

# The INDIAN LIBERTARIAN

Incorporating the 'Free Economic Review' and 'The Indian Rationalist'

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS  
WE STAND FOR FREE ECONOMY AND LIBERTARIAN DEMOCRACY

MAKE ENGLISH THE LINGUA FRANCA OF INDIA

Vol. VIII No. 1

Ym 2 N 5 KO

IN THIS ISSUE

April 1, 1960

	PAGE		PAGE
EDITORIAL	76685	1	<i>A Short History of Political Power</i> by Bernard Iddings Bell
<i>Containing Red China</i> by M. A. Venkata Rao	5	5	DELHI LETTER
<i>The Silver Lining</i> by M. N. Tholal	8	8	BOOK REVIEW
RATIONALIST SUPPLEMENT	I-IV	I-IV	NEWS DIGEST
<i>Whose Fascist Baby Are You?</i> by J. Vijayatunga	11	11	OUR BANGALORE LETTER
			LETTER TO THE EDITOR

## EDITORIAL

### HIGH-HANDEDNESS OF THE GOVERNOR OF BOMBAY

THE country has been shocked by the extraordinary high-handedness displayed by the Governor of Bombay in suspending the judgment of the High Court in the Commander Nanavati murder case. The High Court sentenced the Commander to life imprisonment but the Governor intervened and suspended the Order of the Court till an appeal of the condemned person to the Supreme Court was disposed of. It may last some months! It appears that the Governor has the right to do so under the Constitution. But the letter of the law is one thing, its spirit is another. There was no urgent need, no fear of grave disaster or misdirection of justice, no national or political emergency such as popular upheaval if the sentence was carried out uninterfered with by the executive.

The Prime Minister answered in Parliament that he was approached in the matter and that he advised the Governor and the Chief Minister, to that effect.

His explanation was that the period of suspense

was brief pending appeal to the Supreme Court and that if the Commander meanwhile suffers imprisonment, he will be debarred according to service regulations from being employed again! What a trivial excuse to justify such a scandalous and grave executive misdeed! If service regulations come in the way of the re-employment of an officer wrongly imprisoned, surely the regulations can be waived at the discretion of the executive? Law and the highest Courts in the land should have commanding precedence over all service regulations. The executive has no justification to set them aside to smoothen the career of an officer, however high-placed he might be. This is a great blow to the stability and sanctity of good government and democratic institutions. This shows the trend towards dictatorship in the mind of the Prime Minister. The claim of being more than a Prime Minister that he once openly made is receiving a sinister meaning by such acts that the country cannot afford to overlook.

The sort of climate in which a Soekarno could dismiss parliament and our neighbour could establish a martial law administration overnight, making a clean sweep of all democratic pretensions, (it

appears) is not far from the skies of our country. The intelligentsia has to take due note of this tendency on the part of the Prime Minister and give the right lead to the people so that prompt resistance to such acts of dictatorship might be organised in constitutional ways and save democracy in India.

### THE SUPREME COURT'S OPINION REGARDING TRANSFER OF BERUBARI ETC.

The transfer of Indian territory in the Bengal border at Berubari and in Cooch Behar to Pakistan, agreed to by Premier Nehru in the Nehru-Noon Agreement some time ago as part of border settlement was challenged by the citizens of the area as ultra vires of the Indian Constitution. They held that the Prime Minister was not within his rights to effect such transfers of Indian territory without sanction of parliament and that even the parliament had to pass an amendment specifically for the purpose and could not legalise such transfers in the ordinary way by a simple majority vote. The question was therefore referred to the judgment of the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court has now expressed itself on the matter. It holds that the Prime Minister and parliament are not competent under the present laws to effect such transfers of territory to other nations.

The Prime Minister has already stated that suitable amendments would be brought forward to legalise the Nehru-Noon Agreement!

Apart from the law and Constitution in this matter, people concerned, the inhabitants of the areas

in question and politically conscious elements of the population in Bengal and indeed all over the country, have been shocked at the casual way in which our Prime Minister deals with the land and its people. He treats them as if they were his personal or family property! It transpired during discussion and interpellation in parliament that the West Bengal Government and official experts in the Central and State Governments were not consulted before the agreement was signed with Sir F. Noon of Pakistan! To such questions, the Prime Minister vaguely replied that of course officials were there with the negotiating Ministers i.e. himself. But what is the use of having highly paid experts if they are not consulted? Relevant knowledge should be brought to bear on grave issues which should not be disposed of by the impulse or sentiment of the Prime Minister operating in the void. It is also noticed that in all the agreements signed with Pakistan so far, the Indian side has always been the loser! For, the Prime Minister is more prone to be magnanimous at the expense of the country than keen to defend national interests!

This is part of the reason for the people's opposition to the forthcoming Nehru-Chou meeting at Delhi to negotiate the Chinese border aggression. The Defence Minister's calculated reference to administered territory in his speech at Chandigarh derives a sinister meaning in this context. It looks as though it is decided beforehand to surrender unadministered territory (in this case the Ladakh area under occupation of the Chinese) in exchange for assurances regarding the spots in the Punjab, U.P. and NEFA!

### CHOU ENLAI IS CALLED 'HONOURED GUEST'

Mr. Nehru has referred to Chou Enlai as "Honoured guest" both in the letter sent to him and in conversation with press people and others. He has asked that "the honoured guest" should be given the warm hospitality characteristic of our country. Now this is outrageous. The threat to India posed by China extends far beyond the border areas yet occupied. It may extend to invasion! Nehru himself has said that the hostility between the countries may extend to years and decades! It portends a serious longstanding rivalry between the two Asian Powers for supremacy and leadership in Asia and Africa.

It is a travesty of the truth and an affront to Indian sentiment to call Chou Enlai, the invader whose hands are dyed with the blood of Indian sepoys and police officers as honoured guest. By using such grotesquely inappropriate terms, (hiding hostility and hatred to enemies natural to human beings,) and demanding that the people should suppress their natural instincts and put forth the emotions he demands on their part to support his dubious and pusillanimous policy, Mr. Nehru seems to be claiming totalitarian control over the emotions of the people!

The people may refrain from demonstrations to

**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.

facilitate the Government's negotiations, but to offer honour in place of hostility and hatred is beyond them.

### MR. KOIRALA IN PEKING

Mr. Koirala the Prime Minister of Nepal has a difficult task. He has signed a new treaty with India giving clearer expression to the consciousness of mutual security as between India and Nepal and to solidarity with India. But he has also to please China by professing neutrality!

He has been on a visit to Peking where he has been treated with great consideration and respect. He was given a real glimpse of China's military might, particularly her Air Force. Mr. Koirala referred in his speech to the rising power of Asia and warned outside Powers to respect Asian nations as equals and not to seek to subjugate them and intrigue among them as before.

The words he used were capable of being read as a warning to China as well, asking her as a Big Power to respect small nations and not to covet imperial control over them!

There have been rumours of Chinese entries into northern Nepal for reconnoitering and photographing. There have been reports that Chinese agents have been trying to subvert the loyalties of the simple hill tribes and ordinary people of Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan and announcing the forthcoming arrival of the Chinese Liberation Army! Glowing accounts of the prosperity of the common people under Red China are being circulated in pamphlets and by word of mouth.

The number of Chinese traders and others in India in these border areas and in Calcutta has been increasing. The Government have not yet initiated any policy to check this propaganda and infiltration. The design of the Reds is clear—to take these areas over under their protection and detach them from India!

### MR. KRISHNA MENON AGAIN

The complaints against Mr. Krishna Menon seem to be legion and never-ending!

a. The shaktiman trucks that were constructed in the Defence establishment in the teeth of opposition have proved unsatisfactory. The specimens supplied to the Dandakaranya Refugee Settlement were found unworkable. The answer of the Defence Minister when questioned in parliament was that they were since set right!

Why did the Defence Minister insist on manufacturing these trucks in the defence department ordnance factories instead of purchasing them from private companies, Indian and Foreign? Why did he want to favour foreign manufacturers in allowing them to set up a manufacturing plant for the Defence Department?

And are there not items more urgent than motor trucks to be manufactured by the Defence depart-

ment—such as munitions, tanks, rifles, grenades, tank-bursting bombs and other fighting equipment? Tents, trucks, jeeps, cloth, blankets, food materials, shoes etc. should all be purchased from civilian contractors and private traders and manufacturers. The resources of the army should not be wasted on less urgent civilian goods. But our Defence Minister is a law unto himself.

b. The magazine Link. It is well known that the newly started Link has a pronounced communist slant. It is also known that the Defence Minister is its patron whom it glorifies giving him the spotlight even before Nehru.

A questioner asked whether it was true that 4000 copies of such a communist journal were ordered by the armed forces authorities. Mr. Krishna Menon evaded a direct answer. He said that journals are ordered by different units at their own discretion and that no overall order was given to them from the Ministry to purchase any particular journal! But a suggestion might be conveyed by word of mouth. Parliamentarians and publicists are not so green as to swallow such an answer. All is not well with the patronage exercised by the Defence Minister in all matters.

c. The Bombay Journal Current splashed the news recently that the Defence Minister has promoted Lt. General Kaul out of turn and has favoured him in other ways. Prime Minister Nehru took it upon himself to defend Gen. Kaul in a public press conference castigating the journal for circulating scandal. He defended both the Defence Minister and the general. The general was also charged with purchasing mules from Italy for the army at an exorbitant cost.

The procedure of the Prime Minister once again smacks of unconstitutionality and lack of propriety. The proper place for Gen. Kaul to defend himself is a tribunal. The word of the Prime Minister and Defence Minister is not enough to clear such charges.

The fact that they played a notable part in winning freedom in the past does not confer on them the right to ignore all canons or decency, honesty and integrity in administrative matters.

### NEHRU AND THE PROPOSED TRIBUNAL TO TRY CORRUPTION CASES

Mr. Nehru has clearly rejected the suggestion of Dr. Deshmukh for the institution of a Tribunal for trying cases of corruption in high places—ministers and high officials.

The utmost he would concede was a party committee to go into cases referred to it by the Congress president!

No one is satisfied with this response. Mr. Nehru should remember that the offences complained of are offences against the people as a whole by those responsible for good government.—The government

consists of party men. The party is equally responsible. Any inquiry by the party is therefore only an inquiry by the guilty organisation itself, the accused trying their own case!

People will not be satisfied with anything less than a high powered judicial tribunal with the powers of a High Court.

Mr. Nehru had also said that he would refer such cases to the retired chief justice Mr. S. R. Das. But the judge seems to have refused the assignment, knowing that it was a thankless task and that he would be expected to whitewash the affair. He did not fancy the job of pleasing the Prime Minister at the expense of justice and good government.

It is clear that the Prime Minister has nearly exhausted the tremendous reservoir of goodwill and homage he had from people of all ranks, intelligentsia and masses alike and is holding on to power by sheer patronage and the adherence of party men who cling to him as part of self-interest, for without him they would be nowhere.

### THE BUDGET AND THE THIRD PLAN

After the era of Planning, the central budgets have become prisoners of the Plans, as it has been aptly said.

The budget does not prepare the country for heavier Planning in the next phase. It has not attempted at all to control the inflation that is continuing and depending. The figure of Rs. 153 crores of deficit financing mentioned for the remainder of the Second Plan is too heavy considering that already we have exceeded Rs. 1200 crores recommended by the Mahalanobis Planframe. The taxes suggested will raise prices for the middle classes and the common man. There is no guarantee of adequate food production. The proposal to continue the policy of heavy industries constituting the major part of the Plan and to allot only Rs. 600 crores for good grains increase is a distortion that will extort heavy penalties in the coming years. The authorities seem to be unable to forget and to learn anything, like the Bourbons of France!

READ

ENGLISH  
or  
LINGUISTIC CHAOS  
(Our Language Problem in Perspective)

By  
A. RANGANATHAN

Published by:  
The Libertarian Social Institute,

Arya Bhuvan,  
Sandhurst Road (West),  
Bombay-4.

Price: 25 nP.

