

Indian

Libertarian

INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

EDITOR: D. M. KULKARNI

MAKE L.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION Rs. 6.00

Vol. X No. 19 January 1, 1963

IN THIS ISSUE

	PAGE
EDITORIAL: 'Brothers', 'Friends' And 'Foes'	2
Russia's Global Policy and India's Non-alignment By M. A. Venkata Rao	5
Nehru on Non-Alignment By M. N. Tholal	8
The Achievements (?) of the Communist Regime in China By Yang Shih-Chan	10
DELHI LETTER: The Future of Our Country Rests on Political Realism	11
Book Review	12
Gleanings from the Press	13
News & Views	13



EDITORIAL

'BROTHERS', 'FRIENDS' AND 'FOES'

CHINA'S treacherous aggression on India has made mince meat of the principles of Pan-chashila' and 'Non-alignment', offered on behalf of India as a challenge to the cold war mentality of the West. China will never again be considered by India as 'Bhai' (brother), despite her 'Cease Fire' proposals and the possible or probable chance of a temporary and uneasy peace being made on our Northern borders. Communist China, expansionist by her very ideology, blood-thirsty by her very historical traditions, must ever remain a standing menace to India's security and freedom. She is thus enemy No. 1 of India and will have to be dealt with as such. No amount of sophisticated explanations given surprisingly enough by some of our eminent leaders that India is not up against Chinese Communism as such but Chinese Imperialism will make us forget the fact that it was Communist China under the leadership of the world-famous Communist leader like Mao that invaded India through the Northern Himalayan passes. The Chinese Red bandits have, therefore, got to be hurled back beyond these passes and if necessary, beyond Tibet by enabling Tibetans to exercise their right of self-determination.

But the question posed before India is how to defeat this Red enemy at our Northern gates and beat him 'to a pulp', as our Finance Minister of India said the other day. On this issue of India's sovereignty over Nefu territory to the south of McMahon Line and over the whole of Ladakh and the necessity to fight for it to the last drop of our blood, there are no two opinions in the country. All Congressmen (except those neo-communists who have infiltrated the Congress bodies for sabotaging the war efforts), the Swatantrites, Janasangh followers, Praja Socialists and Lohia Socialists, Dravid Munnetrawalas, Akalis, Forward-blockists, Hindu Mahasabhwadhis are all united in their determination to drive out the Chinese from the Indian Soil. All are trying their utmost to help the war efforts of the government, though some of them may not be satisfied with the tempo of the Governmental efforts in this direction. The Indian communists, whether of the Moscow brand or Peking hue, are to be left out of account, as they are totally unreliable, to judge them from their record past and present and also from their loyalty to outside countries and their governments.

But the NEFA debacle has proved beyond doubt that India however united, is not in a position today to fight single-handed this enemy No. 1. The first impulse of democratic and free India was to call for immediate help, military and

financial, from the West. And America and Britain spontaneously and generously responded to the call, America out of anti-communist and democratic considerations and Britain out of almost paternal love towards us, born of her historical, political and cultural links and associations. The Commonwealth Nations of Australia and Canada also offered us their military aid and unstinted moral support. Russia, the military ally of China despite her loud protestations, has been consistently supporting her 'Brother' China's stand on McMahon Line and is vigorously pressuring her 'Friend' India to accept China's humiliating cease-fire proposals. The Non-allied Asian countries are more in favour of aggressor China than of invaded India. They seem to be mortally afraid of China, to speak out the truth and, may be, that they are lacking enough of democratic consciousness to stand by democratic India.

All these trends have a valuable lesson for us. We have a measuring rod to find out who is our spiritual brother, our friend anaemic or fraudulent, our enemy implacable and inveterate. Democratic consciousness is the measuring rod. Western European countries support us because ideologically they are our spiritual Brothers. Most of the Asian and African non-allied countries have proved to be only our hollow friends, because some are half-baked democrats, and others crypto-communists. Russia is our Friend only to wean us away from getting closer to the West and disturbing the balance of terror in Asia in favour of her Brother China.

This analysis will make it evident that to save her freedom and security, India will have to gradually abandon her Non-alignment policy and increasingly seek spiritual brotherhood with the West, even if she has to do so with tears of sorrow and regret in her eyes. Mr. Harriman's halting support to non-alignment may be a left-handed compliment to our leaders' incorrigibility on this score. We must be guided by our own national interests.

PANCHAYAT DEMOCRACY IN NEPAL

Nepal's experiment with non-partisan democratic government has created a great interest in Indian political circles. Liberal Democracy as understood in the west with its two or multi-party system of government, has of late, proved unworkable in certain Asian countries. Mere counting of heads in elections has only led to the domination of a minority of scheming leaders over the majority of the population, since these heads have had no opportunity of raising them-

selves to a sufficient level of political consciousness. And the present political parties particularly in the underdeveloped countries of the East, never care to educate their masters in this matter, and nay, in fact do not want to do so. They are satisfied if somehow by demagogy they manipulate to vote themselves into power and after so doing, to hold on to it.

This bitter experience of party politics made Burma and Pakistan discard democracy. In Nepal also King Mahendra assumed his monarchical power by dismissing the first Nepalese Parliament and Koirala ministry two years ago. But King Mahendra seems to have realised that the resurrection of out-dated monarchy is now out of question. So he has constituted himself under the new constitution inaugurated by him recently, as the head of the State on the pattern of the President of U.S.A. He has reserved to himself the powers to appoint his own ministers who are responsible only to him and cannot be dismissed by the National Panchayat which he has brought into being under this new dispensation. The political structure that he is trying to build up, is that of pyramidal nature based as it is on indirect election of members to the higher panchayat bodies by the lower bodies at all levels except in the case of basic village panchayats. Adult franchise is given only at this village level. Thus under this scheme direct electional methods are sought to be combined with indirect electional methods. At no stage

party system will be allowed. All candidates seeking election to any panchayat will be independent and non-party men.

Partyless democracy has been recently advocated by no less political thinkers than M. N. Roy, J. Narayan, and Vinoba Bhave. But as contrasted with those leaders, King Mahendra is at heart not a democrat but an autocrat. If he really means what he says, he should begin by divesting himself slowly of his Kingly powers, till he is no better than the constitutional monarch of England or the popularly elected President of America. He must also release the congress leaders from prison and give them a chance to function constitutionally as panchayat democrats. The Congress rebels on their part also must make the best use of this opportunity to slowly extend the frontiers of freedom in Nepal, by sincerely working the panchayat constitution set up by King Mahendra in Nepal and demonstrably expose its defects with a view to amend or improve it.

This rapprochement between the King and the people is a development devoutly to be wished for by all the people in Nepal and India who are now menaced by Chinese totalitarianism from the North.

DEFENCE OF CONGRESS RULES?

