

Indian Libertarian



17 Price 25 Naye Paise / L

Wrong numbering of the issues. Therefore nos. 4-7 are wrongly omitted. Incorporating the 'Free Economic Review'

INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

WE STAND FOR FREE ECONOMY
AND LIBERTARIAN DEMOCRACY

Xm
K0
70535

MAKE ENGLISH THE LINGUA FRANCA OF INDIA

78

Vol. VII No. 1

IN THIS ISSUE

April 1, 1959

	PAGE		PAGE
Behind the News	4	A Reader's Miscellany	13
Building a new Party by M. A. Venkata Rao	6	Socialism and Mr. Nehru by Kumara Sekhar	15
Planning is Marxist Euphemism for bungling, Chaos and Confusion by J. K. Dhairyawan	8	Khrushchev's Bogus Challenge by William Henry Chamberlin	17
The Genesis of Pakisan by M. N. Tholal	10	Revolt in Central Africa by T. L. Kantam	20
Pedlar's Pack by Libra	12	News Digest	22
LIBERTARIAN SUPPLEMENT I to IV			

Editorial

NEW USA-PAK MILITARY PACT

THE news of the month from the Indian point of view concerns the new military defence pact of Pakistan with the USA. Consequent on the debacle of the Baghdad Pact owing to the Iraqi Revolution of Major General Kassem, Pakistan demanded a bilateral pact with the USA for defence against aggression from any quarter including the Indian. The original Baghdad Pact devised by the British and supported by America in a non-official way so far, came to a halt since the revolutionary regime could not achieve solid stability with the support of the people who are yet divided between Nasserism and Iraqi nationalism.

America yielded to Pakistani pressure and signed a new bilateral defence Pact assuring Pakistan, Iran and Turkey of instant military support against any aggression on their territorial integrity. The original phrase against direct and indirect aggression by international communism or any force supported by international communism has now been substituted by the single word "aggression".

Hardly was the ink of signature dry when the Pakistani Foreign Minister came out with the declaration that the significance of the new treaty lay in the assurance that Pakistan and her colleagues in the erstwhile Pact have been given therein that America would go to their support militarily in case of aggression against them from any quarter including India. While America is anxious to assure India that she will not encourage Pakistan or any body else to attack India or to use Aid arms against India, Pakistan is unambiguous and is anxious to let the whole world know that India is her inveterate enemy and wants everyone to take sides in her quarrel with her.

An American spokesman of the Washington State Department Office instantly explained to newsmen that America has not given any new licence to Pakistan to use Aid arms against India. The question put to him by newsmen was tendentious and was influenced by the angle of Pakistani tactics. It was asked whether the new treaty was intended to help Pakistan not only against aggression by international communism but also against aggression by India. This is mischievous and tendentious, for there is no occasion and excuse to create even an imaginative hypothetical case of Indian attack. Everyone ought to know by this time that India is idealistically devoted to pacifism even to the point of neglecting her own defence. It is only Pakistan in the wide world who attributes the motive of aggression to India, knowing full well that it is a pure creation, not to call it a lie.

Here we come up against the perennial question of the classic inadequacy of Congress leadership typified by Nehru to meet the situation created by the confrontation of Muslim ambition in general and Pakistani intransigence in particular.

It is Utopian to expect any change of psychology in the attitude of Pakistan to India, for there is no element or class or rank in Pakistan who is better disposed towards India. It is vain to wait for any change by change of regime.

Meanwhile it is inexplicable why Indian publicity is so far behind Pakistan's in projecting a true picture of Indian attitudes, especially as it has truth on its side. The publicity of India should be so effective that it should make it possible for strangers and foreign diplomats to assess Pakistani propaganda at its true worth—namely worthless falsehood. This question of

the ineffectiveness of Indian publicity abroad is being brought up for criticism in Parliament every year on the occasion of budget demands for our embassies abroad. The Prime Minister gave his stereotyped answer this time as well. He replied that Indian personnel abroad and in the External Affairs Ministry was as good as that of any country and that Indian prestige abroad was high. The position of a country in international affairs does not moreover, he pointed out, depend entirely on publicity by her accredited representatives. It depends also on the policy adopted by the country *vis a vis* important issues of international dispute.

This is hardly a satisfactory answer. The general prestige of a country on the score of the high-mindedness of its policy does not protect it in particular issues with particular hostile countries. Much depends on the justness of its stand and the innocence of its intentions. India is absolutely just in her judgements, in intention at least and is beyond suspicion in regard to motives of aggression.

But unless foreign countries are actually informed of the truth of her stand in matters like Kashmir and the canal waters and the border attacks by Pakistan, they will not be able to appreciate Indian views and attitudes. It is in this that Indian personnel is accused of inadequacy.

The American Ambassador in New Delhi called on the Ministry of External Affairs as soon as the Teheran Pact was signed and apprised them of the fact that the new treaty did not mean any additional supplies of arms to Pakistan and that it did not authorise Pakistan to use Aid Arms against India.

The Prime Minister declared in a press conference that there was some ambiguity in the situation and that he was seeking further clarification from the USA about the matter.

The Communist party of course has whipped up its Hate America campaign into a hysteria. It wants to detach India from emotional links with the free world

and attach her to the bloc of international communism. It proceeds on the policy laid down by Lenin that Russia and China and India should form a solid bloc (which will furnish a decisive lever against western imperialism in the final world struggle between communism and capitalism).

Mr. Ashok Mehta speaking in Parliament sought to prevent this ulterior suggestion from influencing the public over-much and unawares. It is true that the Pak-American Pact is hostile to India *in effect* though not in American intention. We should seek to convey our reaction to America without clouding the issue in emotional outbursts of condemnation. We should also remember, as he pointed out, that it is not only America that is interfering in the Middle East and elsewhere. He hinted that the unsettled state of the Iraq revolution is due to the intervention of Soviet rulers through the local communist party.

The Prime Minister indicated the right attitude to be adopted by India on his issue. He stated categorically that he accepted the assurances of America to India wholly. He felt that the American government and people have nothing but the friendliest feelings towards India. He added that the Russian government and people too have the friendliest feelings towards us. But the trouble lay in the fact that Pakistan had taken up a hostile attitude towards India and was expressing it without ambiguity off and on. The possibility of the misuse of Arms Aid by Pakistan cannot be over-looked.

Such misuse of American Aid Arms has been charged against the French in Algeria. It was notorious in the Anglo-French-Israeli attack on the Suez Canal. Even in India, American Aid articles such as transmitters and special bullets have been found on the Kashmir and Assam borders in the course of Pakistani skirmishes and raids on the border.

What then is the remedy? To continue the old policy of neutrality, and friendship with all including Pakistan—said the Prime Minister.

This appears to the anxious citizen to be a conclusion most lame and impotent.

While improving our military position *vis a vis* Pakistan, it is necessary to *revise our notions of the use and necessity of military pacts*. It is necessary to negotiate a *pact of our own* both with Russia and America. We can have aid from both in military equipment on the ground of a non-aggression pact and self-defence against all attack, from whichever side it may come. We are having economic Aid from both today. There is no reason why a similar Aid for defence from both cannot be negotiated for the security of India. It is of course unusual and difficult but it is worth a sincere trial. It will put both the leaders of the rival blocs on their mettle and trial. It will test their sincerity in regard to India, while furnishing us with sufficient modern Arms.

Neutrality in a global war will be very difficult to maintain. Each side will seek to deny the resources of India to the other side and for the purpose will *seek to control the country for the duration*. They did this to Iran during both the world wars.

We have to take a lesson from Switzerland that armed itself to the teeth and so escaped the attentions of the Hitlerite mechanized hordes.

The Indian Libertarian

Independent Journal of Free Economy
and Public Affairs

Edited by MISS KUSUM LOTWALA

Published on the 1st and 15th of Each Month
Single Copy 25 Naye Paise

Subscription Rates:

Annual Rs. 6; Half Yearly Rs. 3

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.
- * Publications 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.

BORDER AFFAIRS ON THE EAST

Pakistani elements making trouble within our borders seem to have shifted their attention to the Bengal border at Moorshidabad. The Chief Minister Mr. Roy announced that the aid of the military has been requisitioned in this area. No martial law has been declared but the military will go to the aid of the police when called.

If this is found to be insufficient, full powers will have to be given to the military to make their own arrangements to watch the border and punish incuriousists.

PANCHSHEEL IGNORED AGAIN

The pathetic nature of the faith put in pious declarations by Indian leaders comes out in the tangle of Middle East affairs today. President Nasser came out openly against the Iraqi revolutionary leader General Kassem after the failure of the Mosul rebellion. It was clear that he was backing it secretly. It is also clear that his failure was largely due to the aid given by communist elements to Kassem's regime. The general public of Iraq was solidly Arab in sentiment and favoured absorption in his empire. But the actual maker of the revolution came to feel that Arab nationalism could very well be made to support Iraq as an *independent State and society, especially* as the oil revenues made it self-sufficient in finance, unlike Jordan. But this was going contrary to Nasser's ambition to include all Arab peoples under his sway.

Pro-Nasser Colonel Aref has been sentenced to death but the sentence has not yet been carried out. Kassem has accepted the help of the local communist party to support his regime against Nasser. International communism is finding Nasser a hard nut to crack. He is agreeable to accept economic and military aid from Russia but means what he says when he demands that they should be *given without strings*.

He found the Syrian communists a danger to his power and independence. He resolutely suppressed them, even as he earlier suppressed the old Muslim Brotherhood. He has come out with an outspoken denouncement of the communists as traitors who wish to hand their country over to foreign rulers!

General Kassem too has the same sentiments but finds it necessary to use the communists to whip up popular sentiment flowing in favour of Nasser. Iraqi nationalism under Kassem is *struggling to be born* before our eyes.

The Afghans replied to Pakistani protagonists of Pan-Islam some time ago that Pan-Islam as a sentiment did not entail subjection of all Muslims to a *single* government. Pan-Islam may be satisfied by a society of independent nations bound only by the silken bonds of culture and voluntary association.

In India secular nationalism involves the further experiment (which is more complicated) of a multicultural nationalist society on the negative foundation of tolerance without affinity. This might become a success as no abstract limits can be set to human achievement but *no attempts are being made either in Muslim or Indian society to make this possible by the forging of a philosophy and psychology to support such an artificial society and state*.

Nasser's statement and attitude of hostility to Iraqi nationalism under the lead of communism has elicited

a letter of criticism and remonstrance from Khrushchev.

This illustrates our thesis of the dove-tailed character of the drama in the Middle East—the war of the blocs *with Arab imperialism inset within it*, each trying to *use* the other for its own exclusive purposes!

India is trying to bypass this dove-tailed tangle of international conflict, in a negative way by standing aloof from its passionate alignments. It remains to be seen how long she can do so without danger! Fundamental thinking on this basic problem is being shirked by prominent groups in our country. *The Indian Libertarian* is perhaps alone in pioneering in this direction.

TRANSFER OF BERUBARI OPPOSED UNANIMOUSLY

After the unanimous Resolution of the Bengal legislature in its two houses, opinion against the transfer of Berubari tracts is crystallising itself. The Jana Sangh Party Working Committee passed a resolution calling for organised resistance both in the area and in all parts of the country. A Convention of all parties held in Calcutta reinforced the popular demand.

The Resolution passed by the West Bengal Legislature runs as follows:

Berubari—an Integral part of India. "Resolved that—in view of the fact that it is sought to bring about a readjustment of boundaries between West Bengal and East Pakistan by transfer of certain territories from East Bengal to East Pakistan and vice versa, and

Without prejudice to the right of this Assembly to express its opinion on any Bill that may be brought in the Union Parliament for the purpose, and

In view of the fact that the area known as Berubari Union in the district of Jalpiaguri has been all along under the lawful control and possession of the State of West Bengal since the Partition of Bengal and

In view of the fact that any readjustment of boundary which may result in the transfer of any part of the territory of the Berubari Union will adversely affect the economic life and security of the people of the area, and

Further, in view of the fact that the Government of Bengal has spent large sums of money for the development of the area where a large number of refugees from East Bengal have settled.

This Assembly (and this Council) is of opinion that the said Berubari Union should remain a part of the territory of the Union of India."

It should be recognised that this is not a matter of the State of West Bengal alone. It is a matter of the integrity of the whole of India and as such citizens throughout the country should give their minds to this question in earnest and oppose both the substance and manner of the proposed transfer under the Nehru-Noon Pact.

Attention

"Scholarships granted to Post-graduate students in Economics, who are able to undertake research in Free Economy from Libertarian point of view. Apply: Secretary, R. L. Foundation, Arya Bhuvan, Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4."

Behind the News

Nasser In Reverse Gear?

RECENT developments in the Middle East have been of such an ambiguous character that commentators have deduced directly contradictory conclusions from identical facts. *Prima facie*, the Islamic-communist honeymoon which entered on its ostentatious phase with the discomfiture of the West over the Suez affairs, seems to have foundered on the rocks of real-politic as conceived of by the major partner to the *liaison*. The unification of the Arab world under a single political, cultural and administrative set-up which was the frankly declared objective of Col. Nasser's rampagings seemed on the threshold of a spectacular achievement with the merger of Syria and the imminent collapse of pro-western Iraq. But subsequent events suggested that the Iraqi wing of the revolution had been short-circuited mid-way, and that its protagonists decided to mark time between the rival imperiums represented by Nasser on the one hand and Khrushchev on the other. It was a state-mate and inevitably unsatisfactory all round. Since then abortive attempts have been sporadically made to clinch the issue, and force Iraq to align herself either with Russia or with the United Arab Republic. In between, the Western bloc marked time even more warily, convinced that its best interests would be served only by a policy of masterly inactivity.

Today the position is that the government of Iraq is being assailed and supported in one and the same breath both by Col. Nasser and by Comrade Khrushchev! Col. Nasser has no love lost for Gen. Kasseem the man in the saddle in Iraq, but he has not broken with him irrevocably since he admits that the subversive elements creating trouble in Iraq are supported and incited by communist groups. Gen Kasseem has not allowed the grass to grow under his feet, for he has retorted by pointing to pro-Arab or pro-Nasser groups also fishing in the troubled waters in order to hasten the merger of Iraq in the Arab fraternity.

So far it might seem as if it were a domestic struggle for power. But in its external or international facet, it has assumed a sinister importance with the open espousal of the cause of the malcontents in Iraq by Khrushchev himself. The latter has raised the struggle to the ideological plane and has complained that, because it is a communist minority that is being persecuted in Iraq, he cannot remain unconcerned about it both on doctrinal grounds and in view of the services which Communist Russia has rendered to the Arab cause. Nasser's retort has been quick and precise. He won't have any outsider interfering in the affairs of the Arab world, and that he who had—alone and single-handed—defeated the machinations of the Western imperialists was prepared to stand up with even more determination to the communist threats of Khrushchev. This has been followed by an agreeable exchange of personalities to which the conveniences of diplomacy have been inhospitable in recent years. Khrushchev thinks that Nasser is suffering from a swelled head and that he is sorely in need of an operation to reduce him to his proper scale. This is strongly reminiscent of the British brass-hats who thirsted, through a military

showdown, to tick off this imitation dictator. But the ironic fates have willed that Nasser should rise on the grave of British reputations and indeed to hold his own against even heavier odds today.