This is not stability with progress but development without stability. Some classes may benefit but the bulk of the people will find life becoming harder day by day. The spate of strikes by all organised Unions is an indication of the wages seeking to catch up with prices. The Government have to provide Rs. 50 crores for salary increases!

### PAKISTAN SHOWS HER TEETH AGAIN

There is no doubt that there is much clearing of the air in Pakistani public sentiment about India. There is less of jehad cries egged on by League politicians.

High ranking Indian news correspondents have been invited by Pakistan's new Government under General Ayub Khan to tour the country and see for themselves the new tone of the administration and the changed outlook of the common people and officialdom.

They have reported that things are better as regards popular attitudes to India and that the new government is popular. The Pakistanis have discarded the old politicians once for all and are content with the present dictatorship.

They also report that General Ayub Khan seems to be sincerely anxious to have an agreement with India on all matters, particularly on defence matters. He is keen on a joint Defence Pact with India.

But on Kashmir he seems to maintain the old firm demand of the Pakistanis for the whole of Kashmir and Jammu. The General told Mr. Prem Bhatia (Newspaper Correspondent) that he would not be satisfied with the present portion of Kashmir under his control. He wants the full pound of flesh. He is not adamant about the plebiscite. Any other method would suit him. But talks should get started for any move onward!

But meanwhile the old type of propaganda seems to have started again. Pakistan has printed postage stamps bearing the map of Pakistan including Kashmir and Jammu within its borders! Maps also include Junagadh and Manavadar in Gujerat as part of Pakistan! The old way of raising all settled questions seems to have been revived in these ways. Pakistan has also registered her claims to Ladakh and protested against any possible surrender of the area to China by India as part of her appeasement policy. Pakistan had already complained that India has been unable to defend the territory she claims and should therefore hand over jurisdiction over Kashmir and Ladakh to Pakistan, so that it may not go to China through the incapacity of India.

Any agreement with Pakistan will therefore imply further concessions to her by India, unless India is able to forge new bonds on the basis of reciprocity and equality of sacrifice by both in the common cause of security and well-being.

# Containing Red China

By M. A. Venkata Rao

**E**XCEPT the Prime Minister and his habitual supporters, it is clear that thinking people from all sides have become convinced that a real change in policy is required to meet the challenge of Communist China's aggression on our northern borders.

In addition to expressing opposition to and dissatisfaction with the present policy, critics have an urgent duty of offering a constructive alternative. The direction in which such an alternative is to be sought has been indicated by a number of influential politicians not to speak of publicists without official position in party or government or legislature. Mr. Hanumanthaiya, former chief minister of Mysore, known for his independence of thought and expression suggested in the Bangalore Congress session that India might form a cooperative defence association with the other States in South and South-east Asia to pool resources and concert united measures to halt further advance of the Red Dragon southward through India, Burma or Vietnam or Indonesia. Three members of the Congress party also made tentative suggestions through amendments that India might not rule out defence alliances with threatened neighbours or others if the need should arise later. But the Prime Minister poooh pooohed the suggestions. He dismissed Mr. Hanumanthaiya's suggestion as belonging to the impossible, discredited idea of a Third Force mooted and dismissed some time back. He advanced no argument to make the idea of a cooperative defence association with our immediate neighbours appear impracticable. He got rid of the amendments of Congressmen in the AICC through a tornado of passionate invective shedding no light whatever on the question.

Mr. M. R. Masani has broached a similar idea in a recent speech in the present budget session of Parliament. He pointed out that the cooperative defence idea he was envisaging need not be like the SEATO and CENTO with European and American members who act as senior and dominating partners. The cooperative defence organisation for South Asia might buy or obtain arms from outside from either bloc but without any obligation to assist in any crusade against international communism led by Russia and China. In spirit, it will confine itself to resistance to aggression on the area from whatever quarter it may come. It might be modelled on the lines of a collective security Pact directed against any aggressor on any member of the contracting group. Aggression on any one will be automatically considered to be aggression against all. Automatic procedures of mobilisation with quotas of contribution in men and material may be settled beforehand.

But the way to any such commonsense understanding is barred by the present policy of the Prime

Minister and by the whole drift and commitments of his stand all these years, dictated as they have been by a soft, tender-minded interpretation of the good intentions and peaceful progressive character of Russia and China as communist States. While Mao Tse-tung and his colleagues were winning out in China, our Prime Minister as an expert on communism and world politics popularised the idea that they were not full Marxist-Leninist-Stalinists committed fanatically to the orthodox pattern of world revolution destroying earlier culture and creating a proletarian international classless State accepting implicitly the lead of Soviet Russia as the pioneer and pathmaker of world revolution. He accepted the slogan popularised by the communist strategists themselves and spread among fellow travellers throughout the world, particularly in the USA official circles, that Mao and his friends were but nationalist agrarian reformers, harmless to the rest of the world! Now he speaks of the expansionist character of the rulers of China through the centuries. Even yet, he wants us to forget the communist character of the Chinese inspiration but remember only the aggressive quality of their age-old imperialism.

When it was suggested that India should enter into a joint defence pact with Pakistan, the Prime Minister exclaimed: "against whom?" He made himself recklessly responsible for the huge assumption and interpretation that there is no danger to India from China and Russia and their bloc of satellites.

It is clear therefore that it is no longer possible for us to have confidence in the Prime Minister's reading of the world situation, particularly as it bears on the role of communist States in the struggle for the world—which is the basic reality of and a new factor in world politics today.

The people of India have to forge a new and more efficacious policy to contain the menace from the North and possibly from the East as well through Upper Burma.

Before we develop our suggestions for such a policy, it is necessary to deal with the Prime Minister's passionate attachment to the policy of non-alignment in spite of the present set back to it occasioned by the Chinese breach of Faith and cynical treatment of the sacred formula of panch-sheel.

He fears that if India gives up the policy of nonalignment, she must automatically side with America in the war of the blocs. This would perforce antagonise Russia. At present Russia has taken a neutralist attitude so far as outward expressions go in regard to the Indo-Chinese imbroglio.

While acknowledging that she is tied up with Red China with unbreakable fraternal bonds, Russia has also said that she is developing successfully bonds of friendship with India. She suggests that the differences between the two friends should be settled peacefully through negotiations. The Prime Minister's policy of a no negotiation before vacation of aggression, forced on him by public opinion in parliament and outside clashed with this advice and so we have the reversal of policy on Russian advice involved in the invitation to Chou En-lai without mention of conditions.

To repudiate non-alignment now is to throw away whatever advantage there might ensure through Russian moderation of Chinese intransigence. Also, the inner communist strategic bond between Russia and China will then become an overt factor. Russia will then side openly with her colleague and India may have to face Russian forces as well on the Northern border! This is the real fear operating in the mind of the Prime Minister and his advisers or disciples and supporters.

This is a development that the protagonists of new policies in this matter have to reckon with and provide for in their constructive suggestions.

There is no doubt that a reversal of policy today is not easy and involves a radical change of outlook based on a radically different interpretation of the world scene.

First of all, a decision has to be taken on the extent of the military operations for which India should be immediately ready if the policy of military resistance should be resolutely embarked upon. Is it militarily possible with the resources of men and materials we have (and can augment in the near future within operational time limits) to deploy our forces all over the area from Ladakh to NEFA beyond the tops of the Himalayan ranges? Or is it necessary to abandon the undertaking as beyond our resources but make a stand in the plains, using guerilla tactics to harass enemy forces on our own territories with the Himalayas as the fertile provider of favourable ground for "hit and run" methods?

There is the risk that ejecting invading units from Indian soil may extend the range of the fighting and entail full scale war. Should we not be prepared in every sense for such an extension—military and civil, economic and psychological?

The Chinese have planted a whole army equipped with modern weapons and have built roads and air bases in Tibet. Possibly that army is about as large as ours or even larger. At any rate, it is capable of being reinforced from Chinese home areas by air, as roads and railways connecting Tibet with the interior of China are not yet completed.

If we decide to fight on Tibetan ground beyond the Himalayas, it would be foolish and shortsighted not to mobilise the Khampas or Tibetan freedom fighters who are yet carrying on a forlorn struggle in the remote interiors of the vast country.

As for the frequent statements of the Prime Minister that the areas involved are very high, remote and barren and inhospitable in climate (fighting in which is very difficult and not to be contemplated at all, even by our regular forces,) it is necessary to point out in reply that this is the language of the leader who refuses to understand the hard realities of statesmanship. Also, Indian troops and officers were trained by the British for fighting on mountainous ground in the Northwest Provinces. They fought well in the early phases of the Kashmir war on high ground in inhospitable areas near Leh, the capital of Ladakh and saved it for India, airlifting even tanks to the remote, inhospitable area snow-bound for most of the year!

When rulers inherit a country such as ours with high mountain ranges for long distances on the border, it is common sense that they immediately set about fortifying it with fortresses at suitable intervals and a liaison with the tribals in the area and a system of roads and convoys and patrols keeping up communications in all weathers. This is laid down from remote times in India and is mentioned as the duty of the king or emperor in the Code of Manu and the Arthashastra school.

The Mauryans guarded the passes and mountain borders from Kabul in the northwest to Assam in the northeast by such a system for three centuries. The Guptas had to encounter Scythians, Sakas and Hunas within the plains, because they had given up the forward areas beyond the passes like Peshwar.

There are two stages in any effective policy of dynamic defence containing the Reds.

In the first stage, we may be content with stabilising a practicable border after negotiation with the intruders. If we cannot oust him by military action from the points occupied by him in Ladakh, the U.P. and NEFA, we may concede without agreement the new status quo and treat it as the de facto line pending development of strength and an opportunity to restart the campaign for clearing the land of the enemy.

We may remember that this is how at Brest Litovsk, Trotsky left the negotiating table and allowed the German generals to take as large a slice of Russian territory as they wanted, without legitimising it with formal consent!

So too we may surrender temporarily the area in Ladakh occupied by the Chinese without putting on it the mantle of our willing consent. We may concentrate on stabilising the de facto line. We should be ready to put up a fight somewhere, the line being determined by patrols and preparations and outposts and proclaimed to the whole world.

The second stage will consist of moves to clear Tibet of the new imperialist masters, suzerainty or sovereignty notwithstanding. We should meanwhile espouse the Tibetan cause and broadcast it to the whole world. We should reverse our stand on this question in the UNO. We should have the courage

and consistency and love of democracy for all, small and big among nations, to demand freedom for Tibet before the UNO and the world's publicity centres and chancelleries. If we have the courage and idealism to demand freedom for Algeria risking the displeasure of France, we should have the courage likewise to support Tibetan national freedom. If the communist imperialists are antagonised thereby, we should have the courage to face it. We surrendered Tibet to the communist wolves and agreed to call it "the Tibetan region of China" in 1951. We should now have the honesty and repentance to remake the Deed. We gave status to falsehood and tyranny. We should remedy it now by giving or restoring reality to Tibetan nationalism.

It may be said that if the much stronger Western nations could not go to the rescue of Hungary from Soviet wrath, we could not be expected to go to the rescue of Tibet. But such is the challenge of history, the right and effective response to which holds the key to our own freedom and prestige and future in the world of free nations. We retain our freedom by going all out to defend the freedom of others closely bound up with our destiny.

Far from regarding the Dalai Lama as a nuisance, we should recognise him as the exile ruler of Tibet, even as Britain recognised Free French Forces under De Gaulle as the legitimate ruling group of France in exile and Polish personalities in England during the war as the future Government of Poland.

Of course the Chinese would be incensed but we should be unmoved and proceed with our policy.

Meanwhile, we should take military measures to strengthen the defences of Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan along with our own borders—it may be, minus the Ladaki area now under Chinese occupation.

We should develop close understanding with all South Asian countries—Ceylon, Burma, Malaya, Singapore, Indonesia, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos etc. without exception. In consultation with them we should establish and proclaim a perimeter of Indian and Asian Defence, a Line enclosing a Nehru Doctrine or Indian Doctrine within which we warn off all imperialist adventurists—Western or new style Communist, whether military in form or indirect and subversive through local agents and quislings and Janos Kadars.