We have been pointing out in these columns, how after the exit of Menon from the Central Cabinet, the Menonites who still occupy important positions in Congress organisations as also in government departments, are trying to wreak vengeance on all those persons and non-congress opposition parties who demanded Mr. Menon's dismissal from the Defence Ministry. They are slowly but surely rearing up their heads again after the lull created in the Sino-Indian war by the sudden 'cease-fire' announced by the Chinese. They have begun their old game of playing down the Chinese menace and magnifying the danger to India from Pakistan and playing skilfully upon Mr. Nehru's susceptibilities to peaceful methods on the China front and his violent reactions to the Kashmir problem which claims so much of his personal attention. It is notable that they are vociferous in their support only to Nehru and his policies, as apart from other colleagues in his cabinet or government and claim to be more loyal to him than Mr. Nehru's honest critics within the Congress or without.

That this cunning game has begun to make its influence felt on some members of the Congress High command, could be seen from the diatribes they are hurling at veterans like C. Rajagopalachari, Prof. Ranga and Acharya Kripalani, who though vehemently criticising the government for not still realising the seriousness of the Chinese menace to India's security, will yield to none, even to the highest congress-

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.)

ADVERTISEMENT 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 articles does not mean editorial endorsement since the Journal is also a Free-Forum.
- 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.

man, in patriotism and selfless service to the country. The arrest of three sponsors of 'The Himalayan Front Conference' well brings out this new but dangerous trend in government circles. As one Swatantra leader of Bombay aptly put it, the government and the people should be on the watch, lest the Defence of India Rules become only Defence of Congress Rules.

PROHIBITION UNDER FIRE

A hot controversy is raging all over the country over the Prohibition policy of the Government. This Gandhian fad like many others such as Basic education, Khadi, over which the Central and State Governments are wasting crores of peoples' money, is under fire in the context of the financial implications of the Sino-Indian war. The Planning Commission dominated by Gandhites like Shrinan Narayan issued instructions to all State Governments some time ago, that complete prohibition should be introduced in all their regions by the end of the Third Five-year Plan, irrespective of its burden on the national exchequer and its baneful effects on other vital sectors of the country's economy. Bombay and Madras were the pioneers in this field, having fallen a victim to the lavish flattery showered on their Chief Ministers by Gandhiji. They introduced Prohibition immediately after our achieving independence by stages and within a few years made the regions under their control completely 'dry'.

But the smug spiritual satisfaction that congressmen got from this experiment was, alas, short-lived. 'Drinking' which was a source of innocent pleasure and relaxation with some, from their daily routine of life and its attendant worries, became drunkenness, since these very people gulped down their throats at a time large quantities of spirituous beverage genuine or adulterated, whenever and wherever available, in the absence of its assured supply through normal channels. Illicit manufacture of liquor became the largest and most flourishing cottage industry. Bad characters and anti-social adventurists quickly seized this opportunity. They turned millionaires in no time. These goonda elements now are the greatest supporters of the Congress policy of prohibition and are even influencing the decision of the Congress in this matter. The general public is bewildered and amazed. It has now rightly concluded that the prohibition is an unmitigated fraud practised on the people and that it has only increased liquor consumption which has invaded the private homes of the poorer sections and spread even among women and children.

Besides it has been estimated that due to this policy the country is put to the total annual loss of revenue amounting to more than 100 crores. This is too great a strain for the country to bear particularly in these hard and perilous times when our government is engaged

in a war with a ruthless enemy like China. Morally speaking, drinking cannot be objected to. Drunkenness in the public could be penalised by ordinary law as in other countries. Under no circumstances moral fads could be allowed to override the more vital considerations of individual liberty, and also the freedom of the country which is now in peril.

Considered from any point of view, moral, social or political, prohibition has got to go. That is the demand of all sections of the public, not excluding the thinking sections of congressmen. We hope this emphatic public opinion, being expressed throughout the country from day to day will prevail over that of the Gandhian faddists like Vinoba Bhave, Narayan and Morarjee Desai.

A DANGER SIGNAL

'We should not prolong the laws of emergency, but restore normal laws and secure adequate power for the government of the day and at the same time protect the rights of the citizens. Otherwise it would mean that owing to the permanent neighbourhood of a powerful communist expansionist nation, we were definitely giving up democracy and adopting a type of political life and governance prevailing in totalitarian countries'.

—C. Rajagopalachari in 'Swarajya'.

Food For Thought

'The nation is contemptible that will not gladly risk everything for its honour'.

—Jungfrau von Orleans.

'To remain neutral or sitting on the fence is impossible. In the critical situation of the present-day world, so called neutrality is nothing but deception, intentional or otherwise'.

—Liu shao-chi. (Internationalism and Nationalism').

'Democracy is not mob-rule and to do justice to its tasks, Parliament should include the best political minds of the nation. Democracy without Liberalism is a hollow form'.

—Von Mises (—Socialism').

Russia's Global Policy and India's Nonalignment

M. A. VENKATA RAO

Khrushchev prefers the method of slow infiltration to Mao's crude policy of relying on brute strength. But both adhere to the doctrine of World Communist Revolution.

M. Khrushchev's speech on the 12th December before the Supreme Soviet in Moscow is a clear exposition of Russian global foreign policy. There is no excuse to harbour after that any illusions about its spirit and aims and its supposed revisionism.

It also clarifies the issue (between Russia and China) that is making world headlines for years now regarding the role of war in promoting world communism.

We in India have a welcome clarification of the Russian attitude to the Indo-Chinese war over the border which had developed into a full-scale invasion in strength. The Chinese had penetrated nearly a hundred miles into our territory and were on the point of entering the Assam plains before their unexpected unilateral announcement of cease-fire on the 21 of November, effective from the first of December.

We have now sufficient authoritative basis for making our own policy dispositions without further dangerous illusions.

Even with regard to China, our dis-illusionment is not complete. We refuse yet to recognise the communist inspiration of China's aggression which of course has reinforced her traditional Han imperialism and expansionism. This is due to a surviving illusion that communism is peaceful in nature, philosophy and policy in contrast to capitalist imperialism which is supposed to be aggressive by definition.

The basic difference between Russia and China in their global attitude does not lie in their adherence to the communist doctrine of world communism and world revolution, in which as good Marxists they both agree. The divergence between them appears in the role they assign to war in the immediate present in the promotion of world communism.

The classic doctrine is of course that wars are of two kinds in communist eyes—justified and unjustified. Wars undertaken by communist States in pursuance of world revolution are good wars and justified. But wars entered into by capitalist, nationalist imperialists for expansion of power and wealth of their possessing class are bad and unjustified! Lenin foresaw a period of mighty clashes between communist and noncommunist States after his regime was securely established in Russia.

After Stalin's death, Khrushchev is developing communist strategy and tactics in an original way that reflects the new world situation consequent on the advent of nuclear armaments abroad and the growing urban educated middle class in Russia, a class that is hungry for the fruits of peace and technology. This class can no longer be controlled by brutal means so easily as in the days of Stalin. Its consent has to be secured in some measure for policies of peace and war.