It is thus a case of wheels within wheels and also of Nasser at least trying to reverse gear midway in his career. Certain discreet hints scattered in recent news items conveyed the idea that a sort of new *entente* has been arrived at between Col. Nasser and the State Department at Washington, the effect of which would be to restore the influence of the democracies in the Middle East. At the same time, it is not yet clear if Nasser has got out of all his commitments with the Kremlin, specially in regard to military help, the supply of arms, ammunition and the latest type of planes for offensive use. Playing on the sham of his neutrality, Nasser seems to be as eager as ever to make the best of both the worlds. Some commentators profess to see in the publicly staged disagreement between the heads of the two governments a sort of blind to mislead the public, specially inside the Arab world, as to the essential identity of interests between them in regard to the elimination of Western influence from the area. It has to be noted in this connection that the new regime in Iraq has not yet publicly repudiated the Baghdad Pact, although it has ceased its collaboration with the other members of it in their recent confabulations. But this cannot be reconciled with the very uncomplimentary terms in which Khrushchev has ticked off Col. Nasser. It may sound heroic, but is just pure bluff, for Nasser to threaten Khrushchev with the sort of fate that overtook Mr. Anthony Eden. It is in fact *less majeste* new style, and the whole of the regimented communist world would rise to a man to avenge such a deadly insult. Does it mean therefore that the Arab world and the communist imperium have come to the parting of the ways? Can Khrushchev contemplate with indifference the backsliding of a prospective satellite, and accept with equanimity its re-affiliation with its former masters? For a clear enough answer, we can only wait on events.

But to those optimists who over-simplified the Middle-Eastern question as one of a conflict between a decaying imperialism and nascent nationalism, the present posture of affairs in the Arab world must be both distressing and mystifying. The real truth of the matter is that the area still suffers from the effects of a political vacuum which was created by the Suez fiasco, that Nasser is too small a man to fill the bill, while any outsider like Khrushchev, if he should step into the breach, would be the exchange of King Hog for King Stork. In the final analysis, if a show-down should occur with the clients of Khrushchev operating from inside the Arab world the nationalist junta cannot hope to get on top again without the help of the West. In other words, Col. Nasser will have to retrace his steps until he arrives at a point somewhere nearer to his former friends than was thought likely.

As an inset to the bigger problem, we have the issue of the unification of the Arab world, against the rest of the world. The lure of unity is most potent when it is thought to be denied or in danger of being destroyed. It is now being better realised in the Arab

world itself that the issue of unity is being used as a stalking horse by communist subversionists on the one hand and by nationalist evangelists like Nasser on the other. As local autonomy will be the first casualty in the event of either of the forces getting the upper hand, what we see in Iraq is an interesting psychological development which may be described as dynamic neutrality *vis a vis* nationalism and communism. Oddly enough, it was Khrushchev who accused Nasser of wanting to swallow his neighbours. Coming as it does from the man who has liquidated Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and reduced them to the status of satellites, the remark must be deemed an excellent illustration of Satan reproving Sin! Tactically as well as diplomatically too, it may be said that Khrushchev has got the worst of the exchanges he has had with Col. Nasser by his indiscreet and public intervention on behalf of his stooges in Iraq. This is all to the eventual advantage of the world at large which has been too long drilled into thinking of him as a latter-day Colossus.

Turmoil In Tibet

News from Tibet always scarce on account of the difficulty of communications have been even more exiguous and contradictory as from the date of its absorption in the Chinese centralised system of government under communist inspiration. The role of Tibet, in any intrinsic sense, is almost nil; but for reasons of strategy in the light of prevailing ideological conflicts, it assumes an importance that cannot be exaggerated. For one thing, it offers ideal terrain for operations of a military character in the nuclear age; and the new over-lords of China claimed the entire area by pre-emption and under cover of certain trusty obligations and precedents and usages exercised by them unilaterally. It was in fact a naked show of force that led to the reduction of Tibet to the status of a municipal body in relation to the central government of China. In actual practice, Tibet enjoyed sovereignty minus only the label; and in the British era, the status quo was maintained thanks to the superior might of the British empire. We came in as revisionists of the British but without the standing or prestige of Britain. The effect of this disparity was quickly reflected in the assumption by communist China of over-lordship in fact as in same against which we had neither the power nor the inclination to protest. Pandit Nehru's personal temperamental and idiosyncratic complexes have been responsible for our acquiescence in a situation which has altered the *status quo* of a thousand years in a fundamental manner almost overnight.

Had the Chinese government been content to leave the area to enjoy autonomy in its legitimate sphere, things might have settled down more or less. But as communism is a sort of proselytising religion and feels never safe unless it keeps on making converts of others, attempts were made to modernise and secularise the Tibetan system of government and administration. As the government by Lamas is one of the few survivals of a theocracy of sorts, the reformatory zeal of the new evangelists faced rough weather. The usual expedients of *divide et impera* were then employed to create a split in the body politic; and the

Panchen Lama was set up against the Dalai with inevitable repercussions in all directions both domestic and foreign. Coupled with this were other disquieting indications of communist expansionism, since Chinese maps tarred many dubious areas yellow in that vast hinterland of the Himalayas where we have common frontiers with the most powerful countries of the modern world—China and Russia. We however propitiated our big brother by signing the now famous *Panch shila* pact with it, and then relaxed, congratulating ourselves on having done a fine day's work.

But just as the new is in chronic conflict with the old everywhere else, so also there have been fermentations in Tibet which necessarily assumed a political character. Apparently we are the only country in the world to have our accredited representatives in Lhasa, perhaps of the subordinate status of Tibet in the new dispensation. Reports of unrest and of sensational developments began to trickle into the outside world, although there is reason to fear that our foreign department for reasons best known to itself, did its utmost to discredit such news and rumours. At long last however, Pandit Nehru has to admit that there have been risings and revolts and suppressions and that as the only foreign power on the spot, the agitators have even appealed to our representatives to intercede with the Chinese authorities to ensure that their demands were conceded.

Our position is certainly delicate, but Pandit Nehru has not shown either moral courage or political dignity by adopting the pettifogging line of a country attorney in washing his hands ceremoniously of the Tibetan imbroglio. With a solemnity and fervour which are suspiciously over-pitched, he has declared that we cannot with propriety interfere in the internal affairs of another country, and that what we are concerned about is the observance of diplomatic correctitude and the ensuring of the safety of our personnel there. He has also trotted out the idea or fiction that Tibet has never been known to have enjoyed sovereign status, implying thereby that she cannot aspire any more to such a position, and that she has to reconcile herself to her inferior lot for all time to come.

If Pandit Nehru really believed in such a theory, all his other pronouncements and actions give it the lie direct. He has been going out of his way to denounce out-moded ideas and discredited systems of government, and has been egging on the people everywhere to rise in revolt against their rulers in the name of freedom, progress, and other appealing slogans. One of the latest items of news appearing in the papers has it that Ferhat Abbas the so-called leader of the 'Free Algerian government' is on his way to Delhi to confer with him as to the ways and means of achieving a political objective which goes counter to the constitutional and legally established system of its government under the aegis of France. Darkest Africa is darkened with the conflicting claims and counter-claims of freedom groups at daggers drawn against each other, but yet subjecting these tribunes of revolution to a sort of hypnotic influence. Why we ask should there be this sort of double standard—one applicable to one set of freedom fighters (so-called) and the other applicable to the hopeless victims of communist tyranny in Tibet?

(Continued on Page 13)

BUILDING A NEW PARTY

By M. A. Venkata Rao

WIDE CONSENSUS FOR NEW PARTY

THERE is a wide consensus of opinion that the present critical political situation (consequent on the wrong politics of the Congress Government and the rapid way in which it is sliding into autocratic procedures and the crucial steps it is taking to realise socialism in agriculture as well as in commerce and industry) demands the quick formation of a new party. Existing influential parties are all Leftist. If Congress has become openly and fully Leftist after the Avadi Resolution of 1955, the Praja Socialist and its offshoot the Socialist Party are more purely Leftist in origin and programme. They imitate the socialist parties of Europe in all essential particulars and share there ideal of a social regime without individual ownership of property in the means of production. They go further than Congress in demanding more rapid nationalisation of industries though they profess lip loyalty to the desirability of decentralisation of administrative power. The next Leftist party is of course the Communist Party of India which is the type and exemplar of Leftism. It is fully Marxist and indeed is a limb of the international communist movement directed by Moscow to bring about world communism. It does not hesitate to destroy the present economic and social order if thereby it can find a way to seize power. From all signs visible in the political scene today, it would not be an exaggeration to say that the heir of Congress is likely to be, by all odds, the Communist Party of India.

CONGRESS BECOMING COMMUNIST

People in all walks of life are beginning to realise that Congress under Pandit Nehru is decisively pushing India into the orbit of communism so far as social structure is concerned, though he might retain national independence like Tito of Yugoslavia. Nehru has made no secret of his conviction that with the exception of violence and one-party rule, communism is a desirable social system.

SOCIALISM DESTROYS DEMOCRACY

Now all those who are convinced that both the example of communist socialism in the countries of the iron curtain and the balance of rational probability estimated on grounds of psychology, economics and politics are proofs of the evil of communism, should bestir themselves to save the country from the impending catastrophe. This can only be done by the formation of an effective party based on a rival non-socialist or even anti-socialist outlook and programme. It should have the full social appeal of justice to the under-dog and of using science for the abolition of poverty.

Equality and social justice and economic abundance are the keynotes of current humanitarianism and the new party should offer convincing reasons for the

belief that its non-socialist or anti-Leftist platform is more likely to lead to progress without involving the surrender of personal freedom and the regime of Parliamentary democracy. It should be easy to demonstrate that, human nature being what it is, the centralisation of economic power in the hands of the Governing group in society, which is proposed even by democratic socialism, will surely in time lead to the attribution of freedom and the enslavement of the population. For centralisation of economic power entails the reduction of all citizens to the status of employees depending on Government for food, clothing and all the essentials of life. Such dependence will prevent them from exercising an independent choice in elections.

SOCIAL JUSTICE BETTER SECURED THROUGH FREE ECONOMY

Social justice and equality are common to all parties today, in so far as external arrangements and the coordinating functions of the State can promote them. The new party should therefore show that Leftist programmes, vitiated as they are by thwarting individual initiative, cannot lead to the goal proclaimed. On the other hand, it should be demonstrated that a regime of freedom (limited only by regulations dictated by the necessity to prevent individuals from coming in each other's way can realise the goals of justice and equality and high rates of production.

In addition to this intellectual work of interpretation of history and demonstration and criticism, the aspirants for a new national party should evolve effective ways of putting their programmes across to the bulk of the people-intelligentsia in the learned professions, commercial and industrial vocations and to the working classes, agricultural and industrial. Journalists and literary persons are today heavily biased in favour of Leftism on the mistaken impression that it is honourable and ethical so to be! Heavy, continuous and devoted work has to be done by the pioneers of the new way of freedom to counter-act the bias of the writers.

NEED FOR MISSIONARIES FOR DEMOCRACY

But the heart of the psychological problem is the difficulty of finding both leaders and workers adequate to the mission. Indeed they will have to take to this work in the spirit of a mission. It is an uphill task. The ruling party will put all sorts of obstacles in its way and will mobilise vast masses of people to its support with the help of State patronage. Such patronage has reached enormous proportions with the addition of new lines to the public sector and the expansion of the community project scheme to every new groups of villages. Add to this a continuous propaganda that the party of Mahatma Gandhi that brought national freedom is the only one capable of delivering the goods! Also, the enormous funds that Congress can command legitimately and illegitimately from joint

stock companies and groups of millionaires with their own axe to grind give it a heavy advantage in electioneering.

Some experts estimate that sums in the neighbourhood of 25 crores of rupees will be needed immediately if work is to start in the principal election centres and localities where opinion is formed and becomes vocal and influential! Well, if the commercial and industrial and upper agricultural classes realise the present threat to their permanent interests, as they seem to be doing in recent months, the required money should be forthcoming.

But even more than funds, the *right kind of leaders* and *workers* should be mobilised and thereby hangs a tale!

The public have developed a sort of cynicism during these years of Congress rule and "democracy". They see that the sort of persons that fill Congress ranks and occupy seats of power are, by and large, of *the earth, earthy*, in spite of the Gandhian hegemony of spirituality, nationalism and self-sacrifice. They have no impulse to take the trouble of returning a different group of men to power under a different party label! The educated classes in all ranks—upper, middle and lower middle, are the worst offenders in staying away from the polling booths! It is the serried ranks of labour that march to the polling places under the leadership of their Unions! The best organisation is exemplified by the Communist-sponsored labour groups.

BUILDING A NEW PARTY

This only adds to the quantum of work by way of propaganda and actual instructions to the voters regarding the duties of citizenship and the conventions of democracy that have to be given by workers.

WIDESPREAD ORGANISATION

This entails a good deal of permanent organisation. Places of meeting have to be hired and workers should be in attendance there day by day. Adequate literature should be available on the policy, organisation programme and planks of the party for distribution, free or at nominal cost. Lecturers should give talks frequently in every suburb of every city and in every township throughout the country. Rural branches should be established with a skeleton staff on the spot assisted by visiting speakers and guides. It is easy to say that workers should go to the villages and that labour should be rescued from the sinister influence of the communists but to get the organisation going everywhere is a tremendous task.

NO TIME TO LOSE!

But the first *snag* in this is that the well-to-do who are suffering today under socialist policies and stand to lose *everything* as socialism proceeds to conquer new sectors do not come forward with liberal financial support! They are too suspicious and lethargic and also too self-centred! They would rather lose everything when the time comes rather than organise resistance betimes with the intention of *preventing* the dreaded misfortune. This should be done while yet there is enough democracy to permit the organi-

sation of new parties. Already threats of "broomsticks" are being held out by leaders beginning with Nehru himself! Shri Lal Bahadur Sastri advised merchants in Bombay to keep away from organising opposition to the public sector and from ideology itself! Congress may even espouse the communist party programme and accept the ideology of the Kremlin but other parties should not accept any ideology even for self-defence! Intolerance of opposing views is developing with giant strides in the country.

The leaders and workers then should be prepared to incur the wrath of the ruling party visited on them in various ways and in all their activities, although they may be legitimate in law and right and Constitution. They may have to be ready for jail and beating and other forms of repression.

Apart from this sterner side of their work, they will have to display remarkable stamina and persistence in day-to-day work. They should keep party work in mind all the waking hours of the day and night. They should become expert expositors of their programme and competent critics of the ruling party's policies.

MOTIVE FORCE: PATRIOTISM

Now comes the *motive force* for all this extraordinary devotion to party work. Surely it is not possible in the initial stages when the party is still in the wilderness to offer any regular remuneration to workers sufficient to be an inducement for full time work. Only bare expenses of living and transport can be given. Even this would be difficult in the initial stages. Moneyed persons are hard bargainers. They watch to see whether the new party is *likely to make good*. They will come forward with support only when the masses are being attracted to the party. Then their support will not be necessary so much. It is like Lord Chesterfield offering patronage to Dr. Johnson after he attained success, after repulsing him in all the days of his misery!