We should develop an appropriate ideology or philosophy in support of such a radical new policy distilled out of nationalism and democracy as living faiths. We should hold forth the vision of a world of free nations observing panchsheel, (if we like to use the discredited term). But panchsheel is negative and contemplates only non-interference. We want a positive doctrine giving the basis for a mutual programme of assistance in case of attack by third parties. There is no better term for it than collective security. We should deposit such a regional

collective Pact for South Asia with the UNO. It would be better than the present SEATO and CENTO as it will exclude nations outside the area and will not be directed against any bloc in explicit terms—as the SEATO and CENTO are against the communist bloc.

This group will take arms help from both blocs! Such a new policy will entail a great new programme of ideological propaganda in favour of nationalism and democracy for the nations included in the free association. This will counteract the communist propaganda at present having a free field in the areas concerned.

One objection to such a new policy that has been voiced in whispered hints is that it may lead to full scale war with Red China for which India is ill-prepared. India may be defected, too. The consequent bloodshed will have been pointless and would serve no purpose and make no difference to the result.

It is therefore whispered that we should accept whatever concession Chou En-lai may offer in the forthcoming talks and whatever conciliatory suggestion Khrushchev might have suggested to the parties. We should accept for instance an exchange of Ladakh for recognition of the NEFA border and for a concession in regard to pilgrim places such as Manas-sarovar, Badrinath and Kailas.

Such a concession is expected from the Chinese on the analogy of the recent border understanding arrived at between Ne Win and Chou En-lai.

We may accept such a concession but only as part settlement keeping ourselves ready and uncommitted for a complete rectification later on. For this purpose, it is better that we do not accept any formal understanding. We may recognise what cannot be helped as a de facto settlement but with no obligations to respect it longer than it suits us! The analogy for us is that of Brest Litovsk of Trotsky and not that of Ne Win and Chou En-lai. The Burmans now are detached from us and from any South Asian solidarity by means of the clause of non-aggression that is included in the agreement.

We should keep the Tibetan freedom struggle alive, with the maximum help we can render while we consolidate settlements and develop collective security arrangements and expand defence forces and equip them adequately.

We may send volunteers to Tibet even as the Chinese sent volunteers to Korea. We should have grit and spirit enough to play game on this plane! Turkey and Egypt are displaying such spirit and realism and keenness. We should show similar courage and tenacity.

To hold back from such a logical development on the ground of the dangers of violent action entailing the death and mutilation of tens of thousands of young men and the destruction of cities

(Continued on page 8)

# The Silver Lining

By M. N. Tholal

THE Chinese aggression on our borders has, from a long-range point of view, done us a lot of good. Not only that. It is going to do us immense good, if we possess the capacity to survive. Mr. Nehru's shibboleths, born of pique over the Western attitude on Kashmir, have held undisturbed sway for years, mainly because we shared his pique as a nation. His foreign policy based on that pique was a truly national policy, inasmuch as it was enthusiastically supported by all the major political parties in the country. It is far from honest on the part of some of them to turn round now and blame Mr. Nehru for the consequences of pursuing a policy which they have been applauding all along, though of course in the interests of national survival there should be no limit to the agonising re-appraisal of that policy which has been going on in every honest heart since the Chinese aggression became known.

In short, we trusted the Communists, knowing that they were not trustworthy, and are now suffering from the consequences of that trustfulness. Prime Minister Nehru has himself summed up the situation as "breach of trust," but the legitimate fear now hovering over the minds of patriots is that Mr. Nehru, refusing to acknowledge the basic and fundamental wrongness of the policy he has been pursuing, will be tempted to persist in it for the sake of prestige, instead of admitting his Himalayan blunder, and invite the nation to continue treading the path which is full only of breaches of trust, until the Indian Communists, with the help of Chinese arms, take over the government of the country.

## PLAIN COMMONSENSE

Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar has been attacking socialism with his usual brilliance, but far more im-

(Continued from page 7)

by air-bombing is to relapse into the psychology of subjection to which we have been accustomed for so long. Such a cost is inherent and inescapable in the very being of national sovereignty and self-government. If we cannot bear the burden, we pass under those who can, once again!

The present policy of Sri Nehru is to surrender bit by bit the areas claimed by China without developing the will and power to resist further encroachments militarily.

Even the Gandhian Kripalani proclaims that until non-violence becomes the instrument for effective resistance, we cannot rule out war in self defence. But Nehru and Krishna Menon have ruled it out.

portant than the issue of socialism is that of our foreign policy which today threatens our very existence. An incursion on the NEFA region, of the extent we have already witnessed in Ladakh, will be the beginning of the end of all our hopes of survival as a nation, and we do not seem to realise the gravity of the situation facing us. (Mr. Nehru in that case will complain again of "breach of trust," this time perhaps with reference to Soviet Russia, and may even admit that he has been fooled. But what solace will that give the country? No country's territorial integrity and security should be made to depend on the words of foreigners, much less of those whose political ethics teaches them that promises are made only to be broken.) I have, therefore, been wondering why Mr. Rajagopalachariar, who alone of all the great leaders in the country has shown, at least of late, no signs of being afraid of Mr. Nehru, or of earning his displeasure, should have failed to give expression to the grave doubts which must have assailed him regarding the policy of non-alignment in which Mr. Nehru has openly threatened to persist.

Indeed, I was on the point of writing an "Open Letter to Rajaji" in these columns, in an attempt to make him realise the gravity of the situation and the unpatriotic, if not treacherous, character of the determination to persist in the policy of non-alignment which has already landed the country in a crisis that threatens her very existence, when, to my great satisfaction, I read in the dailies an address by him to the Eastern Study Group at the India Exchange Auditorium in Calcutta denouncing our neutralism in the cold war and giving expression to the advisability of dropping the non-alignment policy as one side of the Communist Bloc has, by displaying a spirit of aggression against us, made it impossible for us to persist in it.

What Rajaji said in Calcutta is of course only plain commonsense. But in this country, ridden with inferiority complex, we require even commonsense to be stressed with the utmost emphasis at his command by some great man if it is not to be pook-pooked by the public. Where, for example, is the sense in persisting in neutralism when a very important and powerful member of one bloc has been attacking us for the last five or six years? Even if we had no ideological affinity with the other bloc—which we have to a very great extent—we should have, under the aggressive circumstances in which we find ourselves started leaning towards it and seeking its aid and protection for the sake of maintaining the territorial integrity of the country, which is one of the principles of Panch Shila and aggression against which lays the country open to Communist subversion. Having that ideological affinity we should, indeed, have no hesitation in turning to



our ideological brothers, and even in making amends for the wrongs, if any, which we might have committed in our emotional moods and which might have been responsible for leading us astray from the truly democratic path. The time has indeed come for (what Gandhiji used to call) turning the searchlight inwards and for a change of heart.

### MILITARY AID TO BURMA

Every one who has been following India's foreign policy closely knows the turn it took as a result of Anglo-American support of Pakistan over the Kashmir issue in the Security Council. In the Korean War, we were with the western powers, so much so that the Chinese Communist Radio stigmatised our Prime Minister as the "running dog of American imperialism". Surely and slowly the popular tide in India turned against the USA and Britain as we saw to our surprise that they were supporting Pakistan on our complaint of aggression by it in Kashmir. Our surprise was all the greater as legally, technically and constitutionally, our complaint was justified and there could be no doubt that Pakistan had invaded what was Indian territory. However, our Prime Minister played into the hands of Pakistan and her democratic friends by accepting plebiscite in Kashmir as the solution of the problem and then, finding that a plebiscite would go against India, backing out of it. (In the meantime India had also marched her tanks into Hyderabad, justifying the complaint that we annexed Kashmir on obtaining its Hindu ruler's signature while we annexed Hyderabad against its Muslim ruler's wishes.)

The reason Mr. Nehru gave for backing out of the plebiscite—American military aid to Pakistan—would have been just and fair if Pakistan had not sought American military aid, but in the circumstances it was as funny as funny could be. Surely there was no commitment on the part of Pakistan to the effect that she would follow Indian directives in her foreign policy, breach of which vitiated Mr. Nehru's acceptance of the principle of plebiscite. A free country has the right to render and receive military aid to and from other countries. If we are so much against military aid, why did we supply it to Burma in the hour of her need when Burmese Communists were knocking at the gates of Rangoon, thus turning the tide against the Burmese Communists? What business had we, if we were really neutral, to interfere in a civil war between Communists and non-Communists in Burma?

### COMMUNISTS FISHING IN TROUBLED WATERS

That also brings us to another not altogether irrelevant point. Can we really expect any sympathy and friendship from Russia or China after the military aid we extended to Burma to suppress the Communist revolt in that country? Can we after that expect either of them to believe in our neutralism? It is indeed extremely naive on the part of our Prime Minister to expect anything substantial

from Mr. Khrushchev after our secret military aid to the Burmese Government to suppress the Communist revolt—aid which was openly acknowledged by the Burmese Prime Minister. Even if this deterrent to Communist sympathy with India were not there, it would be foolish to expect Communist Governments to change their policy towards non-Communist Governments simply because Mr. Nehru has been repeating some of the Communist clichés and shibboleths and slogans. The Communist bosses must be knowing only too well that Mr. Nehru's condemnation of the cold war and NATO and CENTO and SEATO is the price he has to pay for Communist support of his stand on Kashmir. When that Soviet Government voted the proposal to send United Nations forces to Kashmir to hold a plebiscite there, it was only fishing in troubled waters. And who can say after the radical change in India's foreign policy brought about by that veto and what preceded it, that that fishing expedition has not proved a very paying proposition and is still paying dividends—most of all to the Chinese?

As the Americans say, Mr. Nehru has made Communism respectable. He has, with some success among the politically backward people of Asia and Africa, equated Communism with Democracy. He has lent the weight of his moral stature, however ill-founded it may be, to bolster up Communism and its relentless bosses—all because they helped him mitigate to some extent the condemnation of India by the Security Council. What is more, by threatening to go over lock, stock and barrel to the Communists—and paving the way for it—Mr. Nehru prevented the Western Powers from continuing their condemnation of India and thus brought about a stalemate over the Kashmir issue. That was of course a great victory for India and for Mr. Nehru personally, and it became absolutely necessary for him to hide the price India was paying for that victory—hide the fact of Chinese invasion of India and of Chinese incursions into Ladakh, publication of which would have earned for him brickbats instead of the bouquets he was receiving.

So Mr. Nehru went on earning his bouquets by a simple subterfuge, that of hiding the fact of Chinese incursions, and thus fooling his countrymen. But no one can fool the whole world for all time and the incursions became known despite Mr. Nehru's natural desire that they should not be known, and he had at long last to admit the same in Parliament—five years after they began—though it must have occurred to him that the delay in announcing the fact of Chinese incursions would go against the Indian claim to Chinese-occupied territory. What is even more important to note here is the simultaneous nature of Russian support of India in the Security Council and the start of Chinese incursions. The Russian support in fact gave the green signal to the Chinese. The Communists did not wait even for a few years to claim their reward. Having cut off India from all possibility of receiving western military aid, Communist troops started moving into

Ladakh. (No wonder Mr. Khrushchev respects our neutrality!) And yet there are some apparently sane people in India who doubt the fact that the Russians and the Chinese are playing with divided cards, with the fullest possible confidence in each other!

#### UNITED FRONT IN SOUTHERN ASIA

Not only that. To discredit the obvious fact, all kinds of plausible theories are being officially inspired to throw dust into the eyes of patriotic Indians. The Russians, we are told, are now afraid of the growing might and expansionism of the Chinese, who may tomorrow claim Russian territory bordering on China, as well as the Russian puppet state of Mongolia. They are naturally afraid, we are told, of the increasing Chinese population, which may be a thousand million in the near future, staking its claim to supremacy in the Communist camp by virtue of numbers. Therefore it is in Russia's interest to put a curb on Chinese ambitions by supporting India against China. And thus, it might be asked, giving those ambitions a Russian direction instead of allowing them to ventilate themselves in India and communizing the whole of Southern Asia. But then of course, in the interests of Mr. Nehru's reputation as a miracle-worker, we are not expected to follow a reasoning to its logical conclusion. We are expected to stop just where the reasoning bolsters up his stand rather than proceed naturally to the conclusion which exposes his stand as absurd, illogical, unreal and unpatriotic in the extreme.