China's internal situation is far different. It has a vast illiterate population, consisting mostly of rural agriculturists who can be dragooned by terror and discipline by party cadres into hard team work. The intellectuals can be harnessed to communist organisation by the same methods the few recalcitrant elements being silenced by drastic punishment in concentration camps and similar measures of labour correction. Also, China feels that her vast population nearing 800 millions can afford a nuclear holocaust! Even if half the number is killed in a nuclear war, Mao calculates that the rest will be numerous enough to dominate a devastated world! He is not deterred therefore by fear of nuclear war! Nor has he to take Chinese public opinion into account in these cold calculations!

But Khrushchev is more vividly aware of the horrors of nuclear war and is determined to avoid it in the final resort while of course not being averse to play on Western nerves and extract any concessions he can by threats in Berlin, Cuba and elsewhere.

In this remarkable speech, he replies to Mao's reported denigration of American war capability as a "paper tiger" with the effective and realistic retort that the paper tiger has atomic teeth!

In the ideological war with the Chinese propagandists, waged mostly with Albania as a whipping boy Khrushchev characterises the Chinese and Albanians as dogmatic left-wing Trotskyists who were discredited long ago in Stalin's days. Trotskyists held the extreme view that the communist revolution in Russia should be used immediately to promote world revolution by mobilising the class war in all countries through local communist parties. For until the whole world becomes communist under Russia's leadership, Russian communism will not be

safe. This view follows logically from the foundational doctrine of communist Russia that class war is inherent in capitalism and that capitalism will take up arms against communism or the Workers' State and destroy it unless the communist State becomes too strong for such defeat at the hands of capitalism.

But world revolution failed in Trotsky's time and Stalin concentrated his attention on consolidating Russian Power as a communist State through collectivisation of agriculture and Five Year Plans in industry. But the goal of world revolution was not given up. It was encouraged through support of communist parties in most States of the free world. The Comintern and its successor the Cominform were the agencies through which leadership and assistance were given by Russian communist leaders to communist parties the world over. Mr. M. N. Roy started the Indian Communist Party through secret emissaries as the trusted agent of Lenin's Communist International. He taught Indian and Asian revolutionaries at a school started at Tashkent in Soviet Asia by Lenin. He sent emissaries later to India.

Today, the Chinese leaders believe after their experience of the Korean war when their numbers in "human waves" could defeat American and other UN forces (equipped with superior arms though they were) that they could over-run Southeast Asia easily, risking nuclear attack from Western nations. They point to American failure to bomb Russian and Chinese positions beyond the Yalu river out of fear of an extension of the war. They are being restrained by Russia which has a more lively sense of the war-making might of the Western Powers and of their atomic arsenal. So in South Vietnam and Laos, the Chinese are assisting the local communists on the sly in jungle warfare with arms, vehicles, airplanes and technical guides. The North Vietnamese who are communist are sending men into the fray—food for powder.

The Chinese are very ambitious and are competing with the Russians in all continents—in Asia, Africa and Latin America. They are sending assistance which they can little afford even to Cuba!

They enter into controversies concerning purely European communist States and encourage anti-Russian attitudes as in Albania.

Khrushchev has pointed out in his speech in the Supreme Soviet that it is not wise to provoke nuclear war with America and defends himself against Chinese and Albanian criticism for withdrawing missiles and bombers from Cuba as a necessary compromise. He said that he gained a point by securing abandonment of the idea of invasion of Cuba from President Kennedy which means that Cuba will remain

as an example of communist revolution to Latin American States.

He taunts the Chinese politely in the guise of approval for allowing foreign outposts like Hong Kong and Macao to remain on the Chinese mainland. This is a compromise which can continue as long as it is useful to communist China.

In fact he redeploys effectively Lenin's idea of Zigzag tactics. Just as a mountain climber finds it necessary when confronted by rocks or depressions or steep places ahead, deviates for a while to right or left or even draws back some way down to strike another path, the diplomat also should be ready to deviate from literal adherence to theory, ready to compromise temporarily but only to resume the fixed course of policy later when circumstances improve! And if alternative but less costly ways are open the statesman should follow it even if it should seem less heroic and revolutionary. Today Khrushchev thinks that communism can be promoted safely but surely through world wide propaganda, winning friends and gaining influence through economic Aid and cultural exchange and also through the traditional methods of infiltration into people's voluntary associations, administration, democratic and national organisations—all known as also through the open and secret operation of local communist parties. This continual pressure on all fronts and subterranean burrowing must in time destroy the traditional structure of society and make its leadership over to communism. This is Khrushchev's technique (strategy and tactics) for the nuclear age.

Compared with this sophisticated policy, that of the Chinese seems crude relying as it does on brute strength as its principal plank.

Khrushchev commends the Chinese on their unilateral cease-fire as from 1 December and says that this is not derogatory to them at all but only shows statesmanship. He points out the danger of Western arms aid to India developing into a world war. He criticises America and Britain for their prompt aid and attributes it meanly to the lure of profit for armament firms and to imperialist motives! He warns India that by accepting this aid she is offering her neck to the strangling Noose of the West! Does he want India to remain unarmed and unprepared for ever as before under V. K. Krishna Menon?

He goes a step further and criticises India's arrest of communist party members and attributes it to the chauvinist nationalism and reactionary revival of Right forces which will stop all "progressive" trends in the country.

Western Arms Aid and the diminution of Communist influence in India are the results of the Chinese invasion that Khrushchev deprecates. This lets the cat out of the bag!

There is reason to think that it was Khrushchev's pressure that forced China to declare a unilateral cease-fire. He says to save China's face that China did not intend an invasion! And he disallowed the thought that it was India that started the fight. The real reason is that war will give China initial control of India and bring on a world war which he does not want.

He prefers the slow process of working through Danges, Guptas, Mukerjees etc., economic aid, cultural exchange and infiltration into Fronts in which Russia will have better chance of bagging India in the long run. India should be gently led from her bourgeois democratic Gandhi-Nehru revolution to People's Democracy through Danges, Nambudripads, Hiren Mukerjis, Russian-sponsored industries, cultural shows, travels etc. It is a competition both in methods and in destination—war as against peaceful penetration, Russians as against Chinese hegemony. The enslavement of India is common to both! We should bear this in mind when we continue our nonalignment policy with Russia. We can derive some advantage from it provided we are awake and alert and do not succumb to "credulity and negligence" again (to use the significant words of President Radhakrishnan).

TODDY AND ARRACK

Critics of Prohibition have been demanding its repeal and a return to the Excise policy solely for the sake of revenue for the public sector and profits for the private sector. Their argument that it had 'failed' is an excuse, since hesitant States have offered to adopt Prohibition, provided the Central Government gave a subsidy. If, by its very nature, Prohibition was bound to 'fail', no financial subsidy will make it a 'success'. The Prohibition Committee, appointed by the Planning Commission, Government of India, was not convinced of its 'failure' or it would not have advocated its early universalisation.