Such devotion to party work against such immense odds is only possible if workers are inspired by a *major emotion* such as *patriotism*. It will of course get re-inforced by the ordinary motives of rivalry with other parties and the passion to succeed. Workers will develop a camaraderie, a fellow-feeling by working together, a "*We-feeling*" as against a "*They-feeling*." This will develop group emotions and group loyalties which will enable them to carry on through days of discouragement and poor results.

A literature of national patriotism should be gathered and read by workers in groups. Nationalism is a *mystique* like religion. Participation in its emotions and exaltations, its agonies and victories will strengthen the feeling of worth-whileness and joyous fulfilment which is an end and reward in itself.

Leaders should be able to evoke this series of emotions in their workers and the response of the workers will *in turn* strengthen the sentiment in the leaders themselves! It is a vital cycle.

The moral support of elderly leaders like Sri Rajagopalachari, Sri K. M. Munshi, Sri V. P. Menon and others will be useful in the beginning but the party should not depend on it over much. After all, what is wanted is a new set of ideas and a new set or element of the people to form the backbone of the new party.

The new leaders and workers should rely on themselves, the inherent appeal of their ideas, their critique of existing policies and the value of their constructive programmes. They will in time draw out a new group of leaders and supporters in most places. If the British Labour Party took over fifty years and the Congress Party over 75 years to achieve power, it should *not* be thought that in India today, a new party will need such long periods of incubation. Circumstances are different today here. There is widespread discontent with the ruling party for its administrative incompetence, its hare-brained schemes, its communist measures of subversion in the name of economic progress, its imitative temper, its refusal to build on actual experience, its indifference to corruption in the administration and its ignorance of and indifference to democratic conventions and the rule of law.

THE WORK OF NEW LEADERS

How will the new leaders persuade the people that *they will be better*? They should crystallise *code of conduct* to be observed by them when they come to power. They should take a *pledge* in its terms before all the people in all areas of the country. It should define what is meant by nepotism and misuse of office for personal gain. They should develop a capacity in the people to recognise such objectionable conduct in politicians in office and outside.

Above all, they should choose *men of integrity* respected by their neighbours. They should choose by merit and ignore caste and creed and personal obligations and favouritism. The *worse* should never be chosen in preference to the *better* candidate.

Also, money should be used sparingly and *only* for purposes of the mechanics of publicity-posters, printed literature, actual expenses of workers such as transport and light refreshments, rent of offices, stationery, and correspondence. Ward bosses have become accustomed to demand money. They should never be indulged. The party workers should approach voters directly in person. They should start their work well in advance of the elections for this purpose.

How are such leaders and workers *made*? The greatness of the endeavour—namely the saving of the nation and its independence and the securing of a great, happy future to generations of our countrymen and the example of great men in our own and other nations is a cause that has the power of kindling enthusiastic devotion in most people. But devotion *unto the last* attached to steady and unwavering work will be forthcoming *in a few* and their number will increase as groups multiply in the service of the party. The *miracle* is performed *in the soul of the leader* who has the vision of truth and people's welfare and will be re-enacted in expanding waves of groups as the work proceeds and evidence of response on the part of the public begins to accumulate.

The tyranny of words

Planning is Marxist Euphemism for Bungling, Chaos and Confusion

By J. K. Dhairyawan

TODAY the world is living under the tyranny of words. Common words have either lost their inherent meanings or else are used to mean something that is not connoted by the words. That is where we have the common misconception that ALL parties of the Left, that is the Liberals, the Socialists and the Communists are "progressive". As against this, ALL sensible parties that are realistic and practical, which are not soaring in the clouds, are dubbed as "reactionaries". All round us, both in the newspapers and on the platforms, there is a sort of a Bedlam where only the babel of meaningless words are bandied about.

Today in India hot Red winds are in the air of "nationalism", of "co-operative farming", (in reality collective farming), State trading, and a thousand and one communist slogans. Prime Minister Nehru talks of his "passionate conviction" of the urgent need of the country for co-operative farming—of course, he gives no answers—to informed critics who warn him of the dangers of such a step. While he talks of his passionate conviction, he also admits that he or his

ancestors have never been farmers. That is a truism, which means that he has no personal knowledge, how farming is carried on, and what are its risks and pitfalls. His enthusiastic supporters, namely the communists and the Socialists, too, have never grown a blade of grass not to talk of raising food. And on the mere shouting of these doctrinaire persons, the country has been starvation, chaos, and ultimately lead to a class-war, the consequences of which are too dangerous to contemplate.

What is true of Co-operative, or collective farming, is equally true of the various marxist nostrums that are dangled before the country by the Prime Minister. The country had already a bumper "crop" of corruption in the various State-managed schemes and undertakings—from the Bhakra-Nangal Dam to the Damodar Valley scheme, not to speak of the pre-fabricated housing scheme and the jeep scandal. Add to them the various Auditor-General's reports of maladministration, corruption and criminal waste of lakhs of rupees down the drain of nationalised concerns. And

what is more, there is no end to these scandals nor any notice taken of the strong strictures passed by the Auditor-General, from year to year.

A TALE OF CORRUPTION FROM BOMBAY

Nearer home in Bombay State, the latest report of the Public Accounts Committee, should make these khaddar-clad "do-gooders" think and pause as to where they are leading the country to. Bombay State, or rather the Bombay Presidency, as it was known during the British regime, was rightly the pride of the whole country as the best administered, go-ahead and efficiently run State in India. Bombay State had a body of Civil Service men, known for their integrity and character, assisted by an equally efficient Indian staff of officers. Where has all the old efficiency and character gone? The answer is that the various "welfare" schemes of the Government and their mad rush for nationalisation and taking over trades, from supplying milk to transport and housing, have been too heavy a burden for the officials to carry on their shoulders or that these officials are not versed in the business side of these various trades.

Another reason is that with every step that the Government takes in taking over trades from the private sector, the "bureaus" or offices are increased, and there creeps in the paralysing influence of red-tapism that chokes the very springs of business machinery. And that is what has happened in Bombay State. The natural tendency in the bureaucracy is to shirk work, pass the official files from pillar to post, as far as possible never to take the initiative or decision, happy in contemplation that salaries are safe at the end of the month. What is happening in India and in Bombay, has also taken place in Soviet Russia and other European countries under the communist orbit. This has been well explained and documented by Milovan Djilas in his book, the *New Class*. In fact, these bureaucrats finally form an elite and become one of the most dangerous kind of vested interest. This is a clear warning to the Nehru Government NOT to follow in the footsteps of the totalitarian regimes. But obviously, Nehru seems too idle or lethargic to heed the warnings, to the detriment of the country.

RS. 71 LAKHS DOWN THE DRAIN

Coming to the report of the Public Accounts Committee of the Bombay Legislature, it is significant that the greatest criminal is the State Trading Department which shows a loss of Rs. 71 lakhs. This money has literally gone down the drain of "nationalisation". The loss, amongst other things, was due to misappropriations, missings gunny bags, thefts and to over-payments of transport expenses. If these things had happened in any of the private concerns during the course of a single year, either that concern would have to close its shutters or would have brought the guilty culprits to book. BUT NOT SO, under "nationalisation". THE LOSSES WERE SIMPLY WRITTEN OFF! That is nationalisation in practice, the Indian way. That the money lost was the hard-earned tax-payers' money seems to be nobody's concern.

ANOTHER WHITE ELEPHANT

If these are the "achievements" of the loudly acclaimed State Trading and other departments like the

Aarey Milk Colony, another white elephant of the Bombay Government, has also skeletons in its cupboard. In the first place the quantum of milk that was promised when the Colony was started had NOT been achieved. The Colony is much behind in reaching the target. The Aarey Milk Colony has virtually become the vested interest of Mr. Kharody, who is the undisputed monarch of that establishment. The PA Committee has some significant strictures to make on the way the Colony is run. Regarding the purchase of cattle-feed, the Committee says: "there were more middlemen than manufacturers in submitting the tenders." Naturally the Committee suggests that a better and more reliable method should be devised for the calling of tenders. Another remiss on the part of the authorities of the Colony is that a case against a merchant for recovery of money could not be instituted as the papers connected with that case were "Lost". Of course, it seems to be nobody's concern to keep the files and documents in safe custody. The PA Committee also refers to the inadequacy of the supply of milk to the City, and advises the Government to see the feasibility of allowing milk to be brought to the City, otherwise through the Government agency, from places like Anand and its neighbourhood where milk is in abundance and cheap.

The same tale of mismanagement, corruption and criminal waste of the tax-payers' money is divulged in the running of the Education Department and the Social Welfare schemes. The complete chaos in the administration is demonstrated when the Education Department has incurred a loss of Rs. 1,41,544 through overpayments of salaries and allowances, and overpayments of grants to certain institutions, the chief "beneficiary" being the Bombay City Social Education Society.

As an off-set to these case of criminal waste of money the Government shows a "saving" of over Rs. 40,00,000 by not carrying out sanctioned water supply works for villages and in rural areas. Out of a provision of Rs. 92,50,000 for village water supply ONLY Rs. 52,12,835 have been utilised so far. The PA Committee "views with concern the large saving in the context of urgent and almost widespread need of supplying drinking water to the rural areas.

The PA Committee also regrets to note "the Government had delayed sanctioning some water for one year and more." A fine demonstration of the oft-repeated but never sincere intentions for the "welfare" of the people the part of the government. The ascetic looking and sour-faced Ministers are more keen on getting their travelling bills and running in their brand new motor cars. "To hell with the people" seems to be their slogan.

And this tale of waste of public money, this chaos in administration and the apathy of the ruling class, once they are installed into seats of power and influence are there as is the case with every totalitarian regime. Despite the false promise of the "withering away of the state" by the marxist rulers of Soviet Russia, the State today, both in Soviet Russia and other European countries under the communist sway, has become a huge Levithian before whom the people have no remedy and no freedom or chance to bring about a change of Government. Perhaps, it may be argued that the people are happy and that the administration is perfect and is running in good order. But

this is far from the truth. With over 40 years of experience in planning, even today the Soviet Sixth Five Year Plan is in chaos and there is not even a final blue-print of it. Here is what the well-informed and influential British journal—*THE SPECTATOR*—has to say in the matter:—

THE WARNING FROM RUSSIA

“...the industrial plan has a number of dubious features....And if they want to examine the relations between the plan and its results, students of planned economy will ask with interest what happened to the plan whose outline was adopted at the last Congress in February 1956. The State Planning Commission failed to draft the Directives, in time, for preliminary discussions, but they were presented to the Congress and adopted as the Sixth Five Year Plan—1956-60. The detailed plan failed to emerge, and in December 1956 it was decided that the makeshift Plan, already in operation, should be scaled down, and a brand new Sixth Five Year Plan prepared by mid-1957. This, too, failed to appear, and in September 1957 the Sixth

Five Year Plan WAS ABANDONED. The planning organs were instructed to prepare a new Seven Year Plan by July 1, 1958. This date, too, passed without any sign of the draft, but in September “These” for Krushchev’s present report were authorized.... They, too, do not constitute a full blown plan.” (*Spectator* 30-1-1959)

So here you have the tortuous and meandering ways and methods through which the so-called planning passes right in the Mecca of the Marxist enthusiasts that is Soviet Russia. Planning is definitely an euphemism for chaos, blundering and official apathy and ineptitude. Where after 40 years Soviet Russia had not been able to evolve out a system to a perfect plan, how can India or any other country, expect to run their so-called plans according to the authors of the Plan. Already we have the “pruning” of the Plans and the talk of the “core” of the Plan in place of the plan itself. Planning by doctrinaire economists and arm-chair bureaucrats from a central place is bound to fail in India as it has done in Soviet Russia. Decentralization and local personal initiatives are needed for the success of any plans.

THE GENESIS OF PAKISTAN

By M. N. Tholal

MAULANA ABUL KALAM AZAD’S “India Wins Her Freedom” deals, among other subjects, with the genesis of Pakistan. It certainly throws a good deal of light on it, but the account is by no means full and a careful student of Indian politics finds some important links missing in the chain of events leading to the establishment of Pakistan. For the benefit of the historian of the future, it is perhaps worth while stringing them together chronologically.

The Congress, with the support of Gandhi, decided to contest the 1936 elections to the legislatures, thus vindicating the wisdom and foresight of C.R. Das and Motilal Nehru and the folly of the boycott of legislatures decided upon in 1920 under the leadership of Gandhi. The problem before Congressmen was to secure majorities in provincial legislatures to be formed under the new Government of India Act on the basis of an extended franchise. In U.P. the ministry had been in the hands of a coalition of business magnates and landholders. Congressmen as well as Muslim Leaguers (whose leaders had been lieutenants of Motilal Nehru and had left the Congress as they were unable to kowtow to Jawaharlal Nehru) were keen on ousting the reactionary coalition. (It is important to remember this point as it was the basis of the gentlemen’s agreement reached between the Congress and the League and Jawaharlal Nehru is absolutely wrong when he says—as he did at a Press Conference the other day—that the Leaguers were not taken into the Congress because they represented the landholders and Congress was anxious to carry out land reforms.)

NO REGARD FOR COMMITMENTS

Feelers were therefore thrown and it was found that the leaders of the Muslim League in U.P. (Khali-

guzzaman and Nawab Mohammad Ismail) were willing to run a joint election campaign with the Congress against the reactionaries in power, in the hope, shared by Congressmen, that the two together would be able to secure a majority and form a coalition government. Thus a gentlemen’s agreement was reached between the two parties, thrilling the hearts of patriots all over the land. Unfortunately for the country, the Congress by itself secured a thumping majority in U.P., as in five other provinces. That changed the situation, as if by the wave of a magic wand. Even Congress volunteers began behaving as if they were members of the ruling race, to say nothing of the Congress leaders. Leaguers were now the supplicants, even as Congressmen had been the supplicants before the elections.

In the period that elapsed in securing some guarantees from the British Government regarding non-interference with ministers by Governors in the day-to-day administration of provinces, a convention of Congress legislators was held in Delhi and a resolution was passed in favour of homogeneous cabinets in the provinces where Congressmen were in a majority in the legislatures. It was freely rumoured at the Convention that Mahatma Gandhi had sent word to the effect that he wanted that resolution passed. (Gandhi at the time was not even a four-anna member of the Congress.) Nobody at the Convention, not one Congress legislator even from U.P. reminded the Convention that so far as Congress legislators of U.P. were concerned they were in honour bound to invite the League leaders to form a coalition cabinet with them! As for Gandhiji, he always forgot his doctrine of “purity of the means” whenever that purity threatened

to stand in the way of his dictatorship—and that was often enough. And now we have Azad's testimony to the effect that Nehru had, like his Master, no regard for his commitments.

Maulana Azad now fixes the main responsibility for the refusal to accept the two League leaders mentioned above squarely on Jawaharlal Nehru, although at the time it was thought in U.P. that Gandhi had rejected the coalition idea in favour of homogeneous cabinets. Nehru, as almost everybody knows, is swayed by emotion. After the death of Motilal Nehru in 1931, emotional integration, which is only a euphemism for flattery, was in full swing in U.P. Emotional integration has obviously little to do with principles of any kind, and gone were the days of Motilal Nehru when efficiency and ability counted most in the hierarchy of Congress leaders. So fiery orators like Khaliqzaman gave place to courtiers like Rafi Ahmad Kidwai who believed in whispering campaigns, and it was Nehru's affection for Kidwai that really stood in the way of the League forming a coalition with the Congress. If two Muslim Leaguers had been taken, there would have been no room for a third (i.e. Kidwai) in a cabinet of six or seven. So the gentlemen's agreement was forgotten. Had the League constituted the balance of power, it might have even been given three seats, but the Congress had an absolute majority and the Leaguers were of no use to Congressmen.