Mr. Rajagopalachariar was therefore emphasizing the obvious need of the hour when he declared that his party would "organise a united front in Southern Asia to deal with nations in a more satisfactory way than the present Government is doing." Indeed, such a front is absolutely necessary in the interest of international peace, which Mr. Nehru's non-alignment policy has jeopardised. Are the Chinese incursions on our borders and the forcible occupation of 12,000 square miles of our territory by Chinese troops conducive to international peace? If war has not flared up with China as a result of her aggression, it is due to Indian forbearance which, again, is admittedly due to our inability to cope with the armed might of China.

Such a humiliating position cannot even be met by a united front in Southern Asia, because China receives incalculable military aid from Soviet Russia, but what the proposed united front will enable the southern Asia nations to do will be to ask for and obtain American and other western aid to cope with Communist aggression. As Rajaji implies, we cannot even ask for and hope to obtain western assistance in quality and quantity sufficient to cope with Communist aggression so long as we are divided against one another.

#### AMERICAN ASSISTANCE ESSENTIAL

As against the implied assertion of Mr. Nehru

that we are a mighty nation which with reference to China is as far from the truth as untruth can be—Rajaji says frankly that "American and other western assistance is essential to cope with any Communist aggression" as "our strength is not enough." The plural pronoun before strength refers to a united Southern Asia. In other words, Rajaji is not prepared to concede that even the united front of Southern Asia will be mighty enough to cope with Communist aggression. That is of course plainly true. Untruth is unrealistic and to be unrealistic is to invite disaster. That is exactly what the present Government has done and is doing.

Says Mr. Rajagopalachariar: "If we have a united body of nations in Asia ranged against Communism, then western assistance on honourable terms can be brought easily without creating any mutual tension among ourselves. I think the present Government does not accept this policy which it should." Rajaji is putting it very mildly. The present Government does not accept any proposition which is likely to deter the Communist Governments from the path of aggression! It does not believe in alignment even to ensure survival. It believes in the hand-to-mouth policy of appeasement and buying off the aggressor, which is only putting a premium on aggression. It does not believe in military aid from the only bloc which can render it to us against China. And not believing either in alignment or in military aid from any quarter, the conclusion is irresistible that it believes in submission to Communist aggression.

The wise learn from other's experience; the fools not even from their own. It was Communist aggression in Eastern Europe which resulted in the cold war and the formation of NATO, both of which have been unequivocally condemned by Mr. Nehru time and again, when it should have been obvious to him that to condemn them is to promote the interests of Soviet colonialism and to campaign against the independence of countries resisting Communist domination.

Of course Mr. Nehru had his reasons. Those reasons were selfish and by some stretch of imagination can even be called national. Evidently he hoped that, as a quid pro quo for his support to Russian and Chinese wrongs, China would forbear or at least Russia would prevent China from being aggressive towards India. But that policy has miserably failed, as it was bound to fail, because there is no generosity in politics and countries, particularly Communist countries, are not swayed by flattery and khusnamad-like Mr. Nehru.

Our foreign policy has been based on suppression veri and suggestio falsi—suppression of truth and suggestion of falsehood. We thought we were very clever and for some time, at least, by the simple stratagem of hiding the fact of Chinese incursions, Mr. Nehru earned a name for himself both in India and abroad as a great tactician who had

(Continued on page 11)

# The Indian Libertarian

## Rationalist Supplement

### DISCUSSION

## Free Thought And Politics

At the suggestion of Sri R. B. Lotvala, a seminar on CURRENT POLITICS was held at 9, Broadway, Madras, on Tuesday the 15th March 1960. Free thinkers, Rationalists, Libertarians, Humanists, and followers of M. N. Roy were present and actively participated in the discussion.

The occasion was enlivened by the presence of Mr. Sydney Willats, a veteran Australian Rationalist, who visited Madras on his way to England and spent considerable time at the R. L. Foundation Library. Mr. Willats described the growth of the Rationalist movement in Australia. One characteristic difference that Mr. Willats noticed between the movement in Australia and that in India was the practical boycott of such meetings in India by ladies, while in Australia at least half the audience consisted of the fair sex. Mr. Willats emphasized the importance of enlisting women in the cause. Surely the members present had their wives, their sisters and their daughters and the least that a Freethinker should do to advance the cause he had at heart was to persuade his women-folk to accompany him to attend these meetings.

Mr. Willats said that he had that day visited Mr. P. Ramaswami, editor of the Tamil weekly "The Atheist," who was in trouble owing to a prosecution launched against him by the Madras Government for publishing articles which were said to offend the religious sentiments of Roman Catholics. Mr. Willats had been in correspondence with C. L. D'Avoine who edited the Rationalist monthly "Reason", from Bombay, thirty years ago, and who was prosecuted in 1934 on a similar charge by the then Bombay Government for offending the religious susceptibilities of Roman Catholics. C. L. D'Avoine was acquitted by the Bombay Magistrate who took a liberal view of the matter and the judgment in that case might now help Mr. P. Ramaswami in Madras. Mr. Willats presented a poem on "Colour Bar" by the British Poet, Mr. W.H. Wood. This poem was

circulated among the Freethinkers in Madras in honour of Mr. Willat's visit.

Opening the discussion on CURRENT POLITICS in the Seminar, Mr. S. Ramanathan said: "The Political situation in India to-day is so complicated and confusing that it is very difficult for a Rationalist to find out what he should do. Man is a political animal and if he is to live a life of freedom he should participate in politics. But in the atmosphere, now prevailing in India, it is impossible for anyone pledged to a life of freedom to give political expression to his inmost longings. It is asserted by many that politics in India is getting polarised between the Congress at one end and the Swatantra Party at the other. The Congress is supposed to express the ideology of Statism, that is, the total denial of freedom of self-expression by the individual while the State monopolised all activities, economic, cultural and political. It is said that the Swatantra Party is the sole advocate of freedom for the individual and the confining of the State to the necessary minimum function of preserving law and order, the State acting as a kind of umpire during the inevitable conflicts and rivalries between individuals. If this talk of polarisation were true there would be no need for Rationalists and Libertarians to worry. They may join either party just as they fancy and in the actual working out of political principles, the party promoting the wrong principle would eventually be found out by the public and its Government would be displaced by that of the rival party. But in India we have the peculiar phenomenon of an admixture of conflicting principles leading to an actual negation of all principles and the conduct of politics merely on the strength of personalities. Such a state of affairs would inevitably lead to totalitarianism. Pandit Nehru is not a man of principles. He has the special knack of borrowing enemy's thunder. The Congress derived its present strength from the personality of Gandhi and Pandit Nehru inherited his present

authority and hold on the masses because of his professed adherence to Gandhi's principles symbolised by the Charkha, meaning a travel back to primitive times and the boycott of modern science and technology. But when the Socialist movement reared its head, Nehru made a clean somersault and proclaimed his support to the Socialist pattern of society to be brought about by a series of five-year plans. This change over was not genuine or full hearted because Nehru still retains his firm hold on the Charkha with one hand while he laps up modern machinery with the other. The five year plan is a curious jumble of this divided allegiance. Pandit Nehru pretends to be a Rationalist and a Humanist before cultured people but he participates in the crude vulgarity of the Holi festival and immerses his head in the waters of the Ganges during Kumbh Melas. This kind of duplicity to gain the support of the masses of illiterate superstitious people is a total negation of principles and is calculated to make the present regime a permanent fixture. It will lead to a totalitarianism naked and unashamed. However much a totalitarian rule may be watered down so as to make it appear beneficent, it is in essence a negation of political freedom. A movement is needed all over India to lead a mass upsurge against Nehru's totalitarianism similar to the one that was recently witnessed in Kerala which put an end to Communist totalitarianism. The whole world knows that in the recent elections in Kerala Roman catholic and Muslim fanaticism and Nayar communalism fought in alliance with the Congress to defeat the Communists. Life under a totalitarian rule resembles a prison and an escape out of it must be found at any cost.

Dr. J. T. Cornelius, M.D., Ph.D., (Lond.) who has retired from a distinguished medical career, and is at present engaged on the problems of prehistory of Dravidians, next addressed the meeting. He is the brother of Dr. J. C. Kumarappa, that ardent disciple of Gandhi, who stuck to Gandhian principles till his death, and would not agree to water them down to suit the exigencies of politics.

Dr. Cornelius said "Rationalism is a guide to action. Every Rationalist is vitally interested in political action. He is interested in the casting of his vote during elections, even though he may not stand as a candidate. In the welter of cross-currents in present day politics in India, we are confused and undecided. The Current political ideologies may be classified into three types. The first is Statism which leads to the welfare state advocated by the ruling Congress party. This concept encroaches on the rights of individuals for the sake of society at large, in pursuit of welfare objectives. Hence the growth of the public sector in Industry under Congress, as against the private sector. The second ideology is that of the Swatantra party, viz. the protection and promotion of the individual's rights, under conditions of least interference by the state, in opposition to statism. The third type is villa-

gism, the organisation of village societies so well described by the Andhra Rationalist, Gora Ramachandra Rao, who has recently conducted a satyagraha movement at Hyderabad. The principle of villagism is decentralisation, starting with village as a unit for political economic and social development. Sooner or later, we as Humanists have to decide which type of political ideology will make the life of individual fuller, more abundant and richer, and provide greater opportunities for evolutionary fulfilment of ourselves and others, in our modern world of Technology."

Mr. E. Laurant who has dared to be an active Rationalist in spite of being born and brought up in an orthodox family of Roman Catholics, next addressed the meeting. He expressed the opinion that Rationalists as such should have no politics. He said "we are a small group and we cannot afford to fritter away our slender resources by entering the field of active politics which would split us still further into smaller groups. In spite of the many political parties in the country, there are only two prevalent political ideologies. Practically all political parties in India are with the Congress in supporting nationalisation. Nationalisation leads to corruption because nationalised wealth, though it is said to be every body's wealth is nobody's wealth and nobody is interested in taking care of it. As an illustration, there is the prevalence of ticketless travel in Railways. Fellow passengers of the ticketless traveller always side with him, as against the ticket-collector making it impossible for the Railway authorities to bring the offender to book. In co-operative societies, even where they are efficiently run, the profits are much less than in private enterprise though the prices are the same for the consumer. Decentralisation is essential if corruption is to be wiped out. Moreover a strong Central Government always leads to wars with neighbours and in the interest of world peace, these huge centralised Governments ought to be abolished."

Mr. Avadhani, a Telugu writer, formerly of the Andhra Patrika, then explained the Royist point of view and advocated party-less politics.

Mr. M. Somasundaram, a retired Headmaster, an eminent Tamil scholar and author of many books on Tamil literature said "the present chaotic politics in India and the suppression of individuality is a direct result of the discarding of the traditions built up by the ancient Dravidian race who founded an agro-industrial civilisation in South India. The Dravidians were over run by the pastoral tribes of Aryans who came from Central Asia. The first century A.D. when Kari Kala Cholan flourished was the classical era of individual freedom in South India. Tiruvalluvar, the author of Kural, who flourished in the fourth century, advocated freedom for the individual. But by about the ninth century, the Aryan conquest was complete and the whole

country was plunged into an era of darkness, which reduced all human activity to mere conformity. The Muslim and the British advents gave some relief from the tyranny of Aryan oppression. But under so-called Swaraj, India is again plunged into darkness and is again subjected to Aryan conformity. Abolition of Native States is a dubious blessing. The imposition of Hindi, nationalisation of text books for school children and state trading are ominous forebodings. People should rise up and struggle against the tyranny.

