser in his manful counterstroke as a liberator against the vestiges of colonialism and as the future denigrator of Israel. Mr. Nehru did not have a word to say about the savage surprise sprung upon Hungary, when tanks and machine-guns roared into the capital mowing down thousands in order to pulverize sovereignty into serfdom. Pandit Nehru again had no word of reproach against the Soviet attempt to reduce West Berlin to obedient status, when the efforts were frustrated by the Berlin air-lift undertaken by Americans in order to save the corridors established by the Occupation Statute. Nor was there any reference in the speech to the furtive attempt of Khrushchov to build missile-bases in Cuba at the risk of a world-war if left unchecked by legitimate use of force in order to bring hoodlums to order. He reserved his thunder for Suez, and congratulated friendly Powers on their supplying stringless aid to India nearly two years after the proclamation of consortiums and aid-India clubs that business-deals may be treated as string-free for the sake of squelching an old obsession.

— Swarajya

News & Views

U.S. OFFERS MORE ARMS, EQUIPMENT
Washington

The United States has informed India that it is prepared to give military help, when ask-

ed, up to limits not yet reached in the first urgent airlift of U.S. arms to repel Chinese Communist invaders.

Indian diplomatic sources said that a list of requirements to modernize the Indian armed forces and re-equip them is still under preparation in New Delhi.

The list is growing longer in the variety of needs Indian leaders foresee as necessary to drive the Chinese out of India.

It is clear that American policy makers are increasingly inclined to view the border dispute between the two great Asian powers as a matter of major importance.

The U.S. is not putting any strings on its military aid beyond the stipulation that it be used only against Chinese aggressors.

This is in recognition of the very serious strain in India-Pakistan relations as a result of the unresolved Kashmir dispute.

264 OF OUR MEN KILLED SO FAR REPORTS CORRECTED

New Delhi

The number of Indian soldiers killed or missing in all theatres of war against the Chinese aggressors, from October 20 till November 16, has now been placed at 1,623.

A Defence Ministry spokesman explained today that 264 were known to have been killed and details about the rest were still being checked up.

The Chinese have already claimed that they are holding 927 Indian officers and men as prisoners of war. If this figure is corroborated, 432 soldiers were missing till November 16.

The earlier reports that Indian casualties, dead and missing, were 2,000 to 2,500 are incorrect. Many soldiers who fought in the Dhola-Tawang area and were missing have since returned.

The total number of men wounded in battles has been given as 155.

CHAVAN: 'RED NAPOLEONS' WILL BE OUSTED

Poona

Amidst the thundering applause of over a lakh of listeners Mr. Y. B. Chavan declared here that India was determined to go on fighting China's "Red Napoleons until they meet their Waterloo in the high Himalayas."

His voice vibrant with emotion and determination Mr. Chavan declared: "If it comes to that we would prefer to die rather than be slaves."

"TIBET SHOULD BE LIBERATED" DR. PRASAD'S PLEA

Patna

Dr. Rajendra Prasad, former President, said that in the country's struggle against the invaders the "ultimate victory will be ours as truth and justice are on our side."

He said that to fight in defence of the country's freedom and territorial integrity was the sacred duty of every Indian.

The former President urged that Tibet should be liberated. He said, "We committed a sin when we allowed Tibetan freedom to be annihilated by the Chinese. We have to atone for that by having been forced to fight the same invaders."

CHINA NURSED ENMITY LONG AGO. PRE- SENT LEADERSHIP BLAMED BY S. K. PATIL

The impossibility of maintaining lasting good neighbourly relations with China was reported confidentially to a Chief Minister by one of the members of his Cabinet six years ago.

Maharashtra's Revenue Minister, Mr. V. P. Naik, who was the Agriculture Minister in 1958, made a five week tour of China to study the country's advancement in agriculture. On his return, in the course of his report to the Government, he said: "I have found that China will never be friendly towards India."

Disclosing this at a prayer meeting held under the auspices of the Religious Amity Centre, Mr. Naik said that China was very ambitious and believed that communism was a panacea for all the ills in the world.

The Union Food Minister, Mr. S. K. Patil, who was the chief guest, referred to the spontaneous exhibition of solidarity of the people in facing the crisis. He said that the country nursed no territorial ambitions and hence the Chinese aggression took it by total surprise. He blamed the leadership for not being quite ready to meet the wanton aggression. There was no explanation for this lapse, he said.

KRIPALANI AGAINST TALKS WITH CHINA Calcutta

Acharya J. B. Kripalani said here that all talk about negotiations with the Chinese aggressors must be stopped and preparations for a "titanic" fight against them must go on until the last inch of occupied Indian territory had been recovered.

He was addressing a mass rally on the Calcutta maidan under the auspices of the West Bengal Socialist Party to discuss the people's role in resisting the Chinese.

Mr. Kripalani made a scathing attack on the communists and said, "We will not consider their patriotism worthy of consideration for we do not want our country to have the independence of the Leninist and Marxist type."