POWER POLITICS

Not one among top Congress leaders expect Azad looked at the problem from the national point of view, though the younger elements felt aghast at this double-crossing. Had the League come in to work with the Congress in U.P. the way would have been open for the League in other provinces to do the same. Here was an opportunity for the Congress to finish the League, as Azad says, and the Congress disdained it in the interests of power politics of a few leaders. It was hoped that the lure of office would compel the Leaguers to join, but events proved that Leaguers had more of character than Congressmen. Khaliqzaman said: "Both of us or none." In the result U.P. Congressmen presented all Nationalist Muslims to Jinnah on a platter. It was a moral lapse the moral of which was obvious to all educated Muslims. The erstwhile colleagues and followers of Motilal Nehru had at least firmly believed in the sincerity and patriotism of Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, and the knowledge came as a rude shock to them that the men whom they had held up as ideals to their community had feet of clay. Jinnah pounced upon the betrayal and began saying: "What have I been telling you all these years?" It was indeed a landslide for Jinnah.

It was natural that there were some witticisms at the expense of Rafi credited to Khaliqzaman. Rafi reacted violently and started a campaign against Khaliqzaman (who was at the time Chairman of the Lucknow Municipal Board) in the correspondence columns of the *National* through a Hindu who eventually replaced Khaliqzaman when the latter was at last ousted from the Board chairmanship. At first the editors of the *Herald* flatly refused to publish the letters, although they were told the letters had the support of Rafi who was one of the Directors of the Company publishing the daily—such was the high re-

gard in which Khaliqzaman was held in U.P.—but Rafi succeeded in enlisting the support of the Managing Director and the editors were persuaded to publish the letters—"After all, they are only letters to the Editor"! One of us in the *Herald* shouted: "Publish and be damned", while another said ironically: "Give them a statutory double-column heading "Rafi's Vendetta."

"WE CANNOT LIVE TOGETHER"

Behind this word "vendetta" lies a story. Rafi Ahmad Kidwai had lost the election to an independent Muslim. (Only two Congress Muslims were elected.) Fortunately for Rafi a Muslim League member of the Assembly died soon after election. It was presumed that there would be a Congress-League coalition. So Rafi Ahmad Kidwai approached "Khaliq Bhai"—nothing like the affection that wells up in time of need—for being returned unopposed from that constituency. "Khaliq Bhai" agreed and Rafi Ahmad was returned unopposed. Hence the "vendetta." (The degeneration of the Congress since the Gandhian era began in the organisation is one of the most interesting chapters in Indian history and deserves a volume for itself.)

Rafi's prinpicks continued and insult was added to injury. Khaliqzaman was ousted from the Board chairmanship. It was a triumph for Rafi and his friends, but they were reckoning without the host, and Khaliqzaman—that powerful orator—was a host in himself. He unfurled the banner of Pakistan. "They (Congressmen) say we cannot work together," he roared at public meetings, "we say we cannot live together."

As if to counter this Jawaharlal Nehru had a bright idea. He began unfurling the national flag, not realising that the flag-hoisting mania can afflict the Leaguers too. Leaguers began hoisting the Pakistan flag. The very word Pakistan was a slogan which summed the Muslim fanatic's hatred of Kafirs and it was not Pandit Malaviya, "the communalist," who had roused that hatred. The choicest of our nationalists had done it. It was obvious that Congress had lost Muslims for good and the cry of Pakistan had come to stay. Gandhi, Nehru and Rafi Kidwai were the trio who founded Pakistan. For sometime Jinnah just looked on in amazement at the response to the cry and it was not without a good deal of cogitation that he set the seal of his august approval on the cry. That seal came as a result of his evergrowing contempt for Gandhi.

Maulana Azad is of course right, but he could have prevented it. There should be a limit to loyalty to colleagues, to *esprit d'corps*, and some regard for the cause and the objective, if not for morals. He had only to say "I am resigning from the Congress" and both Gandhi and Nehru would have started trembling in their shoes—wooden or leather. The shock would have restored their moral sense to them. Surely the country was greater far than Gandhi and Nehru. Why did he not do it? The one man who was indispensable to them, who could have saved the situation, was found wobbling. My only complaint against Azad has been that he did not realise his own greatness, his own worth. Two of his sayings should have been broadcast by Congress propagandists all the year round: "Nationalism is the only religion for a subject
(Continued on Page 14)



Of all the infirmities of age which assail the great ones nothing is more boring than anecdotage. We had thought that it was an exclusive occupational disease of our politicians alone. But we have recently noted with some surprise and more regret the intrusion of the professional soldier into this dubious field. One of the age-old conventions of democracies is that the professional soldier makes himself conspicuous by his disciplined silence. This has been violated by our Defence Chief Gen. Thimmayya. Presiding over some school anniversary or other somewhere in the North, he spoke unexceptionably enough on the role of the soldier in the defence of the country. But he lapsed into a bit of autobiography, and with more zeal than discretion revealed how, when he was young to the service in the early days of the Freedom struggle, he had an opportunity of meeting Pandit Motilal Nehru, and offered to throw up his commission in response to the national call for N.C.O. It appears that he was dissuaded from such a heroic step by the exhortations of that great and sensible man.

The episode is a timely reminder of the gulf that yawns between the ideal and the actual in regard to the members of the fighting services. It is a truism to say that the soldier must be always above politics, just as we pretend that students should not take part in politics. In reality the army personnel are as deeply stirred by political developments as are students; and to expect either of them to be impervious to their seething environment is to ask for the impossible. It is this truth that communist leaders work upon to stage *coup d' etats* with the help of army personnel. The only guarantee against the recrudescence of such violent upheavals is to see that the national sentiment and political consciousness are harmoniously blended in the common soldier into a concept of patriotism which would be proof against emotional or ideological disturbances.

But the disclosure made by the gallant General as to his own reactions to the politics of thirty years ago is disquieting for the reason that it debunks the myth of an army without politics. If a soldier could change his loyalties as he changes his uniform, then it is a poor look-out for the country which looks to him for its protection. As an officer in the Indian Army of those days, his loyalty to the status quo—to king and country—was unconditional and precise. It was not so much a conflict of duties as of inclinations, for even when he entered that army he must have been aware of the political predicament of the country as in subjection to Great Britain. The one place where there cannot be such unfettered scope for the exercise of private judgment is the army. How much more havoc is being wrought in this sphere under the distressing conditions of the cold war of today can be more easily imagined to our discomfort. There is not to reason why, There's

but to do and die—sang Tennyson admiringly when a disciplined force obeyed the call of a stupid commander, and suffered heavy casualties. In these days of 'Janata' organisations in all spheres, such romantic attitudes seem unthinkable.

The visit of Dr. Dag Hammerskjöld to this sub-continent and his 'inspection' of the Cease-fire line in Kashmir have been described as 'routine.' It is odd however that the Secretary-General should have made his first trip to Kashmir almost ten years after the trouble started there. Two other items of news have synchronised with the visit. One of them is a denial by the Pakistan foreign ministry of any near prospect of a meeting of the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan to discuss pending issues like the Canal waters and the plebiscite. The other is another 'fighting speech' by our 'beau-cock' defence minister Mr. Krishna Menon. He announced that India would not tolerate the landing of any foreign troops on Indian soil for any reason, —even under U.N. auspices. We cannot imagine any special development in current politics to account for, much less justify, this belligerent warning. Is there anything brewing in the purlieu of diplomacy to hasten some sort of understanding with Pakistan? If there is a disposition to come round a table, it should follow that every one must be prepared for some kind of a compromise solution which would free both the countries from the incubus of mutual suspicions and mounting defence expenditure.

Khrushchev is said to have remarked that his foreign minister is too busy to waste his time over conferences with his opposite numbers from the democracies. For this reason, he says that it would be better for the heads of the governments themselves to meet at a Summit conference.

The inference is that the heads of government have nothing else to do! Mr. K has certainly a peculiar sense of humour! No one has been able to explain the inwardness of the Soviet insistence—now for more than two years—on a so-called 'summit conference.' Its propaganda value seems to consist entirely in the fact that because the West is unwilling to agree to it, therefore it must stand to lose by it. If Eisenhower should agree, contrary to the expectations of all concerned, the chances are ten to one that Khrushchev would back out of it for some reason or other. The moral of it is simple: The cold war must go on at all costs, for the alternative to it is a hot one; and both sides are too scared to start the latter.

By the time these lines are in print, Hungary bids fair to be repeated in Tibet, and all would be over—the shouting. In his latter throat-parching pastime, we find our leader Pandit Nehru conspicuous by his silence!

Mr. Goray of the P.S.P. group in the Lok Sabha tried in vain to raise a debate on the subject, while a similar move by back-bench M.P's in the House of Commons is likely to have more publicity value. Mr.

(Continued on Page 22)

UTOPIAN MEASURE

By Prof. G. N. Lawande, M.A.

Co-operative Farming will not solve the food problem; it will only aggravate it

FOOD PROBLEM AND ITS IMPORTANCE

ONE of the serious problems which the people have to face at present in our country is the food problem. It has become the most acute problem in our country in spite of the planning. Democratic planning and national independence have become meaningless to the people because the leaders have failed miserably to tackle this serious but most important problem. Unless this basic problem is solved, all talk of economic prosperity through planning will become economic rubbish. It can never be economic realism. More than a decade has passed since we achieved independence but this basic problem has remained beyond the capacity of our rulers, who apparently rule the country not for the well-being of the people but for their vested interests. The main reason why this basic problem cannot be solved is that the Government and the opposition parties look upon this problem from the political point of view. The main business of the opposition parties is to blame the Government for the food crisis without suggesting any concrete remedy to tide over the difficulties. The purpose of the opposition parties it appears, is to create trouble so that the ruling party can be discredited; they fondly believe that the food problem can be solved only by throwing the present ruling party out in the coming election. They make capital out of the food crisis in order to make the Government unpopular. In order to justify their approach some members talk very highly about the achievements of the Communist China on the food front and compare the poor achievements of our Government in this respect. Such comparison can serve only one purpose of hypnotising the poor and illiterate masses, and bring communism in our country with all the evil consequences attached to it. The policy of the Government is also unrealistic and utopian. They always take the optimistic view of the situation and tell the people day in and day out that the food problem would be solved. These assurances served no purpose in the past except to capture votes at the time of election and to pacify the people by appointing committees. For every important and unimportant problem government is appointing committees so that the attention of the public can be diverted to other problems.

It was stated at the end of the Five Year Plan that the food problem was solved and that the First Plan was a great success but the history of the food problem in the Second Five Year Plan tells its own story. In the month of February both the Prime Minister and the Home Minister assured the people that food prices will be lowered and that the people would get ample supplies. People are so accustomed to all these empty assurances that they do not take them seriously. The

Government, in order to solve the economic problems, has adopted economic planning but achievements of the Government have clearly proved that economic planning will not lead to prosperity but on the other hand that it will lead to more and more bureaucracy and regimentation of the economy. This has been proved beyond doubt by nationalisation of Insurance companies, establishing State Trading Corporation and now by imposing two new fads of state trading in foodgrains and Cooperative Farming. Food problem was very acute even before the First Five Year Plan and it was expected that it would be solved at the end of the plan, but to the surprise of all it has become very serious and one will not be wrong if one believes that there is something fundamentally wrong somewhere which our rulers are unable to find out. If Japan and West Germany can solve their problems within a decade without planning, one does not understand why our country cannot solve its basic problem. The fundamental defect is that all our thinking is utopian and impracticable. The Government believes that heavy industries are more important than food production. This is the fundamental mistake of our planners. Agriculture is the basic industry and unless it is well developed it is not possible to achieve economic progress of our country. Our plans should be more realistic and it should be based on the availability of the resources, but our Government is very fond of having grander and bigger plans and this is the fundamental defect of our planning. It appears that the Government has not learned anything from the past mistakes and to solve the food problem the government has suggested that the only way by which it can be solved to the satisfaction of the masses is by state trading and cooperative farming. Both these measures are utopian and impracticable. They will never solve the basic problem but will lead to bureaucracy of worst character. Both these measures are to keep the Communists away from the power but the main point is whether it will solve the food problem.

NAGPUR RESOLUTION

Pandit Nehru has come to certain conclusions: the only way to increase the food problem is by socialisation; he asserts that the government should usurp one by one the functions which were so far performed by the private enterprise. For this reason there must be progressive nationalisation with the result that the state will become the owner of the means of production and distribution. In other words, he wants to bring state capitalism and his recent pronouncements and the way in which he is guiding the Congress party testify to this without any doubt. He wants to esta-

blish Socialist Pattern of Society and with that end in view he has passed the resolution on cooperative farming which is utopian in conception and impracticable in execution. He and his associates have completely ignored the present agrarian conditions, the psychology of the farmers, their attachment to their piece of land and old age conservatism. By passing the resolution the Congress would defeat the very objective of increased food and agricultural production for which it is aimed at. Cooperative farming where there is no cooperative spirit will be nothing more than an imposition and as a result of this the spirit of individual freedom and democracy will be jeopardised and the power of the bureaucracy will tend to increase. So far the Government has not done anything to foster the cooperative spirit among the masses; on the other hand the policy of the government has alienated the sympathy of the public especially of the private enterprise which has been stifled in order to increase the scope and importance of the public sector. It is rather strange that the Congress, the faction ridden body, should talk of cooperation when its members are busy fighting among themselves on petty matters and pull down each other. Unless Mr. Nehru and his associates put their house first in order it is futile to talk of voluntary cooperation among the farmers. This clearly shows how our leaders are unrealistic in their thinking on most important problems like food and introduce Utopian measure without taking into consideration socio-economic set up in villages. This measure may be beneficial from the point of view of catching votes of illiterate masses at the next election but to solve the food problem and reorganise the agrarian economy it will be utter failure. The resolution if implemented will usher in the totalitarian regime on the model of China and Russia. There is no possibility of the people coming together voluntarily to pool their lands and resources in the interest of cooperative and joint farming. "Human nature being what it is, even brothers of the same mother usually separate from one another after the head of the family, the father, has been removed by death or other cause.

In the circumstances it is utopian to expect that an average householder will, all of a sudden, identify the interest with the interest of those hundreds of persons in the village or neighbourhood who were total strangers to his life hitherto."