Even the Madhya Pradesh Prohibition Committee, headed by Sir M. B. Neogi, Retired Judge of the Nagpur High Court, and the Andhra Pradesh Prohibition Committee, consisting of Sir S. V. Ramamurthi, I. C. S. Retd. which pronounced Prohibition a 'failure' have condemned the Excise policy in no uncertain terms. Sir Ramamurthy said that it was 'vitiating' by the objective of maximum revenue than of minimum consumption, characterised consumption of liquor as an 'evil', liquor revenue at 'tainted money' and liquor trade as 'immoral', and condemned its 'profit motive'. The Neogi Committee severely criticised the Excise policy for aiming at maximum revenue while professing reduction of consumption, and unhesitatingly rejected the fiscal motive.

Both these anti-Prohibition Committees recommended a new Excise policy, according to which

licit liquor would be available at a price low enough to eliminate the cheaper illicit liquor, which was deleterious to the health of the consumer. This policy will fetch no revenue or profit. The Sarva Seva Sangh recommended that liquor of guaranteed purity should be given free of charge to those who asked for it at Government dispensaries, like other medicines, in order to save the consumer from illicit and unhealthy liquor. But this will involve a subsidy from the general revenue.

The current liquor revenue in India is contributed mainly by the consumers of Toddy and Arrack, who are perhaps the poorest minority. The selling prices of these liquors are several times higher than their cost price. As Mr. B. Basu, Finance Secretary to the West Bengal Government in 1948, said in his book, *Provincial Taxation under Autonomy*, 'it is taxation of extreme poverty at excessively high rates.' The right to sell these liquors is farmed out at annual auctions to the highest bidder, who has perforce to stimulate consumption to recoup his investment and make maximum profit in the limited time. The Neogi Committee condemned the auction system as speculative and as 'the prolific source of a variety of scandalous malpractices' and corruption, and recommended its immediate abolition. The worst feature of the present system is that the bulk of the revenue and the profit is collected from the consumers when they are increasingly inebriate. In every way it is very iniquitous and anti-social, and should be abolished forthwith.

Prohibition should be repealed and Excise continued but not for revenue and profits. Prohibition has no moral sanction when it co-exists with Excise in the same State and when it permits legal violations since 'foreign liquors' like whisky, can be legally consumed freely by foreigners in India and with ration-permits by some richer Indians, and when it prohibits the consumption of only Toddy and Arrack by the poorer Indians.

The better Excise policy is to leave Toddy alone, and adopt Individual Rationing of Arrack, to be sold in shops with licences renewable annually for a small fee, like other shops, and at a price low enough to discourage illicit Arrack but not involve a subsidy from the general revenues.

Even this policy is liable to violations, but not to the same extent as Prohibition or Excise, and should, therefore, get preference if only as the lesser evil. If laws be hundred per cent effective, there would be no need for the police and the courts.

The loss of revenue from Prohibition has already been made more than good by the Sales-tax. For further revenue, it is best to impose a poll-tax on adults and re-impose the salt-tax. Both of these will be very light and broad-based in incidence and will fetch far more revenue than from Toddy and Arrack and, above all, will be paid when the taxpayers are sober and not inebriate.

—P. KODANDA RAO.

Nehru On Non-Alignment

By M. N. THOLAL

If the Prime Minister feels that Russia is friendly to India, it is up to him to invite Russian Military Advisers to this country, as he invited the Americans and the British.

DR. A. Appadorai, Director, Indian School of International Studies, speaking on "Foreign Policy and the Present Crisis" at the Indian International Centre on December 5, observed that it was in the best national interest to continue the policy of non-alignment even during the present crisis, as the emergency did not call for a re-orientation of India's foreign policy. Unfortunately for him, on the same day as the report of his speech appeared in the Press, i.e., December 6, Prime Minister Nehru was reported from New York to have declared in a television interview recorded earlier in New Delhi: "There is no non-alignment vis-a-vis China." Had the learned doctor been aware of the contents of that interview, his observations at the International Centre would no doubt have been somewhat different.

Dr. Appadorai said there could be three reasons for a change in India's policy of non-alignment in the wake of Chinese aggression: change in the national interest; inadequacy of non-alignment and greater usefulness of alignment. It does not appear to have struck him that the security aspect of the national interest is paramount, and its paramountcy in the determination of a nation's foreign policy admits of no change or abatement. A change in the policy of non-alignment in the national interest can only be brought about by the (now proved and always obvious) inadequacy of non-alignment and greater usefulness of alignment, neither of which were obvious to the learned doctor even after what India has experienced during the last two months. In any case, there can be only one reason for a change in the policy of non-alignment, and that dictated by the national interest which can never—not even for a moment—disregard the paramount need of security.

Dr. Appadorai rightly says, "Our main interest is in world peace, as without it India's economic development is not possible." But he proceeds to observe, despite what has happened during the last some months, indeed for the last five years, that "the policy of non-alignment has helped India in promoting world peace". It is indeed a very queer kind of help in promoting world peace that starts a war on the borders in our own country, howsoever unintended it was, admittedly—a war that might develop into a world war. Good intentions constitute no apology in politics for deplorable results. Before any policy can be said to promote world peace, it must promote peace in the country and in its neighbourhood. Even if our border war does not develop into a world war, a war has started, thanks mainly to non-alignment, and surely no

one can deny that the border war has disturbed world peace.

Our stake in peace in the country is surely greater than our stake in world peace. Our economic development can go on even if the rest of the world is involved in war. It may even be promoted thereby. In any case, a world war in which India is not involved cannot be such a hindrance to our economic development as a war—and a prolonged war at that—in which India alone is involved on her own soil with a mighty neighbour. It would therefore have been obviously truer for him to say that our policy of non-alignment has helped India in disturbing world peace and promoting war which may overwhelm the world.

The learned doctor says that non-alignment has not prevented India from receiving aid from all friendly countries, including Russia, to fight the Chinese aggression. What help has Russia rendered India to fight the Chinese aggression? The question assumes sombre significance where the Russian help extended to India to fight the Chinese aggression is compared to Russian help rendered to China to make that aggression possible. Is the tremendous Russian help to China an irrelevant factor in assessing the Russian help to India? Cannot the relatively trifling help to India be considered a bribe to India to continue her policy of non-alignment and remain at the mercy of China?

No Guarantee For Security

Dr. Appadorai persists in his assumption of aid coming from all friendly countries, which in his opinion, include Russia, when he says, "In view of the fact that the country was getting aid coming from all friendly countries even for defence purposes, there was no particular reason or advantage to change over to alignment." On the question of aid it is surely not irrelevant to take into account its promptness and magnitude. Can problematical aid promised for the future be put on par with all necessary aid flown in at a moment's notice to repel the invader? These are factors which cannot easily be lost sight of by an open mind, particularly when that mind happens to be the mind of the Director of Indian School of International Studies.