People should not cherish fond hopes about Russian help. Whatever happened, Russia would come to the aid of China and their present differences were only as between two brothers and could be ironed out whenever the occasion arose, he said.

OFF-THE-RECORD PERFORMANCE OF MR. MENON

"In a wonderful performance at Delhi University he found occasion to cast doubt on the McMahon Line, "a line easy to draw on the map but capable of actually skipping miles and miles of territory on either side," and presented to his youthful audience a version of the history and society of Tibet on which Peking could hardly improve. Tibet was, according to Mr. Menon, always under Chinese suzerainty until some "British buccaneers" intervened. As for India's role in Tibet he said he would not like her to be on the side of "reactionaries like the Lamas."

Mr. Menon's speech was off the record as I have said. But my informant speaking from notes prepared on the spot swears by this version. In fairness, I must say Mr. Menon was only repeating what he had all along been telling the world. That the Chinese invasion should have made no difference to his views on the subject would show how consistent Mr. Menon is as a "Socialist" crusader and how unreliable he could be as this country's Defence Minister. India's troubles with the Chinese are but the wages of the sin she was guilty of in acquiescing in Tibet's rape by the Maoist regime in China.

Mr. Menon addressed yet another off the record gathering. This time at the celebrated Link Building. Purposely the attendance was confined to Hindi writers. At this meeting he is believed to have said what he did not even in his patronizing letter of resignation to Mr. Nehru whom he sought to put wise on "my policy, our policy." He told the Hindi writers that he was made a "scapegoat"—a term Peking had earlier used—and that Mr. Nehru did not understand much of politics.

One theory I have heard on Mr. Menon's preference for off the record addresses is that he would not like to weaken national unity at this stage by indulging in disclosures about his colleagues, including presumably Mr. Nehru. The other is that he dare not appear in public

which has its own idea of Socialism and reliability not at all to his liking. Whatever it is, Mr. Menon cannot be said to have taken his exit from the Union Cabinet in the spirit of a man who would not mind opening a canteen for the service of this country.

—R. S. in 'Thought'

LADAKH CANNOT BE BARTERED—GORAY

The nation would not tolerate any negotiations with China which would barter away Indian territory, the PSP general secretary, Mr. N. G. Goray, said.

"Any lurking desire to give up Ladakh and keep NEFA will be most decisively rejected by the people," he added.

Inaugurating the "No negotiations week" organised by the Bombay branch of PSP at a largely-attended rally at Shivaji Park in Bombay, Mr. Goray said the "bewildering talks" of opening negotiations with China provided they withdrew to the positions occupied before September 8 "must stop."

Mr. Goray said the people wanted all "genuine democrats and patriots" to close their ranks to support the war effort.

LIBERTARIAN SOCIAL INSTITUTE BANGALORE

Sept. 27:

Mr. A. Venkata Raman addressed the Study Circle Meeting on "Inflation". Mr. M. S. Moses, presided.

Dear Editor

INSULTING FRIENDS

In his recent speech in the Indian Parliament on the Indo-China problem, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru referred to the British action in the Suez incident as an example of imperialistic adventures. When Britain has overlooked India's attitude in the same incident and in the Goa issue, and when she volunteered to help India to fight Chinese aggression, was it necessary, prudent or decent to refer to British action in the Suez affair? Is it necessary to make it difficult for Britain to help India in this crisis, particularly when India needs that help? Should India bite the hand that feeds it, even if were to humour Russia and Egypt?

Bangalore:

— P. Kodanda Rao

ANNOUNCEMENT !!!

The Challenge of Asia

by

Ralph Borsodi

Ralph Borsodi, a former Chancellor of the University of Melbourne, Florida makes a penetrating study of the conflicting ideas and ideals in this book. The author maintains in this book that the decision that Asia will make between the Free world and the Communist world will decide the political future of mankind. In our present crisis arising out of war with Red China, this book should make interesting reading.

Write to:

The Indian Libertarian

**Arya Bhuvan, Sandhurst Road,
Bombay-4.**

THE SCIENCE OF SOCIETY

By

Stephen Pearl Andrews

A profound book on sociology consisting of two essays bearing the following titles: "The True Constitution of Government" and "Cost the Limit of Price". This work is an elaborate exposition of the teachings of Josiah Warren by one of his foremost disciples.

Price Rs. 5.00

Mailed post paid by:

The Libertarian Publishers, Ltd.,

**1st floor, Arya Bhuvan,
Sandhurst Road West, Bombay-4.**

THE DUNCAN ROAD FLOUR MILLS

Have you tried the Cow Brand flour manufactured by the Duncan Road Flour Mills? Prices are economical and only the best grains are ground. The whole production process is automatic, untouched by hand and hence our produce is the cleanest and the most sanitary.



Write to:

THE MANAGER

THE DUNCAN ROAD FLOUR MILLS

BOMBAY 4.

Telephone : 70205

Telegram : **LOTEWALA**