UTOPIAN MEASURE

Even if it is granted that the farmer joins the cooperative out of his own free will he will not be free to opt out of it again once the boundaries have disappeared and his plot of land is engulfed in the midst of a large farm. It is a fact that this experiment was tried in many countries in the West especially in communist countries but it has not succeeded there. In Yugoslavia and Poland the trend has to be reversed and the small farms have again appeared on the scene. It is nothing but madness to try the same experiment in our country where it is said that there is democracy. In an atmosphere of democracy this measure will certainly fail. "The only choice therefore is either to preserve democracy and freedom or to take them away from the people and replace them by violence and bloodshed" To Mr. Nehru it may be an article of faith but it will affect

the lives of 300 million farmers. It will give rise to a new class of farm managers and create a difficult and cumbersome machinery for the cultivator. It is assumed that cooperative farming will increase the food production and raise the standard of life of the farmers, but both these assumptions are based on ignorance. Anyone who has the barest knowledge or acquaintance with the Indian farmer and his love for his land it is difficult to assume that he will put heart to his work in increasing the food. The cooperative system of farming has failed wherever attempted. Collective farms in Soviet countries had failed to increase the productivity of lands or the yields or to raise the standard of living of the tillers or to retain the loyalty of the farmers. Only a free economy can give its people a high standard of living. Such a high standard of living can and never will come as a result of planning and particularly by cooperative farming. "A plausible definition of high standard of living is giving people what they want. And this can only be done when a large number of producers big and small are dependent for profit and survival on satisfying the needs and desires of consumers as expressed through a free market.

Only an economy operating on the powerful twin motors of the profit and wage incentive system and the competitive free market can give the individual the complex of material satisfactions that add up to what is known as a high standard of living."

OPPOSITION TO CO-OPERATIVE FARMING

The protagonists of the cooperative farming believe that production will be increased by the introduction of cooperative farming and large scale farming but the experience in other countries has shown a decrease in production with large scale farming when it is experimented either voluntarily or compulsorily. "To think that these results do not hold good in the present context of our country is to shut ones eyes to realities and betray the immaturity of our wisdom in resorting to an unwise policy which is hollow and strikes at the very vitals of our rural economy". It is no wonder then that this utopian measure is opposed by independent group of eminent persons like Mr. K. M. Munshi, Mr. C. R. Rajagopalachari, Mr. M. R. Masani and Prof. Ranga. They have been dubbed as reactionaries. Prof. Ranga felt compelled to resign from the Congress to oppose this unrealistic fad of Mr. Nehru. Mr. Munshi has challenged this move which according to him will lead to despotism in the country. Mr. Munshi raised three points in refuting the points of Mr. Nehru. "First, cooperative farming wherever tried in India has failed. This is the question of fact and requires an objective and dispassionate inquiry by experts before the contrary is accepted. Secondly, nowhere in the world has cooperative farming on a voluntary basis worked well. Even when coercion has been used as in the case of collective farming in the totalitarian countries food production has not increased. This again is a matter of objective study and not for polemics. Thirdly in the absence of adequate and enforceable safeguards, Ministers and bureaucrats, impelled by vague slogans are sure to drive farmers into joining farming cooperatives against their will."

Mr. Masani says, "Cooperative farming has failed to increase production. It is the last remedy to try

when you want to put more men on the job. Collectivisation was not a part of democratic socialism in any part of the free world. No democratic socialist could possibly want to uproot peasant farming from the country. Every measure of coordination and co-operation, so long as the farm was left in possession of the family and the man-land nexus was not disturbed, is welcome. But if boundaries were uprooted and land taken away from the peasants it would be a move towards totalitarian collective farming" The ruling party has set its feet on wrong road, wrong from the point of public morality, wrong from the point of view of free society and also from the point of view of self-interest."

PEASANT FARMING IS THE ONLY SOLUTION

In order to solve the food problem cooperative farming is not a suitable remedy. The solution depends upon increased production and fair distribution. If instead of cooperative farming the farmers are given better seeds, better manure and credit on easy terms it will be possible for the farmer to increase the yield of the land and sell the product in the market according to the laws of demand and supply. Under cooperative farming there will be no initiative for him to put in hard work and there will be quarrels for the share of the produce. By resorting to co-

operative farming employment potential will be reduced. Under the existing conditions more than 50% of the rural people are unemployed or underemployed. Cooperative farming instead of solving the problem of unemployment will aggravate it. This will be like adding fuel to the fire. Until large-scale industries are established in our countries where the unemployed can be employed there will be no alternative employment to the farmers. When there is no other alternative employment to the farmers, who will be unemployed as a result of cooperative farming, the wisdom of the promoters of cooperative farming must be questioned. The only consequence that will follow will be discontent among the farmers and this will certainly affect the food production in our country and this will give a chance to farm managers to fix the prices of foodgrains arbitrarily and exploit the consumers. Even some Congressmen are against this utopian measure but they are afraid to speak out because of the broomstick of Mr. Nehru which he holds in his hands to wipe out the dissenters from the party. In the Nehru democracy there can be no freedom of expression. One has to abide by the hasty and unrealistic decisions of the Prime Minister. There is no other alternative and for this reason our country is hailed as "bastion of democracy" by the foreigners. Cooperative farming is nothing but one step to the totalitarian regime of Mr. Nehru.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS

By Adib

IN the pre-independence era the foreign rulers had followed a policy of giving free scope to private enterprise and in that period free enterprise by its pioneering efforts and zeal put India in the eighth place among the industrial nations of the world: But after independence our national government reversed that policy and in order to achieve rapid economic development of the country it has introduced planning with the result that the government has trespassed upon the rights and fields of private enterprise. During the First Five Year Plan, even though the private sector was allotted 50% of the total outlay, it fulfilled its allotted target of Rs. 233 crores by way of new investments. In the second Five Year Plan the ratio of the private sector was reduced to 39 from 50. In spite of this reduction it has already fulfilled its allotment during the Second Five Year Plan. It is needless to mention the dynamism of private enterprise for creating job opportunities, for increasing the wealth of the country and distributing it automatically to all sections of the people by way of salaries, wages, dividends on investments. Though the private sector has played its role in the most efficient manner yet it is proposed that the outlay that will accrue to the private sector in the Third Five Year Plan will be in ratio of 30:70. This trend clearly proves that within a short period our country will be communistic with Mr. Nehru as Khrushchev of India. State Trading in Food Grains and Co-Operative Farming are clear proofs to show which way the

wind is blowing. In other words, it means that the economy will be more and more regimented and the State will become the sole monopolist to supply goods and services, and distribute them arbitrarily without taking into consideration the price mechanism based on the laws of demand and supply.

CONTROVERSY BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS

The controversy between private and public sector has received a new impetus when Government decided to have State Trading in Food Grains and when Defence Ministry directed to go into the business of manufacturing automobile trucks in the private sector in West Germany. Manufacturers of automobiles protested against this intrusion by the State. Businessmen also launched protests against State Trading. The main objection against this fad of Mr. Nehru was that it would neither benefit the cultivator nor the consumer. Today the cultivator is able to get the best price by selling his grain to the highest bidder. He thus enjoys a certain amount of freedom of choice. He will not have the same freedom under state trading. He will be compelled to sell his grain at the price fixed by the State. Once the State establishes a monopoly in the trade the cultivator will have only one party to deal with and who may be called "superduper baniya." This Government Baniya will fix the price of foodgrains which may not be acceptable to the

cultivator. He may find that the price offered is too low but he cannot withhold the stock as the State Baniya may pass an ordinance and compel him to part with the grain at the price fixed by that superduper baniya and police will be given extra powers to enter the farms and attach the crop. This will result in fall in food production. As regards the consumer he will have to buy the grains at the price fixed by the state baniya. Thus it is detrimental from the point of producer and consumer.

MR. NEHRU AND PRIVATE SECTOR

This criticism has enabled Mr. Nehru to come down heavily on private sector. He declared at the public meeting that all those opposed to the growth of public sector would be swept aside with a broom. One would have understood and justified the move taken by the Government if the private sector was incapable of doing the job, but there is no case for such a justification. In the past private sector had delivered the goods most efficiently and economically and could continue to do so if proper climate and opportunity are offered. It is a fact that private enterprise is based on profit motive, but profit motive is a sine qua non of economic progress. Profit motive and competitive free market are the twin motors and they alone give the individual material satisfactions and higher standard of life. Secondly are the public enterprises running at a loss? Do they sell the commodities at the cost of production? It can be shown that the prices charged by the public enterprises are definitely higher than those charged by the private enterprise. At the press conference Mr. Nehru again reiterated his preference for the public sector and spoke in a most uncomplimentary manner about the private sector. "The public sector will always get a priority wherever it can do things economically and profitably. The policy of the Government is to proceed towards a socialistic pattern of society—may be slowly if you like—and therefore encourage public sector wherever it can be encouraged." One will have no objection against public sector if it can deliver the goods economically and profitably but the experience shows that corruption, bribery, are the main features of the public enterprises. At the Nagpur session his anger against private sector was very high. "I believe the public sector represents the dynamic urge to go towards a certain society which we are seeking to build up. The public sector has to grow not only in extent but in importance, strategic importance but even so there is a vast field of expansion left for the private sector provided it does not impinge upon the public sector and does not challenge the right of the public sector to do what it is doing." But it must be admitted that even in planned development there is a need for a true appreciation of the role of the private sector. In order to assess the role due emphasis should be given to the place and position of the individual under a democratic set up. "It is necessary to recognise that the greatest need of the moment is to nobilise public energy and enthusiasm for a wide and intensive diversification of industrial and economic activity which alone can solve the problem of unemployment which is assuming serious proportion and giving cause for concern. It is futile to think of increasing employment opportunities by concentrating on development in the public sector alone. Such a process would inevitably

lead to the bureaucratisation of the economy of the land apart from the other limiting factors namely, that State agency for such purposes is comparatively expensive and uneconomical. The decisions taken and judgments arrived at the purely administrative level cannot be a substitute for the informed judgment of the persons who have an intimate knowledge of the free market economy and the needs of the large mass of those constituting the consuming public." Mr. Nehru said that private sector had come in for sharp criticism because it tried to challenge the right of the public sector, but he forgot the main point, namely, that in a democracy both sectors should be allowed to play a full and proper role in accelerating the pace of development. Public sector is entering into spheres of manufacture which appropriately should have been left to the private enterprise. Mr. Nehru admitted that both public and private sectors are necessary today in their right places but the public sector must be prevented from setting up units in sphere of manufacture in which the units of private sector are adequate enough to meet the demands of the people. Again in a mixed economy like ours where both private sector and public sector are operating side by side both must be allowed to work under the same terms and conditions and that no preference is extended to one group to the disadvantage of the other. When the public sector like S.T.C. is trespassing the field of the private sector it is but natural that it should criticise the public sector. The private sector should have at least the full freedom in its proper place so that it can function without any encroachment from the public sector. But the activities of the S.T.C. are extending over the fields which were in the hands of the private sector. If this is allowed without criticism then a day will come when all activities of the private sector will be taken over by the public sector in the name of vague term "national interest."

INDIA — BASTION OF DEMOCRACY

India is called a "bastion of democracy" and if that is so, then in a democracy every one has a right to offer a constructive criticism and the beautiful pamphlets which he referred to are certainly rendering service to mould public opinion against the totalitarianism of the ruling party. "Mr. Nehru occupies a position unique in the affection and respect of the country. But this position from its very uniqueness entails certain bilateral responsibilities. The Prime Minister cannot use this vantage point to shout against and attempt to silence certain sections of India's people who are opposed to his policies. The sycophants who surround him might, for their personal or political advantage, turn this way and that according to his vocal behests. But there still remains a hard core of the individuals who see things differently, not necessarily correctly, but who are entitled to as much attention as those who kneel automatically in obsisance before the Prime Minister. The court of trained courtiers in New Delhi bowing this way and that are more of a mockery of democracy than others in neighbouring countries whom we choose to criticise. Mr. Nehru talks of extending the so called cooperative principle, a cowardice alibi for collectivism from the agricultural to industrial plane. It is time a halt is called to such confused thinking. This is not economic realism. It is economic rubbish".

A READER'S MISCELLANY

Mr. Nehru's economic thinking is a case of arrested thinking. It belongs to Laski and the London School of Economics of thirty years ago. —*Indian Express* Leader

The cohort of trained courtiers in New Delhi howling this way and that are more a mockery of democracy than others in neighbouring countries whom we choose to criticise. Ibid.

The individual is the only reality. The state is a non-living entity. The leviathan has no soul.

—C. Rajagopalachari in the *Swarajya*.

In 1931, in 1939 and again in 1942, we had three separate opportunities for settling the problem of India on the basis of freedom without partition. Every time we failed to see that practical considerations were of greater value than *cliches*—B. Shiva Rao, Publicist and former M.P.

The formation of a national government is all the more necessary as the quantum of integrity, intelligence and organising capacity available in the country is limited. —Acharya Kripalani in the Lok Sabha.

The present trouble of the West over Berlin flows from the short-sightedness and unrealism of the American and British governments in agreeing to a distribution of occupying zones which gave them no direct access to their sectors of it. Messrs. Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Churchill and Attlee share the responsibility for that stupendous folly.

—Capt. Liddell-Hart, the military expert.

Marxism itself had its origin in an earlier humanist philosophy. If it has developed into its anti-humanist antithesis, the time has now come for a grand synthesis in a New Humanism. —*The Radican Humanist*

The Indian ocean is momentarily a naval vacuum with no single or joint command ready to keep open this only highway to the outside world.

—Rear Admiral E. M. Eller of the American Navy.

Men, unlike brute animals, are able to think about their end, and since wherever thinking occurs, error may happen, men can misconceive their happiness.

—M. Adler

In the big cities, parks and public buildings are miniature theatres of war. The New York Parks department now spends \$250,000 a year merely to repair wanton destruction. —*Liberation*

The ballot-box and its use do not necessarily secure

discipline nor training for the citizen in public affairs.

—Dr. C. P. Ramaswamy Iyer on Democracy

Mr. Nehru who claims to believe in neutrality has behaved in an unneutral fashion towards Israel all along. —Ben Gurion in the Israeli Parliament.

We don't need better missiles to destroy each other—the ones we have now will do the job adequately, and there isn't any point in zooming off into space.

—Dr. A. R. Grosch, an American scientist.

In Europe we were slaves; in Asia we will be masters. —Dostoevsky

The test of a first-rate intelligence is the ability to hold two opposed ideas in the mind at the same time, and still retain the ability to function.

The life of a poet is indeed precarious and severe. A life intense and posthumous. —Jean Cocteau.

Asceticism consists in the sacrifice of one part of human nature to another, that it may live in what survives more completely. —Walter Pater.

—F. Scott-Fitzgerald

(Continued from Page 5)

That the uprising of some tribes in southern Tibet is foredoomed to failure may be readily enough acknowledged. But does it therefore follow that we should dishonour ourselves by siding with the big battalions? Freedom is freedom, and all are worthy of it—even the Kampas. In fact the fact that they have dared to challenge the might of a big bully ought to rouse the sense of chivalry in all of us. Instead, it is degrading to find our leader coolly, almost cynically, handing them over to the tender mercies of their enemies with results which we can easily imagine from the analogy of what took place in Poland or Hungary.