Mr. P. Thiruvengadam who is a Tamil writer said "As Rationalists we may discuss politics but we should not participate in politics. We should act like teachers and try to spread enlightenment and free people from superstitions. All of us are Free-thinkers but all are not free men. We have jobs to keep. We may lose our jobs if we are politically active."

Mr. M. Govindan, a writer in the Malayalam language next spoke. He has been a Royist for many years and was an active member of the Radical Democratic party before Roy dissolved it. He said "when faced with religion I am a Rationalist, in politics I am a democrat and by profession I am a writer. My opinion is Rationalists as such should not indulge in politics. I am convinced that India is going to have more and more of nationalisation in spite of the Swatantra party. In the future society of India, the cream of our intelligentsia, will be Government employees and only the scum will be in the private sector. India is a huge country but it is backward and primitive. Only by nationalisation can we make appreciable progress and increase our level of life. Free enterprise is a slow process. Capitalists are exploiters. They are stingy. Laissez faire capitalism is out of date. The welfare state is not a capitalist idea. It was advocated by Lord Beveridge and is supported by the British Labour Party. It is not Communism. Nehru is not totalitarian in the sense that the Communists are. The Dharma advocated by the Swatantra party is pure reaction. Enlightened people cannot join that party let alone freethinkers who seek to free humanity of the incubus of supernaturalism. The millionaires of India now finance the Swatantra party. They supported the Congress until it accepted Socialism. This is only money politics. There was a spontaneous upsurge of the people against the Communist in Kerala. There cannot be a similar upsurge in India against the Congress. Poor Communists in Kerala who did not have one square meal a day became affluent under the Communist Government and began smoking Player's cigarettes. A similar happening is impossible under the Congress rule because Congress is not as efficient a party as the Communist. Partyless politics of M. N. Roy still holds the field. There is nothing to prevent me from advocating my views in my writings without joining any party."

Mr. S. K. G. Rajan, another prominent Royist,

then spoke in defence of Roy's idea of party-less politics.

Sami Chidambaranar, a Tamil scholar and author of many books in Tamil then spoke. He said Rationalists should not take part in politics. The Self-respect movement started more than 30 years ago in South India would have created a mass upsurge against religion in the whole country if it had not made the mistake of entering politics.

He was personally of the opinion that individualism leads to the prosperity of the few and the slavery of the many. Rationalists if they did not enter politics would prevail over every party which might capture power.

Mr. V. P. S. Maniar, a prominent Buddhist and leader of the Scheduled castes said that Rationalism had no popular support. He agreed with Mr. Chidambaranar. He referred to the conference held at the Victoria Public Hall in 1922 which decided that if untouchability were to be abolished, Brahminism should go.

Mr. Ramanathan wound up the discussion by pointing out that he did not propose that the Indian Rationalist Association should become political. But Rationalism should not stand in the way of the individual Rationalists exercising their right to political self-expression. "Rationalism in its essence is freedom to think. It is allied to Libertarianism which advocates full freedom in other spheres besides the thought, like economics and politics. The great Rationalists of the world like Bertrand Russell are opponents of totalitarianism. M. N. Roy had an active mind. Had he been alive to-day he would not still stick to the idea of party-less democracy which has been proved to be unworkable. He would have forged a new political ideology to suit modern conditions. Royists are votaries of truth and truth is not static. Royists should keep supple minds receptive to new ideas which crop up in a changing world. In regard to Millionaires supporting the Swatantra party, it is simply not true. Whatever help the Swatantra party gets from rich people is more or less by stealth. The rich people are still openly supporting the Congress party and giving their money only to the Congress. No industrialist can afford to flout the Congress boss or refuse financial aid to the Congress party, especially under the present set up where every little move in the industrial sphere is controlled by laws and regulations which are exercised at the whims of officials who act as tool of Congress politicians. In regard to the Swatantra party advocating Dharma and religious reaction the same charge can be levelled against the Congress. Pandit Nehru actively exploits religious fanaticism as well as Communalism whenever it suits his purpose. Who knows that after Rajaji the Swatantra party may not throw out

(Continued on page IV)

# This Infamy Of Caste

By A. D. Cohen

FOR the humanist there was much to ponder in the discussion on Hinduism, broadcast as one of a series called 'Four Ways of Life,' the other ways being Islam, Judaism, and Buddhism. Those taking part were Mr. Morris Carstairs (a social anthropologist), Dr. Malhotra, and another Indian.

Unlike the English competitive and individualistic society, Hindu Society is bound by ties of reciprocal obligation of family and caste. The four main groups or castes originally comprised—priests, warriors, merchants, cultivators, and craftsmen, and, lastly, the menial class. If caste were merely a division of functions on the guild model, something might be said for it. It is more a system of religious taboos.

Dr. Malhotra (a Brahman himself) thought caste was 'once a sign of our social advancement' before it became 'the main source of our decadence.' He shrugged it off characteristically as something that 'had no beginning and has no end.' But we do know how it began. There is good reason to believe it was imposed by the conquering Aryans (white), as a device for keeping the indigenous population (black) in perpetual servitude.

It is significant that the same Sanskrit word Varna denotes both colour and caste, and there are many references to colour in the Vedas. The resemblance to Apartheid will be obvious. At bottom it is the exploitation of the weak by the strong, sanctified in the case of caste by religion.

On Dr. Malhotra's own showing, Caste and Karma go together, i.e. a man is born into one or other caste according to his deeds in past lives. Once again we find the priests ganging up with the powers

(Continued from page III)

Dharma and God. There is the precedent of the Congress dropping villagism, the core of Gandhism, as hot potato in spite of the protests of veterans like Kumarappa and Gora who have exposed the fraud involved in such opportunism. 'I do not want Rationalists to join the Swatantra Party but I want them to bring about an alliance of political forces so as to bring about the downfall of the present one party rule.'

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to all those who participated in the discussion.

that be: as the highest caste, Brahmins had every inducement to condition the mass of the people by this means into acceptance of their servile lot.

Gandhi was only partially successful in his attempt to liberate the untouchables and he was inspired not by the Vedas but by the New Testament and Tolstoy. Under India's new constitution, Dr. Malhotra observed, all enjoy equal rights of citizenship. True, but the Orthodox party is still there, waiting and watching in the wings for stage a come-back.

If we forget this infamy of caste, the Hindu way of life is not without its admirable side. In Mr. Carstairs' opinion, Hindus tend to judge a man by what he is, not by what he does. They are apt, however, to make the most sweeping generalizations without offering any proof for them. Truth, they hold, is to be found in the depths of one's consciousness and not by studying the external world; hence their indifference to the imperfections and injustices they see around them. But world renunciation, which all desire, is possible only to the few.

The Hindu's dilemma is how to live in the world without being distracted from the main purpose of life, which is to escape from the wheel of rebirth—a dilemma resolved for him in the Bhagavad Gita, one of the world's great religious poems; you must act in complete detachment from the consequences or 'fruits' of your action.

These abstract, metaphysical ideas, said Mr. Carstairs, are not as remote from everyday life as you may think. Hindu children are taught early to control their feelings, and not to care overmuch either for material possessions or for people. The family will look after its needy members. Hindus learn to live alone, and even the most personal relationships are 'infused with formality.'

Does all this sound too grim and austere a creed? The second Indian speaker, a lady, assured us it was not so. They have their festivities when they sing folk-songs and make bonfires in the night—simple enough pleasures, but it makes for a contented people, living as they do on the very margin of subsistence. To their frank acceptance of sex is probably due to an absence of the many neuroses that attack the sex-repressed European. On the other hand, early marriage brings with it its own problems in a rising birth-rate.

# Whose Fascist Baby Are You?

A bold and frank discussion of the present-day

liberal tendencies in India, and their roots in the

By J. Vijayatunga

**A**S for the schizophrenia that one meets at every turn in India there is an excuse, that it is a reflection of the universal schizophrenia in the world today.

Elsewhere it is a disease, the result of two world wars which brought about a ruthless disintegration of society and complete disillusionment about human values.

But in India schizophrenia has been cultivated and fostered since ancient times. It was isolated and made into a laboratory "culture" in Vedic times. It was introduced into the mental stream of the nation and mothers passed on the strain to their children and instead of its becoming a dreaded virus it became a national trait. Which explains how India is the only country where God and man are worshipped at the same altar.

**Hare And Hound.** A Brahminic money-lender gives money at 12 per cent interest to a Muslim to buy cows for slaughter and the next day joins in a protest demonstration against cow-slaughter or contributes a donation to an anti-cow-slaughter campaign. Cow-slaughter is just an example. All of us have some time or other noticed these paradoxes which have now become a commonplace. Others have found it hard to run with the hare and hunt with the hound; but not those who claim Aryan descent. Long before Hume proclaimed that "carelessness and inattention alone can afford us any remedy," the Brahminic tradition had made sure that nine-tenths inattention. Indeed, attention from those outside the Brahminic fold to what their superiors did and believed was punished with such pleasant tortures as the pouring of hot lead into their ears. The results were most gratifying. They couldn't care less. There was no room for doubt. Dogma made, doubting superfluous. Empiricism, in the circumstances, was just a waste of time.

(Continued from page 10)

successfully defied the western nations and retained Kashmir for India, without apparently suffering any diminution in his moral stature. But the mills of God grind slow and they grind exceeding small, and now we know to our cost what price we have been paying for Soviet support of our stand on Kashmir, as well as the price we are expected to continue to pay for that support. Let there be no doubt about it. In the final analysis we have to choose between Kashmir and India. Both from the point of view of patriotism and of democracy, no Indian, even if he be a Kashmiri like the writer, should have any hesitation in making his choice.

**Aryan-Fascist India.** Everything had been explained, explained away, oversimplified. The mystique of the individual accepting without question the place that a kindly Providence had allotted him was achieved. There was no question of what a word meant or did not mean except for the aristocracy of pundits who sometimes out of sheer ennui went in for a joust of hair-splitting.

"The question is," said Alice, "whether you can make words mean so many different things."

"The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "which is to be the master, that's all."

Who was to be the master was settled at the outset. It certainly was not the populace. It was the Elect. The People had by then accepted without question what the Elect had told them—that biologically the Upper Crust was different from the lower.

In that commerce that then prevailed between India and Asia Minor, a good many of these ideas—censorship, eugenics, infanticide, caste, rule by a priestly oligarchy—had seeped through into Greece, and Plato quickly appropriated many of them and offered them cleverly sugar-coated. Plato's Republic was the Aryan-Fascist India streamlined. Anything less of a Republic than Plato's could not be imagined. India had identified aristocratic prejudice with divine dispensation. Plato wedded divine philosophy to aristocratic prejudice.

Anything but anarchy has always been India's motto. Anarchy is bad, but there are worse things. Anarchy is not the death of the spirit; mental sloth, readiness to welcome any conqueror or a third party from outside so long as the status quo was somehow maintained, the status quo of the upper crust—these have characterized Indian tradition from the time the Aryans descended upon this sub-continent.

**Our Tolerance.** If the methods of the inquisition were not resorted to by us it was because in the beginning itself they had done a thorough job of it—by such devices as pouring hot lead into barbarian ears and the removal of genitals for offences against Brahmins. The greatest crime in the penal code and in the theology of ancient times in India was murder of a Brahmin. You might kill your own child with impunity; matricide, patricide, fratricide, everything, was condoned so long as the sacred person of the Brahmin was inviolate.

Until the time of the Buddha there never was a liberal tradition. A breath of fresh air blew in with his coming, and doubt dethroned dogmatism. Observation and experience instead of theological

dogma were what the Buddha taught. Authority gave place to democracy. Men became equals; women were exalted to the place they should occupy in any civilized society. Even if rule by the majority was still ahead, kings and ministers submitted to rule by ethics.

Mealy-mouthed hypocrisy such as paying lip service to cow-mother scurried and hid itself in dark corners and warrens. A sort of liberal tradition in state affairs and in individual affirmations pervaded the land. But it lasted for less than a thousand years. An arch-apostle of Brahminism, in the person of the Malabar-born Shankaracharya—the current Malabar hegemony is also a matter for concern—did a more thorough job than any vandal could in ousting Buddhism, from Mysore to Nepal.