The learned doctor gives away his whole case when he says that the policy of non-alignment without military strength, backed by built-in resources, might not be a guarantee for a nation's security. But in the matter of the nation's security nothing less than ironclad guarantees will do, and any one who disagrees

with this statement is obviously not a patriot. According to Dr. Appadorai, national security seems to be something with which we can take chances. That in a nutshell is the difference between dreamers and realists, and history shows what it costs nations to have dreamers managing their affairs.

Dr. Appadorai himself admits, "The present crisis has shown that China dared to attack us because we were militarily weak." It is not love of the USA and the UK that makes patriots like Rajaji campaign for alignment with those countries. It is love of India. It is to prevent countries like China attacking militarily weak countries like India and to defeat them when they do. If the present crisis has shown what it has, even according to Dr. Appadorai, then it has smashed the case for non-alignment. This is something which even the architect of the policy of non-alignment, our Prime Minister, himself admits, howsoever unguardedly or indirectly it may be.

The fact seems to be that our security had been looked after for more than a century by the British and we Indians never had to bother about it. The habit persists and we fail to put security first, as in the days of the freedom struggle, even though the British are no longer here to protect us. But for a Director of International Studies to forget that security comes first and foremost, or to forget the existence of the Sino-Russian military pact, is indeed amazing.

No Non-Alignment vis-a-vis China

In the television interview with the National Broadcasting Company, Mr. Nehru declared he still thought non-alignment a good policy for India but it was true that the Chinese aggression had weakened the idea in the minds of some countries. Moreover, he said, non-alignment or Panch Sheel could not stand in the air, adding, "There is no non-alignment vis-a-vis China. There is no Panch Sheel vis-a-vis China. In spite of their loud talk they broke it up." That was indeed, what was fundamentally wrong with non-alignment: that it could not stand by itself; that it was liable to be broken by any power, particularly a neighbouring Power, like China or Pakistan, members as they are of military blocs.

In other words, non-alignment was at the mercy of neighbouring Powers. Not only that. It placed the country professing it at the mercy of the neighbouring Powers. Can anything be worse than that for a country which wants to remain independent and safeguard its integrity, as presumably India does?

But in his speech on December 10 in the Lok Sabha the Prime Minister again said with reference to the policy of non-alignment, "That policy, I think, should continue." If, as he said in the television interview, "The Russians are very friendly to India, why was not a Russian military expert invited to India to help guide us

along with the American and British military experts? Does Mr. Nehru think that failure is any evidence of our trust in Russians, who are very friendly to us? And does he think the Russians are not likely to realise this distrust of their friendship, particularly when their enemies were invited to guide and advise us, and more of them are likely to be invited?

For, in the same television interview, Mr. Nehru said India had not yet thought of accepting U.S. military advisory groups for training and other activities, but "if the necessity arises we shall take advisers". Mr. Nehru added he did not think any political considerations would come in, specially in respect of small advisory groups for training purposes. But where would our non-alignment be if the military aid we receive is from the Western Powers and the advisory personnel we receive is also from the Western Powers? If the Prime Minister genuinely feels that the Russians are very friendly to India, it is up to him to invite them also to come and advise us, despite the fact that they did not offer to come to our aid when the Chinese invasion was on and in fact supported the Chinese proposals when they were made.

In the television interview Mr. Nehru said there was a "compulsion of events" in India's acceptance of military aid, adding, "One takes the aid because one must." If he had taken this aid when it was offered by President Eisenhower, the present sad compulsion of events would not have come into being. "Compulsion of events" is born of the compulsion of circumstances. The events he has got to face as the country's Prime Minister, but the compulsion of circumstances he refuses to recognise in all their nakedness because of a pose he has assumed, although this compulsion of circumstances began with China going Communist. If this invasion has got nothing to do with Communism and Russia is very friendly to us, it is the Prime Minister's bounden duty to invite the Russians to come to help and guide us, just as he invited the Americans and the British.

How far the Prime Minister is prepared to go in his policy of non-alignment was indicated by him in the following sentence: "It is a matter of survival of freedom, of the free society of India, and to further the cause of peace in the world, because it would be a poor thing if, in an attempt to save our country, we somehow help in the process of converting this into a terrible world war." Does he mean to say that, in an attempt to save our country, we shall not be prepared to convert this even into a terrible world war, that we shall rather lose our country than see this war develop into a world war?

In any case, so far as non-alignment is concerned, Prime Minister Nehru has himself strangled it by his declaration that "there is no non-alignment vis-a-vis China" and by his failure to invite the guidance of Russian military experts.

The 'Achievements' (?) Of The Communist Regime In China

By Yang Shih-Chan

(Continued from the issue dated Dec. 15, 1962)

OWING to this lack of understanding, the Party has naturally adopted a policy of a stereotyped nature towards intellectuals and also formed an inaccurate estimate of them. This has made us maintain the following attitude to intellectuals: we may suddenly extend them a warm reception or suddenly give them the cold shoulder as if we did not know what to do with them. Sometimes we feel that the intellectuals are backward in ideology, complicated in personal history and "obscure" in political attitudes, then we become annoyed and conduct a serious struggle against them. This is the predominant attitude. Sometimes we realize that they have some knowledge and technical ability and may play a role in building up Socialism, then we show them warm friendship and call upon them to join the "united front". This attitude is not predominant. At different times, intellectuals may be thrown into the fire or pushed into the water, and sent down to hell, or lifted up to heaven. Going down to hell, intellectuals have a great many grievances and regret that they considered themselves wise at the beginning of liberation and "did not listen to their friends" advice to go abroad to observe the conditions there". Having foolishly followed the Communist Party under a delusion, the intellectuals have to come down from the stage of their operations with the label of "counter-revolutionaries". Not only will they die with unclean records, but their wives and children will also be despised. Going up to heaven, the intellectuals are frightened because they do not know when "the emperor will lose his temper" to make them fall. In the last seven years, they have lived like a girl being brought up under her future mother-in-law in the home of her fiance, constantly trembling with fear. Considered nominally "a member of the family", she has to be very humble and act according to the countenance of her future mother-in-law. Even in this way, she is still afraid that she might commit a mistake and afford the family an excuse to punish her.

In our Party's estimate, intellectuals, it appears, are patriots. They love the fatherland, but hanker after their status in the old society. They are inclined to bourgeois democracy, but not enthusiastic about the cause of our Party's Socialist revolution and even opposed to it.

Such an estimate is inaccurate.

Just because of this inaccurate estimate, our Party policy towards intellectuals has been entirely wrong.

Our Party has failed to foresee and to perceive the ideological change and progress of in-

tellectuals and to form an accurate opinion of them.

Our Party has not welcomed this change by rendering intellectuals adequate assistance promptly so as to enable them to increase their understanding of and enthusiasm for our cause and to have a clear view of their future. However, under the domination of strong and one hundred per cent sectarianism, our Party has become disgusted with intellectuals, given them the cold shoulder, looked upon them with suspicion and distrust and even left them aside. Moreover, it repeatedly dealt them blows during several social reform campaigns. It has devised hundreds of ways and means to torture them spiritually, as if they were too numerous to be killed.