We do not suggest that our country should lead a crusade against China for the liberation of Tibet. But we have a moral duty and right to bring to the notice of the UNO the true and traditional relation that had existed between China and Tibet, and to demand that this ancient relation be restored in letter and in spirit. The apprehensions of Communist China may be met by the formulation of an international guarantee that Tibet would be a buffer state as Afghanistan was in the palmy days of three imperiums meeting round its borders, and that in return China should leave Tibet severely alone. Such a *modus vivendi* is also vital for our own security and good neighbourly relations with both Tibet and China. No technical pleas can prevent the UNO from taking cognizance of events of any kind anywhere in the world; and the liquidation of a religious or racial minority is such an immediate or dire possibility that there is a strong case for urgent consideration being given to this question by the highest international organisation in the world. If Pandit Nehru fails to move in this matter he would be compromising himself hopelessly both in the present and for all time to come.

(Continued from Page 11)

people" and "narrowmindedness is the greatest enemy of mankind".

And so the die was cast and it was not until the Muslims of India celebrated "Deliverance Day" after the resignation of Congress ministries on the outbreak of the Second World War that Congress leaders realised what had happened. When Sir Stafford Cripps was at Delhi and the Congress Working Committee was carrying on negotiations with him, it passed a resolution at one of its meetings which contained the following passage:

"Nevertheless the Committee cannot think in terms of compelling the people in any territorial unit to remain in an Indian Union against their declared and established will."

THE LAST NAIL

Why then was the Cripps Offer refused, although Cripps had proved it to the satisfaction of Congress leaders that he was conceding Pakistan only in name and his scheme could not result in its establishment? Because our magician, Gandhi, was not in the habit of thinking over things from the national point of view, and had told Cripps as soon as he glanced at the document: "If that is all that you have brought, you might as well go back." Gandhi was incensed at the seeming concession to Jinnah. At every crucial moment in the history of the land, Gandhi and Nehru faltered and failed her.

Azad complains that Nehru's assertion that the Constituent Assembly would be free to decide what it liked, opened the door for Jinnah to demand Pakistan again, as the Congress apparently had no regard for its commitments. That was not the last nail in the

coffin of united India. We are all apt to blame the British for everything and to say that the British wanted division of the country, as everywhere else. But that is not true in the case of India. The Defence Minister of England, who was one of the members of the Cabinet Mission, was at pains to explain that military necessity demanded a united India. The only enemy they feared was Soviet Russia and a united India would be able to offer "defence in depth". For the same reason Viceroy Wavell was violently opposed, openly opposed, to partitioning of the country: But the question arose: Defence in depth depended on India remaining a part of the Commonwealth. So, when Nehru was called to London with some other Indian leaders, it was decided that the lady now the Queen should take him out in the gardens and incidentally inquire whether he would remain in the Commonwealth. The question was put and Pandit Nehru blundered again. "We shall be absolutely independent," he blurted out. That was the last nail in the coffin.

READ

THE ASSASSINS

By F. A. RIDLEY

Published by the Author, 65, Gray's Inn Building,
Rosebury Avenue, London E.C.1.

Price Rs. 5 or Sh. 8

Available from:

THE LIBERTARIAN BOOK HOUSE,
ARYA BHUVAN, SANDHURST ROAD,
BOMBAY-4.

DID YOU KNOW...

By Scio



To sustain life, the human body requires at least 700 calories daily—the amount found in three average cups of cooked rice. A human being can live only 30 to 40 days without food and but 3 to 5 without water.



Figured on a world-wide basis, experts say man's life expectancy is now 52 years, that he averages 131 pounds in weight and five feet four inches in height—with the female slightly smaller—and that except for skin color and other superficial differences, all are the same physically.



Beginning this year (1958), the United States will observe the first Wednesday in October as "National Day of Prayer." President Eisenhower set the day aside in a proclamation. He urged his fellow Americans and visitors to the U.S. on that day to join in prayer "each according to his own faith" for the well-being of the United States and all mankind.

SOCIALISM AND MR. NEHRU

K. Kumara Sekhar B. A.

IT is a matter of pleasure that an old leader like Rajaji should be the stronger man today to deal with the nation-wide campaign, and systematic coercion by meddling with normal legislation, that is being carried on to promote the personal desire of Nehru for socialism. It is by keeping out old and wise leaders like him, that Mr. Nehru could append this ideal of his to the congress party, making this historic and nationalist movement just a corollary to the socialist party of India. It is not necessary that India should turn socialist if it wants to turn prosperous. We have all been thinking that the congress stood for middle-of-the-road policies, instead for some "ism" which would ultimately betray the country to vested interests. The slogan "towards a socialist society" is now prominently displayed on posters of the Five Year Plan. No one knows how and why it got there. We require a "Grand Sentinel", like Tagore, as in the days of blind adulation for Gandhiji and the Charka. At least the Charka had some native strength in it, and a patriotic purpose behind it. But this European idea of socialisation of production, which has been experimented in certain Asian communist countries with many untoward effects, is not really attractive to us.

Once our defect was that we refused to obey our own leaders. Today it seems to be, that we are prepared to accept anything that comes from a leader. Mr. Nehru says that even the capitalist countries are resorting to socialist measures. He forgets that the base of their economy is still capitalistic democracy, and that these measures have never been used at the developmental stage, but to supplement the successes of capitalism and ensure its better functioning.

Even Americans are conscious of a certain amount of "state intervention" in their own country, and are complaining about it. But the truth is, that little is essential to neutralize certain negative effects of private capitalism, and not to hinder its positive growth. The state can, as in other things, regulate private capitalism, but not overtake it or suppress it.

The present trend of Mr. Nehru's speeches have been to fight off all opposition to socialism as betrayal of the people, though its implications for agriculture are still in a nebulous state even in communist countries. Production through co-operatives may not really increase production, and may only disturb our economy. All the same it is spoken of as a panacea, and a magic phrase that is going to hush up all talk of governmental despotism. In India at least co-operative farming is not a desire of the people but a sign of the growing Governmental despotism and Mr. Nehru's dogmatic approach to agricultural production. Mr. Nehru seems to be bent upon leading India to class conflicts, and precipitate a class crisis in the near future.

The socialist party of India has never been popular in India because its aims are alien to our traditions. If Mr. Nehru is somewhat successful today with these aims, it is because he has been using the apparatus of Government, and the resolution of the Congress, to

realize them, in a very arbitrary way. If we speak against this, we are said to be against the "progress" of the country. This only shows that along with the communists, Mr. Nehru claims a monopoly in the use of the word. I do not think that the rank and file of the congress has ever given a thought to socialism. It is not only 'turning the clock back' that is a wrong thing, but letting it run too fast. I am sure we all desire to march forward to prosperity, but not at the loss of individual values.

Even before we had reaped any substantial success on the economic front, Mr. Nehru had initiated the process of levelling us down on considerations of equity. As he has been tampering with income as through the tax system, we have in India neither the security of wealth nor the security of work. In the communist countries, at least the right of employment is respected, before doing away with private property. But in India private enterprise is called a sin though there has not evolved public enterprise to replace it. It is perhaps to make secure his position in Government that he is trying to befriend the proletarian masses of this country, challenging again and again the producers here. As for the results of this policy, which proceeds from his anxiety about the failing enthusiasm of the people for his Government, it has precipitated things like undue taxation and the exchange crisis. But it has forged no new link for him with the workers. Trying to befriend China he has irritated America, and has become the Tito of the Western camp.

When Mr. Nehru first declared that he was going to divert his forces to the goal of socialism we thought he was at least for a better variety of it, than that offered by the socialists themselves. We thought it was going to be socialism by consent. We expected it to reckon with Indian conditions and realities and would not lead to the sort of despotism in evidence in communist countries. If socialism is really what Indians desire why need there be any compulsion or controversy that is in evidence here today. Mr. Nehru wants the state to organise farming, confiscate excess land and trade in grains. Because the people do not want these things he is threatening governmental measures to enforce them. If socialism is going to come to India, let it not come on orders from the government. In this respect Mr. Nehru seems to be stepping beyond the bounds of democratic decency, which he should respect at least to face the dictatorships in the neighbourhood. He is trying to impose his ideas on social betterment arbitrarily.

In a way the poor are really rich and the rich really poor. This might seem paradoxical, but it would appear true in the dynamics of the actual economic functioning of any society. May be, the rich are persecuted today for their riches and the poor are praised for their poverty, but a little economic insight into the mechanism of taxation, the framework of modern constitutions and labour laws, would soon reveal which class is harassed and needs sympathy.

Perhaps in feudal times the rich were really rich. They owned wealth and were in material possession of it all, in kind as well as in money. But we have proceeded a long way from those stagnant days. Today, riches do not lie idle and being invested are involved in the vortex of the economic life of society, and the rich are thrown into this perilous process. So the rich today are worse than the poor, who though at the bottom, are not whirled round and round in this distressing manner.

The employee has less worries and less risks than the employer, but receives less pity for his constitution. Joblessness is the only fear of the employee, but the employer faces not only loss of his managerial work, but even his capital sometimes. The rich man is forced to maintain an abnormally high standard of life. Even among the so-called rich it is perhaps only the small capitalist and the relatively poor merchant who is better off, because through volume sales of low-priced goods with low profits, he escapes the penalties of "progressive taxation."

It is usual for people to think that investors, factory owners, house owners, land owners etc are the rich, whatever the circumstances in which they live. On the other hand they are inclined to regard wage-earners as inevitably poor. One has only to imagine a poor investor and a poor house owner, to understand how poverty attends the rich. In one state in America a rental law froze all rents at a certain level, and made impossible all ejections of tenants. May be, this might benefit certain poor tenants who are harassed for higher rent and threatened with ejection. But what about the under-paid poor landlord whose sole income is his rents? What about investors in the building industry who would all be ruined by the law?

It is these "poor rich", who whenever threatened to be put out of existence by socialistic legislation, cry out in a manner more bitter than the "rich poor", who though they do not enjoy the security of wealth are not affected by its anxieties.

Socialism is just one of the pitfalls and temptations after independence, which the congress under wiser leadership would have steered the nation clear of.

By declaring his country neutral Mr. Nehru does not bring into our hands the scales of justice. He has only taken it as an opportunity to create political differences with the west, and ideological ties with the communists. Socialism was in nobody's mind during the freedom struggle, and it is not the sole aim today of all those who aspire for national prosperity.

Even the press is silent on this flagrant violation of Gandhian values and traditional Indian ideals, because whatever the nature of the insight of Mr. Nehru into the state of the country, and whatever his palpably pedantic assertions from time to time, he has been insisting and arranging the establishment of certain new industries, and placing his accent on improved foreign relations: and this has won the attention and approval of neighbour countries and the foreign press.

What is best for the country is a question difficult to answer. One thing that can be however said, is that India should be conservative in her approach to the problem of the development of her national economy, and not be attracted by the many isms that are parading the world today. If it is anything that the

policy of neutrality has given us it is this consciousness of the futility of ideological sensitiveness. In the light of this analysis it is clearly wrong on Mr. Nehru's part to deliberately commit the country on the side of socialism.

The door should be kept open, and we should be able to benefit from all isms. At least until we have developed our resources of capital, the principle of equity in taxation should not be allowed to operate, for the accumulation of capital for industrial purposes would be the need of the hour. Much of Mr. Nehru's anxiety is to create an excellent record of work for his regime, which will assure him a positive place in our history. But even these Nationals plans which try to copy the communist method of forced development, have not changed the face of India. The progress that we have so far made is thus only of statistical interest. The common man has not benefited by the way of increased employment, because the production targets of steel, power, mining, etc while creating employment and high paid jobs for certain workers have left the majority out of the picture. The immediate welfare significances of the production of steel, power etc., is little perceptible to him though the Nehru Government can thereby show big figures to other governments. It is this that makes Mr. Nehru rely more and more on the government rather than the people, for any effort of national development.

Mr. Nehru is not only committing India's economy to socialism, but steering her foreign relationships closer to the communist countries. He has become a champion of the cause of Red China's seat at the U.N. He has been establishing new contacts with Russia, China and Yugoslavia though their totalitarian system repulses us. When we cannot approve of their methods and theories why should we make friends with these socialist countries? Is it to give the Indian socialists more hope? Is it to taunt the west? Actually our entire past relationships were with the democratic west, and he should have strengthened these bonds and developed them on just lines, rather than run into communist arms. Many of these phenomenon are due to the reticence of other prominent leaders of the freedom movement to participate in government, thus leaving the administration entirely to the whims of Mr. Nehru. However the intellectuals of the country have awakened to the situation. They will no longer allow the business community to be chided and checked by leaders like Nehru. Though in the humble manner of studies in free enterprise, they have nevertheless begun their work, of finding a more positive approach to Indian problems than Mr. Nehru's brand of "governmental socialism," which is forced on us today, simply by threatening us that if we rejected it we would have to face worse things. The only possible variety of socialism is this despotic governmental variety of it. As in other countries which have fallen prey to socialism, in our country also, it has first made its appearance as the utopia before the nation's eyes.

But then it becomes vicious, and tries to dig its roots using the claws of governmental despotism. We are at the beginning of this second stage. Obviously referring to India, Mr. Khrushchev has said that there are certain nations in the world fighting the west like themselves, hesitating to call themselves communists,

(Continued on Page 17)

KHRUSHCHEV'S BOGUS CHALLENGE

*Those who practice and maintain their freedom
need not be concerned about it.*

By William Henry Chamberlin

IN the Intervals between rattling his rockets, boastful and garrulous Soviet dictator Nikita Khrushchev has been challenging the United States to a legitimate peaceful competition as to which system, communism or capitalism, will provide better living conditions for the people who live under it. This is a challenge which, on the basis of past performance and future prospects, we can cheerfully and confidently accept.

Some time ago the top boss of all the Soviet republics, without being too specific about the date when this would be realised, announced that Russia would get ahead of the United States in per capita output of meat and dairy products. His more recent boast, after a trip to Hungary last spring, was that the Soviet Union would surpass the United States in the output of consumer goods. "Then we will see who eats better and who has more clothing." Still more recently Khrushchev declared that the figures of the new Soviet Seven Year Plan, which will run from 1958 until 1965, would "amaze the world".

The superiority of the American standard of living to the Soviet is one of the biggest stumbling blocks to Soviet propaganda. Despite the frantic and highly mendacious efforts of Soviet state-controlled newspaper to paint America as a country where the workers live in misery, victims simultaneously of inflation and unemployment (no mention of the fact that unemployment compensation—our domestic brand of socialism—provides a much better standard of living than the average employed Soviet worker enjoys) most Russians know that the United States is well ahead of their own country in material well-being.

The clothes worn by the average American tourist, the car which the occasional American drives into Russia, are more eloquent than any amount of Voice of America broadcasting. Millions of Russians in uniform got into Germany and Austria after the last War and many of them got an idea of the superior rations and pay of the American Soldier.

(Continued from Page 16)

but much unclear about socialism. Truly, in India Socialism is nothing more than the purposeless persecution of the producers.

Mr. Nehru wants to draw a line between socialist and communist aims which very few will accept. The real cause for this peculiar phenomenon of the mighty congress seeking the objectives of the humble socialist party, is that the organisation has abdicated its primary function of creating the necessary ideas for its continued existence. In this last phase of the party it has become the private organisation of Mr. Nehru. The best proof of the growing reluctance of its leaders in its aims and existences, is the way they gladly abandoned the presidentship to Nehru's daughter.