Human nature soon tires of Panch Sheel. It asks for something to worship—frightful, long-toothed, many-armed gods and goddesses, or at least the phallus, the lingam. So the phallus it became from Sringeri in Mysore to Pasupatinath in Kathmandu.

India never regained the liberal tradition.

**New Europe, New India.** With the European impact and the century and a half of British rule, an educated class came into being and the spirit of questioning became fashionable. They questioned the right of foreigners to rule India; they questioned priestly authority; they questioned the right of one caste to oppress another.

This was also the period of the liberal tradition in Europe. From the close of the 17th century, liberalism had begun to influence European thinking. Evidence as against authority, order without tyranny, democracy as against oligarchies—these were the watchwords of Locke and his contemporaries.

Liberal Britons brought and propagated these ideas in India. Bengal was the first to benefit by them, then Bombay; Madras, then as now the stronghold of Brahminism, was the least influenced by liberalism.

But with the practised flair of the schizophrenia, orthodox Madras accepted with both hands the gift held out by a foreign government. It the British Collector of the district was a Freemason many a subordinate Hindu official became one. Theosophy, boy-scouting, rotary—anything that offered self-advancement without one's having to forego the Gayatri mantram was availed of. They justified their actions in terms of liberalism, but it was a bastard, opportunist liberalism.

The political trend, however, gathered a momentum that had not been anticipated and a goodly number were forced to become extremists. They had the courage of their convictions and suffered for them. But the majority of those who suffered got no rewards for "political suffering," the post-independence disease, and their bones rotted on the beaches of the Andamans and in the dungeons of Port Blair. Their names would not figure in any

record of the Freedom Movement now being written.

A still greater number, more vociferous than the abovementioned, suffered when Reuters was there to see them suffer. These became "political sufferers," and we rub shoulders with them daily, and it calls for some adroitness on our part to escape before they start showing us their operation scars.

Nevertheless the years of political agitation were the most lively within the experience of most of us. Everything was going to be changed, once India became free.

Came independence.

It was nice to start with a fresh slate and call ourselves a secular state. Probably it was for the first time in India's history that the idea had been brought to public notice that religion should not loom large in public affairs.

But one of the ghastliest tragedies in these eleven years of independence was caused by religious fanaticism when a horde of savage sadhus assembled at Allahabad for the Kumbh Mela, trampled to death more than 500 men, women and children. That was a fine bit of secularism, what?

Let us, however, grant that according to the Constitution, the state does not put a premium on religion, not that building architectural ghastly temples and installing in them idols, sculpturally ghastlier, will ever cease to be one of the major activities of the nation.

**Ideology: New God.** But we must be watchful lest an even worse fanaticism, ideology, supplant religion. A few hundreds trampled to death, the sati of a woman here, and another there, the "marriage" of some thousands of children barely seven years old during an auspicious period as happened in Jodhpur recently, the decapitation of a few thousand goats during Kali Puja—these are nothing to the sacrifice and liquidation that would be demanded in the name of ideology, once it raises its head. It has not done so yet, but that is no guarantee it will not. We see signs of it in India today.

In 1940, having attended the Ramgarh session of the Congress and having felt some doubts and misgivings I wrote to Pandit Nehru airing my misgivings. In the course of his reply he wrote to me:

"Political and even economic changes can certainly be brought about suddenly. But human changes are inevitably more gradual and unless human changes take place no ultimate political or economic change has a firm enough foundation. To desire a quick change is one thing, but to have the capacity to bring it about is another. In India it seems to me quite a possibility that a change might be in the direction of greater reaction and that an indigenous type of facism might arise and control the situation. We have seen in Europe during the last few years the victory of reaction in most places in spite of organised and ideologically conscious leftists and advanced groups. In India the classes



out of whom fascism emerges are relatively stronger than in many countries in Europe and any attempt to push them aside completely might lead to disaster..."

That is exactly it. Isn't Indian fascism, whether garbed in sannyasi ochre or invoking the ghost of departed national leaders, pushing the rest of us aside? So long as Pandit Nehru is alive we can enjoy a comparative lull. But what guarantee of immunity have we, once he is no more? Already a language that three-fifths of the people do not want is being rammed into us. If we considered the Austrians in Yugoslavia and the Russians in Poland tyrants because each wanted to impose their language upon a different regional group why should we not condemn the government for the linguistic programme it has pledged itself to?

Intolerance in many other forms obtrudes itself in India today. Prohibition, for example. We should profit by the miserable failure it was in America. It is not that we want a nation of drunkards but we do not want Puritanism to dictate to us. Remember Chesterton's definition: that the Puritan objects to bear-baiting not because it gives pain to the bear but because it gives pleasure to the onlookers. We have a lot of sour-pusses in our midst. They are not exactly ascetics, they are as much flesh-pots as the rest, but they consider themselves superior because they can do without a Martini while you and I might occasionally drink one. In other things that the flesh is heir to they are weaker than most of us. But Martinis they abhor, which makes them the pure in heart. I have watched some of them at close quarters.

**Hugging The Fascist Baby.** Nor is legislation, such as Preventive Detention, what we would have expected from a government which stormed against the gagging of free speech and a free press under British rule. To quote E.M. Forster:

"Democracy has another merit. It allows criticism, and if there is not public criticism there are bound to be hushed-up scandals. That is why I believe in the press, despite all its lies and vulgarity, and why I believe in Parliament. Parliament is often sneered at because it is a talking shop. I believe in it because it is a talking shop. I believe in the private member who makes himself a nuisance."

A free press is almost a misnomer today in India. There are hardly any private MPs; jobukuru is the keynote of our public life. Our press is His Master's Voice. We might be living under totalitarianism. Everything that is national, from so-called classical music, which gives me the pip, to Kathakali, which gives me a pain in the neck, must be praised. Not to praise but to protest is to invite official wrath and public scorn.

Is this how democracy should be fostered? Is this how values are given their right place? To quote Forster again:

"Dante places Brutus and Cassius in the lowest circle of Hell because they had chosen to betray their friend Julius Caesar rather than their country Rome... Love and loyalty to an individual can run counter to the claims of the state. When they do, down with the state, say I, which means the state would down me..."

But how many of us would be condemned today for betraying Julius Caesar and how many called every vile name under the sun for daring to go counter to public opinion? This is not the infant democracy we are holding. This is a fascist baby we are hugging.

Forster regards the periods between wars as "civilization." We have no war on our hands today. But despite the spate of publications by the Publications Division of the Government of India—all of them on heavy art paper and authored by the rankest of amateurs, publications that tell us what wonderful things we have done in 11 years—we cannot regard the years since 1947 as "civilization."

They have been go-getting years for the hustlers and political sufferers and jobukuruwallahs but terrible disillusioning years for those of us who opposed British rule just because we wanted to breathe freely, speak freely and be able to say when we felt like it, "Down with the state."

Try saying it. This is a fascist baby we are nursing. But being schizophrenics we call it the baby of ahimsa sired by the Father of the Nation who was all for ahimsa.

I feel no reassurance in India's future, particularly after Nehru.

—Caravan

## A Short History Of Political Power

By Bernard Iddings Bell

It is undeniable that political history is largely a record of brigandage in state after state, brigandage by a few who have been entrenched in power over the masses, brigandage maintained until revolution has dislodged the brigands. The revolutions have resulted in the installation of new groups, new classes in the places of authority, and then of the corruption of these new groups by

cupidity and conceit. Out of revolution has come new oppression, which in its turn has had to be overthrown. There is no dodging the fact that the stronger the State has been and the more manifold its controls over industry, commerce, agriculture, transportation, the more sure and speedy has been the reduction of the many to a servile condition,

(Continued on page 14)

# Kurukshetra Against Congress

(From Our Correspondent)

**T**HE rise of the Swatantra Party is proving equal to the most optimistic forecasts regarding its future. If the measure of its growth is to be judged by the apprehensions regarding it in Congress hearts, its founders have good reasons to be satisfied with it. It is bound to make its mark on Indian politics to a much greater extent than other non-Congress parties have done, because like the Congress, and unlike other parties, it has got a leader who knows his mind, has a mind of his own and is not lacking in brilliance. At the Patna Convention of the Swatantra Party he summed up the task before the Party in four words: "Kurukshetra against the Congress". The party emerges at a time when the Congress, as well as its leader, stands discredited, when Congressmen are no longer holding their heads high, as during the twelve years of Congress rule since the country gained independence in 1947. The house that Nehru built is in ruins and the cloven foot of the Congress leader is very much in evidence.

If you add to this the fact that only a few Congress leaders share the views of Jawaharlal Nehru and most of them are with him because they think their electoral chances are improved by recognising his leadership in varying degrees, the possibility

(Continued from page 13)

of their enslavement by an oligarchy responsible to the holders of special privilege. Nor can anyone doubt that, as H. L. Mencken has said, in every modern land:

The State has taken on a vast mass of new duties and responsibilities; it has to spread out its powers until they penetrate to every act of the citizen, however secret; it has begun to throw around its operations the high dignity and impeccability of a religion; its agents become a separate and superior caste, with authority to bind and loose, and their thumbs in every pot.

It is hard, in short, to avoid the following convictions; that the whole world is today suffering from statecraft prostituted to carry on ignoble and unjust class exploitations; that our own country is no exception to this; that all round the world the puffing up of government to unprecedented power is sure to result sooner or later in an honest-to-goodness explosion, a revolution nihilistic and anarchic beside which our present social disturbances, waged between various groups of would-be exploiters each entrenched in its imperialistic or nationalistic setup, will seem like a game of tin soldiers.

—Freeman

of a landslide in favour of the Swatantra Party becomes apparent. It will not be going too far to suggest that at the moment many Congress leaders are sitting on the fence, trying to figure out whether they will, or will not be jeopardizing their political future by following their natural inclinations and crossing over to the Swatantra Party. Nothing succeeds like success and much will depend on the coming months.

## NEED OF MERGERS

What the situation demands is a merger of rightist parties, like the Jana Sangh, with the Swatantra Party. The Jana Sanga has no leader worth the name since the demise of Shyama Prasad Mukherjee, and its real leader, who prefers to remain behind the scenes, for reasons best known to himself, has not caught the imagination of the people in the course of more than a decade of leadership. If a leader does not catch the imagination of the public over such a long period, he is not likely to do so when a leader of the eminence of Rajaji jumps into the arena on his side, while the very fact of working behind the scenes is a tacit acknowledgment of deficiencies—both real and imaginary.

Besides, persistence in non-alignment at a juncture like the present may be all right for fellow travellers of Communists. It has hardly any sense in a rightist party even when it is the result of banking on the (now fast disappearing) popularity of non-alignment. Love of leadership will perhaps prevent any merger taking place, but there can be little doubt that the Jana Sangh will again witness some of its periodical defections in groups by those who realise the futility of multiplicity of parties on the basis of love of leadership of individuals. Love of leadership is natural enough, leading one to build a mosque of a brick and a half for himself—as a Hindustani proverb says—but it is the duty of the public, from among whom followers are sought, to put a curb on this self-adulating fissiparous tendency. It is this aspect of the matter, it is felt here, which needs emphasising by the well-wishers of the Party. For all those who are fed up with the Congress and want it supplanted by some other party, the phenomenal rise of the Swatantra Party poses the question: Do you believe that any other party has a fair chance of succeeding the Congress as the ruling party in the near or foreseeable future? If the answer to that question is obviously in the negative, as it is, then there is no practical alternative to supporting and joining the Swatantra Party.