We have applied to intellectuals these methods of punishment, which peasants would not apply to landlords or workers would not apply to Capitalists. During the social reform campaigns, unable to endure the spiritual torture and humiliation imposed by the struggle and to accept our "Tung Chao's and Hsueh Pa's pattern of assistance" [Tung Chao and Hsueh Pa were local tyrants in China's history], the intellectuals who chose to die by jumping from tall buildings, drowning in rivers, swallowing poison, cutting throats or by other methods, were innumerable. The aged had no escape, and pregnant women were given no pardon. A case of five corpses with six lives occurred in the South-China Teachers' College during the counter-revolutionary suppression campaign. People groaned in the streets and God must have been angered. Comparing our method of massacre with that adopted by the Fascists at Auschwitz, the latter appeared more clumsy and childish. At any rate, they hired executioners, and were more prompt and "benevolent." If we say that Comrade Stalin cannot escape the condemnation of history for his cruel massacre of comrades, then our Party, in my opinion, will also be condemned for our massacre of intellectuals who had already "surrendered" themselves to us. Our Party's massacre of intellectuals and the mass burying of the literati alive by the tyrant, Ch'in Shih-huang, will go down in China's history as two unwashable stigmas. This cannot but make us feel utterly heart-broken!

However, we remain happy and complacent, saying: 'achievements are predominant'.

Where are our achievements?

(Concluded)

The Future Of Our Country Rests On Political Realism

(From Our Correspondent)

Home Minister's Efforts to Prevent Criticism of Nehru wasted—How to make Chinese vacate Aggression—Lessons of Colombo Meet

The efforts of the Home Minister to prevent criticism of the Prime Minister are wasted during the debates in the Lok Sabha. On December 10 in that body, during the debate on the Chinese invasion, there were repeated clashes between Mr. Ranga and the Prime Minister in the course of the latter's reply to the debate. That perhaps was as it should be in a parliament. But the Prime Minister had to pay the price of overdoing things. His remark that the members opposite got angry when he said something which pricked their conscience brought forth angry protests from Mr. Ranga and his colleagues. Mr. Ranga retorted: "You are suffering from bad conscience. That conscience is on your chest and on your head. In any country this Government would have been dismissed." As if that was not enough, Maharani Gayatri Devi came to her leader's help with the observation, "If you had better knowledge than us, you would not have landed the country in such a mess." The Prime Minister said he did not want to bandy words with a lady, but surely a lady member has the right to make her contribution to the debate.

Journalists here were asking, "When has Mr. Nehru ever said something which could prick the conscience of Opposition members?" Surely the latter were not responsible for the appointment of Mr. Menon as Defence Minister. Surely they were not responsible for the selection of the general who commanded the Indian troops in NEFA. Indeed, not being responsible for any of the policies of the Government or their execution—much less for their failure—how can the Prime Minister say anything which can prick their conscience? Facts apart, there should be some semblance of plausibility in what the Prime Minister observes, unless the intention is to provoke the Opposition into blurting out what they refrain from doing in response to the Government's call for unity to keep up the morale of the people to resist Chinese aggression.

In the debate itself the most striking point was made by Mr. Indulal Yagnik when he said the main question now confronting the country was how the assurance of the Prime Minister that the Chinese would be compelled to vacate aggression would be carried into action. In this connection the Prime Minister's explanation of the Government's reaction to the three questions put

by the Chinese in their latest note is not irrelevant. The first question was whether India agrees to the cease-fire. Although the Chinese declaration was unilateral, said the Prime Minister, India accepted it and had done nothing to impede its implementation. Obviously, if the Chinese are to be compelled to vacate aggression, there would have to be an end to the cease-fire, which will have to be put to end by those who want to compel the Chinese to vacate aggression. That being so, India is naturally not in favour of disengagement of both sides on the basis of the Nov. 7, 1959, line of actual control. That is India's answer to the second Chinese question. Thus the third question regarding meeting of officials of the two countries to consider various matters does not arise.

Forcing the Chinese to vacate aggression would not be an easy task. The attempts that have been made to explain India's forthright case to the non-aligned powers meeting in Colombo would appear to show that the Government is in favour of getting the Chinese aggression vacated peacefully through the good offices of the Colombo Conference Powers. That is as it should be, though the chances of the Government's hope fructifying do not appear to be very bright. In any case peaceful means have to be exhausted after the unilateral cease-fire decision by the Chinese—before hostilities are renewed.

It will be difficult enough to have the aggression in the country vacated and, in the circumstances, it does not appear at the moment proper to indulge in bravado and talk of throwing out the Chinese from Tibet too. From Mr. Ranga's point of view there is no doubt a good deal of sense in the suggestion that the Dalai Lama should be allowed to set up an emigre government in India, but that is conditioned by the Government securing massive aid from all friendly countries to fight the Chinese menace, which is hardly possible so long as Mr. Nehru remains wedded to his policy of non-alignment. China will always be a menace so long as it occupies Tibet.

There is really no point in the Prime Minister's argument that even those countries who had come to India's aid in this crisis felt it would be wrong for us to abandon this policy. It

is more in our interest than in theirs that we abandon it. It is much more in our interest than in theirs that we secure their co-operation in driving the aggressors out not only from India but from Tibet also. If, as Mr. Nehru says, it is a matter of survival of freedom and a free society in India, why should not the champions of freedom help us not only with weapons but with soldiers also, and that too in a big way? As matters stand Mr. Nehru's attitude regarding driving the Chinese out of Tibet would appear to be quite proper and balanced.

When, pleading for the continuation of the policy of non-alignment, Mr. Nehru says, "But we must take all measures to defend our motherland and take the help of friendly countries who are willing to assist in this sacred task", what he really means to say is that we must take all measures except the most — one is almost inclined to say, the only — effective one of alignment, of our "joining a military bloc for military purposes"—to put it in his own words. Surely driving out the aggressor and getting the aggression vacated is a military purpose, and not a disdainful one either, if his own assertions are sincere.

"It is well to remember," said the Prime Minister, "that the one country that does not approve of non-alignment for us or anybody is China". If the Chinese, as has been frequently reported, have been calling us lackeys of Western Imperialists, they have been accusing us of alignment with them, and not disapproving of our non-alignment. Where does the Prime Minister get his facts from? Surely a little of the storehouse of his vast knowledge should be made available to every man who during the elections is called His Maesty the Voter.

"The future of our country is at stake", as he said, "and we have to rise to the occasion and to consider mighty problems before us". We cannot rise to the occasion unless we try to be realists, and the Prime Minister is hardly being a realist when he says that it is now well-known that there is no love lost between the Soviet Union and some other Communist countries on the one hand and China on the other. Deeds should carry more weight than words and deeds point to the overwhelming military aid, unparalleled in the annals of history of peacetime, provided by Russia to China. It is absolutely unrealistic to mistake for reality a drama that is being played by Russia to make India continue to tread the path of non-alignment which has proved so profitable to China. It is sheer wishful thinking in the face of the Russian supply of her latest weapon to China to bring down the American U-2s. These alleged Sino-Russian differences began with the Chinese aggression but have not had the slightest effect on the Russian supplies of military equipment to China. So what comfort can we Indians legitimately draw from them?