A SOVIET OBSESSION

To get ahead of the American Standard of living has long been a matter of prestige, almost an obsession with the Soviet leaders. Almost thirty years ago, just when the First Five Year Plan—with its expropriation of the peasants and its sacrifice of consumer goods in the present to building huge factories to produce tractors, machines and chemicals in the future—was condemning most Soviet citizens to extreme hardship and some to actual starvation, Stalin grandiloquently declared:

"When we put the Soviet Union on an automobile and the peasant on tractor, then let the worthy capitalists, who boast so loudly of their civilization 'try to overtake us.'"

It was an official Communist Party slogan in Russia at that time "to overtake and outstrip America" And a contraband joke went the rounds by word of mouth of a humble Soviet Citizen going up to a communist and whispering:

"Comrade, when we just come abreast of America, let me off. I don't want to go any further."

Stalin did not live to see the day when the Soviet Union was ahead of the United States in goods and services provided for its people. And it is a safe prediction that Khrushchev, to turn against him one of the homely peasant figures of speech of which he is so fond, will no more see the Soviet Union ahead of America in output of food and consumer goods than he will see his own ears. And this prediction also goes for Khrushchev's successor, whoever he may be.

Some fainthearted and gullible persons in the United States have been so impressed by Soviet success in putting earth satellites (which add nothing to what people can eat or wear) in orbit and by greatly exaggerated reports of the efficiency of Soviet education (which has just been subjected to a major overhaul) that they were inclined to accept the probability that Khrushchev might make good on his "overtake and outstrip America" programme. But a few comparative facts and figures, based on Soviet official sources, which many economists believe are computed on a basis calculated to magnify achievements and minimum deficiencies, show clearly that the United States possesses such a tremendous lead in standard of living that the Soviet Union could not hope to catch up in any predictable period of time.

FREEDOM OUTYIELDS COERCION

In many ways contrary to general belief, the United States is further ahead of the Soviet Union now than it was over forty years ago, when the Czar was overthrown and Lenin and his Communist party took charge. For year in and year out, even in times of depression and recession, the United States, under its

comparatively free enterprise system, has been turning out an infinite variety of goods for the consumer, including such expensive durables as automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines, radios, television sets. This output in terms both of quality and quantity, is so far ahead of the Soviet that there is really no basis of comparison.

Money income comparisons between the two countries are almost meaningless because the rate of exchange for the Soviet ruble is completely arbitrary and strictly phony. Officially, four rubles are the equivalent of one dollar. An unskilled worker earns from 300 rubles (the minimum wage) to 500 rubles a month; a skilled worker may go as high as 1000 to 1200. The average wage is estimated by John Gunther in *Inside Russia Today* at 650-800 rubles.

Here are some current prices of everyday goods, as reported partly by Gunther, partly by a more recent visitor to Russia, Mr. Victor Maier, East European specialist for the *Neue Zuercher Zeitung*, one of the most highly reputed newspapers in continental Europe.

Nylon blouse	— 320 sables
Chocolate bar	— 14.80 rubles
Washing Machine	— 800 rubles
(Inferior small type)	
Man's Felt Hat	— 160 rubles
Butter	— 28.50 rubles a kilo (.2 pounds)
Beef	— 15 rubles a kilo
Pair of Shoes	— 200-500 rubles
Man's shirt	— 90-300 rubles

Set these and other similar prices for staple food-stuffs and articles of clothing against an average monthly wage of 650 or even 800 rubles and one sees that the Soviet Worker enjoys a pretty meager standard of living, a standard incomparably far below that of the worker in America or in almost all countries of Western Europe.

John Gunther, who almost leans over backward in his attempt to be fair to give credit for Soviet achievements wherever credit is due, reaches the conclusion: "The great majority of the people are sordidly poor".

Victor Meier, who by his work is quite familiar with the poverty which is general throughout Eastern Europe, sums up his impressions of a visit to the Soviet Union as follows:

"As far as the people's living standards are concerned, we thought we knew all about it before we arrived here. But we found the reality worse. Soviet living standards are considerably below those of the satellite nation with the exception possibly of Rumania, Bulgaria and Albania. Poland had impressed us as a poor and suffering country when we crossed it on our way to the Soviet Union. It looked relatively prosperous to us on the way back. Its fields seemed better tended, its flocks more numerous, its people much better dressed. A detail: Eyeglasses which are most difficult to obtain in the Soviet Union, seemed to be plentiful in Poland, and dark glasses, in particular, for which exorbitant black market prices are being paid in Moscow, apparently are no longer a luxury in Warsaw."

Gunther, with his well-known reporter's camera eye, had these observations on Moscow, which has always been the show window of the Soviet Union far better provided than the provincial towns:

"One reason why the streets are so thronged at night, even in winter, with crowds solidly marching down the boulevards in broad phalanxes and men and women carrying infants swaddled to the eyes, is that homes are so unbelievably crowded, squalid, and uncomfortable. People, even after a hard day's work, rush out of doors simply because the circumstances of life at home are so tedious, if not unbearable. . . .

"What contributes most to Moscow's superficial look of drabness is people's clothes. These have certainly improved in the last few years, but they are still revolting.

. . . . Russians are, as a result acutely conscious of the clothes foreigners wear, particularly their shoes, and people on the street will offer to buy your shoes off your feet. The whole country has a fixation on shoes. Moscow is the city where, if Marilyn Monroe should walk down the street with nothing on but shoes, people would stare at her feet first.

And in the sizable Black Sea port of Novorossisk, what struck Gunther most was that "so far as we could tell, there was not a single cafe in the whole city, not a place to sit down in, chat without guide, who had a characteristically Russian volubility and have a drink. We saw nothing but the lean walls of factories and tenements, blotched with snow."

INEDIBLE PLANS AND STATISTICS

Soviet leaders in their official speeches and Soviet apologists among foreign visitors try to divert attention from the deadly drabness of Soviet daily life by two methods. They pour out reams and volumes of statistics about increasing output of coal, iron, steel, cement, copper and what not. And they point to new buildings, new installations, subways, dams, hydro-electric power plants, factories which have sprung up since the Revolution.

But there is a fallacy in both these approaches. Few Americans, except economic specialists, know or care how much coal or steel or copper or electricity is produced in the United States. What Americans are interested in is what they can buy in the shape of food, cars, houses, household appliances, and other consumables. Statistics are not something that can be worn or eaten. It does the Moscowite, crowded with his family in one or at best two rooms in a squalid tenement, little good to tell him that the government proposes to build such and such a quantity of housing in 1965.

The argument which has impressed some impressionable visitors to Russia, that the Soviet regime, if it has not "overtaken America" has achieved wonders in transforming an economically retarded country, is also open to serious objection. For the assumption is that Russia, under a different political and economic system, would have stood still during the last forty years. And such an assumption is contrary to the facts of Russian development before the Revolution.

PRE-REVOLUTIONARY PROGRESS

During the forty years before 1917, Russian businessmen and engineers, with the aid of foreign capital, built a large network of railways, created centers of industry that were quite up-to-date for the time, developed the coal and iron resources of the Donets

Basin and the Valley of the Volga. Russian grain, largely produced on efficient private estates, flooded the markets of Europe. The money received for this grain made possible the importation of many European products that made daily life much easier for the average Russian. The Russian standard of living, low by West European Standards was steadily rising. There were not enough schools, but the number was steadily increasing. Some of the most solid apartment houses in Moscow and Leningrad, far better constructed than the typical Soviet housing project, bear dates between 1905 and 1914.

So there is every reason to assume that during a period of forty years, Russia under a non-communist political and economic system would have gone ahead and achieved most, if not all, the economic progress for which the existing regime likes to claim exclusive credit. There is also every probability that this progress would have been achieved without certain accompaniments for which the Soviet regime bears exclusive responsibility: famine, slave labour camps, and a prodigious discrepancy between what the people produce and what they receive. This discrepancy is explained partly by the obsession of the Soviet leaders with militarist development, partly by the prodigious losses and waste motion which are inevitable when a bumbling, fumbling bureaucracy tries to replace the normal functioning of the free market with arbitrary decrees regulating production, wages and prices.

CONSIDER THE FACTS

A few indisputable facts and figures show how fantastic is the suggestion that, within any future in sight, the Soviet Union will provide better living for more people than the United States does at the present time. One-eighth of the American population, working on farms with modern machinery and improved agricultural methods, produce enough to feed the whole country and even to pile up unmanageable surpluses, along with exports for foreign markets. Over half the Soviet population, employed in agriculture, produces a distinctly skimpy diet for the Soviet people—a limited privileged upper class excepted.

The United States normally produces about six million passenger cars a year and has gone as high as eight million. The Soviet Union's record output of motor vehicles, in 1957, was 495,000, but most of these were trucks. There were only 114,000 passenger cars. So the motor car advantage of the United States is about 50 to one. Most Soviet cars are reserved for the needs of the State and party bureaucrats.

The holiday on the road is commonplace for vast numbers of Americans, including a great many workers and farmers. And this type of holiday is being enjoyed more and more in Western Europe. But it is virtually unknown in the Soviet Union. Visitors to Russia who have motored from the frontier to Moscow or from Moscow to the Crimea are impressed by the absence of traffic on the roads. The arrival of a car especially a car of foreign make, in a Soviet village causes excitement and interest comparable with the circus coming to town.

The United States reported over 60 million telephones in operation at the beginning of last year; the

last official figure for the Soviet Union was \$61,000, only a little over the average annual number of new installations in the United States. One of the first discoveries of the visitor to Moscow is that there is no generally accessible telephone book.

It is not only in comparison with the United States that the Soviet Union comes off badly, on the showing of its own figures, in Khrushchev's chosen field of competition; economic well-being. The Federal Republic of Germany, a speck on the map compared with the Soviet Union, is much poorer in natural resources and was flat on its back ten years ago, as a result of war bombing and negative occupation policies. But Germany in recent years has been turning out, by comparison with the Soviet Union more than twice as many automobiles, three times as many cameras, almost three times as many motorcycles, and more watches and television sets. And what West Germany actually put up in housing in 1957 was very close to what the Soviet Union planned to build, although the Soviet population is four times the German, and the Soviet need in housing is almost indescribable.

GIVING PEOPLE WHAT THEY WANT

A dictatorship, also to conscript labour and concentrate all national resources on a single objective, can always put over a crash programme from building pyramids, auto highways, sputniks, or whatever may be the immediate desired objective. But only a free economy can give its people a high standard of living. Such a standard of living never has and never will come about as a result of state planning and allotment and allocation, of fixed wages and prices and state directed labour.

For a plausible definition of a high standard of living is giving people what they want. And this can only be done when a large number of producers big and small are dependent for profit and survival on satisfying the needs and desires of consumers, as expressed through a free market, giving the individual not so many square yards of housing space, but the kind of house he wants, along with a long list of other commodities and services. Only an economy operating on the powerful twin motors of the profit and wage incentive system and competitive free market can give the individual the complex of material satisfactions and add up to what is known as a high standard of living.

It is the failure to gear production to consumer needs and desires that makes for the appalling drabness which even friendly and sympathetic observers usually report after visiting the Soviet Union and other communist-ruled countries. This is why Soviet clothes are so shoddy and Soviet apartments often begin to show cracks in the plaster as soon as they are put up and why John Gunther could not find a single public cafe of tearoom in Novorossisk where he could sit down and relax.

Communism cannot give freedom, political or economic, or cultural without ceasing to be communism. That is why the Soviet Union will always lag far behind the United States in the enjoyments and satisfactions which it can give its people—unless Russia scraps communism or the United States persists in its abandonment of the basic principles of the free individualistic economy.

REVOLT IN CENTRAL AFRICA

Is the Experiment in Racial Partnership Doomed to Failure?

By T. L. Kantam

THREE powerful movements are fast changing the face of the Dark Continent—nationalism, racialism and detribalization. The tensions in Central Africa, which have been highlighted by the recent events in Nyasaland, involving rioting, shooting, mass arrests and deportations, show the inter-play of all these three forces. But they have their roots in the past, in the greed for gold, the desire to extend the British Empire and the means adopted to achieve these objects.

“RHODES: COLOSSUS OF SORTS”

In 1888, Cecil Rhodes, whose methods were those of a robber baron, negotiated with the African king Lobengula and obtained exclusive metal and mineral rights over an area of about 75,000 square miles for the paltry consideration of £100 a month and one thousand rifles and ammunition. It may be mentioned here that this region was the greatest gold field of the ancient world.

Mineral rights, however, were not enough for Cecil Rhodes and the British South Africa Company he organized and which obtained its charter from Queen Victoria in 1889. Political and personal ambitions came into play and so in 1890, a column of 200 white South Africans engaged on a promise of a 3,000-acre farm and 15 gold claims each, occupied Mashonaland on behalf of the Company and hoisted the Union Jack on what is now Salisbury, the capital of South Rhodesia. The Africans were perfectly peaceful and offered no resistance.

Three years later, the chartered company invaded the adjoining Matabeleland with the help of 672 white men, each one of whom was offered 6,000 acres of land and 20 gold claims. As an additional inducement they were promised “loot”, half of which was to go to the Company and “the remainder to officers and men in equal shares”. Over 10,000 warriors were killed in this war before the Company’s troops could claim victory. The new country was named Rhodesia after Cecil Rhodes.

From 1889 to 1914, the Rhodesias, both North and South, were administered by the British South Africa Company. When the Company’s charter expired in 1914, there were three possible alternatives. First, the Company could get its charter renewed. Second, the Rhodesias might join the Union of South Africa. Third, South Rhodesia might become a British colony. The British government, in the end renewed the Company’s charter for ten years, with the stipulation that the people might be granted self-government even during that period. In 1922 bitter quarrels arose between the Company and individual settlers. The British government held a referendum on the future of the country. By a narrow majority, the electorate chose not to join the Union of South Africa, which was the original intention but to become a self-governing British colony. In September 1923 South Rhodesia was annexed to the

British Crown as a self-governing colony and the rule of the Company came to an end.

North Rhodesia and Nyasaland were not conquered by the British. The Chiefs of these territories voluntarily placed themselves under British protection and entered into treaties with the great Good Queen Victoria. When the Company’s rule ended, they became British Protectorates.

CENTRAL AFRICAN FEDERATION

When the future of these territories was under consideration, Sir Andrew Cohen, who is considered one of the most brilliant minds in the British Colonial Service, “sold” the idea of a federation to the then Colonial Secretary in the Labour Government. A draft constitution was prepared in 1952. It aroused a great deal of controversy both inside the British parliament and outside. Finally, the House of Commons decided to set up a federation by 304 votes to 260. The people of North Rhodesia and Nyasaland had no opportunity to vote because they were British Protectorates but the entire African population of these territories was strongly opposed to federation.

In South Rhodesia a referendum had to be taken, since it was self-governing. Out of 40,000 white voters, about 25,000 were in favour of federation.

And so the Central African Federation was established on October 23, 1953 by the merger of South Rhodesia, North Rhodesia and Nyasaland. The inhabitants of this area are united neither by language, religion, history, geography nor convenience. Physical contiguity, British rule and racial tensions are the only common factors.