## CHINESE PREMIER'S VISIT

The Chinese Premier's letter to Mr. Nehru,

placed on the table of the Lok Sabha, indicates that Mr. Chou En-lai will be in Delhi for a week, from April 19 to April 25. The duration of the period of his stay suggested by him has naturally given rise to mis-apprehensions in political circles in the Capital. It was believed that the Chinese Premier would be here for a couple of days or so, but the longer period suggested by him shows that he hopes to negotiate the border issue and do so in detail. There is no indication of any sort that the Chinese Government is prepared to withdraw from the Indian territory it has occupied and retrace its steps. On the other hand, the flight of unidentified jets over the NEFA region, on the eve of the visit of the Chinese Premier, is taken here as an indication that the Chinese Premier is thinking of talking to the Indian Premier from a position of strength.

The Government of India, on the other hand, as revealed by the statements of its Prime Minister and Defence Minister, is in two minds, one of which has already conceded what the Chinese have occupied. So, it is argued here, the Sino-Indian talks can only be regarding territories not so far occupied by the Chinese but claimed by them. Mr. Nehru, in one of his statements to the Lok Sabha, was quite definite about the kind of negotiations he could have with the Chinese Premier. He said, "Now let us be clear about certain basic factors, so that they need not be thought to be in doubt. We are committed, from every point of view, to defend our country, to preserve its integrity, to preserve its honour and self-respect." But he also said later that his difficulty was that there were vested interests opposed to an understanding with China. Since it is difficult to imagine the existence of vested interests—apart from the Communists—who are really opposed to defending the country, preserving its integrity and preserving its honour and self-respect, it is quite clear what the difficulty is that they pose for the Prime Minister. Mr. Nehru was obviously thinking of concessions to the Chinese Government when he referred to the difficulty posed by vested interests, which really consists in the patriotism of the people.

Our Defence Minister, who often draws the chestnuts out of the fire for the Prime Minister, made the very significant statement recently regarding the Government's determination not to cede any of its "administered territories" to the Chinese. After all, the public has to be prepared for what is coming and Mr. Menon is doing the valuable work of preparing the public and drawing the odium on himself, instead of letting his Prime Minister bear it alone. Since he has no standing of any sort in the Congress Party, he is the fittest person for the task; and since he owes his job solely to the Prime Minister's favour he has to undertake it to please his Chief. It is no use getting angry with Mr. Menon or even with Mr. Nehru, at least for those who believe in non-alignment. We are only paying through the nose for the policy we have been pursuing.

## CORRUPTION TO CONTINUE UNCHECKED

So, after all, Mr. C. D. Deshmukh's plea for the appointment of an impartial commission to probe into charges of corruption against Ministers has evaporated in thin air, even after the Prime Minister's professed willingness to appoint a judge or an ex-judge of the Supreme Court to investigate specific complaints against any individual against whom a prima facie case is made out to him. That is where the real difficulty comes in. Who could have forgotten the Jeep Scandal in which Mr. Menon was involved, and how members of the Public accounts Committee who were in favour of the matter not being pursued were promoted to high offices and those who were for the matter being pursued to its logical end were in disfavour with the Prime Minister? It was Maulana Abul Kalam Azad's insistence that Mr. Menon should be first cleared of all charges against him in the Jeep Scandal before he is appointed a member of the Cabinet, that delayed Mr. Menon's appointment as Cabinet Minister for a long time. We have no Azad now in the Cabinet. Mr. Deshmukh's difficulty is that a charge made to Mr. Nehru soon becomes known to the individual concerned—Mr. Nehru has himself expressed surprise about how matters about which no one knows anything except himself become known outside—and attempts will then be made to destroy evidence.

The fact of the matter is that Mr. Nehru is inclined to be very soft-hearted towards his supporters. He is known to lament the poverty of the material at his disposal and also for his preference for the flattering section in that material. So what is happening—and everybody knows something about it—is natural enough. Integrity and flattery go ill together. It is only those wanting their palms greased or illegitimate gains who resort to flattery, and where the boss is inclined to succumb to flattery, like Mr. Nehru, the man of integrity is left behind in the race of promotion. Those who knew Mr. Nehru knew all along that nothing will come of the offer made by the Prime Minister to Mr. Deshmukh. At a time when the Congress Party is likely to be in trouble with the public for the foreign policy it has been pursuing, it will be the height of folly for the Congress boss to allow probes into the conduct of his lieutenants, with the probability of those probes showing the public what a corrupt lot these Congressmen are. So we are where we were. One is reminded of the cry of Master Tara Singh that what the country needs is an Ayub to enable her to get rid of the corruption stalking the land. How are the mighty falling in Pakistan and preferring the option of retiring from public life for six years, rather than face a public trial! There is no reason to believe that, under similar circumstances, the option of most of those holding high offices in India would be different.

## PAKHTOONISTAN ISSUE

A communique issued after talks in Kabul between Mr. Khrushchev and Afghan leaders said that a solution to the Afghan-Pakistan problem of the

Pathan border peoples should be reached under the United Nations Charter principles of self-determination. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan responded to the proposed solution by accepting it. He claims that the Pakhtoons of Pakistan have already exercised the right of self-determination through a plebiscite in 1947 and all that remains now is to give an opportunity to the Pakhtoons in Afghanistan of deciding whether they want to continue there or come over to Pakistan. What is sauce for the goose is obviously sauce for the gander too! It is true that in 1947 the right of self-determination was not unfettered; as the choice was confined between India and Pakistan, but those voting for Pakistan were an absolute majority of the electorate.

As the Foreign Minister of Pakistan says, it is reasonable to assume that Pakhtoons, whether they live in Pakistan or Afghanistan, belonging generally to the same stock, want to be together under the same flag. That flag can be either of Pakistan or of Afghanistan, or an independent one. In all probability, according to him, the verdict of the Pakhtoons in Afghanistan will be in favour of Pakistan. Officially inspired propaganda here suggests that, should Afghanistan take Pakistan on its word, Pakistan will be in a quandary. Why then has Afghanistan not taken Pakistan on its word? The truth is that the propaganda regarding the Pakhtoons wanting to join Afghanistan is inspired propaganda and there is no truth in it. With Ayub, a Pathan, at the helm of affairs in Pakistan, the probability of the Pakhtoons of Afghanistan deciding in favour of remaining under the Pakistan flag cannot be dismissed. No wonder the Soviet Ambassador in Pakistan has been forced to assert that "it is illogical that a section of Pathans separated from Afghanistan by British colonialists 60 years ago, should be asked through a plebiscite whether they want to remain in Pakistan or join Afghanistan or form an independent state". He refers to Pakistan Foreign Minister's offer of a referendum as a joke. This is going back on the Afghan-Soviet communique signed by Mr. Khrushchev himself, after Pakistan had called the bluff!

## Book Review

THE HISTORY OF A SOVIET COLLECTIVE FARM by Fedor Belov. Published by A. Praeger, New York, Special Student Edition, 10 Cents.

This is an account of a Soviet collective farm in the Ukraine written by one who was a captain in the Russian army. After demobilisation and discharge, he drifted to his village and was appointed manager of its collective farm. He served in this capacity for nearly three years and maintained diaries of the day to day events on the farm. The account consequently has a vivid anecdotal character contributing to its life-likeness in an extraordinary degree.

Though formally he was an elected official on the farm, in practice he was regarded by the party apparatus in the village and district echelons as a limb of the party whose first loyalty was perforce to be to the Party and only secondarily to the villagers of the farm.

The book describes the routine of operations and management partly through meetings and partly through administrative directions. It describes the hard work of both men and women, the latter being mostly leaders of work brigades responsible for the heavy work in the fields.

The pervading atmosphere among the villagers is one of discontent with the collective farming system. They would prefer the old custom of individual holdings but they have to submit to the new order, willy nilly. They have no choice.

Their work is rendered all the more thankless when it is remembered that any over-fulfilment of the targets set for them in the various products of the farm—grains, meat, eggs, etc.—owing to lucky factors will bring demands for extra contributions to the State. Party officials send agents to collect extra quantities and managers have perforce to submit.

One such demand and pressure brings a conflict between the ex-captain manager and the district party. Captain Belov refuses to comply and sends lorries empty away—greatly daring. He is dismissed and re-posted to the army in East Germany. He escaped from there to the West and now lives in the USA.

The overall impression that the reader derives from this realistic account of the Russian Kolkhoz system is that the peasants do not have abundance in any sense. The economies of scale and mechanisation do not in fact lead to any striking increase in productivity. The peasants lead a stunted life eking out their collective farm wages with some extra production on the home plots, which they are reluctantly allowed. Women and children work on these home plots after their collective farm work. There is an air of over-strenuous work and exhaustion but poor compensation by way of return.

In fact so depressing is their lot that Captain Belov says that the only hope of the peasants for relief lies in foreign conquest! Even this hope has withered after the defeat of Hitler!

—M. A. Venkata Rao

## News Digest

### RETAIN ENGLISH

Hyderabad: Prof. N. K. Sidhanta, Vice-Chancellor of the Calcutta University said here that English should continue as the medium of instruction for higher education till the relevant literature was developed in the regional languages.

Delivering the valedictory address to the train-

ees of the Central Institute of English, Prof. Sidhanta said that if a change was brought about in the medium of instruction, education would remain extremely limited and the standard, for which once the country was very proud, would go down. We fully endorse the professor's view and could hope that educationists like him would persuade the Hindi fanatics not to attempt the replacement of English by Hindi which is the most backward language that modern India possesses.

### COMMUNIST INSTIGATIONS

The Indian press has failed to publish the Federal Government of Germany's findings on the Communist share in the anti-Semitic incidents. In a typical affair at a town near Hanover, two of the three arrested youths were proved to be members of East (Communist) German organisations, one of them a delegate to a summer Communist Youth Festival. The Government has shown that the Communists have been active in the instigation and perpetration of the incidents. But the Communists who obviously do not want to see an united Germany play up the incidents as a revival of Nazism.

### SOCIALISTS ON THE RETREAT

The British Labour Party made a retreat from doctrinaire socialism and adopted a compromise formula on selective nationalisation advocated by its leader, Mr. Hugh Gaitskell. Giving up the original 1918 Constitution which pledges the party to an economy based "on the common ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange," the Party has now accepted that "both public and private enterprises have a place in the economy." Though socialism has not been given up by the Party, it has considerably watered down the central socialist principle. In Germany, the Socialist Parties have almost given up socialism and have gone so far as to accept the market economy. But in India, we find Nehru offering socialism as the latest discovery in economic thought.

### THE ENDLESS STREAM

During the period February 6 to February 12, 1960, a total of 2,147 refugees from the so-called German Democratic Republic sought asylum in the Federal Republic of Germany.

### PEOPLE DEPRIVED OF FREEDOM C. R. INDICTS CONGRESS

Patna: Mr. C. Rajagopalachari told a public meeting here that the time had come when the "people must choose between freedom and slavery." They would have to make the choice in about one and a half year's time during the next general elections.

If they returned the Congress Party to power, Mr. Rajagopalachari said, they would have to submit to its tyranny for several years more and there won't be democracy in the country.

Mr. Rajagopalachari alleged that the Congress was out to deprive the people of their property, business, industry and freedom.

## Our Bangalore Letter

Mr. P. H. Seshagiri Rao, former Deputy Auditor General of India, addressed the study circle meeting of the Libertarian Social Institute, Bangalore on Friday 18-3-1960 on 'The truth about Inflation'. Mr. Philip Spratt, the President of the Institute presided.

Mr. Seshagiri Rao said that the Congress Party is misleading the public about the prices. Price is a function of supply and demand. The prices are going higher and higher every day because of various wrong policies of the Government. Inflation is the result of deficit financing which is followed by the Government of India in the name of financing the Five Year Plans. Inflation is a tax on all goods and services. If money is spent on productive goods it does not cause inflation. Both cost inflation and money inflation are making the prices to shoot up. The best remedy to reduce inflation is to reduce the supply of money. There will be inflation during the development period is not completely true. After the second world war, countries like Germany and Japan who had suffered a lot, have now developed their countries to such an extent that they are prepared to give loans to other countries. These countries maintained stability of prices during the development period. Mr. Seshagiri Rao in the end suggested the following as a remedy for the inflation. The Khadi board and National Extension Services should be abolished. The administrative cost must be reduced. He quoted some statistics that how the administrative cost of the Government was going high after the 2nd world war; the total number of employees in the Government of India from assistant to under-secretary was 590 in 1939. At the end of the war it rose to 2000, Today their number is more than 7000. There are 550 under-secretaries now. In 1939 there were only 20. In the Central Secretariat at present there are 40 secretaries or officers of that rank. 30 additional secretaries, 135 joint secretaries and nearly 350 deputy secretaries. Five Central Ministries are now, each one of them, bigger than the entire Government organisation twenty years ago. The Third Plan is expected to increase the number of Central Government employees to at least twice the present strength.