OUR COLOMBO COLLEAGUES

The Colombo Conference of six non-aligned nations not only failed to condemn Chinese aggression, it also failed to take a firm stand on denying the fruits of aggression to the aggressor, if the reports emanating from Colombo are to be credited. Since the object of the Conference was to promote peace it was perhaps thought inadvisable to condemn any side, but the guiding motto seems to have been "Discretion is the better part of valour". Fuller comment must be withheld until the proposals are published, but opinion here would appear to be gaining ground that the surprising promptness of Anglo-American aid and its projected magnitude — despite the alliance with Pakistan — has helped the cause of peace much more than the diplomatic deliberations of the non-aligned Powers. Non-alignment, it seems, does not and cannot go with fearlessness. That seems to be one of the lessons of the Colombo Conference. No wonder Mr. Nehru has had to admit that the idea of non-alignment has been weakened by the Chinese invasion of India. The non-aligned Powers are proving to be non-aligned with a vengeance even in respect of a dispute of an aligned with a non-aligned Power and to the extent of extending their non-alignment with non-aggression. Mr. Khrushchev seems to have been well aware of the constituents of non-alignment.

Book Review

WE TOO CAN BE PROSPEROUS: By Graham Hutton (The Promise of Productivity) Mac-Millan Company New York 1954 with a Foreword by The British Productivity Council.

The later book by Mr. Graham Hutton called *Inflation and Society* published in 1960 by Allen and Unwin was reviewed in these columns sometime ago. It has become an outstanding exposition of the disastrous results of inflation more and more resorted to by modern governments subjected to pressures of various kinds, those arising from war and those springing from demagogic politics.

This earlier book by the same author offers a wide basis of experience and reflection, pooling the observations and studies of dozens of British and American experts in industry and commerce. Mr. Hutton was invited by The Anglo-American Council on Productivity to review and glean the results of the reports of sixty four teams of employers and employees, economists and trade unionists of an extensive study tour of various phases of American industry and commerce.

Mr. Hutton distils for the reader the reasons for the remarkable productivity per man hour/year of American industries in general as compared with that of Europe and Britain.

He points out that the only way in which British economy could rise to the occasion, pay its debts incurred in and after the war, pay for enhanced welfare services, higher wages and salaries extracted by trade union pressure and the new demands of social justice and social solidarity and at the same time avoid stagnation is by a sharp increase in productivity in the short as well as the long run.

He summarises the findings of the sixtyfour study teams who observed American conditions in all aspects—management, worker efficiency and willingness, education of salaried staff, inventiveness and initiative of American capitalists, readiness of American Labour to consent to good salaries to staff and good dividends to shareholders, willingness of American labour to co-operate in the installation of new machinery and the initiation of rationalisation and scientific management methods generally. American capital and labour are more mobile and adventurous and less custom and status bound than European.

The book brings out vividly the lesson that industrial progress requires a new psychology on the part of society-labour, salaried staff, capitalists, bankers, government and the public generally. India needs such lessons very urgently.

It is easy to buy machinery but to develop the required attitudes on the part of society and its relevant classes, (elite and workers) is not so easy. Indian leaders should study this book with close attention, with an eye on Indian conditions.

—M. A. VENKATA RAO.

THE CALCULUS OF CONSENT by James M. Buchanan and Gordon Tullock. University of Michigan Press, 1962.

The Authors analyse democratic institutions such as simple majority rule, qualified majority rule, bicameral legislatures, pressure groups, as contributors to the satisfaction of individual often conflicting preferences in any given society. For the purposes of the analysis, individuals are assumed to be rational in the same sense as the conceptual 'economic man'; that is, they will choose more rather than less of any combination of goods and services available. This rational self-seeking man is an analytical postulate, not empirical or normative. Saved thus from values judgments and from the censure of moralists the authors write a happily utilitarian work, replete with econometric techniques.

An annoying feature of the book is a persistent and inadequately supported emphasis on the costs of collective action (anticipated disadvantages to any individual of a majority decision) and a minimising of the costs of private voluntary co-operation. This becomes an important part of the basis for a number of judgments on institutions.

Too much of argument depends on hypo-

thetical political problems being solved in a political environment like that of the United States. The discussion of bicameralism, for example, has little or no relevance for central government in a country like New Zealand with its disciplined party system and Parliamentary procedures.

However, the analysis of logrolling and, in particular, the application of games theory to this analysis is illuminating and relevant to the internal politics of large organisations, local government and many types of committee.

Gleanings from the Press

BEWARE OF 'MOSCOW' PATRIOTS' PROTESTATIONS

From this point of view, as well as others, it is a pity that the Prime Minister maintains his benevolent attitude towards the pro-Russian wing of the Communist Party. The two wings do not differ in their hostility to Indian interests or in their willingness to spy or sabotage on behalf of a foreign power.

The communist leaders are of course doing everything they can to encourage the Prime Minister in his error. The speeches which Professor Mukerjee and Mrs. Chakravarty make in the Lok Sabha nowadays are quite false to communist doctrine and tradition. Patriotism always has been anathema to communists: their true traditional policy is revolutionary defeatism.

For the present, believing that Russia desires it of them, they are committing the unheard-of deviation of supporting a capitalist government in a war against a communist country. But their protestations are entirely hypocritical, and they may reverse this policy at any moment. People must not be deceived.

—Mys-India

News & Views

A PARTYLESS CENTRAL GOVERNMENT TO SPUR MOBILISATION APPEAL TO PREMIER

Supporting Dr. Rajendra Prasad's plea for a National Government during the emergency, four prominent persons have appealed to Mr. Nehru and Acharya Vinoba Bhave to "rise to the occasion" and work in that direction.

'Bringing the country's best talent together in a National Government would not mean "changing the horses in midstream" but help fortify the Centre and inspire the people to maximum war efforts', declared Mr. Kedkar Nathji, a social worker, Sir Rustom Masani, former Bombay University Vice-Chancellor, Mr. Vaikunth Mehta, Chairman of the All-India Village Industries Commission, and Swami Anand, an associate of Mahatma Gandhi.

In a joint statement, they called for the establishment of a partyless Central Government with the State Governments functioning as its agencies for the sole purpose of driving the Chinese out.

The statement says: "Let us bear in mind that no outside counsel can render us as disinterested a service as our own countrymen, though there may be differences among them on domestic issues."

"It would, therefore, be unwise to deprive the nation of the benefit of their services in this hour of distress."

"NO DISTINCTION BETWEEN 'MOSCOW COMMUNISM' AND 'PEKING COMMUNISM' SAYS S. K. PATIL

The Chinese aggression has given us an opportunity to reassess our claim to a democratic way of life, said Mr. S. K. Patil, Union Food Minister, in Bombay on Monday.