Although Nyasaland is the smallest of the three Federation sisters (49,177 sq. miles) it has the largest African population, about 2,630,000. The Europeans number about 7,500 and the Indians 10,000. The country is called the “Land of the Lake” and it “clings to Lake Nyasa like a long green caterpillar attached to a blue leaf”, the blue leaf measuring almost 7,500 square miles. It is agricultural and though fertile is unable to feed the large population. Every year thousands of Nyasaland young men go to the Rhodesias and Union of South Africa to find work.

North Rhodesia is nearly twice as big as South Rhodesia and about six times the size of Nyasaland. The North Rhodesian Copperbelt is the second richest copper deposit in the world and produces about 450,000 tons of copper a year, valued at about 175 crores of rupees. The whole economy of North Rhodesia as well as the federation depends upon copper. This metal forms two-thirds of the country’s exports, yields one-quarter of the total national income and one-third of all federal tax revenue. The heavy fall in the price of copper (the London price fell from £436 to £160 per ton between March 1956 and

March 1958) has proved disastrous to the country's economy and has added to the Federation's troubles.

In spite of the industrial complex, large areas have been left virtually undisturbed. There are in North Rhodesia, 65,000 Europeans 2,127,000 Africans and 8,000 Indians.

South Rhodesia, with an area of about 150,000 square miles, has the largest European population, about 175,000. Almost half of it is South African. The Africans in South Rhodesia number 2,311,000 and Indians 14,000. One half of the total land and the best land is owned by Europeans, though they constitute less than a eighth of the total population. South Rhodesia is largely agricultural. Partly for this reason and partly for historic reasons, the African population has not been so active in organizing itself as in the other two territories.

PROS AND CONS OF FEDERATION

The British pushed through federation for a variety of reasons. One was to make Central Africa a bulwark against the spread of South African influence northward. Another was to protect British interests in this vital part of Africa. "One strong country is better than three weak countries". More than anything else, it was regarded as a hopeful experiment in racial partnership, since if successful it would set the pattern for the evolution of multi-racialism in other countries, such as Kenya.

PROBLEMS OF "PARTNERSHIP"

The 1953 Constitution states that "partnership" in racial matters is to be the official policy of the new country. The term is left vague and undefined. The legislatures of the three constituent territories are given the power to legislate on African matters. Thus South Rhodesia could and does continue its policies of legal separation and social discrimination against the Africans and Indians, patterned closely on the practices in South Africa. On the other hand, continuing Colonial Office control over the two Northern territories means more liberal policies in them, though discrimination continues to exist in all the three territories.

It is not the constitutional issues that bother the African so much as the daily application of discriminatory laws and attitudes. In most areas strict pass laws require the carrying of papers and documents justifying each coming and going. Segregated and vastly inferior bus services are daily irritants. Scores of thousands are packed like sardines into new townships, miles away from their places of work. Lawrence Vambe, Editor of the *African Eagle* returning enthusiastically from a State Department sponsored tour of the United States was promptly ejected from the "Embassy" Hotel in Salisbury, after he had been invited there as the guest of an American firm. Such instances could be multiplied. No wonder that the terms "partnership" and "multi-racialism" have become discredited among the Africans, who define the present "partnership" between the African and the European as that between the horse and its rider.

WELENSKY VERSUS TODD

A major issue in Central African politics is the feud that has developed between Garfield Todd, formerly Prime Minister of South Rhodesia and Sir Roy Welensky, Prime Minister of the Federation. This feud which is a conflict between the two leading personalities in the Federation has deeper roots. It may be regarded as a collision between the Rhodes tradition, represented by Sir Roy, who "consciously models himself on the Empire Builder" and the Livingstone tradition, represented by Todd himself, a Missionary. The latter has an obstinate and genuine belief in the "partnership" concept, which the "great majority of the White Central Africans understand to be a principle to be admired, like the Ten Commandments, rather than a practice to be followed".

The clash between these two leaders has extended to the Central African public at large and even into the international scene. While African, British and American public opinion favoured Todd, South African and Central African white opinion supported Welensky. The crisis has been arrested by the resignation of Todd from the Prime Ministership of South Rhodesia in February 1958 and his replacement by Sir Edgar Whitehead, a close associate of Lord Malvern (formerly Sir Godfrey Ruggins, who was Prime Minister of South Rhodesia for twenty years and the first Federal Prime Minister and who is now in retirement).

The Africans trusted Todd and looked upon him as one who was devoted to their gradual advancement. His downfall is viewed by them as further evidence of their helplessness at the hands of European politicians over whom they have no control.

WHAT OF 1960?

The federal constitution is due for review in 1960. Sir Roy Welensky has long complained that while Ghana and Malaya headed for independence at "breakneck speed", the Federation finds itself "forgotten". He, however, ignores the fact that if the British control were removed from the Federation, power would pass not into the hands of the majority but to a small settler-immigrant managerial class, thus creating a second "South Africa", the prevention of which was one of the main objects of the Federation. Sir Roy has made it clear that while he is at the head of the government "there will never be any question of our considering universal adult suffrage". Is it any wonder then that the people of Nyasaland, whose ancestors voluntarily placed themselves under British protection, were alarmed at the prospect of their being "sold down the river" to the South Rhodesians?

Nyasaland is all Livingstone country. The great doctor has left a rich heritage. The people are intelligent, hard-working, reliable and imbued with a spirit of adventure. Their passionate yearning for self-government cannot be crushed by outlawing the well-organized and militant Nyasaland African Congress.

As Keith Irvine, an authority on African affairs and editor of "Africa Weekly" says "The tide of history in Africa is increasingly running in favour of Africans. The sooner the Whites... recognize this fact instead of opposing it, the smoother the course of that history will be—and the sooner will a new society and a new civilization be built in Africa that will genuinely reflect the aspirations of that continent's inhabitants".

NEWS DIGEST

INDIA ASKS FOR COMPENSATION FOR ASSAULT AND LOOT BY PAKISTANIS

NEW DELHI, March '3: India has asked Pakistan to punish the culprits responsible for the raid on an Indian national's house within the jurisdiction of the Karimganj Police station of Cachar District and also to return the loot and compensate the injured, Mr. Nehru told Mr. V. K. Dhage in the Rajya Sabha today.

Replying to a short notice question, the Prime Minister said that three Pakistani soldiers and one civilian had raided the house of an Indian national in the village of Ratanpur on February 28, assaulted the inhabitants, exorted Rs. 1,700 from the owners and molested two women.

Asked whether such instances of molestation of women had become common, the Prime Minister said that he did not think so.

BORDER INCIDENTS

The Prime Minister said that there used to be very frequent incidents on the Assam-East Pakistan border. But, on the whole, they had gone down. Recently, there had been incidents on the West Bengal-East Pakistan border.

The Prime Minister said that, regrettable as it was, it should not be assumed that molestation of women had become some kind of "common industry on the border." Even if two or three objectionable cases had taken place, they could not march an army across.

Mr. Bupesh Gupta asked whether Pakistani aggression had not been increasing in the last six months and whether this was not as a result of encouragement to Pakistan by U. S. aid. The Prime Minister said that it was a question of inference and not of fact.

Mr. Gupta asked whether the Prime Minister's attention had been drawn to the fact that when such instances took place, the American press played them down and presented them in a manner as if both countries were equally guilty.

Mr. Nehru: I have not noticed it recently.

Sentence on Indian: The Indian High Commissioner

(Continued from Page 12)

K recently accused Col. Nasser of wanting to swallow Iraq; but his tender heart felt no such chivalrous solicitude for the rape of Tibet by Chinese communists. Our Prime Minister has in effect taken the view that Tibetans were never free and so have no business now to aspire for such a status. The apostle of dynamism, the evangel of the atomic age, the insatiable revolutionary is, not for the first time, backing the wrong horse here. We have been aping the manners of a great power; but when an opportunity is given to us to act greatly, we seek mean safety in the role of a Parolles. But

Three cheers to Goray—

Hip, hip, Hooray!

For wanting to save the patriots of Tibet

From falling victims to the gibbet!

Libra

at Karachi has taken up with the Pakistani Government reported the sentence of death passed by a Military Court at Sialkot on an Indian national, Mr. Sardul Singh, for alleged smuggling, Mr. Nehru told Mr. Nawab Singh Chauhan.

The Prime Minister said that the High Commissioner had asked for a copy of the judgment and other details and requested that in the mean time the sentence should be stayed. The Pakistani Government had asked the West Pakistani authorities to stay the execution of the sentence pending further orders.

Rehabilitation of D.P.s: The Rehabilitation Minister, Mr. Mehar Chand Khanna, refuted the charge, reported to have been made in the West Bengal Assembly by the State Minister for Rehabilitation, that the Center had discriminated in the matter of rehabilitation of refugees from West and East Pakistan.

Replying to a short notice question by Mr. Bupesh Gupta, Mr. Khanna said that the clarification of the West Bengal Government had been sought on the speech of the Minister, Mr. T. K. Ghosh. The reply was still awaited.

PAKISTANI TROOPS USE HELICOPTERS BORDER FIRING INTENSIFIED

MURSHIDABAD, March 12: Pakistani armed forces continued firing heavily for the fourth day today on the border village of Char Rajanagar, official sources here said.

The firing was going on as reports of heavy concentration of Pakistani troops along the Pakistan side of the border were being received here.

The reports said helicopters were being used for movement of Pakistani troops.

Three Indians have so far been injured in the heavy and continuous Pakistani firing on this sector, since it began on Friday, last.

The intensity of firing increased as darkness fell, reports said.

Meanwhile, attempts by the District Magistrate of Murshidabad to bring about a cease-fire at a meeting with his counterpart in the Rajshahi (Pakistan) have so far failed.

The Pakistan District Magistrate did not turn up at the appointed place for the meeting yesterday.

Official sources said that Indian border security forces were compelled to reply Pakistani firing in self-defence.

The sources added: "Determined action would be taken to defend Indian territory against Pakistani aggression."

It was officially learnt that the District Magistrate of Murshidabad was informed by the Rajshahi Magistrate (East Pakistan) on telephone that in the firing by Indian security police, two persons, including a sepoy of the Pakistani armed forces, were killed. The Rajshahi Magistrate it was stated, also demanded compensation for the alleged loss of two lives.

LOAN FOR INDIA

NEW DELHI, March 12: Under the United States Developmental Fund Loan Programme, announced at

Washington on Wednesday, India will receive 175,000,000 dollars for the development of railways, steel imports, cement and the jute industries.

No condition has been fixed as to the nature of repayment of the loan. It can be paid in rupee currency also.

About 40,000,000 dollars is for the import of structural steel products for the manufacture of nearly 20,000 freight cars, 300 steam locomotives, 600 coaches and 2,500 underframes in our factories.

There is also provision for the import of buses, trucks and jeep components for the betterment of road traffic in India.

In public and private sector of the steel industry, the loan provides an aggregate of 40,000,000 dollar for the import of machinery from foreign countries.

BOURGUIBA AND NASSER

President Habib Bourguiba of Tunisia, following his last month's break with the United Arab Republic on the charge that Nasser was trying to become dictator of the entire Arab World, arrested a group of Egyptian Officers who, he said, had been sent by Nasser to Tunisia "to assassinate the chief of state himself and overthrow the present regime." He denounced Cairo's inflammatory propaganda and its intervention in the Algerian struggle. Western diplomats are hopeful that Mr. Bourguiba's firm stand will cut down the flow of Nasser's influence, guns and agents towards the west, and thus make easier a local settlement in Algeria. Britain and the United States, notwithstanding French objections, are expected to send arms to Tunisia in the near future.

Egypt's President Gamal Abdel Nasser is being taught the bitter lesson that politicians seem unable to learn by any method other than painful and direct experience; that you cannot do business with Moscow, except on Moscow's terms. Like so many tempted souls who deal with the devil, Nasser paid no attention to the blood sealed terms of the contract when he welcomed Soviet "technicians", asked Soviet political help against the "Western Imperialists", and accepted Soviet economic aid to store up his hard pressed economy. His half-opening eyes suddenly begin to see that though Syria voted union with Egypt in the United Arab Republic, it is Moscow's agent, Khalid Bakdash, who has been gaining control over Syrian policy; that Moscow, not Cairo, is the favoured beneficiary of Iraq's anti-Western revolt; that throughout the Mid-East the Communists are showing that they

India's Foreign Policy A Critique

BY
OM PRAKASH KAHOL

Price 50 Naye Paise

This pamphlet will be given as a gift to the new subscribers of "The Indian Libertarian"

Published by
THE LIBERTARIAN SOCIAL INSTITUTE
Arya Bhuvan, Sandhurst Road, Bombay-4.

are as adept to anti-Nasser as at anti-Eisenhower slogans. So Nasser, caught in his trap, tries with one hand to lash out against the local Communists while with the other he signs the agreement on Soviet aid for the Aswan Dam. The lesson, that is to say, is still only half taught.

INDIRA GANDHI

Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, Socialist leader, told a Press Conference here today that the election of Mrs. Indira Gandhi as Congress President was a concrete development in the theory who should succeed Mr. Nehru as Prime Minister.

Dr. Lohia said that she had been a good freedom fighter in the past and should prove a good Prime Minister.

DR. LOHIA WENT THIS WAY

Dr. Lohia has paid us a flying visit and has offered Kerala the benefit of his views on diverse things including plantations. It would be presumptuous to suggest that he does not know a great deal about most of the things he comments on, but Dr. Lohia is not the kind of politician who will be stymied by the mere fact that he does not know the facts.

It is reasonable to ask Dr. Lohia, although it may not be quite prudent, why does he think plantations are fit to be nationalised? Has he any special reason why they should be? Is it because they are foreign-owned? Would his advice be changed if he knew that British-owned plantations cover less than 20% of plantation nationalized because they are prosperous? Or is he against scientific agriculture? The correspondent who put the question to the Socialist leader did not care to follow up his question with why Dr. Lohia thinks plantations should be nationalised?

Those who think that we are a humourless, mordent people would do well to go through Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia's not infrequent statements on men and matters. He has contributed his bit to the lightening public life to the vaporous quality of his ideas.

Read

The Indian Libertarian

IT STANDS FOR FREE ECONOMY
and
LIBERTARIAN PHILOSOPHY

Published Every Fortnightly

Price Single Copy 25 Naye Paise

Annual Subscription Rs 6/-

Post Paid

Write for a Sample Copy to:

The Circulation Manager
Arya Bhuvan Sandhurst Road,
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

DUNCAN ROAD FLOUR MILLS

BOMBAY 4

Telephone: 70205

Telegram: *LOTEWALLA*

JUST OUT

DIAMAT

by PHILIP SPRATT

A most penetrating criticism of Dialectical Materialism in the light of recent findings in psychology. A real treat to anyone interested in philosophy.

Price Rs. 2-8-0

Available at:

**LIBERTARIAN PUBLISHERS LTD,
ARYA BHUVAN,
SANDHURST ROAD
BOMBAY 4**

A BOOK IN A THOUSAND

*Very Frank and Correct
analysis of Political
Trends in Asia*

THE CHALLENGE OF ASIA

BY DR. RALPH BORSODI

Chancellor of Melbourne University

Price Rs 15

*Concessional Price of Rs 12 to Members of the
Libertarian Social Institute and to the Subscribers of
"The Indian Libertarian"*

Available from:

**Libertarian Book House
Arya Bhuvan, Sandhurst Road
Bombay, 4.**