### THE SWATANTRA PARTY CONVENTION AT PATNA

19-20 March 1960

By V. R.

The Swatantra Party's Convention held in Patna on the 19th and 20th March attained a success beyond the hopes of its leaders. The open session was attended by a vast gathering variously estimated from half to over a lakh of people. A vast shamiana seating 1500 persons was erected

for the subject committee meetings of delegates. Nearly a thousand delegates from most States of the Union had come to the historic session formally inaugurating the party with a constitution, flag and first leadership.

The Central Council of the party met a day earlier and got resolutions for the plenary session ready. The General Secretary, Mr. Masani, read his report of the position of the party up-to-date which was approved.

According to him, the membership stood on the day at 3,35,000. The annual membership fee was eight annas. Members sought to reduce it to four annas but the present rate was approved for the rest of the year when the matter could be reconsidered. It was felt that half a rupee would help to accumulate more funds which would lessen the dependence of the party on donations.

The party had the largest number reaching a lakh of persons in Madras State, Mr. Rajagopalachari's home province. Mr. C. R. had, assiduously and indefatigably toured every district and town of Madras in the last few months and everywhere he received enthusiastic response to the new party.

Just before going to the Patna Convention, he toured the principal cities of the Andhra State in company with the president of the party, Prof. Ranga, where the experience of Tamil Nad was repeated.

Rajaji halted a day at Calcutta where he delivered a campaign speech under the auspices of The Institute of Social and Political Studies of which Mr. K. K. Sinha is the Director. Mr. N. C. Chatterji, former President of The Hindu Mahasabha, former Judge of the Calcutta High Court and now advocate of the Supreme Court at Delhi, presided over Rajaji's speech.

By the bye, Mr. Chatterji had just joined the Swatantra Party in spite of his Mahasabha background and antecedents and had been elected president of the Calcutta (West Bengal) branch of the Party. The Swatantra Party is thus drawing recruits from all regions of the nation's political life. Many new members are ex-Congressmen who had left it in despair.

In the Punjab, many Akalies are joining the Swatantra party in the hope that it would support them in their demand for their Punjabi (or Sikh) Suba.

Mr. Modi, former Governor of Bihar under the Congress and a prominent Bombay Parsi personage, joined the party last August. But he had stood on Ram Raja Parishad in Rajasthan in the last elections to the surprise of everybody.

The Constitution with its district Councils and organising committees was passed and gave the party a definite working apparatus and line of responsibility.

A five petalled star on a blue background was adopted for the Party Flag.

Prof. Ranga continues as President of the party. Rajaji will be as heretofore the Founder-Leader like Mahatma Gandhi to the old Congress, a sort of

super leader.

Mr. Modi, Raja Bahadur of Ramgarh and Mr. V. P. Menon are Vice-Presidents and Mr. Masani, the General Secretary.

Rajaji used a number of analogies and pithy bon mots in his speeches at Calcutta and at Patna in his inaugural address which are worth remembering.

In Calcutta, he said that while communism was his enemy number One, the Congress was his enemy number Two!

Congress was like the mother who neglected feeding the baby but was preoccupied with her own make-up! This is to indicate that the Congress was so absorbed in battenning on the people and the fat of the land while neglecting its duty of serving them.

As for the PSP, Socialist and Communist parties, he said that they were not true opposition parties. They are more satellites of the Congress with the same ideology—viz: socialist pattern of society.

He also called them ginger groups of Congress, making it go faster in the same wrong direction that Congress was already going!

C. R. A pointed to the abnormal fear that the people entertained towards the Congress Government, which was not healthy.

To those who wanted to wait until the party became a good opposition party, before deciding to join, he said that it was like saying that they would join after the party reaches its goal!

The present situation when everybody is flattering the Congress leaders and Government out of fear and expectation of patronage is unhealthy. He wanted an opposition to remove this fear from the people. Brakes are wanted as well as engines for a car. Therefore as a friend without fear, he had come to criticise the Prime Minister. It is only opposition that can keep Nehru from going wrong.

Rajaji said that the Government was mismanaging everything. He opposed ceilings on land holdings, though some of the delegates argued that it would enable greater distribution of land among the poor and bring popularity.

Finally, Rajaji said that his party wanted to enthrone dharma in the capital, New Delhi.

As at Gaya in Bihar, the Congress started its policy of non-cooperation against the British, now in Bihar, he was inaugurating a movement for the attainment of freedom by the individual from the Congress Government which was abridging and stifling it day by day. Rajaji expressed gratified surprise that the response to his effort was so great in such a short time of six months.

Mr. Masani also declared that the people of wealth were afraid of joining the party for fear of displeasing the ruling party but that such fear was exaggerated. He said that the bulk of the membership consisted of rural land holders. This is a doubtful statement as the agricultural associations that have figured in current pre-Nagpur agitation are run only by a handful, the bulk being passive observers. It is the cities that have swelled

the ranks of the party, mostly professional men, businessmen, lawyers and ex-administrators. But the elements that have joined are certainly the cream of the politically conscious intelligentsia and will attract larger numbers as election time approaches.

There is reason to think that the Swatantra party programme and its leaders speak for the bulk of Congressmen themselves though for tactical and personal reasons they prefer to stand behind Nehru. Socialism has meant in actual practice the monopoly of all power and patronage to Congressmen and their supporters in Government and society. The great middle classes are suffering from rising prices and unemployment. They are also hit by the all-pervading corruption in the administration in all its branches.

Mr. C. R. moved the principal resolution which was seconded by Mr. K. M. Munshi, one of the Vice-Presidents.

Mr. Rajaji had said that Communism was ruling the country through Congress just now, for, all Congress policies are communist in spirit, implication and drive.

Mr. Munshi dwelt on this theme impressively. He said in trenchant terms that the ruling party was inspired by totalitarian ideology! It was, he continued, materialistic, totalitarian and anti-Indian! The common man has been the first victim of the policies of the ruling party. He is faced with a perpetual food crisis.

To this misery must be added the ever rising level of prices of all consumer goods. Cloth, housing etc. were all subject to stringency. Illiteracy persists in spite of the slogans of socialism.

The Government have committed the country to the wrong form of planning which is copied from communist countries. Democratic planning which is more in consonance with the freedom of the people is jettisoned without discussion of its merits. The urge of self-expression and incentives are denied opportunity.

The Planning Commission is circumventing parliamentary procedure. The party therefore called for the ending of the institution and the close of the practice of Five Year Plans.

Mr. Munshi is a staunch advocate of Indian culture and believer in the genius of our race. He said that he left Congress because Congress left democracy!

He believed in the principle of prosperity through freedom, the slogan that was accepted by the party in expanding its twenty-one principles.

The Raja of Ramgarh who has switched over to the new party was the Chairman of the Reception Committee. He gave expression to sentiments of despair at the behaviour of the Congress and Government while asking for support to the Swatantra party. He said that the country was today groaning under the rule of the white caps and the bureaucracy.

He said that the Congress was trying to impose socialism on the unwilling country. It is destroying

industry and enterprise. For fighting communism, it was determined to put an end to capitalism despite the fact that Government had not adequate resources to develop the country.

It was hitting the middle classes very hard. It was trying to perpetuate one party rule.

A film actor, Mr. Prem Nath, criticised the censorship of Government over films. He wanted freedom of expression to films like the press freedom. He said the proposed tax on exposed film would ruin the small producers.

It is impossible to indicate the spirit and quality of the speakers by bold summaries of their speeches. It was clear to observers and participants in the Convention at Patna that the party has established itself securely and that its management was in sure hands. It gave expression to the discontent widely felt all over the country about the administration of the Congress Government and offered a clear alternative by way of policy and no doubt by way of personnel, with its large body of experienced administrators and politicians.

Mr. Modi summed up the proceedings and gave the concluding speech. Adapting Lincoln's definition of democracy, he said that the Congress was a government of the people, for the leaders and by the leaders!"

The resolution on defence called for a rally of South Asian nations for defence against China. It also expressed sympathy with Tibet in her distress and condemned the Chinese for destroying her religion.

The suggestion of a delegate that the power of recall should be vested in the electors was not approved by the Convention. Mr. Munshi showed the disadvantages of the proposal in importing instability in the working of democracy.

The Convention issued an enlarged statement of its principles under the title—Prosperity through Freedom. This is a testament of private enterprise and freedom in every walk of life, which is sure to evoke much beneficent discussion on the fundamentals of a free society.

Rajaji recommended Swarajya to workers for information on the ideology of the party. We might add the names of The Indian Libertarian, Bombay, and Freeman of Irvington-on-Hudson, New York, for instructive discussions and debates on free economy and free society.

## Letter to the Editor

Dear Madam,

The articles by Albert Morgan, pp. 10-11, in the Indian Libertarian, January 15, 1960, touches on very important aspects of approach to economics as distinct from finance.

The chief impression is its emphasis on distinguishing 'values'. However it does not satisfactorily define wealth, value, utility, culture, or labour. It claims that "Wealth involves the idea of value".

One definition of wealth from thirty years ago, is that "Wealth is that part of natural resources for which man has found a need." In the same set of definitions: "Natural resources are gifts for the needs of man in the development of his capacity." So it follows: "Utility is the capacity of wealth to satisfy the needs of man" and that "Goods are the forms of wealth that have utility." To reconcile these approaches, it proposed a definition of 'value': "Value is the eligibility for credit in the processes of fair exchange." It was said: "Services are the processes by which goods are put into the use of man." The elements of Fair Exchange were given as: "Natural Resources: Wealth: Utility: Goods: Services: Valuation: Exchange." Even for "plus and minus values" the exchange of service for service, implies labour to abate nuisance. Given 'inspiration' as the birth of ideas, they too, are gifts. Planning is a service, application is human effort, or labour. Cultural satisfaction postulates 'fair exchange', rather than exploit. From the foregoing proposed definitions, there crystallised in May 1932, a four-fold symbolism for 'money' as a group of ideas.

Seeking relationships of basic, standard, and effective wages, brought into perspective, the four-fold recognition by economists of: Standard, measure, medium, and store: without satisfying distinction through defined units-of-account. It is now possible, and feasible, to say that the Standard of VALUE, is 'fair exchange' among free and equal people; and this can be made to satisfy religious-economic aspirations, when it is acknowledged that

evidence can be advanced to show consistency of economic law in fair exchange, with the law of brotherhood in equal love of neighbour; The measure of COST, is seen to be in terms of labourtime; without which in some form of human effort, no needs of man can be filled; The Medium of Exchange, becomes price as worth to sustain living-time, without which no labourtime can be applied;

The store of wealth, is recognized as surplus output from labour applied to natural resources; from which profit accrues in forms that will sustain leisuretime, and new-divisions of labour.

The important inference from this survey of economic realities and root causes is that standard of value, cost-in-labour, price in worth to sustain living and profit of the earth for all, are fundamentally different ideas related to population, division of labour, and efficiency of human industry. Therefore, to solve the problems of fair exchange at home and reciprocal trade abroad, it becomes necessary to face the reconstruction of the whole economic structure, to bring book-keeping honestly into line with the movements underlying supply (by relatively few) and demand (by all the people); diminishing returns from varied output of labour in different divisions of labour; and disutility of unwanted surplus. It is possible to symbolise this fourfold approach to human relationships, in terms that represent human and natural time-scales.

Victoria,  
Australia.

—L. G. De Garis

## 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