Speaking on "Defend Our Democracy," under the auspices of the Progressive Group at Gul-Mohr, Mr. Patil stated that in keeping with our past traditions, the country had rightly chosen a democratic form of Government.

About 40 Afro-Asian countries have become free after India attained independence. Almost all of them had accepted a democratic form of Government in one sense or another.

But it was only India that had sincerely made efforts to strengthen democratic institutions.

Referring to Indian communists, he pointed out that he would not distinguish between any two forms of Communism whether Chinese or Russian.

Any political party having loyalty to a place outside the country was dangerous to the security of the nation and its democratic way of life, especially when it was engaged in a war, he remarked.

He doubted whether the so-called nationalist Communists in India could be trusted. They turned nationalist either under "duress" or on account of the pressure of times.

6-POINT PLAN TO PUSH OUT CHINESE

"Indians For Victory" in Bombay on Thursday passed a resolution suggesting the adoption of a six-point programme for throwing out the Chinese.

The six points are: Equipping our Armed Forces with arms from friendly democracies, severance of diplomatic relations with China, priority for friendship with Pakistan and Nepal, isolation of Indian Communists and their fellow travellers with a ban on the C.P.I., recognition of the Dalai Lama as Head of free Government of Tibet and arming of the Khampas.

HEINOUS CRIME OF THE CHINESE

TEZPUR: Brigadier Hoshiar Singh was shot by the Chinese near Darrang Dzong on November 27,

six days after the unilateral ceasefire by the Chinese, it was reliably learnt here.

He was shot at point blank range in most inhuman and treacherous manner by a Chinese officer after his retreating column of 200 officers and men were ambushed and encircled by the Chinese marauders.

GUJARAT MLAs' PROTEST AGAINST LABELLING OF NEHRU CRITICS AS TRAITORS

AHMEDABAD: Swatantra Party leader Bhailal Patel lashed out against Congressmen who condemned critics of Prime Minister Nehru as "traitors."

Mr. Patel was initiating the Gujarat Assembly debate on the official resolution on Chinese aggression earlier moved by Chief Minister Jivraj Mehta.

P. S. P. leader Ishverlal Desai also joined the vigorous protest launched by the sepugenarian Swatantra leader.

Mr. Patel read out a passage from the "Congress Patrika," the official weekly organ of the Gujarat Congress, which described the Swatantra and Jan Sangh leaders as "traitors" because they had launched a "mud-slinging" campaign against the Prime Minister.

Defence of Congress Act?

Turning to the Treasury benches, he asked whether the Defence of India Rules were to be interpreted as "Defence of Congress Act." The nation was not the private property of any individual or party, he added.

It was the duty and the constitutional right of the Opposition to watch over the way in which the frontiers of the country were guarded. Those who failed to protect them would be answerable to the people, Mr. Patel thundered.

RED SYSTEM OF PLANNING DECRIED

Mr. A. D. Shroff, President of the Forum of Free Enterprise, said in Bombay that Communist planning was failing even in Soviet Russia and there was a move there to relax control of central planners and to introduce the "profit motive."

Addressing the sixth annual general meeting of the Forum, Mr. Shroff said that Indian experience of implementing the Communist model of planning was also approaching the dawn of disillusionment.

Citing instances, Mr. Shroff observed that our State enterprises were not only uneconomic — the yield was hardly 0.3 per cent on Union Government undertakings — but also had failed in their primary duty of meeting the needs of defence.

M. P.'S. URGE TO SCRAP PROHIBITION

Ten members of the Opposition in Parliament have jointly urged the Prime Minister to scrap prohibition. They have expressed their firm opinion that with a view to augmenting financial resource to meet the urgent needs of national defence, prohibition should be abandoned for the duration of the emergency. During the recent debate in Parliament on the supplementary demands voices were raised on both sides against the continuance of prohibition during the emergency. The signatories to the representation are: Mr. H. V. Kamath, Dr. M. S. Aney, Mr. S. M. Banerjee, Mr. Kapur Singh, Mr. C. L. Narasimha Reddy, Mr. Hukam Chand, Mr. Gauri Shanker Kakkar, Mr. Hari Charan Roy, Mr. H. N. Mukherjee and Mr. Prabat Kar. It may be stated that at a recent meeting of the Planning Commission with the economic advisers it was indicated that the prohibition experiment had not made encouraging progress.

BENGAL FIGHTS ILLICIT DISTILLATION: LICENCES FOR MORE LIQUOR SHOPS

CALCUTTA: The West Bengal Government has decided to give licences to open more liquor shops in the State.

There are at present nearly 500 licensed liquor shops in this State.

According to an official spokesman there is no way out to stop large-scale illicit distillation of liquor except by raising the number of licensed shops. About 27,000 cases of illicit distillation were reported in 1961-62.

Revenue from the sale of liquor was a little over Rs. 7 crores in 1961-62. The opening of more shops is expected to yield an additional Rs. 1 crore revenue.

NO REPLACEMENT OF ENGLISH NOW, CAUTIONS WADIYAR

HYDERABAD: Mr. Jaya Chamaraja Wasiyar, warned that if "we relinquished English immediately or reduced it to a position of anaemic weakness, we may be creating a gap in higher education which would be hard to fill at once."

The Mysore Governor, addressing the convocation of the Osmania University here said replacement of English at the highest levels by any or all of our languages, must follow, and not precede the development of our languages to a position of sufficient strength to deal adequately with all branches of modern scientific learning.

"This may take some time, but the time taken would be a good investment, and indeed a necessary one."

Scientific and technological learning is a field in which we must catch up with those who are in

advance of us and who will still be marching ahead all the time," he added.

WE MUST REGAIN THE PASSES AT ANY COST

A nation's freedom depends upon the inviolability of its frontiers. That inviolability, in its turn, depends upon political alertness and economic strength.

Because of indifference to one single mountain pass, the Khyber Pass, the battle-field of Panipat saw the rise and fall of empires repeatedly and the eternal city of Delhi got subjected to plunder and carnage.

These lessons are now deeply and indelibly inscribed on the consciousness of our people. The mountain passes, like the seaports, are doors to our destiny—to hold their keys in our hands is crucial to the preservation of our freedom.

The Chinese have through foul aggression snatched the command of some of the Himalayan passes. To regain them is to reassert our freedom. No expenditure of blood and treasure can count against the overriding need of keeping these passes in our control.

—Asoka Mehta.

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.

FOREIGN FRIENDS' LEAGUE

1958, Laxmipuri,
KOLHAPUR 2, India.

The only League of its kind in the World which will help you to come into contact with hundreds of pen-friends, stamp and coin collectors, teachers, students, doctors, businessmen, and many more* having different interest, almost from all countries.

Articles on various Hobbies will be welcomed.

Just remit your Annual Membership Fee: Rs. 10/- (\$ 2.50 or Sh. 15/-) with your complete address, interests and age. No Application Form needed. Save time! Know your neighbours !!

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 Bhavan,
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